

DECEMBER, 1936



THE

COMMUNIST

Results of the 1936 Elections

The Communist Party on the Results of the Elections

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

•

The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Victory C. A. HATHAWAY

•

The Wisconsin Elections GENE DENNIS

•

The Elections in New York I. AMTER

OTHER ARTICLES

Specific Features of the Spanish Revolution M. ERCOLI

•

The Crisis in the Socialist Party (Article 3) WM. Z. FOSTER

•

Review of the Month A. B.

•

Index of articles published in "The Communist" in 1936

20
CENTS

DECEMBER, 1936



THE

COMMUNIST

Results of the 1936 Elections

The Communist Party on the Results of the Elections

STATEMENT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

•

The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Victory C. A. HATHAWAY

•

The Wisconsin Elections GENE DENNIS

•

The Elections in New York I. AMTER

OTHER ARTICLES

Specific Features of the Spanish Revolution M. ERCOLI

•

The Crisis in the Socialist Party (Article 3) WM. Z. FOSTER

•

Review of the Month A. B.

•

Index of articles published in "The Communist" in 1936

20
CENTS

NEW BOOKS

On the  **INTERNATIONAL** Scene

U.S.A.

WAR OUR HERITAGE

JOSEPH P. LASH *and* JAMES A. WECHSLER

The moods and aims of American youth in the quest for peace—the deep-seated anti-war sentiment and activity in the universities today—by two of the outstanding leaders of the student movement.

With an introduction by Bruce Bliven and drawings by Redfield. *Special paper edition 50c*

Great Britain

REVOLT ON THE CLYDE

WILLIAM GALLACHER

The autobiography of a Communist Member of Parliament—struggles of the British labor movement since the World War—intimate snapshots of prominent British political figures like Ramsay MacDonald, Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, etc.

With photographs, etc., \$2.50

China

LANDLORD AND PEASANT IN CHINA

CHEN HAN-SENG

A study of the agrarian crisis in South China. With an introduction by Frederick V. Field, of the Institute of Pacific Relations. *\$2.00*

Soviet Union

SOVIET UNION AND THE CAUSE OF PEACE

Important declarations on the peace policy of the Soviet Union from the famous "Decree on Peace" of November, 1917, to the present time. *Paper, 30c*

Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

THE

COMMUNIST

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of
Marxism-Leninism



PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Vol. XV

DECEMBER, 1936

No. 12

CONTENTS

REVIEW OF THE MONTH	1091
By A. B.	
THE COMMUNIST PARTY ON THE RESULTS OF THE ELEC- TIONS	1104
<i>(Statement of the Central Committee, C.P.U.S.A., issued November 7, 1936)</i>	
THE MINNESOTA FARMER-LABOR VICTORY	1112
By CLARENCE A. HATHAWAY	
THE WISCONSIN ELECTIONS AND THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY MOVEMENT	1125
By GENE DENNIS	
THE ELECTIONS IN NEW YORK	1141
By I. AMTER	
THE CRISIS IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY	1154
By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	
SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION	1168
By M. ERCOLI	
INDEX—VOLUME XV—1936	1181

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates \$2 a year; \$1 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20c.

Two Important New Pamphlets

THE CRISIS IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

5 cents

A big, 72-page pamphlet at a special price to ensure a wide distribution.

Analyzes the past history and present situation in the Socialist Party. Reviews the development of the working class parties in the United States. Evaluates in clear, forceful style the course traveled by the Socialist Party in contrast with that of the Communist Party up to the present day. Special efforts must be made to bring it to all Socialists.

HOW THE SOVIET UNION HELPS SPAIN

By HARRY GANNES

5 cents

A vital and timely pamphlet. Shows how the U.S.S.R. is rallying the peace forces of the world to the defense of the heroic people of Spain who are defending their country and their liberty against the fascists within and without. Order immediately!

(The new catalogue of the Workers Library Publishers is now off the press. Send for your copy.)

Order from your bookshop or from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

Review of the Month

Labor Drives Forward—The Strategy of Big Capital—Entering a Higher Stage of Class Struggle—Landon's Defeat, the Two-Party System and the Farmer-Labor Movement—Thomas Looks Backward—Labor's Non-Partisan League and the New Political Realignment—A Program of Struggle for Legislative Demands—Shall It Be Old Style Lobbying or Independent Action?—For a Farmer-Labor Bloc in Congress—Next Steps in the Fight for the People's Front—The Tampa Convention and Trade Union Unity—An Appendix to the Liberal Bourgeoisie or a People's Front Government—It Is a Race Between the New Deal and the Farmer-Labor Forces—Problems of Agitation and Organization—The Communist Party's Face Before the Masses.

CONFIDENCE in its own strength and a determination to use it, these are the things that characterize the mood of American labor today. These are also the things that nurture its class consciousness. Out of such moods can and will arise a politically independent labor movement and working class. Out of this mood of confidence and urge to advance will come a powerful and united American Federation of Labor built on industrial unionism and a mighty Farmer-Labor Party that will in time become the government of the United States.

Labor and its allies are in a mood to go forward. It is the task of the leaders of labor to crystallize this mood into organized and effective action.

In the industries we see labor driving forward to organization and union recognition. Higher wages and shorter hours are the chief immediate objectives. Big capital is trying to check labor's drive. According to the scheme of the Steel Trust, the workers of the steel industry would get a wage increase of 10 per cent provided they agree to tie down their wage levels to the fluctuations in the cost of living. This the steel workers have correctly characterized as freezing wages to a subsistence level, and as a surrender of the workers' right to fight for and secure *a higher standard of living*.

But this is not all of the strategy of big capital. The Steel Trust also seeks to utilize the 10 per cent wage increase in order to tie the workers down to the company unions. For the first time in the history of company unionism in steel, Morgan & Co. have become very liberal and are willing to sign a contract with their company

unions covering not one plant but many. The idea is to legalize and perpetuate the company union, a sort of modified company union, as the workers' agency for collective bargaining in steel.

In other words, for the offered 10 per cent wage increase the Steel Trust wants a freezing of wages to subsistence levels and legalization of company unions. Nothing more nor less. But the steel workers, also those in the company unions, understand the game of the Steel Trust and show little inclination to fall for it. John L. Lewis and the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee have branded the Steel Trust's strategy as another "yellow dog contract". And the spokesmen of the Carnegie-Illinois company unions have expressed themselves substantially in the same way. They said they would accept the offered wage increase but without the "yellow dog". They will accept the present wage increase and will organize to fight for more.

This is the spirit of American labor today. It arises from the new sense of confidence in its own strength that came with the elections.

Steel does not stand alone. In the forefront today march the maritime workers. The splendid traditions of the 1934 strike on the Pacific Coast are alive. And in addition there is stronger organization and a higher degree of solidarity not alone on the Pacific but also in the Atlantic and Gulf ports. Next come the textile workers and their union—the United Textile Workers—preparing for an organizing drive, including the South, and for a struggle to secure higher wages and better working conditions. And the garment trades, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Organizing and wage movements are unfolding in the auto industry. Railroad labor is preparing to battle for the 30-hour week. In all industries labor is standing up, ready to organize and defend its rights.

This forward march of labor is taking place not only in the industries but also on the political arena. In fact, both go hand in hand. Never before in the history of the American labor movement of the last fifty years have the economic and political demands of the masses been so closely connected and their struggles for both so closely related. It is a higher stage of the class struggle that we are entering. It is a stage of class struggle where the political movements of labor will begin to serve directly its daily economic needs and demands, and where its economic struggles will directly feed and strengthen its political struggles. Here is where the millions will begin to learn the truth of the Leninist proposition that "politics is concentrated economics". And when the millions have learned that, they will have learned also the need of Soviet power and socialism.

What is taking place now on the political arena is that labor *as labor* is formulating its political demands, its legislative program, in preparation for the January session of Congress. The American Federation of Labor, Labor's Non-Partisan League, the miners, textile workers, the garment and the railroad workers, each and all, are preparing to present legislative demands covering minimum wages, hours, working conditions, collective bargaining, social security, etc.

In this political activity there are only *the bare beginnings* of independent *class* political action. There is still too much of the narrow trade union politics and of the old lobbying "non-partisan" sort of political action. But the significant thing is that labor as a class has begun to move away from this sort of politics, that it is moving in the direction of true independent working class political action. He who does not see that, sees nothing in present-day American life.

Intensified political activity is not confined to labor alone. The Negro masses have become conscious of their political power to a large degree. And they are going to assert it ever more effectively. The toiling farmers are also preparing their legislative demands. And so are the youth, large sections of women and the middle classes.

Labor and its allies are on the march. They are preparing to make sure that their election mandate is realized. They are seriously undertaking the work of strengthening their positions, economically and politically. They are moving in great masses in the direction of the People's Front, in the direction of a Farmer-Labor Party.

These are today the moods, attitudes and trends among the working population of the United States.

* * *

LABOR'S growing confidence in its own strength is of course closely connected with the outcome of the election struggle. By defeating Landon, labor and its allies have given reaction a hard blow. The overwhelming defeat of Landon, the man whom Hearst picked, and the resounding smack received by Coughlin and Lemke—these results have been brought about largely by the *organized* political efforts of labor and its allies. Efforts which, though uneven as regards various states and cities, on the whole carried a certain measure of independence from the old parties.

Speaking on the results of the elections, the Central Committee of the Communist Party said:

"The overwhelming vote for Roosevelt was primarily due to the extraordinary activities of new forces, of new movements, representing the broad masses of the people—workers, farmers, Negroes, and middle class groups." (See page 1104 of this issue.)

Labor and its allies know that. They know that it is they who defeated Landon and who made possible Roosevelt's overwhelming vote. Hence they expect and demand results. Hence they feel confident in their strength to bring about results.

Not to see that is to fail to see one of the most important sides of the outcome of the elections. Yet Norman Thomas manages not to see this side of the outcome of the elections. All he sees is this:

"The outstanding facts are the immense personal political strength of Roosevelt and the equally great devotion of the American public to the two-party system when it comes to voting." (*Socialist Call*, November 14, 1936.)

No one will deny, or be justified in overlooking, the political strength of President Roosevelt. Nor will it be correct to ignore the fact that the major struggles of the elections revolved around the two major parties of the capitalist class. The fact is that the people re-elected Roosevelt, the candidate and leader of a capitalist party. They did not elect nor did they vote in large number for Browder or Thomas. And the additional fact—which is even more important for the moment—that there was no Farmer-Labor presidential candidate in these elections, something for which we worked very hard up to the last moment.

But to see this *alone*, as Norman Thomas does, is to see the election results very much one-sidedly. Which means seeing them not at all. The masses voted for Roosevelt. Yet, while doing so, large numbers of them were already supporting Farmer-Labor Parties and formations, and even large numbers were looking *through* the election campaign *toward* a Farmer-Labor Party. The two-party system still played a major part in the elections. Yet this is the thing—that the masses are moving away from and not towards it. And even those considerable masses of toilers who voted for Roosevelt without any other perspectives in mind, even those had a very definite mandate in mind that they expect Roosevelt to realize and will be ready to organize and fight independently to bring about this realization. In fact, this is already beginning to happen.

The statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party on the election results says that:

"The masses of the people still expressed their discontent and their fear of fascism, their demands for constructive social legislative measures and for a higher standard of living within the framework of the two-party system." (See page 1104 of this issue.)

Yet they did it in a *new way*. And this is the other side which is of decisive importance.

"On a national scale this was expressed by the increased activities

of the trade unions, particularly of the C.I.O. and of Labor's Non-Partisan League, by the farm organizations and by the bolt of the progressives from the Republican Party. On a state scale it was expressed by such movements as the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party, the Wisconsin Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, the American Labor Party in New York, the Commonwealth Federation in Washington, the California EPIC movement and many others—movements that in no sense were identical with the Democratic machine but which set as their objective the defeat of the Hearst-Liberty League combination backing Landon and Knox." (*Ibid.*)

In other words, it is *the new political realignment*, the coming together of the Farmer-Labor progressive forces on the political field moving in the direction of independent action, that has made possible the overwhelming defeat of Landon. And it is this political realignment that is becoming conscious of its strength and historic mission as a result of Landon's defeat.

That is why the Communist Party statement finds it possible to say that:

"Despite the return to power of Roosevelt and his middle-of-the-way policy, and the presence within the Democratic Party of powerful reactionary groups, the forces advocating democracy scored a victory which is a setback to the Hearst-Liberty League-Wall Street drive toward fascism and to all extreme reactionaries." (*Ibid.*)

But Norman Thomas can only see the two-party system. He sees it not in the process of break-up, which this election has tremendously accelerated, but as static, as *the* thing. No wonder he sounds so pessimistic and precisely at a time when the toiling masses are exhibiting unprecedented optimism and confidence in their ability to march forward.

This optimism and confidence of the masses in their strength are no surface phenomena. They are the outward manifestations of a deep process which the Communist Party characterizes as follows:

"The awakening of the masses of the people, the role they are playing in the destiny of the nation, their fight for better conditions and more democratic rights, show that the tradition of Farmer-Labor democracy in the United States is being reborn. This people's democracy which backed Jefferson, Jackson and the Populist movements of the 90's is being revived. *It is coming to life in a different setting and in a more advanced form to protect the American people, their liberties and their standards of living, from the rule of decaying reactionary capitalism and its worst products—fascism and war.* The union of workers and farmers is coming to life today *not as a silent partner of the capitalist politicians which was its role in the past.* It is emerging now as an independent force, led by labor, and increasingly conscious of its role as a barrier to reaction, fascism and war." (*Ibid.* Emphasis mine—A.B.)

What are the immediate plans of Labor's Non-Partisan League for the further promotion of the Farmer-Labor political realignment? The joint statement issued by Lewis, Hillman and Berry on the immediate plans and perspectives of the League is far from satisfactory. The statement announces that the League will set up a national and state legislative committees to work for the enactment of labor and progressive legislation. And in general it expresses adherence "to the proposition of thoroughly organizing the workers and their friends of the liberal movement of America so that we can be in a position to adjust ourselves intelligently and effectively to any political realignment that occurs".

There are several points that are not satisfactory in this statement. First, about the *character* of the legislative plans of the League. In this connection the following practical questions arise.

Who will formulate labor's legislative program? In what practical way and through what organizational medium is labor going to collaborate with the toiling farmers, the Negro people, the youth, the middle classes, the women—collaborate in formulating and presenting to Congress a common legislative program? In what way and by what methods will labor and its allies press Congress and the President to enact this legislative program?

These are immediate and burning questions. And they have to be answered satisfactorily if labor is to proceed successfully with the struggle for social legislation. The statement of Labor's Non-Partisan League is rather vague on these questions. It is therefore necessary to introduce clarity into the matter and for this purpose the Communist Party has advanced a number of practical propositions.

1. Labor's legislative program shall be formulated and adopted at a national conference to be held in Washington, D. C. This conference shall consist of representatives of labor, toiling farmers, Negroes, youth, women and middle classes. It shall formulate a program of legislation that will meet the immediate political demands of all these groups and shall present this program to the next session of Congress in the name of the conference and be backed by the organized forces represented in the conference.

2. This conference shall undertake to sponsor the organization of a Farmer-Labor progressive bloc in Congress. The organization of a bloc that will fight for the legislative program of the conference in an organized and disciplined way and that will collaborate with and feel its responsibility to the conference.

3. Similar representative conferences shall be encouraged and set up in states and localities to promote state legislation, to back the national program and to develop their activities in the direction of a Farmer-Labor Party. In states and localities where Farmer-

Labor or Labor Parties are already in existence, the task should be to strengthen and broaden these parties as effective political instruments of labor and its allies in those localities.

This is a practical program. It is suggested by the Communist Party as the most effective way of fighting for labor and progressive legislation in the present most favorable situation. It is also presented as the next step in the promotion of the political realignment toward a national Farmer-Labor Party. It is, in addition, the only way of preparing properly for many important local elections in 1937 and above all for the Congressional elections of 1938.

In the light of these practical proposals, it will be seen at once that the method of action announced by Labor's Non-Partisan League is in many respects archaic and obsolete. This method looks too much like the old time lobbying in the Gompers tradition of "non-partisanship". Futile and bankrupt is the name for such methods. Labor and its allies are now in a position—yes, they are now strong enough—to unite and organize their forces for a common legislative program. They are strong enough and conscious enough to bring to life a Farmer-Labor progressive bloc in Congress that will honestly and consistently fight for their program and that will feel responsible to the legislative conference of labor, farmers and progressives.

The old-time lobbying by individuals and conflicting groups of labor, toiling farmers, Negroes and other progressive forces is discredited and dead. Labor is not interested in reviving it. For Labor's Non-Partisan League to revert back to this bankrupt method would be taking a step backward even from its own position in the election campaign.

This is first and immediate—the independent and united struggle for a Farmer-Labor progressive legislative program.

Second, on the perspectives and direction of the Farmer-Labor realignment. On this the statement of Labor's Non-Partisan League says that they will seek to organize thoroughly the workers and their liberal friends "so that we can be in a position to adjust ourselves intelligently and effectively to any political realignment that occurs". In this there is something that is good and something that is not so good. What is good is the pledge to organize thoroughly the workers and their friends of the liberal movement of America. The question is: organize into what? We propose to organize them at once into the national and state legislative conferences and to bring about a Farmer-Labor progressive bloc in Congress. If this is done, then the pledge to organize will mean something progressive. Otherwise it may lead to a reversion to old-time lobbying.

As to getting into a position "to adjust ourselves intelligently and

effectively to any political realignment that occurs"—this is vague at best, at worst it may be dangerous. On the whole it is altogether too passive an attitude and positively out of tune with the mood of the masses in the industries and elsewhere. Especially disturbing are the remarks of George L. Berry (if correctly reported) "that he felt that in four years there would be a realignment of political forces into two parties, one liberal and the other conservative, and that the League would be on the liberal side". (*The New York Times*, November 12.)

Is labor going to wait for four years to see what happens and then passively line up? And line up with whom—with a liberal capitalist party as against the conservatives? No, Brother Berry, this is not at all what progressive labor and its allies propose to do. Just ask by referendum the membership of the unions that are affiliated to Labor's Non-Partisan League and you will find out soon enough that they have altogether different plans. The plans of progressive labor, as well as of the progressive farmers, Negroes and all toilers, call for the immediate building up of the independent political power of the Farmer-Labor democracy of this country. These plans call for an effective struggle for a legislative program in a new and independent way, not by way of the old lobbying. These plans call for an independent fight in the forthcoming municipal elections in the important localities and immediate preparations for the Congressional elections of 1938. They call for a steady promotion of the *already* crystallizing realignment in the direction of a national Farmer-Labor Party.

Progressive labor and its allies want to be practical. The question is: practical for what? And the answer is: practical for the building of the People's Front, the Farmer-Labor Party and *not* for the building up of a Farmer-Labor appendix, a silent partner, to liberal capitalist politicians.

* * *

CERTAINLY, the road to the national Farmer-Labor Party is not going to be smooth sailing and always along a straight line. That, however, must not obscure the more important facts for the moment. And these more important facts are:

First, that now is the opportune moment for a decisive advance, on the broadest scale, *in the direction* of the national Farmer-Labor Party. Second, that the concrete, practical and immediate steps for such an advance are clearly visible.

In the foregoing we have tried to lay the basis for these conclusions. The Farmer-Labor democracy of this country is on the march. The class forces that go into the making of the People's

Front, the Farmer-Labor Party, are moving—of this there can be not the slightest doubt. Nor can there be any doubt as to the direction in which they are moving. They are breaking with the traditions of the two-party system and are going toward a Farmer-Labor Party. And most important in this general movement of the masses is the fact that *labor*, organized labor, is growing conscious of its leading mission in the People's Front.

This is a most favorable situation for a broad advance towards the national Farmer-Labor Party. It is in fact the opening of a new period in the life of the American people. Let us make sure that this great opportunity is not missed. Let us make sure that organized labor does not overlook its truly big chance the way it missed a number of smaller chances for advancement during the last election struggle.

With this general perspective clearly and definitely before us, it is not difficult at all to decide upon an immediate practical course of action. The elements of this course we have tried to outline in the foregoing. We can restate them briefly. A concerted and organized drive for Farmer-Labor progressive legislation by the setting up of national and state Farmer-Labor progressive conferences. The building up of a responsible Farmer-Labor progressive bloc in Congress in close collaboration with these conferences. Intensive preparation in the same independent way for the forthcoming municipal elections and for the Congressional elections of 1938. And the systematic building up, in the course of the above activities, of state and local Farmer-Labor Parties.

Of course, basic to the whole question are the unity and solidarity of organized labor, the building up of a united and powerful American Federation of Labor resting upon industrial unionism. At this writing the menace of a split in the A. F. of L. looms great. On the eve of the opening of the Tampa convention, the voices of the reactionaries calling for the expulsion of the C.I.O. unions are becoming loud and insistent. Even William Green, who for a while was speaking as though he favored conciliation, has again begun to echo the split demands of the Freys and Hutchesons.

The outlook would be dark indeed if the Freys and Hutchesons were today the true spokesmen of labor's wishes. Fortunately it is not so at all. Labor did not follow Hutcheson in the election campaign. Labor has demonstrated through resolutions of its unions and in many other ways that it wants unity and is determined to have it. Labor, we are certain, will not allow the Freys and Hutchesons to split the A. F. of L. and thus to injure the bright prospects for advancement and progress that lie before the working class and its allies. The Freys and Hutchesons and William Green, if he chooses

to side with them, can create temporary difficulties if they prove to be in control of two-thirds of the Tampa convention. But the progressive forces are immeasurably stronger among the rank and file of the unions as well as among the unorganized. If these forces stand firmly by the principles of trade union unity—fighting against all split maneuvers the reactionaries may succeed in putting through the Tampa convention—and arouse the unions and the workers generally for the maintenance of the unity of the American Federation of Labor, at the same time intensifying the work of the organization of the unorganized in steel and the other mass production industries and leading the workers' advance towards the betterment of conditions—if all this is done as advocated by the Communist Party, the unity of organized labor will be preserved and a truly powerful, united American Federation of Labor resting upon industrial unionism will emerge as a result.

* * *

HESITATION to proceed along the correct road towards the national Farmer-Labor Party undoubtedly exists among certain leading elements in Labor's Non-Partisan League. This hesitation must be overcome. But this will not be accomplished by the peculiar, to say the least, criticisms of Norman Thomas. On the contrary, such criticisms will hurt rather than help the cause of the Farmer-Labor Party.

Thomas regrets that he cannot share our view "that a desirable Farmer-Labor Party on a nationwide scale is practically inevitable". (*Socialist Call*, November 14, 1936.) He believes, on the contrary, that "the personal strength of Roosevelt and the acceptance of the two-party system likely mean that until the next crisis knocks at our door, Roosevelt, with a man like Governor Earle of Pennsylvania as a probable successor, can maintain the Democratic Party as spokesman of those whom Lincoln called 'the common people'". (*Ibid.*)

In saying this, Thomas is carrying over into the post-election situation some of the errors and fallacies of the fundamentally wrong political line that the Socialist Party followed during the elections. And that is bad. The sooner this line is abandoned, and a thorough clean-up of Trotskyite influence in the Socialist Party is carried out, the better for the Socialist Party and for the labor movement.

The trouble with Thomas' position is that it seeks a Farmer-Labor Party that would be a Socialist Party in everything but the name. This looks very "Left" but in reality is merely reformist opportunism. If he had a correct conception of a Socialist Party, namely as a *revolutionary party* that stands for the proletarian revolution, Soviet power and socialism, and if the masses of this country were

today ready to join and follow such a party into the revolutionary struggle for socialism clearly, there would be no need then of a Farmer-Labor Party. Moreover, the entire situation in the country, and internationally, would be different, radically different. Instead of the American people facing the task of checking the advance of fascism, they would be preparing to follow the revolutionary Socialist Party (which is the Communist Party) into the carrying out of the socialist revolution. The whole world would look different.

It is precisely because the American people are not yet ready for that course of action, and capitalism there continues, that the menace of fascism and war is today actual and acute. That is why a Farmer-Labor Party is *necessary*. That is why it is also *possible*, more possible now than for a long time. This is different from the mechanical "inevitable" which Thomas ascribes to us. The Farmer-Labor Party does not become inevitable by itself. *We can make it so*, if all progressive forces join hands in promoting it and building it.

Are Thomas and the Socialist Party ready to join in and help do the job? That is the question which the Socialist Party has to answer.

Certainly, the march to the national Farmer-Labor Party will not be smooth and always in a straight line. It hasn't been so thus far, yet we have moved forward though various *detours* had to be made. That President Roosevelt will try to tie labor and the farmers to his apron strings, at least for a while, is not only likely but reasonably certain. It is equally certain that President Roosevelt and the New Deal group in the Democratic Party will seek to maneuver in such a way as to impede the march of the masses to the national Farmer-Labor Party. It was precisely because the Communist Party clearly saw this angle of the New Deal (as well as all the others) that it adopted the election policy that it did and carried it out successfully, as events have already demonstrated.

Events have already shown that the re-election of Roosevelt has not strengthened but *weakened* the two-party system of the bourgeoisie. No doubt, finance capital will attempt to repair it. Roosevelt himself, as already indicated, will try to keep the emerging Farmer-Labor democracy as his silent partner. Will he succeed? That depends largely upon progressive labor and its allies. In other words, *we are now in a race*. It is a race between progressive labor and its allies, on the one hand, and Roosevelt with the New Deal, on the other. If progressive labor and its allies win, the result will be a national Farmer-Labor Party, collaborating with and eventually absorbing all the truly progressive forces now and formerly in the Democratic and Republican Parties. The result will be a People's Front government in the United States. If, on the other hand, the race is won by Roosevelt and the New Deal, labor and its allies will,

at best, have the questionable comfort of serving as an appendix or silent partner to capitalist politicians and a capitalist party. The result for labor and its allies—for the American people—will then be not progress but regress from the present position. The barrier against fascism and war will not be erected.

We repeat: it is a race. And its outcome depends upon the consciousness and independent activity of labor and its allies.

* * *

THE Communist Party works in this race for the victory of labor and its allies, for the national Farmer-Labor Party. This was the aim the Communist Party pursued in the elections. It continues on this road only under immeasurably more favorable conditions and with much brighter perspectives.

We do not say, as Thomas does, that we “will want to watch out not to be sold down the river by too great trust in everything that calls itself a Farmer-Labor Party”. We say, on the contrary, that we will continue to work with even greater intensity among the broad and rising Farmer-Labor democracy of this country and will strive to contribute our share in shaping the destinies of this movement along the lines of an independent Farmer-Labor Party as a barrier to reaction, fascism and war. And we call to the Socialist Party to join us in this work.

And to Norman Thomas we will say additionally: Had you shown toward the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites a tiny fraction of the caution and suspicion that you manifested toward the movement for a Farmer-Labor Party, you might have saved the Socialist Party from the Trotskyite invasion and from the consequent disruption of the Socialist Party organizations in many parts of the country. It is time—still time—to reorientate, Comrade Thomas.

The Communist Party has already spoken on the results of the election in the statement of its Central Committee (*Daily Worker*, November 7). It showed how the elections confirmed the correctness of the Communist policy. It showed how the Communist Party policy and activity contributed to the defeat of the Hearst-Landon combination in the elections and to the *further and deeper realignment of class forces* in the United States. Our Party says: Now is the time to go forward on all fronts to strengthen the independent power of labor and its class consciousness. Now is the time to march confidently to independent struggle on the economic and political fields for the immediate demands of the masses. Fight for the people’s mandate. Now is the time for a great advance to build the Farmer-Labor Party.

The Party will now gird itself for new and greater efforts.

It will examine the work of its organizations in the election struggle to draw the necessary lessons for the strengthening of the Party and more intensive recruiting of new members. The Party will examine afresh all the problems of mass agitation, propaganda, education of the Party members in Marxism-Leninism in order to equip us better for the great tasks ahead. *Many of the old problems of agitation and organization will have to be reviewed in the light of the new situation and the new tasks.*

Centrally in this review will be the problem of *always keeping the Party's face clearly before the masses.* This is not a new problem. But it will have to be tackled anew and afresh in the light of the present situation which demands more than before that the Party's Communist face never be blurred, let alone hidden, from the masses in our everyday activities on all fronts of the class struggle. The present situation gives us new and more favorable opportunities for accomplishing this central aim. Now more than before it is necessary and possible to make every Party unit a real center of Communist activity and mass leadership.

During the election struggle we established ties with large masses. We created an atmosphere of sympathetic attention and interest to Communism among millions. Now the task is to strengthen these ties, to make them permanent, to make them active and alive in the everyday struggles of the Party among the masses. These are problems not alone of policy but of *agitation, propaganda, organization.* These are the problems to be tackled. Reinforced by the growing confidence of the masses in our Party and in our leaders, the Party will tackle these problems successfully and will proceed at a much faster pace than heretofore to build itself into the revolutionary mass party of the American proletariat.

A. B.

The Communist Party on the Results of the Elections

(Statement of the Central Committee, C.P.U.S.A., issued November 7, 1936.)

THE American people gave a hard blow to the reactionary forces in last Tuesday's election. Despite the return to power of Roosevelt and his middle-of-the-way policy, and the presence within the Democratic Party of powerful reactionary groups, the forces advocating democracy scored a victory which is a setback to the Hearst-Liberty League-Wall Street drive toward fascism and to all extreme reactionaries. The main task confronting the toiling masses of the country is to take advantage of the favorable outcome of the elections by pressing forward aggressively for the satisfaction of their immediate economic and political demands.

The campaign and the election results clearly show the sharpening of class lines in the United States. On the one side stood the great mass of the voting population. On the other stood an unprecedented concentration of organized wealth and reaction. Never before was the political struggle so much a question of the poor and downtrodden against the rich and the oppressors. The election struggle sharpened class alignments, and the check to reaction administered by the forces of democracy will speed up the differentiation of the population along class lines.

The masses of the people still expressed their discontent and their fear of fascism, their demands for constructive social legislative measures, and for a higher standard of living within the framework of the two-party system. The results reflected a determination on the part of the people to defeat the Landon-Knox forces at all costs. They reflected a preference for the Roosevelt ticket with the belief that through its victory the people could secure those essential things which they today desire.

The overwhelming vote for Roosevelt was primarily due to the extraordinary activities of new forces, of new movements, representing the broad masses of the people—workers, farmers, middle class groups. On a national scale this was expressed by the increased activities of the trade unions, particularly of the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League, by the farm organizations and by the bolt of progressives from the Republican Party. On a state scale it was expressed by such movements as the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party, the Wisconsin Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, the American Labor Party in New York, the Commonwealth Federation in Wash-

ington, the California EPIC movement, and many others—movements that in no sense were identical with the Democratic machine, but which set as their objective the defeat of the Hearst-Liberty League combination backing Landon and Knox.

The defeat of Landon was due to a growing political and class awareness on the part of the workers and farmers and large sections of the middle class. They saw through and rejected the Red-baiting campaign of Hearst and the Republican Party. They did not succumb to the unbridled demagoguery of the Republicans and their stooges, Coughlin, Townsend and Lemke. They saw that the issue was progress or reaction, and they voted in overwhelming numbers against reaction, against Wall Street, for progress and for a better life for the people.

The awakening of the masses of the people, the role they are playing in the destiny of the nation, their fight for better economic conditions and more democratic rights, show that the tradition of Farmer-Labor democracy in the United States is being reborn. This people's democracy which backed Jefferson, Jackson and the Populist movements of the 90's is being revived. It is coming to life in a different setting and in a more advanced form to protect the American people, their liberties and their standard of living from the rule of decaying, reactionary capitalism and its worst products—fascism and war. The union of farmers and workers is coming to life today not as a silent partner of the capitalist politicians, which was its role in the past. It is emerging now as an independent force, led by labor and increasingly conscious of its role as a barrier to reaction, fascism and war.

The people expressed in their vote last Tuesday not primarily their satisfaction with the things Roosevelt had accomplished, but a fear of the consequences of a reactionary victory and a determination to realize their aims in a very real sense. They gave Roosevelt a people's mandate to achieve very definite objectives in the course of the next four years.

In striving for the defeat of the Landon-Knox ticket, huge masses accepted at face value those promises, both direct and implied, made by Roosevelt. They took the words of Roosevelt, in his last Madison Square Garden meeting, as a pledge. In that speech he said:

"Of course we will continue to seek to improve working conditions for the workers of America—to reduce hours over-long, to increase wages that spell starvation, to end the labor of children, to wipe out sweat shops. Of course we will continue every effort to end monopoly of business, to support collective bargaining. . . . For all these we have only just begun to fight."

From this and other declarations made by President Roosevelt during his campaign, the people will expect to realize the following main aims:

Higher wages, shorter hours, the right to organize and real collective bargaining.

Real social security with full protection, or jobs for the unemployed.

Protection for the farmers from evictions and foreclosures, with prices for farm products sufficient to meet the cost of production, with a satisfactory margin of profit for the farmers.

Complete equality for the Negro people, with the elimination of persecution, segregation, jim-crowism and lynching—the enforcement of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

A system of taxation which will take the burdens off the mass of the people, particularly the elimination of sales taxes and the like, and place the tax burden on those able to pay—the rich.

Protection of the people from the assault of the monopolies on their living standards.

Legislation beneficial to the women and youth of the country, giving them those guarantees of economic security and equality which for them are burning issues.

The adoption by the United States government of such policies in the international arena as will make it an active, aggressive force for peace, cooperating with the Soviet Union and other nations striving for the maintenance of peace, against the war moves of the aggressor nations—Germany, Italy and Japan.

Definite measures to curb the powers of the Supreme Court, once and for all preventing it from nullifying or hampering the execution of social legislation beneficial to the people.

These are the needs and hopes that the people voted for. But these hopes cannot be realized without mass demands upon the government and independent struggles for these demands.

This must now be done without delay. Now is the time for the people to press forward and strike decisive blows at the forces of reaction. But although the reactionaries are checked, they are by no means decisively defeated. They will exert tremendous pressure on Roosevelt and on Congress to block measures beneficial to the people. They will use every means of terror and repression to prevent the forward movement of the masses. The Liberty Leaguers, the Hearsts, the big bankers and industrialists will do everything within their power to realize, *through the Roosevelt regime*, those policies which they sought to realize through a Landon-Knox victory. Within the Democratic Party itself, through the reactionary forces constituting its basis in the South, through the corrupt reactionary Democratic machine in the industrial centers (Tammany in New York, the Hague machine in New Jersey, the Kelly-Nash machine in Chicago, etc.) they will strive to defeat the people's will.

The only guarantee that the mandate of the people will be realized in life is through the independent organization of the people; through the building of more powerful trade unions, particularly in the mass production industries; and through the organization of labor's forces politically in an all-inclusive Farmer-Labor Party. Only thus will the people be able to carry forward the struggle for their aims.

In fact, unless the greatest haste is shown in building the Farmer-Labor movement, uniting all progressive forces, the way will be left open for the building of a reactionary, a fascist movement of the type of the Coughlin-Lemke Union Party movement which served as a cloak for Landon in the last campaign.

The organization of the people independently is the thing that at the moment will alone assure the realization of those demands expressed in the people's mandate last Tuesday. The workers must carry forward the most intensive organizing drive to build the trade unions, to establish them in the mass production industries, to carry forward the fight for their economic demands. The workers, the farmers, and progressive middle class groups must clearly formulate their legislative proposals to be submitted to the new Congress in January, to be fought for there, as well as in the various state legislatures. The fight for the needs and desires of the people must go forward through the trade unions, through the political struggle for legislative demands.

The election results are a mandate by the working class and the people as a whole to the American Federation of Labor meeting in national convention at Tampa, to the C.I.O., to Labor's Non-Partisan League, to the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota, to the Wisconsin Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, to the California EPIC movement, to the Washington Commonwealth Federation, to the American Labor Party, to all farm, unemployed and progressive organizations, to the Socialist and Communist Parties.

The mandate is to build the independent power of the people, to take advantage of the opportunity which lies ahead to consolidate the progressive forces and to move forward decisively to a People's Front, to the national Farmer-Labor Party. Reaction has been checked but the people now must take advantage of the setback they have given to Wall Street to build their forces, to consolidate their ranks and to organize the Farmer-Labor Party.

In the elections, labor was in the main united against the menace of reaction. The unity and strength of labor are necessary for the future progress of the American people.

The workers must use their election unity to press forward on all fronts and, in the first place, to organize the unorganized in the

mass production industries. They must rally to the support of the steel drive, whose success will strengthen the entire American people and the Farmer-Labor movement. They must take advantage of the decisive defeat of Hutcheson and the other Liberty League agents in the ranks of labor to work for a united and powerful American Federation of Labor, based on industrial unionism and the widest trade union democracy.

In the elections, the movement for a Farmer-Labor Party, as distinct from the Left forces within the Democratic Party, became more clear. On a national scale, Labor's Non-Partisan League already gave a certain independent character to the political activities of the labor movement. In New York this expressed itself through the American Labor Party as a movement separate from that of the old parties. In other states (California, Washington, etc.), though working through the old parties, the progressive forces, labor, farmers and middle class groups already gave to their movement an independent character.

In several states (Minnesota, Wisconsin) the forces of the people already organized themselves into completely independent political movements, Farmer-Labor in character, and more clearly expressing the people's demands. These movements already represent the unity of the trade unions, farmers' organizations and middle class groups in a federation of Farmer-Labor political forces. In these cases the Communist Party gave its support to the building of these movements and to the Farmer-Labor candidates.

The overwhelming and unprecedented victory of the movements in Minnesota and Wisconsin are living proof of the value of the People's Front. They show that an all-inclusive Farmer-Labor movement is the road to victory. These movements were subjected to the most vicious attacks from the Right. The reactionaries tried to frighten the masses with their Red-baiting, pointing to the support given by the Communist Party to these movements. The victories won in Wisconsin and Minnesota are proof that large sections of the American people favor a united, all-inclusive people's movement of trade unionists, of farmers, of middle class progressives, of Communists and Socialists, in the fight against reaction and for the needs of the people.

The overwhelming sweep against reaction creates favorable conditions for the advance of the forces of progress and peace, against the forces of fascism and war. Now is the time to build a genuine people's movement for peace. Now is the time to build a broad, American National Peace Congress, of all genuine peace forces. Now is the time to work for collaboration with the peace policies of the Soviet Union and the forces of peace throughout the world.

The defeat of Landon and Hearst showed that the American

people are uncompromisingly opposed to the forces of reaction and fascism both here and abroad. They hate the Hitlers and Mussolinis as much as they hate the Hearsts and the Coughlins. That is why it was necessary for the Republicans to cloak their reactionary plans with the wildest demagogy. That is why the forces of reaction in the election campaign fought under the banner of "democracy" in a battle in which the democratic forces were all in the other camp. But the American people saw through these fascist tactics. They defeated the Red-baiters. They administered a defeat to those who would take America on the bloody road of fascism. The overwhelming vote against reaction was a rebuke to Hearst, Coughlin, and the other reactionaries who support the Spanish fascists. It showed that large sections of the American people are in sympathy with the struggle of the Spanish people to maintain their democracy. It showed that the American people will respond to a positive approach on the part of the administration to cooperate with the forces of democracy throughout the world, and assist the friendly democratic Spanish government. The international significance of the election lies in the rebuke given by the American people to Hearst and the other reactionaries who try to throw the United States on the side of fascism and the war-makers. This beginning of the crystallization towards the People's Front is an expression of the world-wide movement against reaction and fascism, and will strengthen the progressive and peace forces of the world.

The Communist Party gave all its energy to the defeat of the forces of reaction, to the building of the Farmer-Labor Party, toward the strengthening of its own position as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class movement. In each state and locality it concretely faced the problem of the unity of the progressive forces against reaction. In those states where the movement was already taking on a definitely Farmer-Labor character, it gave support to these movements. In other states it gave support, with various qualifications, to the crystallization of progressive forces within the old parties, placing always in the forefront the central objective of defeating reaction and the building of the Farmer-Labor Party.

It realized that in the present situation, the possibilities existed for the crystallization of a new anti-fascist people's movement that would soon find its expression in a national Farmer-Labor Party. Everywhere we furthered those measures and those movements that would help in the formation of such a Farmer-Labor Party. Therefore, the increasing influence and strength of the Communist Party cannot primarily be measured by the vote for its presidential candidates, in view of the determination of the masses to defeat Hearst-Landon reaction by concentrating upon President Roosevelt's re-election. The growing influence of the Party was unmistakably seen

during the campaign in the increased vote for local candidates in a number of states, in the support and successes for local Farmer-Labor Party candidates, by the many huge election meetings and in the response of large sections of the population to the appeal of the Party, after Tampa and Terre Haute, in defense of civil liberties.

In this respect the position of the Communist Party is to be sharply contrasted with that of the Socialist Party.

In contrast to the Communist Party, which recognized that the fight for socialism was inseparably connected with the fight against reaction in the 1936 elections and therefore concentrated on the defeat of the Hearst-Landon reactionaries, the Socialist Party incorrectly declared that the immediate issue in the campaign was that of socialism versus capitalism, thereby playing directly into the hands of the Hearst-Liberty League-Landon forces. Norman Thomas said that "the immediate demand of the Socialists is socialism". The Socialist Party enthroned within its own party the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites and in its policies accepted to an increasing degree those disruptive, wrecking policies which are harmful to the whole labor movement, as well as to the Socialist Party itself.

The Socialist Party, by adopting a reformist and sectarian policy, failed to contribute toward the realignment of progressive forces and suffered disastrously as a result, as seen in the catastrophic drop in its vote. The Socialist Party weakened its relationship with the labor movement and with all of the progressive forces of the country.

The crisis now existing in the Socialist Party following the elections can only be ended when the Socialist Party rids itself of the Trotskyite disrupters, makes a united front with the Communist Party, and aids in the furthering of the people's movement against reaction, fascism and war, and in the movement for an all-inclusive Farmer-Labor Party.

As a result of its election policies, the influence of the Communist Party in the trade unions, in the ranks of the progressives, among the Farmer-Laborites is greater than ever before. We have been and will continue to be an active and growing force furthering the differentiation among the masses, advancing the movement toward a Farmer-Labor Party!

Large sections of the people realize that we have contributed in the way of unity of the broad masses of the workers, farmers and progressive groups.

After the elections the Communist Party, all its members, all its sympathizers have the task of pushing forward on every front with the objective of realizing those aims listed above. It is our task to promote the organization of all progressive forces independently, the building of the Farmer-Labor Party as a coalition of the trade

unions, the farmers, the Negro people, the Communists, the Socialists and of all progressive groups.

On the trade union front it is the task of our Party to help in the organization of the unorganized, to win their demands for higher wages, for shorter hours, for the recognition of their unions, for the right of collective bargaining, and to work for a united powerful American Federation of Labor.

It is our task to aid in the unification of all of the best forces of the country, including the trade unions, the religious and pacifist groups, of opponents of war, in a mighty movement that will cooperate on a world scale with all of the forces of peace. A movement that will press the government toward a course of cooperation with the Soviet Union and those other nations advocating and working for peace, to pursue such policies in the creation of this peace movement as will make realizable the correct slogan of our Party: "Keep America out of war by keeping war out of the world."

Our influence has been increased, our membership has grown. It is our task to build our Party, to draw into its ranks all of those honest, working class and revolutionary forces who see in our Party the most powerful force in rallying the people for their immediate needs, and in carrying them forward in the struggle for socialism. The present economic upturn cannot and will not do away with the general crisis of capitalism. More and more the masses will come to realize that only a new social order—socialism—can bring a full and lasting solution of their problem.

The Communist Party fully recognizes its obligations to the American working class and to the people as a whole. It will continue to fight with all its power for the progress, happiness, freedom and prosperity of the American people. It will continue with redoubled energy and strength, derived from the increased confidence of the masses, directed for the People's Front, for the Farmer-Labor Party, for progress and peace, for the speeding up of the day when the American people will abolish capitalism and take the road to socialism.

The ranks of our Party are growing. Greater numbers will now be recruited. We will carry forward the banner of Communism, the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin with increased strength, with the knowledge that we have the growing confidence of the masses.

Forward under the banner of the Communist Party! Into the Farmer-Labor Party, the consolidated forces of progress against reaction! Forward under the banner of Communism—the Americanism of the twentieth century!

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
William Z. Foster, Chairman
Earl Browder, General Secretary

The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Victory

By CLARENCE A. HATHAWAY

THE unprecedented victory of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party in the elections of November 3 has a special significance and raises special problems which unavoidably become obscured in any general, national estimate of the election outcome. This fact warrants a separate discussion of the Minnesota results and of the tasks now confronting the Farmer-Labor Party and the Minnesota Communists.

The chief factor giving Minnesota a place apart and necessitating a separate examination is the existence there of a firmly-established, statewide Farmer-Labor Party as the dominant party in the state. This party, born in 1918 and going through various stages of development since then, swept the state in the present elections by a greater majority than ever before. Two years ago, the personally very popular Floyd B. Olson carried the state with a majority of 72,000. This year with less known candidates, the majority amounted to roughly 250,000 for the leading officers.

Some may think that this tremendous increase is due only or primarily to the fact that the Farmer-Laborites endorsed Roosevelt, and that this sweeping victory was merely an outgrowth of the general Roosevelt landslide. This view is strengthened by the impression, popularized by the Republicans and the Al Smith Democrats, that President Roosevelt and Jim Farley withdrew *all* Democratic state candidates and endorsed the Farmer-Laborites in return for their endorsement of Roosevelt.

It is true that the Farmer-Labor leaders endorsed Roosevelt for re-election, and it is undoubtedly true that by doing so they greatly strengthened themselves. In fact, if they had not done so they probably would have been defeated—but *Roosevelt then would also have lost the state*. It was a case where a united front against the reactionaries was vital to the success of both Roosevelt and the Farmer-Laborites. Any other course would have resulted only in their mutual defeat.

But it is wholly wrong to conclude that the Minnesota Farmer-Labor victory is *merely* the result of the Roosevelt landslide. In the first place there is the question: Why did Roosevelt and Farley decide to withdraw the Democratic ticket? And the further question:

Why did they *fail*—withdrawing in fact only *a part* of the ticket? The answers are to be found only in a deeper examination of the Minnesota situation.

As stated above the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party dates back to 1918. Beginning then, the most conscious and determined sections of the working class and farmers' movements definitely embarked on the road of independent political action. After going through experiences of trying to capture one of the old parties, comparable to the present efforts of the EPIC movement in California and the Commonwealth movement in Washington, they finally cut loose from the old parties and formed a Farmer-Labor Party organizationally independent of other political groupings. This party from the outset had the support of the trade unions, cooperatives, farm organizations and many liberal, middle class bodies.

In the succeeding years, it has definitely established itself as the liberal, progressive political force in the state. The Republican Party has long since won its place there as the party of reaction. The Democratic Party has continuously dwindled since 1918, running a bad third in state contests and kept alive by federal patronage. In state elections reactionary Democrats have tended toward alliances with the Republicans, and progressive Democrats with the Farmer-Laborites. In short, Minnesota has long been the scene of a political regrouping, with the Farmer-Laborites tending more and more to gather together all that was healthy and progressive in the state's political life. Confronted with this situation Roosevelt realized that he could only carry the state in alliance with these progressive forces crystallized in the Farmer-Labor Party.

But this alliance was not realized without a struggle among the Democratic leaders both nationally and within the state. And when it was put over it was by no means a neat, clean job on the part of Roosevelt and Farley. In fact Farley botched the job badly at the outset.

As an outgrowth of the swing of the broad mass of the Minnesota people to the Farmer-Labor Party the state Democratic Party was badly split, with two main factions fighting for control. The Noonan-Regan-Ryan faction, though supporting Roosevelt, insisted on the complete independence of the Democratic Party within the state, believing that with federal patronage and with Roosevelt's prestige they could re-establish their party as a major political factor. The Wolf faction, on the contrary, was convinced that in state politics the Farmer-Laborites were invincible and that Roosevelt's victory in the state was dependent on an alliance with the Farmer-Labor forces. At the national Democratic convention in Philadelphia Jim Farley supported the Noonan faction, giving it the national com-

mitteeman. At that time Farley also thought that the Farmer-Laborites could be ignored.

But in the primary elections in Minnesota, the candidates of the Wolf faction won the Democratic nomination for the leading state offices, with the understanding widespread that their victory would be followed by their withdrawal from the state race in favor of the Farmer-Labor ticket. In other words, the Democratic voters forced the hand of Roosevelt and Farley; the candidates nominated for leading offices (senator, governor, etc.), had run at the outset only to hold control of the Democratic state committee and to use that control to throw progressive Democratic support to the Farmer-Laborites. They were convinced that their own political future was bound up with the Farmer-Labor and not the Democratic Party. This victory was a further expression of the deep-going political regrouping in the state to which Roosevelt and Farley belatedly were forced to bow.

Later events bring out still more clearly the deep-seated class differentiation in Minnesota politics which proves that the Farmer-Labor vote cannot be considered as *merely* a state expression of the Roosevelt landslide, though, of course, it was favorably influenced by it. In the first place, the only Democrats to withdraw from the race were the candidates for United States senator, for governor and for congressmen in *one* or *two* districts. Democratic candidates for lieutenant governor, state treasurer, attorney general, railroad and warehouse commissioner, and for congress in most congressional districts, remained in the race. Moreover, the Noonan-Regan-Ryan faction, *though campaigning actively for Roosevelt*, kept their candidates in the race against the Farmer-Labor Party *and supported the Republicans where no Democrats were on the ticket*. This faction, mind you, was not an Al Smith, anti-Roosevelt faction. It was fully and energetically for Roosevelt. But it refused to go along with the Roosevelt-Farley-Wolf policy of an alliance with the Farmer-Laborites. They supported Roosevelt's New Deal; they condemned Landon and Knox. But for United States senator and for governor they supported the Republicans, Christianson and Nelson, in an effort to defeat Ernst Lundeen and Elmer Benson, whom they joined with the Republicans in characterizing as "Communists".

From these facts it should be clear that the Farmer-Laborites were an independent force, which, though supporting Roosevelt, nevertheless stood apart from Roosevelt, even in the eyes of large numbers of his own supporters. The Farmer-Laborites were recognized, not as Roosevelt New Dealers, but as a group with its own program, to the Left of the New Deal, and unacceptable to many Roosevelt Democrats. This is shown in the results: Roosevelt carried

the state by approximately 360,000; Lundeen and Benson, the leading Farmer-Laborites, carried the state by roughly 250,000—110,000 behind Roosevelt. This difference represents roughly the number of votes polled by those Democrats who remained in the race in opposition to the Farmer-Labor candidates. The Farmer-Laborites polled approximately 600,000 votes.

The Farmer-Laborites themselves contributed to this differentiation between themselves and Roosevelt. They made clear that their support for Roosevelt did not mean the acceptance of the New Deal, or even the endorsement of any of its specific planks. Their aim, as stated by the Farmer-Labor leaders, in view of the absence of a national Farmer-Labor ticket, was to present a united front of progressives against the Republican-Hearst-Liberty League forces. Governor Floyd B. Olson, just before his death, put it in these words:

“In this campaign we must choose between President Roosevelt and Governor Landon. Progressives and liberals cannot afford to divide their votes and thereby place in the Presidency a reactionary Republican. For the liberals to split their votes is merely playing into the hands of the Wall Street gang.”

Governor-elect Elmer A. Benson associated himself with that declaration and consistently campaigned for Roosevelt, but always making clear that his was the Farmer-Labor platform. Benson's position is best stated in his own words in the following excerpts from a statement given to the press following the election:

“But the Democrats should take no encouragement from the support we gave them in this election. We are out to build a third party and are now contacting sympathetic groups in other states.

“In supporting Roosevelt we did not commit ourselves to the Democratic Party and not even to Roosevelt, whom we expect to have occasion to oppose in the next four years.

“Roosevelt was the best choice in an emergency. There was no time to put a third party into the field for 1936. Roosevelt's own party will now try to hold him back. For us to support the Democrats again, they would have to be quite a way to the Left of where they are now.”

In the same post-election press statement Governor Benson set forth the following program which further differentiates the Minnesota movement from the New Deal:

- “1. Strengthening of the workers' right to organize.
- “2. A minimum wage program, also governing hours of work.
- “3. A social security plan in which only the employer and the government would be required to contribute.
- “4. A government subsidy to agriculture.
- “5. Expansion of the public health service, though perhaps not outright socialization of medicine.
- “6. Greater tax on incomes, inheritance and corporative taxes.

"7. Government ownership of railroads, coal mines, utilities and even air transport.

"8. Nationalization of munitions."

By following such a policy—a clearly defined Farmer-Labor platform (more fully set forth in the Party's election platform and in Governor Benson's keynote speech), a completely independent Farmer-Labor state ticket, and support for Roosevelt nationally in order to contribute to the defeat of Landon—the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party undoubtedly added to its own strength within the state.

Moreover, by such a tactic it blocked the efforts of the fascist Coughlin-Lemke crowd to throw the state to Landon and to split, confuse and set back the state Farmer-Labor Party movement. The masses in Minnesota, under Farmer-Labor leadership, demonstrated their ability to differentiate between Coughlin's demagogic, fascist third party and a Farmer-Labor Party. If the Minnesota Farmer-Laborites had associated themselves with the Lemke-O'Brien ticket as some desired, they would have gone down to defeat. Moreover, they would have started on a course which could only lead to the destruction of their own movement. The Farmer-Labor campaign and the election results contributed to the further rallying of progressive, anti-fascist forces behind the Farmer-Labor Party. Moreover, they contributed, despite all campaign weaknesses, to the further maturing of the movement there in the direction of a genuine Farmer-Labor Party.

One can summarize by emphasizing the unquestionable fact that the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party victory, though merged with the victory of Roosevelt, contributing toward it, and deriving benefit from it, was nevertheless *mainly* an expression of the *gathering* and *consolidation* of the distinctly Farmer-Labor forces, of the potential People's Front forces. Within the framework of the general national mass upsurge against reaction, which expressed itself mainly in the Roosevelt landslide, the Minnesota victory marked the further consolidation within the state of new, class forces which are destined to mature on the national arena before the next elections.

The Communist Party contributed considerably to the Minnesota developments. In fact, a number of the Farmer-Labor Party's most significant accomplishments would not have been possible were it not for the constructive, helpful contributions of the Communists, striving to give to the party a distinctly Farmer-Labor character and to unite all progressive and radical forces in the state behind the Party. It is of greatest importance to note that it was the Communists who most sharply and clearly raised the issue of unity against the Republican-Hearst-Liberty League crowd and exposed the role of Coughlin and Lemke as stooges for these reactionary forces.

A most important turning point in the life of the Farmer-Labor Party was its last state convention, its nominating convention, held last spring. Some forty or fifty active, leading members of the Communist Party participated as delegates in the Farmer-Labor Party convention—as delegates from local unions, cooperatives, farm organizations, affiliated middle class groups, and Farmer-Labor ward clubs. There the issue was faced: an all-inclusive, united movement, including all forces ready to unite against reaction, or a narrow movement, excluding Communists and Left-wingers, and itself engaging, along with the reactionaries, in a war against the Left.

Under the leadership of the late Governor Floyd B. Olson, and with the support of Governor-elect Elmer A. Benson, the party took the first steps toward becoming an all-inclusive People's Front movement. Red-baiting was rejected and the party began the achievement of that inner-party unity that enabled it to draw around itself every force that was progressive in the state. The greater and more energetic participation of the trade unions, the increased strength of the Farmer-Labor Party in the rural areas, the enthusiastic support of the Cooperatives, the ability to attract wide middle class support and even the ability to split the Democratic Party, drawing to itself the support of the progressive Democrats, were due in the first place to the broader inner unity established at the Farmer-Labor nominating convention—thanks to the assistance of Governor Olson and Governor-elect Benson.

Can anyone doubt the contributions of the Communists then in striving for a united all-inclusive Farmer-Labor movement? Can one imagine the realization of any of the great accomplishments of the November 3 elections if every trade union, every farm organization, every cooperative, had been a battleground between warring factions for or against the policies which brought this election victory?

In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that the sabotaging tactics of the counter-revolutionary, wrecking Trotskyites—parading as Socialists—were defeated in the first place through the inner unity, with Communist Party cooperation, which was set up last spring. Their efforts to turn sentiment against the Farmer-Labor Party, and even to split the Farmer-Labor Party and progressive forces were defeated even in those local unions in which they have their greatest influence. The sentiment of the workers for unity became so overpowering that the Trotskyites, who had filed their own candidate for Secretary of State and had decided to campaign against the Farmer-Labor Party, were compelled to discontinue holding their own mass meetings after one meeting was held. All other Leftist, sectarian tactics were overcome or defeated in the first place through the efforts of the Communist Party members. At the same time the Commu-

nists sought to prevent the adoption of policies or tactics which would have marked the abandonment of Farmer-Labor principles.

The results of the election demonstrated conclusively that the great mass of the Minnesota people welcomed the broad, all-inclusive character given to the Farmer-Labor Party at its spring convention and the militant program adopted by that convention. The campaign was the bitterest and most fiercely fought in the history of the party. All of those methods used nationally against Roosevelt were used in double doses in Minnesota.

In addition, the reactionaries developed an especially bitter campaign around Minnesota issues. They threatened that a Farmer-Labor victory would result in the moving of industries out of the state. They charged that the Farmer-Labor Party was the chosen vehicle of the Communists for the realization of their revolutionary objectives. They conveniently ignored the fact that those points of agreement between the Farmer-Labor Party and the Communists were their joint support for the immediate needs of the people. Our leaflets and platforms were reprinted in the local capitalist newspapers with scare headlines to "prove" that the Communists had virtually taken over the Farmer-Labor Party. Congressman Lundeen's support for the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill, his favorable impressions of the Soviet Union, expressed in the report of the first Trade Union Delegation, his use of the term *tovarishi* in addressing a Madison Square Garden meeting held under the auspices of the Friends of the Soviet Union, were dug up to "prove" that he not only had the endorsement of the Communists, but that through these acts he had indicated his own sympathy for Communism. Senator Benson's support for the American Youth Act was likewise used to show that he had taken up measures initiated by the Communists, thereby showing his sympathies. Efforts were made to arouse religious antagonisms. A letter was sent out to every priest and minister in the state warning them that a Farmer-Labor victory would mean the undermining of the church, and of religion. There have been but few instances in American politics where more money was spent, or where dirtier methods were used than in the elections in Minnesota this year.

It is necessary to note that in the face of this reactionary barrage hesitations and vacillation became evident within Farmer-Labor ranks, which shows that there is still much work to be done before the Farmer-Labor Party really expresses that all-inclusive unity of working class and progressive forces which is essential to victory in the fight against reactionaries. There were those in the Farmer-Labor ranks who through inner-party channels exerted a powerful and persistent pressure on the leading candidates and on those responsible

for the conduct of the campaign, insisting that they repudiate the Communists and Left-wing support. They joined in the Red-baiting of the reactionaries.

Neither Governor-elect Benson, nor Senator-elect Lundeen yielded to these demands. In reply to these allegations they truthfully declared that they were not Communists, and that through a Farmer-Labor democracy they hoped to make Communism unnecessary. They charged that it was the reactionaries with their ruthless exploitation of the masses of the people, accompanied by a curbing or destruction of civil rights, that caused people to turn to Communism. They declared that for their part, they were for the building up of a movement which would maintain democracy, which would achieve the people's demands, and which would be supported by all people interested in the maintenance of democratic rights. Aside from a tendency to be too defensive in the campaign, it must be said that the leading candidates on the whole waged a satisfactory Farmer-Labor campaign.

The same cannot be said of many of the Right trade union and farm leaders. They were unable to sense the sentiment of the masses for a broad, united militant movement. They thought victory required capitulation to the Republicans. This found its expression in one issue of the *Minnesota Leader* which carried a headline: "Benson Repudiates Communism"—a headline that reflected not Benson's statement, but rather the hopes of the headline writer.

The results of the election should once and for all lay this Red-scare ghost in Minnesota. It should be conclusive proof to all those who became frightened that the mass of workers, farmers and progressive middle class groups welcomed the broadest unity of progressive and radical forces against reaction and for a militant Farmer-Labor program.

Of course, the election results should not be interpreted as an endorsement of Communism by the Minnesota people. Such could not yet be the case. But it does mean that they cannot be frightened by a bogey-man dressed up as Communist by the reactionaries to serve their reactionary ends. The people want a progressive movement, an all-inclusive movement and one marching firmly on the road toward the realization of progressive policies.

The Farmer-Labor Party as a result of the November 3 elections has a very definite election mandate. The vote there was not merely a vote against the reactionaries; it was not merely a vote for the New Deal policies of Roosevelt—it was both of these things, but it was more: *it was a vote for the platform of the Farmer-Labor Party; it was a vote for the declarations of the leading candidates, Senator-elect Lundeen and Governor-elect Benson.*

The people expect that that program will now be put into effect. It was for that reason that they elected the Farmer-Labor United States Senator, that they increased the Farmer-Labor representation in Congress from three to five, that they elected all Farmer-Laborites except one to state offices, giving to the Farmer-Labor Party for the first time control of the powerful state executive council, and that, for the first time, they gave to the Farmer-Labor Party a strong majority in the lower house of the state legislature (the state senate was not elected this year). Governor Benson, in his post-election declarations, has clearly pledged himself to carry out the platform and campaign pledges. Senator Lundeen has made similar declarations.

The problem confronting the victorious candidates and the Farmer-Labor Party is that of how to realize their program in life. They cannot accomplish it if they permit themselves to be limited and restricted by the purely parliamentary procedure, with its checks and balances, of Minnesota democracy. The state senate is still in the hands of the reactionaries, with but scant possibilities for the organization of a liberal or progressive group there strong enough to secure the adoption of Farmer-Labor measures. The courts cannot be relied upon to react sympathetically to progressive social legislation. Many state commissions and boards are in the hands of reactionaries with fixed terms of office (board of regents at the university, State Board of Control, etc.). All of these things will be serious obstacles in the way of the Farmer-Labor Party.

Moreover, the Farmer-Labor Party cannot return to the people two years hence and say: "We did our best, but we were blocked on all sides by reactionaries, inherited from the old regime." The people will say, and with justice: "What did you do to overcome their resistance? What did you do to defeat their sabotage?" It is the reply to those questions that the Farmer-Labor Party must face now, at the very beginning of this administration.

Its legislative program, and its general drive to aid the people of Minnesota in improving their living standards can be achieved with the positions that the Farmer-Labor Party has now won. The party today is sufficiently strong if it properly develops its struggle to realize the major points in this program. This can be accomplished, however, only if the Farmer-Labor Party brings into existence *a broad mass people's movement supplementing and backing up the action of its legislators and its executives.*

At the very outset the Farmer-Labor leaders in mapping out their legislative proposals would do well to consult the leading, active forces of the workers' and farmers' movement of Minnesota. Consultations with farm groups, with the unemployed, with the trade

unionists, with teachers and other professional groups, with the small independent merchants, would draw these people into the actual framing of that program and into the rallying of the people to actively fight for this program throughout the legislative session. Such consultations could be the starting point for what Senator Benson has labeled a "people's lobby" when referring specifically to the action of the Minnesota farmers who marched to the state capital, bringing with them their dying livestock, and through that action compelling a reactionary legislature to adopt Farmer-Labor proposals on drought relief.

At the coming session of the state legislature, which opens on January 5, every principle measure should be backed up by such a "people's lobby" as will bring the people by the thousands into the capital to compel the senate reactionaries to accept the Farmer-Labor program. In the legislative districts throughout the state discussions of Farmer-Labor bills should be organized—these bills contrasted with those of the reactionaries, and the people aroused to put pressure on their representatives through resolutions, delegations, etc., to support progressive legislation. Such policies as these will in the first place result in a victory in the state legislature for the Farmer-Labor Party, but they will do more than that, they will sink the roots of the Farmer-Labor Party still more deeply among the masses of the people, drawing the people more fully into the daily life and activities of the party, and thereby transforming the party ever more into a genuine People's Front against reaction.

A similar policy should be followed on matters not directly legislative in character, but nevertheless vital to the strength and power of the Farmer-Labor Party. Here I refer to the direct participation of the Farmer-Labor Party in the building up of the workers' and farmers' movement on all fronts. There are large numbers of workers in Minnesota in basic industries, still not organized in trade unions; this applies particularly to the iron mining industry, the flour mills, agricultural laborers, etc. It is the duty of the Farmer-Labor Party to encourage and support energetic organizing campaigns in all such industries now, with the governor and the state executive council taking all those steps necessary to guarantee to the workers their right to organize, freedom of speech in these steel-trust dominated towns, the drastic curbing of all strikebreaking activities by imported scabs, detective agencies, Black Legion groups, etc. Such fascist formations must be cleaned out of the state as a first responsibility of the Farmer-Labor administration. This they can do with the executive power now in their hands. In like manner, aid must be given to the farmers, to the cooperatives, to middle class

groups in strengthening their organization and activity for their demands.

The Communist Party has great responsibilities in aiding the Farmer-Labor Party, in continuing to give its full cooperation in all measures that will contribute toward the transformation of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party into a broad, all-inclusive militant People's Front movement. Undoubtedly, the prestige of the Communists has been increased in Minnesota during this period. Our contributions at the nominating convention last spring were constructive throughout, helping to place the Farmer-Labor Party onto a road that led to its overwhelming victory on November 3. Throughout the campaign the energy, self-sacrifice and good sense of our comrades contributed much toward the rallying of the broadest masses for the most active campaign that the Farmer-Labor Party has ever waged. There are reasons to believe that these efforts on our part are appreciated in Farmer-Labor ranks. It is our job to see that this work continues and improves.

In the first place, it is the duty of our comrades to give aid to the Farmer-Labor Party in the building up of a mass, legislative movement, such as is indicated above. We should cooperate with the Farmer-Laborites in the drafting of measures covering the immediate and vital demands of the workers, farmers and middle class groups—social insurance, old age pensions, minimum wages, maximum hours, farm legislation extending the moratorium law and preventing evictions and foreclosures, legislation against chain stores, etc., etc. We should take the initiative in bringing these agreed-upon legislative measures to the people in all parts of the state, explaining them, winning support for them, organizing the people to fight for them on a militant mass basis.

In the trade union field our best organizers should give their energy and ability to the efforts to organize the workers in the unorganized industries, bringing these unions as they are formed into the Farmer-Labor movement, into the struggle for progressive legislation, and into direct trade union struggle for trade union recognition, for higher wages, for shorter hours, etc.

At the same time the Communist Party of Minnesota, while cooperating fully with the Farmer-Labor Party in the fight for the realization of these immediate objectives, must justify its own continued existence and growth as the party of proletarian revolution, as the party which alone will ultimately bring victory to the people through its leadership in the revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalism and to achieve socialism. The explanation of our revolutionary aims, and the winning of mass support for them, remain a fundamental task. Such explanation is necessary even to make clear

to the Farmer-Labor masses the reasons for our independent existence as a party, and for their cooperation with us as an independent though affiliated body. Convincing propaganda for our Marxist-Leninist program is the only final means of defeating the Red scare.

Through such activities the Communists will further gain the confidence of the Farmer-Labor masses, proving to them in life the constructiveness of our outlook and policies, and bringing more quickly the moment when the Communists can participate fully as a legally recognized, affiliated section of the Farmer-Labor Party. It would be premature for our comrades to force this affiliation issue to the front at the moment. To do so would play into the hands of reactionary forces at a time when the mass of the Farmer-Laborites are not yet prepared clearly to face and settle this question. But on the basis of our work until now, and on the basis of further constructive work in the preparation and carrying through of the struggle for the realization of a progressive legislative program and for the building of the trade unions and the Farmer-Labor movement, it should be possible already to get wide agreement on the elimination of that clause in the Farmer-Labor constitution, a carry-over from the past, which is directed against cooperation with the Communists. Between now and the January convention of the Farmer-Labor Party an effort should be made to win the majority for a policy of eliminating that clause from the constitution. Such a first step would prepare the way for the entrance of the Communist Party into the Farmer-Labor Party at an early date.

Above all the Communist Party must build itself in this period in Minnesota. Possibilities now exist for the recruiting of hundreds of new members, workers and farmers active in the unions, cooperatives, in the farmer organizations, and in the Farmer-Labor Party itself. The recruiting of these most active and most developed workers will enable our Party to play a greater role in building and in strengthening the Farmer-Labor Party as an effective anti-fascist people's movement. The existence of these well-organized Communist groups throughout the Farmer-Labor Party will be the best guarantee that the Farmer-Labor Party will not become a prey to those who would transform it into an opportunist body serving only their job-seeking ambitions.

To build itself, it is necessary for the Communist Party, while basing all its policies on the building, strengthening and transforming of the Farmer-Labor Party, to maintain at all times its own independent role. The Communists must not lose their identity in the broader mass movement. They must not maintain a relationship to that movement based on a hiding of their identity as Communists. It must be the aim of our Party and our comrades to legalize themselves in the

Farmer-Labor Party as its best builders, as its best fighters for an agreed-upon Farmer-Labor program, representing the broad, united movement of which the Communists are a recognized part.

Our comrades, of course, should never shirk those responsibilities which are given them in the Farmer-Labor Party, or other broad united front movements. When they are elected as secretaries, as chairmen, as organizers of these movements, they should loyally and with greatest energy undertake those responsibilities. But the acceptance of these positions and the duties that they involve should not cause them to become less attentive to their duties and responsibilities as Communists. It becomes still more necessary that they maintain the closest relations with Communist Party committees, units and leading comrades in order that they can contribute with the whole body of Communists to the carrying out of those things that will further the advancement of the People's Front movement. It is necessary to emphasize these things, because with all the strong sides of our Party activity in Minnesota and with, on the whole, the excellent work of our comrades, there were tendencies to forget, or overlook some of these elementary rules which are essential to the work of Communists in such broader mass movements.

Recruiting, greater Communist discipline, a more centralized organization, more thoroughgoing Marxist-Leninist educational work, and, above all, complete inner-Party unity are the central things that must be given attention by our Minnesota comrades. If these things are accomplished the Party can go forward to strengthen further its position in the trade unions, in the farm organizations, in the Farmer-Labor Party, contributing to the growth and effectiveness of these movements.

The November 3 elections brought a tremendous victory to the Farmer-Labor Party, opening up far-reaching perspectives for the people's movement in Minnesota, opening the way there for the realization of a genuine People's Front which can contribute towards the development of such a movement on a national scale. The reactionary forces in Minnesota, both Republicans and reactionary Democrats, suffered a decisive defeat. The Farmer-Labor Party is in a position to carry out its pledges to the Minnesota people. It must realize, however, that the forces of reaction are firmly entrenched in the economic, social and political life of the state, and that every gain made by the Farmer-Labor Party can only be won through the most stubborn and persistent struggles involving the broad masses of the people. It is the duty of the Farmer-Labor Party and of the Communists to take steps now to unleash all the mighty forces of the people for the consolidation of their victory and the realization of the Farmer-Labor program.

The Wisconsin Elections and the Farmer-Labor Party Movement

By GENE DENNIS

I

ONE of the outstanding features, if not the most important, of the November 3 elections in Wisconsin is the victory of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, which received the united support of organized labor, the farm organizations, the Socialist Party, Communist Party and large sections of the Progressive Party. The Federation, baptized in its first general election, midst an unprecedented barrage of Red-baiting and vicious attacks from the local Hearsts, Law and Order Leagues, Republicans, Democrats and Chambers of Commerce, and despite the anti-united front and Red-baiting policies carried out by certain of its Right-wing Socialist and Progressive leaders, established itself as an independent political movement which is developing in the direction of a Farmer-Labor Party. The Federation won twenty-two seats in the state assembly, six in the state senate, and elected six congressmen. Likewise it won a number of county offices throughout the state.

In addition to its successful candidates who ran on the Progressive Party ticket, the Federation was primarily responsible for the sweeping re-election of Philip LaFollette and the Progressive state ticket whose platform incorporated all of the election planks of the Federation. Moreover, it was the most important factor in electing, besides its own candidates, twenty-four Progressive assemblymen, eight Progressive senators and one Progressive congressman, thus bringing the combined Farmer-Labor and Progressive members of the legislature up to forty-six in the assembly and sixteen in the senate, with a progressive congressional bloc of seven.

Notwithstanding basic shortcomings and weaknesses which restricted the victories and development of the Federation, with which we will deal later, the election successes of the Federation and its mass campaign together with the victory of the Progressive Party headed by Governor LaFollette, are of great political importance and constitute the most significant electoral gains yet made by Wisconsin labor and the progressive movement. They are an organic part of the new developments on the American political scene.

The framework of the American two-party system is in the process of change and disintegration, and labor and its allies are

emerging now, unevenly but more firmly and on a wider scale, as a new independent political force. Labor is coming forward as that force which alone can fully bring into life the people's mandate, for economic security and the protection of their liberties and democratic rights, which was given to Roosevelt largely out of the uncertainty and fear of the results of a reactionary victory and because of the absence of a national Farmer-Labor Party.

In this lies the chief significance of the Wisconsin elections, as well as those in Minnesota and a number of other parts of the country. For in Wisconsin the victory of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation represents a genuine advance of the movement for independent political action, along Farmer-Labor Party lines. It signifies not only the acceleration of the breaking away of larger masses of workers, farmers and liberals from the two old parties of capitalism, but also evidences the strengthening of the Farmer-Labor Party forces in relation to the third-party movement of the LaFollettes and indicates the winning of a wider section of the Progressive Party to the camp of independent Farmer-Labor political action. It has given further impetus to the national Farmer-Labor Party movement.

One of the most important results of the elections and a factor strengthening the position of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation was the powerful rebuff given to the Red-baiters and to the enemies of the united and people's front. The Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation officially unites in a new people's coalition the Wisconsin Federation of Labor, the Railway Brotherhoods, the Wisconsin Workers Alliance, the Socialist Party and Progressive Party, the Farmers Equity Union, Farm Holiday Association, and the Wisconsin Milk Pool, and enjoys the qualified but active support of the Communist Party, including the energetic participation of nearly 250 Communists directly in its ranks and leading committees. It represents an important beginning of a broad people's front, and for this reason it was subjected to the heaviest attack from the Right.

The chief election battle-cry of the Republicans, as well as of the Wisconsin Democrats, was that the Federation was "Communistic", that the "LaFollette-Socialist-Communist united front" had been formed on "orders from Moscow" and was designed "to destroy American democracy and its institutions". The wild, Hearstian Red-baiting offensive leveled against the Federation and its candidates knew no limits. But the working people gave their answer—a clearcut and overwhelming repudiation of the Red-baiters, an unequivocal refusal to be stampeded by the Red-scare propaganda of the class enemy.

Similarly the outcome of the elections gave a fitting reply to that section of the leadership of the Federation and Progressive Party which is violently opposed to the united front and has capitulated to the reactionaries by fostering a Red-baiting policy within the Federation. These people, such as Henry Rutz, Jack Friedrich, Andrew Biemiller, and Harold Groves, have carried out the disruptive splitting tactics and anti-Communist policy of the Old Guard Socialists and Right-wing Progressives. They have used as one of the chief arguments for attempting to exclude Communists from the Federation and for opposing an all-inclusive people's anti-fascist front, the Red specter of the "Communist label" which allegedly was to have repelled the "backward masses" from the Federation if it opened its doors to the Communists and if the Communist Party publicly supported the Federation election campaign.

But facts are stubborn things. The election is over. The reactionaries branded the Federation "Communitic" ten thousand times over by every available instrument of publicity, press, radio and speeches. On the other side, the Communist Party conducted the greatest and most extensive mass campaign in its history, in which it consistently and publicly, by words and deeds, supported and helped organize the Federation and its campaigns, and was an important factor in securing its successes.

Scores of leading Federationists, including a number of its candidates and some of those elected to office, are known Communists. In those centers where the Federation launched an active mass campaign, unmasked the Red bogey of Hearst and Chapple, and worked to build a united front against reaction, it was, in the main, victorious. It developed a great attractive power for the workers, farmers and all genuine lovers of democracy and progress.

Federationists like Congressmen Thomas Amlie and George Schneider who indulged in "respectable" Red-baiting were elected only by the narrowest of margins, thanks to the united efforts of the trade unionists, militant Socialists, Communists and Progressives who refused to let their ranks be divided and carried on a stubborn campaign against the reactionaries. But the majority of the Federation ticket in Milwaukee, Kenosha, Madison and Racine went down to defeat primarily because in these places the Federation leadership surrendered to the Red-baiters, side-stepped the central issues in the campaign of developing a united mass struggle against reaction, for security, concrete economic demands, democratic rights and peace, and restricted the campaign to reformist parliamentary electioneering.

Those candidates of the Federation, like Emil Costello of Kenosha and to some extent Paul Alfonsi of Iron and Vilas counties,

Walter Rush of Taylor County, Michael Kresky of Green Bay, to mention only a few, who went over to the counter-offensive against the reactionaries and their pro-fascist anti-Communist attacks, emerged successful and the interests of the Farmer-Labor Party movement were advanced. Other Federationists like Max Geline, Waldemar Sonneman, and Paul Gauer from Milwaukee who waged an aggressive campaign against the Red-baiters were defeated, due partly to the unfavorable class composition of the districts in which they ran and to the partial sabotage of their campaigns by the official Federation leadership. Their defeat, in some respects, was also a victory, a victory measured not in terms of votes but in the positive effects of a campaign that served to promote the cause of the Farmer-Labor Party.

The issue is clear. As in the municipal elections in April and in the primary election of September 15, so in the November 3 general election, it has been proven that a militant anti-fascist campaign, a united and people's front of struggle, can check reaction and defeat the Red-baiters. The Red scare, creature of Hearst and the reactionaries of all shades, can be smashed. Capitulation to the Red-baiters, advocacy of a Red-baiting policy, opposition to the united front with Communists and other militant sections of the labor and progressive movements, divide and weaken the Federation, organized labor and the liberal forces and can only lead to defeat and ultimate disaster. Milwaukee and Madison are miniature examples, Germany and Austria, classic ones, France and Spain, their counterparts.

The people have spoken. On November 3 they voiced a mighty approval and desire for the people's front, for a Farmer-Labor Party, for a fighting front of the people which is all-inclusive, which unites trade unionists, farmers, Progressives, Communists, Socialists and their organizations. The leaders, members and adherents of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation must act in time and carry out the people's mandate. The impending coalition between the Wisconsin Republicans and Democrats, the growing attacks of the employers must be defeated. The united and people's front must be forged or reaction will win. The Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation must be strengthened and broadened, must be developed into a fighting Farmer-Labor Party, as an organic part of the national Farmer-Labor Party movement. This is the will of the people. This is the central task confronting the Federation and its supporters. This is the way to realize the demands of the masses and the essentially anti-fascist platform of the Federation.

II

An important factor and development in the Wisconsin elections was the election policy and campaign of the Socialist Party and the

effects of this policy among the masses and upon the Socialist Party, as well as the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation.

In this connection, it is necessary to distinguish between the national and state campaigns of the Socialist Party which were developed more or less in contradiction to each other. The former represented the line of reformist sectarianism and semi-Trotskyism, the latter was based on the policy of Right opportunist Social-Democratic reformism and Old Guardist liquidationism. Yet both resulted in accentuating the crisis within the Socialist Party, impeding the united front and further abandoning the principles and teachings of Marxism.

The national campaign developed in Wisconsin in behalf of Norman Thomas differed little from that conducted elsewhere. The editorials of *The Milwaukee Leader* in support of the Socialist presidential ticket repeated the hackneyed doctrinaire phrases concerning the "collapse of capitalism", "the issue is socialism vs. capitalism", "the Socialists stand for socialism". Norman Thomas, in his meetings in Wisconsin, elaborated on these points, adding to the confusion, sectarianism and abstractions of the Socialist Party by promulgating a Trotskyist position on war, slandering the peace policy of the Soviet Union and its "military alliances with imperialist nations".

The logical fruits of this disastrous policy were already manifested early in the course of the election campaign and were ignominiously "crowned" with catastrophic results on November 3. The national election program and tactics of the Socialist Party not only brought Thomas and his adherents to a head-on collision with the labor and progressive movement in Wisconsin as elsewhere. It likewise brought them into a head-on collision with the majority of the members and followers of the Socialist Party. It served to push a big section of the Socialist membership and sympathizers over into the camp of Roosevelt, some into the Lemke-Coughlin forces, as well as playing directly into the hands of Mayor Hoan and the Right-wing Socialists who are pursuing a policy of liquidating the Socialist Party as an independent political force and factor, substituting the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation for the Socialist Party.

On the one hand this was indicated by the position of the majority of the Socialist delegates in the July state convention of the Wisconsin Federation of Labor who supported a resolution giving tacit endorsement to Roosevelt. Again this was expressed in the stand taken by the Socialist delegates from Polk County to the Farm Holiday state convention in support of Lemke, as well as by the open organization of and participation in "Roosevelt for President" clubs by a number of prominent Socialists such as Mike

Sosterich, Socialist leader in the South Slav organizations in Milwaukee. On the other hand, it was sharply emphasized in the chaotic drop of the Socialist vote, which in the industrial centers went chiefly to Roosevelt and in the farming areas partly to Lemke. A few figures will suffice: In Milwaukee County Thomas polled 6,259 votes as compared to 32,874 in 1932; Douglas County, 78 votes in comparison with 1,113 in 1932; Racine County, 243 this year in contrast to 2,110 four years ago; 5 votes in Iron County as compared to 115 in 1932; 260 votes in Dane County as compared to 1,725 in the last election.

This unparalleled drop in the Socialist vote is, of course, not merely the inevitable outcome of the reformist, sectarian, and semi-Trotskyist election policy conducted by the Socialist Party nationally, but also was brought about as a result of the Right-wing social-reformist policy pursued by the Wisconsin Socialist leadership.

The Socialist Party of Wisconsin did not carry on a vigorous or a broad campaign for Thomas and Nelson. It did not wish to be "embarrassed" by the political line of the national campaign committee. It piously wanted to see a large Socialist presidential vote in order to strengthen the "bargaining" positions of the Socialist Party in the maturing national Farmer-Labor Party, but it did not wish to jeopardize its activity in Wisconsin with the sectarian, anti-labor policy of Thomas. Above all, it wanted practical electoral success in the Wisconsin elections. Hence it sabotaged the Thomas campaign.

In contrast to the position of the National Executive Committee that the central election issue was "Socialism vs. Capitalism", the Wisconsin Socialists formally endorsed the policy of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, which clearly stated that the main question facing the working people was to "unite the labor and liberal forces to defeat reaction". In opposition to the anti-Farmer-Labor Party stand of Thomas, Hoan and Company endorsed and became an intimate part of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation and its campaign. In fact, Hoan endeavored to impart to the national Socialist campaign a virtue which it did not possess, claiming, in a United Press interview, that the "main aim of the Socialist Party in the presidential elections is to lay the foundations for a national Farmer-Labor Party".

While the Socialist presidential vote all but disappeared from the Wisconsin scene, the heretofore stronghold of American Social-Democracy, the Wisconsin Socialists succeeded in electing eight assemblymen and one state senator on the Progressive-Federation ticket in comparison to three Socialist assemblymen in the 1934-36 legislature. This took place in spite of the fact that the Wisconsin Socialists abandoned practically all independent Socialist activity. This was

made possible, however, primarily because of the joint activity of the labor unions, the Communists, Left-wing Progressives and the rank-and-file Socialists who loyally supported and united around the Federation, its candidates and platform.

But this was a costly victory for the Socialist Party, as is evidenced by what happened to the Wisconsin Socialists in the process of the elections. Did the Socialist Party emerge stronger politically and organizationally? Did it fight for the "unity of labor and liberal forces" and come forward in favor of building the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation into an all-inclusive Farmer-Labor Party? Did it combat the attempts of the Right-wing Progressives to convert the Federation into an appendage to the Progressive Party? To pose these questions is to answer them, and the answer is no!

Unlike Thomas and the Trotskyite wing in the Socialist Party who view the Farmer-Labor Party as a rival to the Socialist Party, Mayor Hoan and the Right-wing Socialists approach the Federation and the Farmer-Labor Party as a substitute for the Socialist Party. This has determined the latest developments in the Socialist Party and its changed role in the political life of the state. Independent activity and the membership and mass meetings of the Socialist Party have been systematically curtailed and are now virtually extinct. The branches of the Socialist Party have in the main ceased to operate. In Milwaukee, in place of the former twenty-seven ward branches of the Socialist Party, one central county branch is shortly to be formed. Almost all political activity, including election work, has been transferred from the Socialist Party to the Federation. *The Milwaukee Leader*, Socialist organ founded by Victor Berger, is in the process of reorganization and will shortly appear as the organ of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation. Here it is necessary to state that while this situation alters in some respects the *form* of the struggle for the united front between the Socialist Party and the Communist Party, yet the problem of united Socialist-Communist action becomes ever more vital and imperative, especially within the Federation, labor unions and Workers Alliance.

Let there be no misunderstanding. There can be no quarrel with the Wisconsin Socialists for having entered the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation. This was a correct step, which objectively, at least, serves to advance the Farmer-Labor Party movement. Our criticism of the Wisconsin Socialists is leveled at their policy of joining the Federation at the expense of the Socialist Party, at their aim and practical policy of liquidating the Socialist Party, and at the series of political concessions which they are making to the La-Follettes at the expense of Socialism and the Farmer-Labor Party movement. Furthermore, our criticism arises because the Right-

wing Socialists are endeavoring not only to build the Federation as a substitute for the Socialist Party, but are likewise striving to unload upon the Federation their Social-Democratic reformist policies, including attempts to narrow down the base and role of the Federation as a broad anti-fascist people's front by trying to commit it to an abstract reformist program of "production for use". They also are seeking to convert the Federation into an anti-Communist, anti-united front organization, a policy which, if not defeated, can only bring the Federation, like the Socialist Party, to ruin, with disastrous consequences for the masses.

This has already been established in the spring election, again on November 3. It is a matter of fact that it is primarily a small clique of Right-wing Socialists in the Milwaukee organization of the Federation who are the chief purveyors and instigators of Red-baiting and proletarian disunity within the Federation. It is a matter of record that these people are endeavoring to guide the Federation, like the Socialist Party, along reformist parliamentary channels, abandoning the class struggle, and oppose the launching of a people's mass movement to achieve the demands of the masses as put forward in the program and principles of the Federation. This explains, for instance, why the majority of the County Committee of the Federation in Milwaukee, dominated by Socialists, voted to refuse to participate in the Committee for Defense of Spanish Democracy, because, in the words of Andrew Biemiller, state educational director of the Socialist Party, "this is an election period and we can't afford to injure the campaign", and more crassly in the words of Jack Friedrich, "we can't co-operate with the Committee for Defense of Spanish Democracy because there are Communists in it, just as in the Spanish People's Front". This is why the Federation in Milwaukee during the election campaign did all in its power to isolate the Federation from the strike and unemployed movements and sought to insulate the Federation from the anti-fascist struggle. This is one of the main reasons why the Federation was unable to forge ahead more rapidly and to win more substantial successes on November 3.

Yet it is to the everlasting credit of the Left-wing Socialists, headed by Mrs. Meta Berger, that they combatted this treachery and came forward during the election campaign in defense of the Spanish people and the cause of world peace and championed the fight for working class unity. Likewise it is a most promising sign that within the Federation there is growing at a rapid pace a strong Left-wing core and sentiment, influenced by the experiences in France and Spain, by the events in Terre Haute, and Wisconsin, as well as by the united front policy of the Communist Party, which

stands for building the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation into a united anti-fascist Farmer-Labor Party, which is working to set in motion a broad people's movement of struggle around the program of the Federation. The strength of these forces lies in their anti-fascist policy and widening base in the trade unions and C.I.O. movement, as well as in the Workers Alliance and farm organizations.

It is these conflicting trends and policies within the Wisconsin Socialist Party, coupled with the sectarian course and ruinous tactics pursued by Norman Thomas and the N.E.C. of the Socialist Party, which explain the drastic shrinkage of the Socialist vote and influence in Wisconsin, as elsewhere in the country and explain why the crisis in the Socialist Party gains in momentum and has become so acute.

Of course, what we are dealing with here is not merely the results of a disastrous election policy. The problem is more basic than this, its roots go much deeper. It is organically bound up with the profound crisis of Social-Democracy in general, and with the sharp decline in the political influence of the Socialist Party in Wisconsin, with its narrowing base and organizational collapse in particular. (In 1934 the Socialist Party of Wisconsin had 5,500 members; in May, 1936, 2,300, and today less than 1,000.) It is the natural result of the political bankruptcy of the Socialist Party which has been accelerated especially during the crisis years, a situation brought about by the violent opposition of the majority of the Socialist leadership to the united and people's front; by the weaknesses, unclarity and vacillation of the Left-wing Socialists; by the recent infiltration and devastating influence of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism within the Socialist Party; by the historical and practical failure of its policy of class collaboration and "municipal socialism" and its theory of the "peaceful" transition and evolution from decaying capitalism to socialism via the road of cooperatives and the ballot box.

It is, basically, the consequence of the whole post-war crisis of international Social-Democracy and the tragic results of its policy in Germany and Austria on the one hand; in contrast to which stand the triumph of Marxism-Leninism, the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the mighty achievements of the united and people's front in France, Spain and other countries.

Whether or not the Socialist Party of Wisconsin and America emerges from its profound crisis depends to a large extent upon whether, as the Central Committee of our Party stated on November 7, "the Socialist Party rids itself of the Trotskyite disrupters, makes a united front with the Communist Party, and aids in the

furthering of the people's movement against reaction, fascism and war, and in the movement for an all-inclusive Farmer-Labor Party".

III

The keynote of our Wisconsin state election policy, based on our national campaign, strategy and tactics, was united action to defeat the parties and forces of reaction, to advance the movement for independent political action and to strengthen the people's front movement being crystallized in Wisconsin through and around the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation. Inseparably interwoven with this twofold task was our policy of popularizing our immediate demands as well as our basic program for socialism, and of strengthening the Communist Party and its independent presidential campaign and mass work of mobilizing and organizing the masses for the defense of their immediate economic needs and political rights, for halting the advance of fascism and war, thereby hastening the developments toward socialism.

We first formulated the essential content of this policy immediately after the formation of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation in December, 1935, and correctly applied the tactics of the united and people's front in giving qualified support to the majority of the Socialist and Federation candidates in the municipal elections in Milwaukee and several other centers in March and April, 1936. At this time we achieved initial successes in operating our policy to the advantage of our Party and the masses, strengthening both our Communist activity and the united front movement, and helped to lay the foundations for pushing forward the building of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation.

On June 8 we addressed an open letter to the State Executive Committee of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, submitting constructive proposals for expanding and developing the Federation into an all-inclusive, anti-fascist organization, democratically controlled and based primarily on the trade unions and farm organizations, and for actively drawing the Federation into the national Farmer-Labor Party movement. We outlined our policy for the approaching elections in November and further recommended that committees of our organizations meet to consider how best to secure the defeat of the Republican and Democratic Parties, return a Farmer-Labor legislative and congressional bloc and by an electoral pact avoid any splitting of the Farmer-Labor and Progressive vote.

The Socialist and Progressive leaders of the Federation refused to meet with us. Notwithstanding this, and despite the absence of an official agreement, we proceeded to develop our mass campaign for unity over the heads of the leaders, directly with the membership

and lower organizations, and boldly came forward in critical support of the Federation. We entered no state or county Communist ticket, other than those Communists who were subsequently selected to run as Federationists on the Progressive Party ticket, or who, as in Taylor County, ran on a united front ticket in the primary election.

The position of our Party and its proposals for unity of action met with enthusiastic response. Our policy was clear-cut and constructive and met the needs and aspirations of the people and served as a guide to action. It became the instrument, together with our national election platform and campaign, for developing broad mass movements and for widening our relations and connections with rank-and-file Socialists, trade unionists and Progressives on an unprecedented scale.

Despite the fact that Henry Rutz, state secretary of the Federation, and Andrew Biemiller, campaign manager of the Federation in Milwaukee County, issued two slanderous, Red-baiting public statements during the campaign repudiating our qualified endorsement of the Federation and its candidates, our Party continued its day-to-day activity in cooperation with the membership and followers of the Federation and the Socialist Party. It was also able to conclude election agreements with seven Federation assembly candidates, one senatorial and one congressional candidate, and established friendly working relations with nearly a dozen other candidates.

Because of the correctness of our policy and due to the effectiveness of our efforts in energetically working to build the Federation and to develop a united movement in support of its Farmer-Labor program and demands, coupled with the ability of the Party to link up closely the state campaign with the extension of its independent mass agitation and activity around our Communist presidential campaign, the Party succeeded in multiplying its mass contacts, enlarging its political influence, extending its base in the trade unions and Workers Alliance, as well as in the Federation, this in spite of the official barring of Communists from membership in the Federation. It became an important force in determining the results of the elections in a whole number of districts in favor of the Federation and the Progressive Party. This was more than verified by the influential role of the Party in helping to bring about the election of the Federationists in the 2nd and 6th Assembly Districts in Milwaukee and the 2nd Assembly District in Kenosha, as well as the election of senators George Hampel, Michael Kresky and Walter Rush and Congressman Thomas Amlie.

In reviewing the election policy and work of the Communist Party, an important factor which must be considered is the some-

what complicated set of tasks which our Party was called upon to fulfil. We had to differentiate between the camps and trends within the Progressive Party, which included the necessity of giving a conditional endorsement to Gov. LaFollette and the Progressive state ticket following the primary election and after the Progressive platform convention had adopted the Federation election platform and the Federation had modified its tactics to vote the straight Progressive ticket, as well as to win the followers of the Progressive Party for the Federation. We had to combine a line of giving qualified support to the Federation with a consistent exposure, criticism and struggle against the opportunism, vacillations and unprincipled maneuvers of the Federation leadership. We had to differentiate in our agitation and propaganda between the Landon and the Roosevelt forces on a national scale on the one hand, while directing equal fire against the equally reactionary state Republican and Democratic machines and campaigns. We had the task of combining the unmasking of and struggle against the Landon-Republican Party-Liberty League combination and developing consistent criticism of Roosevelt, his record, policies and role, with the necessity of sharply exposing and waging an intensive fight against the Lemke-Union campaign and ideology which was relatively strong amongst the farmers and Catholic population, at the same time aiming to win the Coughlin and Townsend followers to the Federation banner. Side by side with all this, we had to conduct a two-fold struggle against both the reformist and sectarian policy of Thomas and the N.E.C. and the Right-wing Social-Democratic opportunism of the dominant Hoan group in the Socialist Party of Wisconsin.

A significant achievement of the election activity of the Party was its ability to apply concretely the line of the Central Committee and to map out correct tactics in this complex situation and at each change of events.

Equally important was the ability of the Party to combine its vigorous work within the Federation and its united front activity in support of the Federation program with the task of broadening and strengthening the independent mass activity and presidential campaign of the Party.

It is true that in the Fox River Valley region and in certain districts in La Crosse, Clark, Racine, and Kenosha counties, the Party organizations, due to organizational weaknesses and insufficiently strong Party cadres, developed very little open, independent Communist activity and to a great extent submerged their identity and work almost completely in the Federation campaign, this to the detriment of both the Party and the Federation. In a few sections

certain Right opportunist tendencies were manifested, primarily in an inability to combat effectively the Red scare, failure to organize the election campaign as a campaign of struggle for immediate economic and political demands, a tendency in isolated cases to form united front agreements "at all costs" with certain Right-wing Progressive and Socialist leaders, an insufficiently critical stand toward LaFollette and a weak explanation of the position of our Party towards Roosevelt. But in the main, these weaknesses and deviations were not widespread, and certainly did not in any way characterize the work and line of the Party as a whole.

Without question, the Party organized the greatest independent mass campaign in its history and boldly brought forward our program and policy. This is not only confirmed by the general results of the election and the influential, and in some cases leading, role the Party played in organizing and guiding successful united front movements around the Federation campaign and program, and in contributing to the election of many Federation and Progressive candidates, but is likewise indicated by the increased Communist votes for a number of local Party candidates, *i.e.*, by the election of nine known Communists as state committeemen of the Progressive Party, and by the large vote polled by Sam Amorelli, open Communist candidate running for coroner on the Progressive ticket in Taylor County.

Moreover, while the Communist presidential vote showed a slight decline in Milwaukee County and a 40 per cent drop in Racine and Kenosha Counties in comparison to 1932, the vote for Browder and Ford showed a substantial rise throughout most of the state, ranging from a 75 per cent or better increase in Winnebago, Sheboygan, Taylor, Iron and Fond du Lac Counties to 300 per cent increase in Dane County. The decline in the Communist presidential vote in Milwaukee County where our Party developed a really mass campaign and expanded its independent Communist activity is to be explained not only by the general fear of a Landon victory which was widespread in the labor movement, but because our Party was unable to offset in time the broad campaign for Roosevelt conducted in the trade unions by the C.I.O., Labor's Non-Partisan League and the Progressive Party, and did not succeed in turning this powerful anti-Hearst-Republican sentiment into channels of independent political action in support of Browder and Ford.

Secondly, the expansion of the independent work of the Party in the elections is expressed in some degree by the scope of the mass agitation and propaganda of the Party which can be partially measured by the following figures: the Party organized 44 local radio broad-

casts in Madison, Racine, Superior and Milwaukee. It held throughout the state 76 street and mass meetings and participated in 20 non-Party symposiums, reaching approximately 22,000 people. It published and distributed 225,000 election leaflets and pluggers. It distributed 75,000 election platforms and 50,000 other national and special state pamphlets. It also raised over \$5,000 for the national and state election fund, in addition to a large amount for the Federation.

Thirdly, and of paramount importance, was the fact that our Party in a number of places linked its election campaign with the organization of and active participation in a number of important strike struggles, such as the *Wisconsin News* and Seaman Body auto strikes in Milwaukee, the new Case auto strike in Racine, the Snap-On, American Brass, and Simmons struggles in Kenosha. It is playing an important role in the struggle for trade union unity and industrial unionism, aiding in strengthening the Wisconsin C.I.O. movement, and actively assisting in the drives to organize the Allis-Chalmers, the packing-house workers and the Case auto workers. It increased its activity among the unemployed in north-western Wisconsin and in the Fox River Valley and to some degree among the project workers in Milwaukee. It energetically participated in the united front movement in defense of Spanish democracy and world peace. Likewise it coordinated the election campaign with the movement in the sixth ward, Milwaukee, for improved housing conditions and equal rights for the Negro people.

It was on this basis that the united front movement was advanced and our election activity broadened. Nevertheless, this phase of the mass work of our Party was very unevenly developed and did not commence to measure up to the needs and possibilities of the situation. There was on the whole inadequate attention to the key task of organizing and heading mass struggles for the most pressing daily economic and political rights of the masses and of using this as the *main starting point and link* for widening and consolidating the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation and the united front movement against reaction and the heightened danger of fascism and war.

To a limited extent the increased independent activity of the Party was also reflected in a strengthening of its organizational base and position, chiefly within the Federation and trade unions. The membership of the Party in Wisconsin has now been increased to over 1,200. But this slow rise in the Party membership during the campaign is all out of proportion to the growing mass influence of the Party and its role as a more influential factor in the labor movement and in relation to the requirements of the present situation.

It was the inability of the Party to consolidate organizationally

on a broad scale its increased prestige and activities that hampered the development of our election campaign to the extent made possible by existing conditions. It was the inadequate number of sufficiently developed Marxist-Leninist cadres which restricted the further advance of our mass work. Similarly, the glaring weaknesses of the work of the Party among the youth, before and during the campaign, adversely affected our election activities and curtailed many aspects of our mass work.

Today more than ever we must really face and solve this problem, the problem of consolidating our political influence and united front activities and of building and strengthening the Party and the Young Communist League into real mass organizations and centers of independent mass political activity.

This task is fundamental; without it our Party cannot exert a decisive influence in American life and politics. Upon the realization of this problem, the task of finally transforming the Party into a real mass party, depends to a great extent the immediate development and future of the united and people's front movement, of the crystallization of a national Farmer-Labor Party, of the success of the struggle for security, democracy and peace, of the tempo of the march towards socialism.

IV

One of the central problems confronting the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, the Progressive, Socialist and Communist Parties, and the labor and farm organizations is to guarantee that the people's mandate given to the Federation and Progressive members-elect of the Wisconsin legislature shall be put into life. The social legislation program of the state government must be exactly the same as the people's front program of the Federation upon which Governor LaFollette and the majority of the legislature were elected. The election victory of November 3 must be pushed forward not only by the adoption of a legislative, executive and administrative policy conforming to the program of the Federation, but must be consolidated and ensured by the launching of a broad people's mass movement.

The Communist Party on its part pledges to work loyally to bring about the realization of the people's mandate. It will sponsor and support, in alliance with other labor, as well as farm and liberal organizations, a program of social legislation in accordance with the above. It will support all measures introduced by the Federation and Progressive bloc in the Wisconsin legislature and Congress which are based upon the program of the Federation and will advance the interests of labor and the cause of progress and peace.

Above all, it will bend every effort to organize the struggle of the masses of people and to strengthen the Federation and the class organizations of the workers and farmers, which is the chief guarantee that the program of the Federation will be carried into life.

Unfortunately there are people at the head of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, certain Right-wing Socialists and Progressives, who do not share this view. These people would reduce the fight for the program of the Federation to a system of parliamentary debates and maneuvers. They would, as in the past, endeavor to secure support for a program of social legislation by the process of forming unprincipled blocs and coalitions with representatives of the reactionary Republican and Democratic Parties instead of by winning the support of the masses, by forming a fighting coalition of the working people. They would narrow down the organization and activity of the Federation to that of an electioneering apparatus, an instrument for vote-getting and poll-duty. They would make the Federation an appendage to the Progressive Party and would prevent it from developing into a fighting anti-fascist Farmer-Labor Party which would function as a unifying center and active participant in the everyday struggles of the people, in the fight against reaction, fascism and war.

To defeat these tendencies, to overcome these Social-Democratic and third party influences, without which the program of the Federation cannot be achieved nor the Federation fulfil its basic principles and historic role—it is imperative that the growing Farmer-Labor Party wing within the Federation and its adherents in the trade union and farm organizations, in the Socialist Party and Progressive Party, together with the Communists, coordinate their forces and activities and boldly embark upon the path of transforming the Federation into a militant, all-inclusive Farmer-Labor Party, allied with and participating with the Minnesota and other Farmer-Labor Party organizations and forces in the speedy launching of a national Farmer-Labor Party.

The Elections in New York

By I. AMTER

THE New York State organization of the Party carried out the most energetic and effective election campaign in its history. This campaign was notable (1) for the new methods used; (2) for the new territory opened up; (3) for the organizations and sections of the population the Party was able to reach; (4) for the splendid work done by the Young Communist League, which conducted an independent campaign.

These advances were due to the patient work that the Party has done over a period of years in entrenching itself among the masses of the state, particularly in the trade unions. The Party has a membership of close to 16,000 in the state, of whom more than 10,000 belong to the A. F. of L. In several trade unions the leadership of the Communists is established. Although this is a decided plus as far as the election campaign is concerned, nevertheless, it also presents an element which requires special consideration in New York because of our status in the trade unions, as well as because of the American Labor Party, of which the trade unions are an integral part.

Let us briefly survey the economic and political situation in New York as the background and basis of the election campaign. New York is one of the states worst hit by unemployment. Owing to the character of industry in New York, and particularly New York City, as well as the composition of the population from an occupational standpoint, unemployment played and still plays a very significant part in all the issues before the people. Thus, only a few months ago, the records of New York City showed that there are nearly one million unemployed in the city. Very significant are the facts, as established by a survey made by the W.P.A., that there are 393,000 young people between 16 and 25 years of age in New York City who have never had a job, as well as 245,000 white collar, professional and middle class people, who are deprived of a regular income. Although there has been a revival of industrial production throughout the country—and this has also affected New York—nevertheless, as a result of rationalization and technological improvements the number of unemployed in the state declines very slowly. A small number of workers have been re-employed in private industry, but the main feature of the situation is that the workers are working longer hours and wages have increased slightly.

This leaves a large number of workers without prospect of work.

For some months, and now more sharply than ever, relief cases are being closed whether the client actually is in need or not. Twenty-five thousand cases in New York City are to be closed willy-nilly. W.P.A. workers are being subjected to a very sharp examination as to their economic situation, with the aim of cutting down the W.P.A. to the minimum.

For more than three years a definite struggle has been going on in Tammany Hall, the most reactionary political organization in New York City, and one that plays a very significant part in American politics. In the elections of 1933—and only a few months after the inauguration of Roosevelt—there took place the Mayoralty elections in New York. In these elections the open struggle in Tammany Hall between the pro-Roosevelt and anti-Roosevelt forces was manifest. The pro-Roosevelt forces placed McKee in nomination in opposition to the Tammany candidate, O'Brien. As a result of this split and the organization of the Fusion movement, both Tammany and Roosevelt lost out, and LaGuardia, the Fusion candidate, was elected. This struggle continues to date. In fact, without considering the defection of Al Smith and Judge Cohalan, both of whom were potent forces in Tammany Hall, it is a fact that only a few days before the elections on November 3 the leaders of Tammany Hall issued a statement in support of Roosevelt and Lehman. A similar struggle has been going on in the Republican Party between the so-called Old Guard and Young Guard. It is not a question of a difference of policy, but of drawing new people of the type of Hamilton, the national chairman of the Republican Party, into the leadership in New York. The Old Guard, however, still controls the Republican Party of New York.

The elections in New York showed an unprecedented sweep for Roosevelt, even exceeding the figures of 1932. Roosevelt had a plurality of 1,404,296 votes—this including about 300,000 votes cast for him on the American Labor Party ticket. (The exact vote on the American Labor Party ticket has not yet been officially reported, but it is estimated at at least 300,000 throughout the state.) In 1932, Roosevelt's plurality amounted only to 596,996. To be sure, this year the vote cast in the state was far higher—more than a million more people went to the polls. Relief and the W.P.A. played a very significant part in his victory in New York. This, together with Roosevelt's challenging speech at the final election rally at Madison Square Garden, helped produce the vote on Election Day.

Lehman, who originally did not "choose to run", was prevailed upon by the national convention of the Democratic Party to accept

renomination in view of what was considered a danger in the national elections through the possible loss of 47 votes in the electoral college. New York was regarded as one of the pivotal states. Lehman, however, by his dictatorial attitude towards the farmers during the projected milk strike, and at the hearings in Albany, lost considerable support. Simultaneously he antagonized many workers and trade unionists in New York by whitewashing District Attorney Geoghan of Kings County, against charges and a demand for his removal made by the Kings County Grand Jury. Lehman signed the Ives Loyalty Oath Law for teachers, and did not oppose the McNaboe resolution for an investigation of Communism in the schools. Lehman, whose voice was considered that of Roosevelt, went further than his chief during the election campaign and proposed, if necessary, an amendment to the United States Constitution to curb the U.S. Supreme Court.

These facts, which, on the one hand, gave material to the reactionaries in the Democratic Party, on the other hand, supported the more progressive elements through Lehman's record and his proposal for an amendment. Nevertheless, another factor entered into the situation. Lehman, as a Jew, could reasonably count upon a solid Jewish vote, which is very powerful in New York State. On the other hand, the religious issue was introduced, especially by certain supporters of Judge Bleakley, who is a Catholic. The result was that Lehman won the governorship by a plurality of approximately 839,000 throughout the state, this including about 300,000 votes cast for him on the American Labor Party ticket.

Judge Bleakley, a reactionary of Westchester County, advocated the whole program of the Republican Party for economy, balancing the budget, etc. At the same time he pretended to be a friend of labor. He laid stress upon his connections with the labor movement in Westchester County. Like Landon he declared labor had the right to organize. In New York City he ran ahead of Landon by 210,000 and in the state by more than 240,000. It must be remembered that Bleakley was supported by one of the most reactionary outfits in the state. Father Coughlin supported Bleakley, and the German-American Alliance (Nazi organization), which is quite strong in New York, threw its support to Landon and Bleakley.

There was also a special election in New York City for President of the Board of Aldermen, as well as several propositions for vote by referendum. These included a new city charter, proportional representation, a state constitutional convention, an eight-hour day for the firemen, and a \$30,000,000 bond issue for relief. The first three propositions, of vital importance to the whole state, were discussed very little during the election campaign.

It was in the midst of this situation in New York State that the Communist Party entered the election campaign. The State Committee, even prior to the national convention of the Party, and as early as spring of this year, prepared for the election campaign and took steps to set up the election machinery. As the campaign developed, the machinery was perfected. Nevertheless, we must say that we have still to learn how to build a real election machine, functioning in the assembly and election districts, in close contact with the people in their homes, and making this an integral part of the work of the Party the whole year around. Such measures are now being adopted by the State Committee for the municipal elections of 1937.

The issues before the people of New York State and New York City were embraced in the Party's national platform and were concretized in the assembly and congressional districts. Relief, W.P.A., housing, milk, transit unification, Negro rights, civil liberties, schools, needs of the youth, women, etc., were outstanding issues. These were handled in a more concrete manner by the county, sections, and assembly districts than ever before. Leaflets of a new type, pamphlets thoroughly examining the local neighborhood situation were issued in tremendous quantities. Outdoor movies, symposiums, lectures, forums, were arranged. The Party reached large numbers of women's civic and fraternal organizations with which it previously had no contact. Colleges, universities and schools organized meetings and symposiums with our leading candidates, Comrades Browder and Minor. (Comrade Ford spent only three days in the state.) Open-air rallies, marches, torchlight parades, took place through the whole period of the campaign.

But, above all, the Party entered new neighborhoods, especially Irish and Italian neighborhoods, with which we had no contact before. The Spanish situation, the Italian-Ethiopian war, stimulated national and religious feelings and encouraged backward elements against the Party. However, the concrete proposals of the Party and the correct approach to these masses made it possible for us to hold many meetings among them, sell and distribute our literature, to win converts and some recruits, and at least to neutralize a large section of these people.

The State Committee put forward some of the leading comrades as candidates. Our state candidates opened up new towns upstate. New contacts with progressive trade unionists were made. Relations with the Socialists upstate in some instances improved. The Party had as its candidates twenty-seven women, eighteen Negroes and twelve youth. Most of the candidates were active in the campaign. The Party had six state broadcasts and 50 local broadcasts. The State Committee itself issued more than a million leaflets, and

at least a similar number was issued and distributed by the county, sections, branches and units. Shop papers, shop bulletins, posters, neighborhood papers, assembly district papers, having real agitational and organizational quality, were issued. More than 1,380,000 pamphlets, booklets, etc., were issued directly through the state literature department. Although mainly in English there was a large quantity of pamphlets in Jewish, Spanish, Italian, German, etc. The state organization was supplied with the record of the Congressmen and Assemblymen, with an analysis of the outstanding local and state issues, by the periodical *State of Affairs*.

The weaknesses of the campaign were: failure to organize sufficient election committees, to organize Browder-Ford clubs in the unions, mass organizations and neighborhoods. A few were formed and carried on work, but the number was totally inadequate. A further weakness in the campaign, and one of serious import, was the failure to raise the question of the struggle of the Spanish People's Front as an integral part of our election campaign. Another weakness, and not only a local phenomenon, but one that took on larger dimensions, was the failure to bring forward the question of the revolutionary way out, the building of socialism in the United States, and link it up with the election agitation and propaganda.

But one of the outstanding features of the whole campaign was the absence of struggles of major importance. There were many small strikes, but only one of any dimension took place, namely, that of the painters of New York. This was of short duration. Upstate the strike of the Remington Rand workers was in progress, but owing to the weakness of our Party organization in Syracuse and other towns, we obtained very little contact with the strike. The seamen's strike began toward the end of the campaign. There were struggles at the relief bureaus, but they did not assume big dimensions even though they were militant. Struggles developed in Harlem, but even there they did not assume a very large form. It was obvious that the relief and W.P.A. workers looked to Roosevelt for continuation of relief and W.P.A.

Repressive measures against the Communist Party were employed not only in the South and Terre Haute, but in so-called liberal New York. The Communist Party was prohibited from holding a meeting in Town Hall or in schools in Jamaica, Queens. Comrade Browder's meeting in Buffalo was stopped in two halls and finally took place in a church. At Kingston and Peekskill similar measures were taken against the Party, although finally meetings were held. The reactionary Hearst press of New York, which is very strong, attempted to whip up a fury against the Communist Party.

Two weaknesses that appear almost inconceivable in the midst of

such an extensive campaign manifested themselves: the circulation of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker*, and recruiting. The circulation of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker* remained practically stationary during the campaign, although there were several special editions. It was clear during the campaign that the *Daily Worker* was not made an integral part of every rally and meeting, of every speech. Recruiting, which should have been immensely intensified during the campaign, and for which great possibilities existed, not only did not increase but even went below normal. It appeared as if the Party were "too busy" with the election campaign to think of recruiting—even though letters were sent by the Central Committee and State Committee to each member of the Party reminding him of the necessity of recruiting: even though functionary and membership meetings were held emphasizing this part of the campaign.

The culminating point of the election campaign was the splendid mass rally at Madison Square Garden, which even the capitalist newspapers admit was equal to that of Roosevelt and of Landon (with thousands unable to get in) and which put in the shade the terrible fiasco of the Socialist Party. This meeting and the attention paid to our campaign throughout its course by every capitalist newspaper show how deeply our Party has penetrated the masses of workers, farmers, and middle class people, and what a tremendous base the Party now has from which to go forward. The election campaign showed the State Committee the necessity of much more intensive work upstate, not only in the industrial cities, of which there are many, but also among the farmers. Our farm work is just beginning. This important section of the New York population can no longer be neglected in view of the significant part the farmers can play in all major struggles in New York.

At the Ninth Convention of our Party, after analyzing the political situation, the Party adopted the thesis that its main task in the election campaign was to defeat reaction. The main slogan in the campaign was "Defeat Landon at All Costs". At the same time the Party adopted three other distinct tasks in the campaign coupled up with the general campaign, namely: (1) to build the Farmer-Labor Party as the expression of independent political action on the part of the workers and farmers; (2) to pile up a big Communist vote; (3) to recruit into the Party and extend the circulation of the Party press. The success of carrying through this tactic would determine to what degree we had broken with the old sectarian practices, as called for by the Seventh World Congress.

The State Committee carried on a very extensive campaign of clarification both inside and outside the Party. To no question, per-

haps, has the State Committee paid such minute attention as this one. By and large, we can say that the membership of the Party and the Y.C.L. grasped our election tactic. But momentum in the campaign did not develop until the last month and a half of the campaign. As a result of the clarification in the state, and especially through mass meetings and radio broadcasts, the prestige and influence of the Party rose very high. We can say that the Party organization in New York came through with flying colors and as a consequence the Party has been brought closer to masses of workers in the trade unions, mass organizations and among middle class people.

The Y.C.L. carried on not only an independent campaign but one that in many respects showed excellent initiative. The Y.C.L. State Committee developed an independent apparatus and activity that would interest and involve large numbers of young people. It issued its own literature, had its own broadcasts and developed its own campaign around two of its outstanding candidates. It issued tens of thousands of leaflets and very attractive folders and reached large numbers of young people in shops and trade unions, in schools and colleges. This campaign of the Young Communist League in the State of New York shows not only a break with the imitative method that the Y.C.L. had employed in the past, but also demonstrates that the State Committee of the Y.C.L. is capable of developing its own methods that will attract large sections of the youth of this state.

Another effective feature of the election campaign was the work done among the women. This revolved particularly around one of our leading woman comrades, Comrade Grace Hutchins, candidate for State Comptroller. This took the form of marches and rallies, as well as the opening of the doors of many women's organizations to the candidates of the Communist Party, and helped to rally many non-Party women in the campaign of our Party.

Labor's Non-Partisan League established a party in New York, the American Labor Party. Established from the top down, the American Labor Party entered the campaign with only one aim—the re-election of Roosevelt and Lehman. Although pressure was exerted upon the State Committee of the American Labor Party to nominate local and congressional candidates on the American Labor Party ticket, this was not done. The American Labor Party was based on trade union affiliation. During this process there had developed, particularly in New York City, the formation of Farmer-Labor Party clubs, which were united through the People's Committee for the Formation of Farmer-Labor Clubs. After some nego-

tiation, these clubs affiliated to the American Labor Party and played no mean part in the election campaign.

Only in a few instances did our fractions in the trade unions develop a campaign for the Communist Party of sizable dimensions. It is true many leaflets were issued, rallies and forums organized. Still there was lacking a real mobilization of the Party forces in the unions affiliated to the American Labor Party to carry on a campaign for the Communist candidates.

In the American Labor Party clubs, which were composed of members of the former Farmer-Labor Party clubs, as well as trade unionists assigned to the clubs in the respective assembly districts, the members of the People's Party, especially the Old Guard leaders, like Waldman, Oneal, Classens, etc., developed a real Red-baiting campaign. They tried to keep the Communists out of the clubs. But our comrades avoided head-on collisions; in a proper manner they exposed these reactionaries, and at the same time kept many progressives from leaving the American Labor Party in disgust.

The American Labor Party entered the election campaign for the re-election of Roosevelt and Lehman. The results of the elections far exceeded the expectations of the leadership of the American Labor Party. The American Labor Party developed little or no machinery in the assembly districts. To be sure they had clubs in the assembly districts, they held many effective open-air rallies, distributed many leaflets. But they had no machinery such as is needed to build up an election campaign. This was hardly to be expected. In several cities upstate—Rochester, Utica, Buffalo, Jamestown, etc.—the American Labor Party was organized. In Rochester it obtained about 15,000 votes, which is due to the trade union base on which it is built. In some small towns in Orange and Rockland County, the Labor Party came out second in the elections. This shows the tremendous possibility of building up the American Labor Party in the State of New York. Considering that in New York City, with 750,000 organized workers, and with the American Labor Party receiving 227,000 votes, there is every possibility that through proper organization and through the nomination of labor candidates on a labor platform, the American Labor Party will be able not only to elect a number of city councilmen in the municipal election of 1937, but to become the governing party in New York City. This can easily be achieved on the basis of the unexpectedly high vote this year, as well as through the development of democratic procedure in the building up of election machinery in every assembly and election district.

A development of unusual importance was that of the All-People's Party of Harlem. This party was formally launched in June

with the aim of embracing the whole of Harlem—Negro Harlem, as well as Latin American and Italian Harlem. The Party put forth three candidates, Marcantonio for Congress, Horace Gordon, a Negro progressive, in the 19th Assembly District, and Angelo Herndon in the 21st Assembly District of Harlem. In the course of building the All-People's Party, its activity, and that of the Party comrades working in it, were gradually shifted to Lower Harlem, among the Latin American and Italians, etc. This was a serious political and organizational error which was naturally reflected in the votes in Upper Harlem.

In Lower Harlem, a real election machinery was built up. Struggles were conducted. In one congressional district in the struggle against Tammany Hall and the Republican Party, which endorsed Marcantonio in the primaries, the All-People's Party received 5,200 votes. The Party is built on a firm basis and now has the task of achieving its original aim of establishing itself among the Negroes in Harlem together with the Puerto Rican and other elements representing what it known as All Harlem.

The American Labor Party carried on an election campaign in Harlem and succeeded in polling about 5,000 votes in the whole area. The American Labor Party built little election machinery during the campaign. The task lies ahead of merging the two groups in Harlem and of effecting affiliation of the All-People's Party to the American Labor Party.

During the latter period of the campaign there were organized some Junior American Labor Party clubs. This organization, originally sponsored as part of the progressive movement, became an integral part of the American Labor Party. There are splendid perspectives for the organization of young people into the American Labor Party through the medium of the Junior Clubs.

The Socialist Party sized up its campaign in the issue of the *Socialist Call* of November 7. Across the front page, the *Call* declared "We have lost the battle; we shall win the war". We can only say, we agree with our Socialist comrades. They have lost the battle, but if they continue to make such analyses and carry on such activity as they did in the 1936 elections, they will be found nowhere when the war is on.

The analysis made by our Party regarding the Socialists nationally applies to New York as well.

Before the split in the Socialist Party, the Socialist Party could claim considerable support in the trade union movement. On the expulsion of the Old Guard the Socialist Party retained but few contacts in the trade unions. Their refusal to recognize the danger of reaction and fascism in the United States; their refusal to build

the united front with the Communists because it would "isolate them from the trade unions"; and their reformist, opportunist position in rejecting the American Labor Party because in its very first stage it had not completely broken with capitalist ideology, undermined whatever stand and prestige the Socialist Party had in the trade union movement. Practically every union in which the Socialists had any influence or leadership has affiliated to the American Labor Party, in spite of Socialist Party opposition. This was merely a formal indicator of the growing isolation and sectarianism of the Socialist Party, based upon its reformist and sectarian political position.

As a result of this situation, the Socialist Party vote in the City and State of New York diminished tremendously. In 1932 the Socialist Party obtained 177,000 votes for Thomas in New York State. In 1936 it may obtain about 70,000 to 80,000 votes. (The state vote is not yet tabulated. The vote for Thomas in the city of New York was 39,528.) In other words, the Socialist Party will have lost more than half of its state vote. In fact, in 1932 the New York City Socialist Party vote for President was 122,565. This year's vote is a drop of about 68 per cent, or more than two-thirds. In 1934 the vote for the Socialist candidate for governor—Solomon—was 126,000. The vote in 1936 of the Socialist candidate for governor in the City of New York was 48,004, which may increase to 80,000 or 90,000 throughout the state. In other words a very serious reduction in the Socialist vote. It is obvious, however, that the Socialists still have considerable influence upstate. This is due to the weak influence of the Communist Party which, however, is growing, as well as to an old Socialist sentiment that exists in many upstate industrial communities.

The most startling situation, however, is in New York City insofar as local candidates are concerned. In 1934 the Socialist Party ranked third in votes. Only in a few assembly districts did the Communist Party vote exceed that of the Socialists. In 1936, on the other hand, the Socialist vote declined seriously and fell below that of the Communists. In all the assembly districts in the five counties of New York City, the Socialist vote reached a total of 58,900. In the special election for candidate of the Board of Aldermen in New York City the Socialist vote was 56,468.

Now let us examine the Communist vote. The vote for Browder and Ford in New York City was 32,172 (the vote upstate has not yet been recorded). The vote for the Communist presidential candidate of 1932 was 24,000. The 1936 figure for New York City alone shows an increase of 8,000 votes in spite of the complicated political situation. The vote for Minor in New York City was

37,554. This vote will unquestionably be increased 7,000 or 8,000 upstate.

The vote for the other state candidates as well as totals for the assembly districts in New York City, and for president of the Board of Aldermen, ranged from 61,000 to over 66,000. Thus in the City of New York, the Communist Party takes the fourth place among the political parties, after the Republican, Democratic and American Labor Party, and puts the Socialist Party in fifth place. In addition, it is very probable that the upstate vote for the other state candidates, aside from Comrade Minor, will increase up to 75,000. This shows therefore a decided increase of the Communist vote in the state which in 1934 was 45,000—an increase of fully 50 per cent; and an increase of about 22 per cent in the assembly districts in New York City.

The important conclusions are: (1) a steady decline of the Socialist Party and a continual increase in the vote for the Communist Party; (2) and this is the most important, the replacement of Socialists in prestige, influence and leadership by Communists in the trade unions. It shows a tremendous entrenchment of the Communists in the trade unions and mass organizations—something which is of basic importance in the building of the Farmer-Labor Party.

The New York State organization of the Party can be satisfied with its participation in defeating the arch-reactionary Republican Party in New York, and in helping to build the American Labor Party. There is one very bad factor, however. The failure to receive 50,000 votes for Comrade Minor, candidate for governor, will put the Communist Party off the state ballot. The State Committee did not early enough recognize the danger that might confront the Party in view of the general political situation and failed to mobilize the Party and its supporters to a clear realization of the danger of losing our status as an official party. The masses of supporters of the Party readily accepted the first part of the main slogan of the Party "Defeat Landon at all costs". But in supporting the Party policy they failed to carry out in sufficient numbers the second part of the slogan, namely, "Vote Communist". This means that the Party again in 1938 may be compelled to get on the ballot by petition, unless an amendment to the state law can be passed to the effect that any state candidate who received 50,000 votes shall validate the party as an official party. Surely approximately 75,000 votes that were cast for the other state candidates alone show the real voting strength and support of the Communists in New York.

What are the perspectives? At the present time a strike is taking place in the New York port of basic importance to the district. The

strike of 8,000 seamen, who came out in solidarity with the West Coast maritime workers, has now developed into a strike putting forward demands for the seamen on the East Coast similar to those on the West Coast. This strike is but a forerunner of the labor struggles that are developing and will increase to a very high degree throughout the country as a result of the encouragement given the workers by what they feel as an election victory. In the final election rally Roosevelt declared "We have just begun to fight". The workers are taking up this slogan on their own account. The unemployed who face the danger of elimination of relief and W.P.A., the discontinuation of the National Youth Administration, the question of the high cost of living and of attacks upon the rights of the Negro people, are outstanding problems.

Help for the Spanish people and their government, both financial and political, for the People's Front, is the central task of the whole working class and upon which the State Committee will concentrate all efforts. This demands the building up of the united front, the strengthening of the American League Against War and Fascism, the broadening of the peace movement generally, drawing in trade unions, workers' fraternal organizations, peace, church movements, etc., and especially Catholic organizations.

The building of the American Labor Party is a central task, and the broadening of it to include farmers, progressives, liberals and the Negro people, and drawing in units of the Coughlin and Townsend organizations in preparation for the elections of 1937 are imperative.

The State Committee has decided to continue the struggle on the basis of the election campaign platform, concretizing it for each situation. We do not conceive of the election campaign as having a program of its own, but as embodying demands and proposals as long range means of solving the questions facing the American people. We intend still further to popularize this platform, continue the activity of our candidates in their particular assembly districts, and thus reach further masses through our concrete leadership in the struggle for the achievement of our platform.

The State Committee accepted the task of doubling its membership by Lenin Memorial Day. This means the recruiting of 14,000 members, many of whom must come from basic industries. The comrades in the seamen's units have shown that new militant forces can be drawn into the Party. They recruited seamen during the last strike and are doing this effectively in the present strike. The mobilization of the whole Party membership, to have each member recruit at least one worker into the Party, can and will be realized.

One of the outstanding tasks remains the building of the cir-

culatation of the *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker*. In New York we have not yet discovered the real reason for lack of circulation of our central organ. The *Daily Worker* and *Sunday Worker* have improved. There are tremendous sympathy and support for the *Daily Worker*. Nevertheless we have not found the key to circulation in our territory. This remains an urgent task which must be solved without delay.

NOTE: *Due to lack of space, we are holding over for next month's issue of THE COMMUNIST an article by Morris Raport, "The Commonwealth Federation and the Washington Elections", and a review by Harry Gannes of R. Palme Dutt's new book, World Politics, 1918-1936—Ed.*

The Crisis in the Socialist Party*

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

IV. THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY

THE TURN TO THE LEFT

AS WE have seen, the present crisis in the Socialist Party is not a matter of recent development. It is the piled-up result of long years of wrong policy, of Right opportunism, of flagrant violation of the Marxian class struggle policy which was fundamentally necessary to build the Socialist Party. But in the last three years there has been something of a change in the Socialist Party's traditional trend. That Party has shown fresh Left tendencies, and with them some signs of renewed growth and activity.

Among the more marked of these tendencies were an overhauling of the Socialist Party's theoretical line, which resulted in the adoption of a more Left statement of principles at the Detroit, 1934, convention; greater mass activity in the daily class struggle, especially among the unemployed; a growing tendency towards united front movements with the Communist Party; a growth of the Party's membership from 10,389 in 1931 to 19,121 in 1935; an increase in the national election vote to 883,341 in 1932, as against 262,805 in 1928; the defeat of the "Old Guard" as the Party leadership, and the split with these elements at the Cleveland 1936 national Party convention.

A number of forces combined to bring about the new Left tendencies in the Socialist Party. The most decisive of these was the great radicalization of the proletariat during the past few years—marked by the many big struggles of the unemployed, the huge strike wave, the expansion of the unions, the growth of Labor Party sentiment, the formation of the C.I.O., the widely spreading mass discontent with capitalism as a system, etc. This basic mass radicalization movement naturally had its effect upon the Socialist Party by forcing it, especially from the pressure of its new proletarian members, into activity and into a more Left position. Another very important factor in the Socialist Party's reawakening was the shameful surrender of German Social-Democracy in face of the rise of Hitler. This development, followed soon afterward by the victory of fascism in Austria, exposed the utter bankruptcy of social

* Continued from last month's issue of *The Communist*.

reformism and stimulated the Left tendency, not only in the American Socialist Party but also in many other parties of the Second International. Another basic factor greatly encouraging Left developments in the Socialist Party was the continued success of the Soviet Union. The victorious Soviet government, the fruit of Communist policy, stands out in glaring contrast with the great defeat of the whole line of the Socialist reformists and consequently has a revolutionizing effect upon the proletarian members of the Socialist Party. The growth of the popular front movement in Spain and France in the past two years had a similar result. And, finally, the growth of the American Communist Party, in contrast with the crippled Socialist Party, has a big influence in developing Left sentiment among the Socialist Party working class members.

The Communist Party welcomes the new Left tendencies in the Socialist Party for the good and obvious reason that every increase in revolutionary sentiment and organization is fundamentally advantageous to the working class and hence also to the Communist Party. And in supporting the new Left trends in the Socialist Party a central task is to analyze and evaluate them. The question before us here is to learn whether in its new orientation the Socialist Party has succeeded in overcoming the ruinous reformist policies which it pursued for a full generation and which have reduced it to its present critical position.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY'S PETTY-BOURGEOIS LEADERSHIP

First let us consider the question of leadership. In previous pages I have pointed out what a disaster it was for the Socialist Party to have been dominated from the outset by a petty-bourgeois leadership of lawyers, preachers, doctors, etc. They were the chief source of the opportunism that hamstrung the Party throughout the years. What has happened to the Socialist Party then in this respect in its new Left turn?

Here we get an unfavorable answer. The situation remains substantially as before. True, a raft of these petty-bourgeois reformists quit the Party in the 1936 Right wing split, formed the People's Party and are now waging war against the Socialist Party. There are new, young leaders developing in the Socialist Party, but still the Party is heavily dominated by non-proletarian elements. This was manifested at the Cleveland convention, with its many preachers, lawyers, etc., and it is also expressed by the petty-bourgeois make-up of the Socialist Party National Executive Committee. Of the eleven members in this committee four are lawyers, four are preachers and two professors; only one is proletarian, and he is a trade union official. Compare this Socialist Party non-working class leadership with

the Political Committee of the Communist Party which is composed of 11 members, all proletarians.*

The Communist Party is not in principle against the membership of middle class intellectuals. Such intellectuals, when they are revolutionary, have a great contribution to make to the working class movement. This was brilliantly demonstrated by the life work of Marx, Engels, Lenin and many others. But not by the type of opportunist intellectuals that have always shaped the policies of the American Socialist Party. Throughout its entire history these petty-bourgeois reformists have been a barrier in the way of the Socialist Party's developing a healthy class struggle policy and, despite the new Left trends, that barrier still exists. The proletarianization of the leadership of the Socialist Party is a fundamental necessity in order for that organization to develop towards a strong and revolutionary party.

Next we turn to the question of policy. I shall state the question concretely: In previous chapters I have pointed out in considerable detail, how the inability of the Socialist Party to build itself into a strong revolutionary party during its long history must be ascribed to its failure to carry out a Marxian class struggle policy, that is, (a) its failure to come forward aggressively as the mass leader of the working class in its struggles for everyday economic and political demands; (b) its failure to educate and develop a solid body of trained Marxian revolutionaries as the backbone of the Party. Now let us see whether or not the Socialist Party, with its recent Left turn, has liquidated these two fatal reformist weaknesses or shows indications of doing so.

PART I. THE QUESTION OF THE DAILY MASS STRUGGLES

The answer to this question must be negative. The Socialist Party's new line, especially in its latest developments, does not make for increasing its leadership of the masses in their daily economic and political struggles. Throughout the history of the Socialist Party prior to 1934, as we have seen, the openly Right wing reformist policy of the Party, the tendency for the opportunist petty-bourgeois leaders to soft-pedal and compromise all struggles of the workers, was the obstacle that prevented the Socialist Party from becoming the daily mass leader of the proletariat. The Party has not, despite its new turn, been able to free itself of this traditional reformism. It has only succeeded in adding new forms to its reformist line.

These new forms of reformism consist of a tendency towards

*The Socialist Party National Executive Committee is still more unrepresentative in that it contains no Negro, women or youth members; whereas in the Communist Party top committees these elements are fully represented.

sectarianism. The sectarian tendency dresses itself up with many revolutionary phrases, but it is opportunistic just the same. And it is no less fatal to effective mass work than open Right opportunism. It has been especially manifest in the past year and has already done the Socialist Party much harm. Unless it is speedily corrected it will have deadly effects upon the Socialist Party by still further isolating it from the life and struggles of the masses.

A. THE NEW SOCIALIST PARTY SECTARIAN REFORMISM

There is at present great theoretical confusion in the Socialist Party, what with groups of "Old Guard" reformists, Thomasites, Hoanites, "militants", Trotskyites, Lovestoneites, and a minority of developing Leninists all advocating their respective policies and struggling for control of the Party, while the split-off "Old Guard" makes war from the outside. The dominant voice in the inner-party chaos is that of Norman Thomas. He is the outstanding theoretical leader of the Party and he is especially active in injecting the new elements of sectarianism into the general reformist line of the Party. His program boils down to a curious combination of Right and "Left" sectarianism superimposed upon a basic structure of the old discredited class collaboration of the Second International.

It is not surprising that there should develop sectarian tendencies of revolutionary phrasemongering among the Socialist Party membership. Unquestionably, the proletarian members of the Socialist Party in their new Left mood want to make a revolutionary organization of their Party, but with no solid Marxian training as a background, they drift off into mere revolutionary phrase-making instead of making a sound revolutionary policy. It is what Lenin called the infantile sickness of "Leftism". This tendency is worsened by the petty-bourgeois opportunist leadership of the Party which systematically diverts the workers' revolutionary moods into mere radical phrase-making and thus avoids real mass struggle. They continue their opportunist line in a different form.

At first glance it may seem astonishing that a pronounced advocate of the new sectarian tendency should be Norman Thomas, who hitherto has always been an open Right opportunist. But such "Left" vagaries are not uncommon on the part of Socialist middle-class intellectuals all over the world. I need only refer to the case of the ultra-opportunist C. E. Russell joining with Debs in warning against opportunism in the Socialist Party in their pamphlet *Danger Ahead*, or the case of the reformist Frank Bohn lining up with Bill Haywood in the 1912 inner-party fight, or the recent instance of A. J. Muste, who in a few years completed the cycle of preacher—progressive trade unionist—Left Socialist—Trotskyite and then back

to preacher again. Right opportunists can easily fly over to "Left" sectarian positions.

The sectarian danger in the Socialist Party was greatly increased by that Party's recent absorption of the Trotskyite group. Just at the time when these counter-revolutionary elements were being proved to be terrorists and assassins the Socialist Party saw fit to take them to its bosom. But it will inevitably pay dearly for this mistake in loss of strength and influence. The Trotskyites, who are finding easy pickings in the confused, chaotic Socialist Party, are tending greatly to turn that organization into an anti-Communist, anti-Soviet sect. This will drive the best worker elements out of the Socialist Party and will further weaken its contacts with the masses. Not long since the French Socialist Party also made the mistake of swallowing the noisome Trotsky group, but it soon had to relieve itself of the poisonous, indigestible mess, and the American Socialist Party will have to do the same if it is to develop into a healthy party.

B. UNDERESTIMATION OF IMMEDIATE DEMANDS

Now let us look at the practical application of the Socialist Party's new mixture of sectarianism and Right reformism, of which Thomas is the great champion. The heart of Thomas' theorizing is to the effect that inasmuch as capitalism is now breaking down the fight for partial economic and political demands is relatively unimportant and that the immediate issue upon which all attention should be concentrated is the basic revolutionary question of socialism versus capitalism. His position, in substance, is that the workers cannot satisfy their most immediate needs or protect their most elementary rights short of establishing a socialist society. Thomas says, "The immediate demand of the Socialists is socialism."*

Now all this sounds very revolutionary, especially coming from Norman Thomas who only three years ago was enthused over the "steps toward socialism" of Roosevelt. But actually it is only radical phrasemongering. Its general effect is to weaken the struggle of the workers and to play into the hands of the bosses. Its continuance will make havoc with what membership and standing the Socialist Party still has left.

Thomas' playing down of immediate partial demands goes counter to the whole need and trend of the revolutionary movement. His line is one of mere agitation, not struggle. The fight for partial demands is the starting point for all revolutionary struggle. And never did they play such a vital role as they do now, with the workers' civic, working, and living standards being so viciously attacked by

* Radio speech, Oct. 20, 1936.

the growing fascist reaction. As the Communist Party correctly stresses, a militant defense of the workers' immediate interests is the first condition for the development of the struggle against capitalism as a system. It is only in such fights that the workers can develop the necessary understanding, confidence and organization. When Thomas puts out his slogan, "If reform is the way out, better stick with the Roosevelt administration", and then backs this up by soft-pedaling the fight for the immediate issues confronting the toiling masses and by concentrating upon mere agitation for the establishment of socialism, he abandons the present-day fighting field of the revolutionary movement and reduces the whole struggle for socialism to an empty abstraction. He not only undermines the present-day fight of the workers but the ultimate aims of the working class as well. In the name of socialism he hampers the fight for socialism. And the effect of it all upon the Socialist Party is still further to isolate it from the life and struggles of the masses and thus to push it along the fatal road of sectarianism. It is also water on the mill of the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites who are struggling to control the Socialist Party.

C. THE RETREAT BEFORE FASCISM

Consequent upon his failure to perceive the fundamental importance of the fight for immediate demands in the development of the revolutionary struggle in general, Thomas abandons the field in the face of advancing fascism. With his constant harping upon the one string of "socialism versus capitalism" he quits the real revolutionary battle which, in its present preliminary stages, is now being waged around the central question of "democracy versus fascism". Is this not as clear as day in France and Spain? There the workers and their allies, who in their overwhelming mass would remain unresponsive to sterile and academic talk such as Thomas' about establishing socialism forthwith, are nevertheless drawn into revolutionary activity by their fight against the attacks of the fascists upon their present civic, working, and living standards. Their movement begins as a defensive fight for the most elementary immediate needs, their wages, their right to organize, the national independence of their countries, etc., but it soon passes over to a counter-offensive struggle for major objectives making definitely towards a revolutionary clash with capitalism.

Thus in France the workers and their allies were not content simply with setting up the Blum government as a defense against fascism but carried their counter-offensive much further, adding 3,000,000 new members to the trade unions, securing wage increases, shorter hours, vacations with pay, etc., etc. And in Spain this whole

revolutionary trend is even more marked. Who can doubt but that the masses in these countries, starting from their defense of their democratic rights and developing their counter-offensive, have made huge strides in the direction of the final struggle for socialism? And the same general rule applies to the United States. When Thomas does not see the question of progress versus reaction, of democracy versus fascism, as the issue of immediate struggle, he fails to see the present-day revolutionary struggle in general and he lives in a realm of reformist sectarian abstractions.

Where Thomas' blindness on the issue of democracy versus fascism leads to in actual practice is shown by the tragically ridiculous position of the Socialist Party in the 1936 Presidential election campaign, which is still going on as I write this. The situation is that the Liberty League and other great capitalist interests, which embody the real threat of fascism and of which such figures as Coughlin, Smith, Talmadge, etc., are satellites, are bitterly opposed to Roosevelt's concessions to the toiling masses, meager though they were, and they are almost solidly behind Landon. Roosevelt has served them well. His proudest boast is that he saved the capitalist system by the New Deal. But the big exploiters are determined to find an even more convenient instrument for putting across their ultra-reactionary program, a program which inevitably leads in the direction of fascism.

It is clear that the Republican candidate Landon, with his false-face of liberalism and his tutelage by the fascist Hearst, is the spokesman of the main fascist danger in this country. Although he himself is not definitely a fascist and while his victory would not result immediately in the establishment of fascism, it would, nevertheless, undoubtedly stimulate enormously the employers' reactionary offensive and greatly facilitate the growth of fascist tendencies. In line with the realities of the situation, therefore, the Communist Party has correctly singled out Landon as the chief expression of the fascist menace and urges his defeat. But this by no means implies endorsement of Roosevelt. On the contrary, the Communist Party points out that with his constant service to reactionary finance capital Roosevelt is an ardent defender of capitalism and is no barrier to fascism. It advocates the formation of a united front anti-fascist Farmer-Labor Party and, in the absence of such a party, in the present elections, it calls upon the masses to vote for the Communist Party candidates, Browder and Ford.

But Thomas can see no fascist danger in Landon. Quite the reverse: he concentrates his main fire against Roosevelt and gives direct support to Hearst's man, Landon. The fascist-like election strategy of the Republican Party and its heavy financial backers is,

through the candidacy of Landon, to put something of a liberal face upon their reactionary program and thus to delude the masses. But Thomas, instead of joining with the Communists, trade unionists, liberals, etc., in exposing this dangerous demagogic trick, proceeds to give it practical support.

Thomas aids the capitalist demagogy by absolving Landon of any taint of fascism and accepting this pseudo-liberalism at its face value. He assails the Communists for ascribing a fascist tendency to Landon and he can see the trend towards fascism only in such figures as Coughlin, Smith, etc. Says Thomas, "The fascist demagogue will talk like Huey Long or maybe like Lemke, but not like Landon or Knox".* This attitude constitutes direct aid to the fascist Hearst's candidate, as it tends to disarm the masses and lure them into the demagogic trap set for them by fascist-minded big capital.**

But Thomas goes further than this. He also undertakes to cleanse Landon's big financial supporters themselves of any suspicion of fascism. This he does with doubly fallacious argument. Firstly, he presents the deadly reformist illusion that fascism is a movement of the middle class,*** instead of its being basically the movement of finance capital, with the middle class serving as its tool; and secondly, he makes the ridiculous assertion that the Republican Party, the party of monopoly capital, instead of tending on towards fascism and further monopolization, is actually trying to turn back the wheels of time and return to the period of relatively free competition, to the individualistic capitalism of the nineteenth century. He declares, "Landon, or the forces and interests behind him which are stronger than Landon, are in the strict sense of the word reactionary. They want to go back to an older capitalism".**** Thus, Thomas would have the workers believe that finance capital presents no real menace of fascism, but is actually a barrier against it.

Consequent upon this absurd analysis, Thomas arrives at the conclusion that it makes no difference whether Roosevelt or Landon is elected. But in reality the weight of his argument favors Landon, and gives him direct support. Indeed, Thomas finds a characteristically ridiculous reason for the election of Landon when he says: "Conceivably a Landon victory might put iron in labor's blood."*****

* Quoted in *Daily Worker*, July 13, 1936.

** Thomas' acceptance of Landon's demagogic pretenses of liberalism was evidenced by his much publicized letter to Landon asking him to state more precisely his position towards labor. For this service to Landon, Thomas was heartily praised by Hearst and the whole Republican press and roundly condemned by many spokesmen of labor.

*** "The essential thing about fascism in Europe is that it is a middle class movement, directed nominally as much against international bankers or plutocrats as against organized workers." *After the New Deal—What?* p. 144.

**** *Socialist Call*, Sept. 12, 1936.

***** *Ibid.*

When Hearst, to elect Landon through a Red scare, lyingly alleged that the Communists were supporting Roosevelt, Thomas at once rushed into print and seconded Hearst's charge. Small wonder then that Hearst, the chief American fascist, should quote him approvingly in his great chain of papers. And it is significant that with the Republicans in the election campaign fiercely denouncing not only Browder, but also such people as Frankfurter, Tugwell, Ickes, Wallace, Lewis, Hillman, Dubinsky, and even Roosevelt himself, as dangerous Communists, they exempted Norman Thomas entirely from their attack. In Mineola, New York, the Republican city authorities refused a public building for a meeting of the American Labor Party (to which 450,000 New York trade unionists are affiliated) on the ground that it was Communistic, but they freely allowed the use of the hall the following night to the Socialist Party, with Norman Thomas as speaker.

The 1936 national elections constitute the sharpest class divisions in American history. On the one side, there is the greatest aggregation of capital that has ever backed any American political party and, on the other, an unprecedented concentration of the toiling masses. Although the opposing class line-up and program are as yet by no means complete and clear-cut, this election fight amounts to the first real battle between the forces making for fascism and those fighting against it. And in this important situation the Socialist Party finds itself on the wrong side of the barricade. For this it is already paying dearly in lessened prestige and influence, and it is being exposed still further to the Trotskyite poison within its tissues.

D. A REACTIONARY PEACE POLICY

The new trend in the Socialist Party has not given that Party a revolutionary peace policy. True, the Socialist Party makes a great show of radicalism in its attitude towards the war that now threatens to deluge the world anew with blood. But in reality its policy in this vital matter is only its traditional reformist line, with the new sectarian trimmings. Its wrong attitude stands in the way of the Socialist Party doing real anti-war service and of its developing mass leadership on this fundamental issue. The membership of the Socialist Party are, of course, genuinely in favor of peace but their Party's program is not a true peace policy. And this wrong policy in the struggle against war is made all the worse by the growing influence of the Trotskyites in the Socialist Party.

Briefly, the war situation is this: Fascist Germany, Japan and Italy in an imperialist drive to acquire markets, natural resources and colonies, and to smother their own internal crisis, are developing a great bloc for a war offensive against various other countries as

occasion dictates, among them the capitalist democracies of France, England, the United States, Spain, Czechoslovakia, etc., as well as against the Soviet Union. It is a basically different situation from that prevailing on the eve of the 1914 World War. At that time two mutually warlike and aggressive groups of imperialist powers confronted each other; but now the capitalist democracies, colonies and socialist U.S.S.R., which all want peace, are definitely on the defensive in the face of the militant fascist offensive.

Should the fascist aggressors succeed in their war plans of mass slaughter and subjugation, it would be a crushing blow to liberty in every country. Their murderous attack aims to extinguish all semblances of labor organization and civil rights in Europe and to reduce the living standards of the toiling masses to coolie levels; it also menaces the political independence of many countries, and its most central objective is to drown the Soviet government in the greatest bloodbath in history. The fascist offensive threatens the very existence of modern civilization and its success would be a major disaster to the human race.

In the face of this ultra-dangerous situation the Soviet Union leads the struggle for the maintenance of peace. It seeks to develop a combined defensive by the socialist and democratic forces of the world, on the basis of a program of collective security, to stop the war which the fascists are preparing so deliberately. And more and more the world's labor movement and the democratic countries are rallying to this program. But this struggle has still greater implications than that of saving the world from a horrible slaughter. It also dovetails with the fight of the revolutionary movement for socialism at the present time. Should the combined peace forces be able to prevent the war it means that the advance of socialism thereby will be greatly facilitated in every country; and if they have to defeat militarily the fascists in a war forced by the latter it will surely be a prelude to proletarian revolutions in many countries. The struggle to preserve democracy and to maintain peace is also, for the toiling masses, the fight for socialism.

But the so recently super-revolutionary Thomas will have none of this. He repudiates all efforts to force the American government to take a stand with other democracies against the fascist aggressors and he likewise rejects this policy for European nations. With a pseudo-radical gesture he sweeps away the correct revolutionary strategy of the Communist International and the Soviet Union. Echoing the "Red imperialism" slanders of Kautsky and the lies of Hitler that the U.S.S.R. is the real source of the war danger, Thomas denounces the Communists and other advocates of collective security against the fascist barbarians as "crusaders for a new holy war". He sneers at the peace struggle led by the Soviet Union

to halt the war-making fascists as being merely preparations for "a 'good' war between capitalist nations".* Then he plumps for the American bourgeois imperialist policy of "neutrality" and "isolation", the policy mask behind which American capitalism hides its aggressive aims.

Thomas' policy of "keeping out of it" is, in plain English, a shameful surrender before the attack of Hitler, Mussolini & Co. It is an abandonment of the embattled revolutionary labor movement of Europe. Thomas' determination not to actively assist the workers of Europe in case of a fascist-made war he justifies by the following puerile argument:

"It should be remembered that there is no particular virtue in helping an 'innocent' nation [one of those attacked by the fascists—W.Z.F.] by enabling the du Pont family to sell powder to them at a great profit."**

The readiness of Thomas to betray the Soviet Union in case of war is clearly shown in the following disgraceful statement:

"Is not Russia today strong enough to take care of herself without asking workers in other lands in her behalf to accept the terror and futility of one more 'good' war?"***

The American imperialist policy of "isolation", which Thomas accepts with a flourish of much radical phraseology, cannot prevent war nor keep the United States out of war if and when it comes. "The way to keep America out of war is to keep war out of the world", correctly says the Communist Party. And this can only be done by an organized struggle for peace on the part of the anti-war forces of the world against the mad-dog fascist war-makers. The great present task of the revolutionary movement is to mobilize the workers and their allies for this struggle against war, and it is a task that the Communist Parties are everywhere loyally fulfilling. But the Socialist Party, with its "stay out of it" American capitalist neutrality theories, has abdicated mass leadership in this struggle for peace and is objectively lending support to the fascist war-makers in Europe and this country.

E. A SECTARIAN LABOR PARTY POLICY

The matter of breaking the masses away from the two capitalist parties and building a great Farmer-Labor Party is a fundamental necessity to combat the advance of reaction and fascism in this country. And never was the sentiment so strong as now among the

* *After the New Deal—What?* p. 218.

** *Ibid.*, p. 140.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 136.

workers for such a party. But hesitancy and delay in the matter are highly dangerous. Because the A. F. of L. trade union bodies, upon whom the principal responsibility falls for launching such a party, have failed to act we see huge masses of discontented workers, small farmers, etc., falling under the control of the Coughlins, Lemkes, Townsends, etc., in their incipient fascist third party which is openly aiding Landon reactionaries in the election campaign. It is the great task of the Farmer-Labor Party, the American form of the People's Front, to prevent the huge toiling masses who are seething with discontent from being trapped by reactionary and fascist demagogues and to give these masses a powerful anti-fascist political weapon. It is because of these vital considerations that the Communist Party is a constant and militant fighter for the establishment of the Farmer-Labor Party.

But here again on this basic issue the Socialist Party still follows a reformist policy highly detrimental to its development of mass leadership and effective struggle. In previous pages I have pointed out that the Socialist Party with its preacher-doctor-lawyer leadership followed for many years a sectarian anti-labor party policy that was disastrous to the Socialist Party's development as a mass proletarian party. For a few years there was a tendency to correct this disastrous policy, but now the Socialist Party, with its outbreak of sectarian phrasemaking, is falling again into the historical mistake of an anti-labor party policy.

It is true that the Socialist Party does lip service to the question of the Farmer-Labor Party, but that is about as far as it goes. In practice the Socialist Party follows a line inimical to the Farmer-Labor Party. This manifests itself by the Socialist Party's systematic opposition to all steps leading towards the actual formation of the Farmer-Labor Party. It hinders the Farmer-Labor Party by insisting upon an unduly radical program for it and by putting forth pessimistic arguments that there is as yet no mass basis for such a party. Besides, the Socialist Party takes little or no active part in the now necessary preliminary agitation and organization steps—the building of local and state parties, Farmer-Labor Party conferences, etc.—and often actually resists these movements. Thus the Socialist Party declined even to attend the important Chicago, May 30, conference called by the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party and it assumed an attitude of sharpest hostility towards the American Labor Party of New York, which is an important indication of the trend of the Committee for Industrial Organization towards a national Labor Party. And highly significant of its sectarian attitude, the Socialist Party in its most important 1936 election campaign document, the Party platform, does not even raise the question of the Farmer-Labor Party,

an omission which puts forward the emaciated and half-lifeless Socialist Party, as the only political perspective, organizationally speaking, for the American working class and its allies.

The Socialist Party never, at any time, fully freed itself from the harmful illusion which it held for many years that the Labor Party was a rival party, a competitor to the Socialist Party. And now, with the new wave of sectarianism in the Socialist Party, this long-imbedded wrong conception gains fresh ground. This is clearly shown by the platform omission of the question of the Farmer-Labor Party. It is also evidenced by the fact that at the 1936 convention of the Socialist Party 64 delegates (against 119) voted opposition in principle to the Labor Party. The baneful and growing influence of the Trotskyites in the Socialist Party greatly increases this anti-Farmer-Labor Party trend. Thus the Socialist Party raises a high barrier of sectarianism that blocks its way to mass influence and leadership on the fundamentally important issue of the Farmer-Labor Party.

F. THOMAS' DEFEATISM

To the foregoing instances of sectarian trends and openly opportunist hang-over policies from the past that still remain in the mass work of the Socialist Party many others of similar character could be added. The same narrow line is to be observed increasingly in the Socialist Party's work in the trade unions, among the unemployed, in the youth activities, among the sharecroppers, etc. And the general effect of it all is, during the past year or so since the sectarian trends have become more pronounced, to cut away the Socialist Party's already greatly weakened mass influence and to reduce still further its badly shattered membership.

It is characteristic of Norman Thomas' role in the Socialist Party that, with his great show of radical phrasemongering, he should find the way to distort into a sterile sectarianism the Socialist Party proletarian membership's desire to make their Party truly revolutionary. In every important situation Thomas seems to have the unhappy faculty of finding the way to inaction and surrender. He is a confirmed prophet of pessimism and defeatism. But fortunately his non-fight way is not the way of the masses. For them the class struggle is not merely a matter of philosophical speculation; their very lives and liberties are at stake, and they will fight notwithstanding the surrender advice of Thomas.

Many examples might be cited of Thomas' non-struggle policies. Thus, for instance, when Roosevelt promulgated his N.R.A. Thomas promptly called upon the workers not to strike. Happily, however, they disregarded his counsel of passive reliance upon Roosevelt and

carried through successfully one of the greatest strike waves in American history. Again, in his book, *As I See It*, Thomas was at great pains to show, in his defense of purely parliamentary tactics, that armed action by the workers has been rendered obsolete and impossible by the development of the airplane and other modern military weapons. But the workers of Spain, against whom the great bulk of the trained army revolted, are now giving a glorious negative to Thomas' surrender propaganda. Thomas' abandonment of the European workers' fight for peace is also a non-struggle policy that the masses will reject. And now in his new book, *After the New Deal—What?* Norman Thomas not only sees fascism as inevitable in the United States following the next serious economic crisis,* but more or less universal after the world war that is now brewing. But again the workers will disappoint this monumental pessimism of Thomas. They will never accept his inevitability-of-fascism theories. They will have a big word to say before fascism can possibly succeed in this country, and what realist can doubt that the next world war, instead of being followed by a spread of fascism, will give birth to a new wave of proletarian revolutions that may well crack the capitalist system all over Europe?

Thomas' new sectarianism has its roots in this basic pessimism, in his glaring lack of faith in the fighting ability of the working class and its allies. His whole conception is an escape from the hard realities and severe tasks of the class struggle into the easy realm of glittering radical generalities. But it is a path that the working class will never tread. It will not fit itself into Thomas' narrow sectarianism, defeatism and crass opportunism. On the contrary, it will forge ahead along its line of militant mass struggle and leave the Socialist Party, if that Party persists in its present policies, sitting in sterile isolation.

* He says, "The only hope of bourgeois democracies to escape fascism is to escape this crisis." *After the New Deal—What?* p. 154.

Specific Features of the Spanish Revolution

By M. ERCOLI

THE heroic struggle of the Spanish people has deeply stirred the whole world. Since the October Socialist Revolution of 1917, this is the biggest event in the emancipation struggle of the masses of the people in capitalist countries.

The struggle against the remnants of feudalism, the aristocrats, the monarchist officers, the princes of the church, against fascist enslavement, has united the vast majority of the Spanish people. The workers and peasants, the intellectuals and the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and even certain groups of the bourgeoisie stand in defense of freedom and the republic. But a handful of mutinous generals are waging war against their own people with the help of Moroccans whom they have duped, and the international criminal scum of the Foreign Legion.

The struggle of the Spanish people contains features of a national revolutionary war. It is a war to save the people and the country from foreign bondage, because the victory of the insurgents would mean the economic, political and cultural decline of Spain, its disintegration as an independent state, the enslavement of its people by German and Italian fascism. It is a national revolutionary struggle for the further reason that its victory will bring liberation to the Catalonians, the Basques and the Galicians who were oppressed by the old aristocracy of Castile.

The victory of the people will deal a death blow to fascism in Spain, will destroy its material basis, will hand over the big landed estates and the industrial enterprises of the fascist rebels to the people, will create the prerequisites for a further successful struggle of the toiling masses of Spain for their social liberation.

The victory of the People's Front in Spain will strengthen the cause of peace throughout Europe, and in the first place will prevent the warmongers converting Spain into a military base for the fascist encirclement and invasion of France.

The struggle of the People's Front in Spain is setting the democratic forces of the whole world into motion. The success of this struggle will strengthen the cause of democracy in all countries, will weaken fascism in those places where it has control and will hasten its doom.

THE REVOLUTION IN SPAIN IS A PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION

The revolution in Spain, a component part of the anti-fascist struggle throughout the world, is a revolution with *the widest social basis. It is a people's revolution. It is a national revolution. It is an anti-fascist revolution.*

The relationship of class forces within Spain is such that the cause of the Spanish people is invincible, but the forces of world reaction, first and foremost the German and Italian fascists, hinder the victory of the Spanish people. They are supporting the insurgents, supplying them with arms, with the connivance of the democratic governments of capitalist countries. It would not be correct to draw a complete parallel between the Spanish revolution and the Russian Revolution of 1905, still less with the Revolution of 1917. The Spanish revolution has its own specific features which arise from the peculiarities of the situation both at home and abroad. Big historic events and movements are not repeated with photographic exactness either in time or in space.

The Spanish people are solving the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The reactionary castes, whose power the fascist rebels wish to restore, ruled the country in such a way that it became the most backward and poorest country in Europe. All that is healthy, creative or vital in all strata of the Spanish people felt and still feels the strangling oppression of the past which is irrevocably doomed to disappearance. All that is creative and living in Spain is expecting a radical improvement of its position from the solution of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

This means the necessity, in the interests of the economic and political development of the country, to solve the *agrarian question* by destroying the feudal relations which dominate in the countryside. It means the necessity to liberate the peasants, the workers and all the toiling population from the intolerable burden of an out-of-date economic and administrative system. It further means the necessity to liquidate the privileges of the aristocracy, the church, the religious orders, the necessity to smash the uncontrolled power of the reactionary castes.

But Spanish fascism stands in the path of the solution of these tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Spanish fascism is not only the bearer of capitalist reaction, but also of medieval feudalism, monarchy, clerical fanaticism and bigotry, the inquisition of the Jesuits, the defender of the reactionary castes, of aristocratic privileges, which, like a leaden weight, drag the country backwards and hinder the development of national economy. It is not only the representative of trustified capital, which resorts also to social demagoguery in order to crush the masses; it brings with it naked violence without demagoguery; it is the representative of the old order, rotten

through and through and hated by all. Therefore, in a country where the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution have not yet been solved, it has not succeeded in forming a party with a wide mass petty-bourgeois basis. By rising in armed rebellion against the lawful government, fascism alienated even some of those bourgeois elements which, in the conditions of a bourgeois constitution, would have sought to make agreement with it. Fascism brought about a position in which the petty bourgeoisie turned decisively to the side of the proletariat, and in which those reformist elements in the workers' movement which stood for the "constitutional" path of development were forced to take up a position on the side of the people; more than ever before, fascism rallied against itself all the parties and organizations of the Peoples' Front, from Martinez Barrio to the Communists, from the Basque nationalists to the Catalanian Anarchists.

The Spanish people is solving in a new way the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution which corresponds to the deepest interests of the broadest masses. In the first place, it is solving them in circumstances of civil war caused by the insurgents. In the second place, the interests of the armed struggle against fascism force it to confiscate the property of landlords and employers who are involved in the insurrection, because it is impossible to secure the victory over fascism without uprooting its economic positions. In the third place, it has the possibility of utilizing the historic experience of the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution by the proletariat of Russia after it had conquered power, because the great proletarian revolution brilliantly accomplished "in passing" and "in the course of events" those things which form the basic content of the revolution in Spain at the present historic stage. Finally, the Spanish working class is trying to bring about its leading role in the revolution, placing upon it a proletarian imprint by the extent of its struggle and its forms.

THE ROLE OF THE SPANISH WORKING CLASS IN THE REVOLUTION

At all stages of development of the revolution in Spain the working class took upon itself the initiative in all the chief actions against the forces of reaction. The working class was the soul of the movement which overthrew the dictatorship of Primo De Rivera and the monarchy. Strikes and demonstrations of the workers in all the big industrial towns were the starting point for the mighty wave of the mass people's movement in the towns, in the villages, in the army, against which the monarchy was unable to stand. The tireless heroic struggle of the working class has helped to deepen the people's character of the revolution, in spite of all the efforts of the bourgeoisie, of the Republican leaders and even of the Socialist Party to

hinder and crush the mass movement. The working class of Spain has a tremendous historic service to its credit—the first barrier against the fascist onslaught was raised by the general strike and the armed struggle of the Asturian miners in the unforgettable days of October, 1934. In spite of a bloody defeat, the working class after October was, and still is, the organizer and main backbone of the anti-fascist People's Front.

But the special character of the revolution in Spain consists above all in the peculiarity of the conditions in which the proletariat brings about its hegemony in the revolution. The split in the working class in Spain has its own special feature. In the first place, the working class of Spain was at the time of the overthrow of the monarchy in 1931 without a genuine mass Communist Party, which at that time was only taking form, not only organizationally but ideologically and politically. In the second place, the Spanish proletariat was under the strong influence of the Socialist Party during the period while a mass Communist Party was growing up in the process of the revolution. For decades the Socialist Party had been the means through which the influence of the bourgeoisie penetrated to the working class and for two and a half years was in coalition with the bourgeoisie. This Party had much stronger positions in the working class than, for example, the Russian Mensheviks in 1905 and in 1917. In the third place—and this distinguished and distinguishes Spain from all other countries of Europe—there are in the Spanish proletariat, along with the Communist and Socialist Parties, mass Anarcho-Syndicalist organizations. The ideology and practice of these organizations frequently form a hindrance to the penetration of proletarian organization and proletarian discipline into the ranks of the working class.

Spanish Anarchism is a peculiar phenomenon which reflects the economic backwardness of the country and the backwardness of its state structure, the scatteredness of the proletariat, the existence of numerous strata of declassed elements and finally a specific particularism—features which are characteristic of countries with strong feudal relics. At the present time, when the Spanish people are exerting every effort to drive back the frantic attack of furious fascism, when the Anarchist workers are fighting bravely at the fronts, there are plenty of elements which, hiding behind the principles of Anarchism, are weakening the solidarity and unity of the People's Front by hasty projects for compulsory "collectivization", the "abolition of money", the preaching of "organized indiscipline", etc.

The tremendous service performed by the Communist Party of Spain consists in the fact that, while tirelessly and consistently struggling to eliminate the split, it fought and is fighting to create the greatest possible prerequisites for ensuring the hegemony of the

proletariat as the basic factor for the victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The establishment of a united front between the Socialist and Communist Parties, the formation of a united organization of the toiling youth, the formation of a united party of the proletariat in Catalonia, and, finally, the most important, the conversion of the Communist Party itself into a big mass party with tremendous and ever-growing influence and authority—all this is a guarantee that the working class will be able still better to bring about its hegemony, taking upon itself the leadership of the whole revolutionary movement and leading it to victory.

THE PEASANTRY

Such is the situation in the ranks of the working class. How do matters stand with the peasants? It is known that the majority of the army, consisting mainly of the sons of peasants, were dragged along by the officers, and during the first days of the rising found themselves in the camp of the enemies of the people. And the fact that the fascist officers were able to draw to their side relatively large groups of soldiers represents the price republican parties, the Socialists and the Anarchists are paying for their neglect of peasant demands for many years. However, there are tremendous grounds for the active participation of the Spanish peasants in the revolution.

In the Spanish villages there are two million agricultural workers. Although in many of the northern districts they are still partly under the influence of the landlords and the clericals, the agricultural workers, even in the most backward provinces, are an element of revolutionary ferment. This big strata of the agricultural proletariat in Spain opens up wide possibilities for the workers' organizations to influence the peasant masses, drawing them into the active struggle against fascism, consolidating the alliance of the working class with the peasants and strengthening the leading role of the proletariat in this alliance. Moreover, the remaining three million peasants consist mostly of poor peasants, mercilessly exploited and oppressed for centuries, and passionately expecting land and liberty from the revolution. These masses of peasants, liberated from the servitude of monarchist prejudices, gradually freeing themselves from the influence of the church, undoubtedly sympathize with the republic. And although the military units of the People's Militia contain compact groups of peasants, nevertheless the millions of peasant reserves have not yet entered the active struggle against the fascist rebels. With the exception of Galicia, there is not yet a wide guerilla movement. In the rear the peasants have as yet caused little trouble to the fascist rebels by their actions. But their entrance into the active struggle is inevitable. The millions of peasants reserves are getting into motion and they will soon say their decisive word.

For long years the illiterate Spanish peasants lived outside political life. A distinguishing feature of Spain is the fact that the Spanish peasants entered the revolution without having their national party. The only attempt to form a peasant party was made in Galicia by the priest Basilio Alvarez, who formed the Galician Agrarian Party with a program of struggle against the local feudal privileges, known as "foros". This party fell to pieces in 1934-35. But it is interesting to note that Galicia is the only district where the peasants en masse have taken up armed struggle against the rebels and are now organizing a guerilla struggle at the rear of the reactionary bandits. The Catalonian organization of sharecroppers and tenant farmers, the so-called "Rabassaires", has also some of the distinguishing features of a political party of the peasants. And it is also characteristic that in the Catalonian villages, where this organization is influential, the fascists have had no success.

The only party which fearlessly defended both the immediate demands of the peasants and the demand for the confiscation without compensation of all the land of the landlords, the church and the monasteries for the benefit of the peasants was the class party of the proletariat, the Communist Party. Unfortunately, it was not yet sufficiently strong to carry with it the broad masses of peasants.

THE URBAN PETTY BOURGEOISIE

As for the urban petty bourgeoisie, the vast majority of them are on the side of democracy and the revolution, against fascism. Here, their strivings for liberty and social progress, their hatred of the past, steeped in poverty and superstitious ignorance, play a decisive role. Spanish fascism, in view of this, is deprived of the possibility of forming a mass basis for itself in the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie as was done or is being done by fascism in other capitalist countries. Its social demagoguery breaks down against the fact that the petty bourgeoisie of the towns, the handicraftsmen, the intellectuals, scientists and artists can see how in one rank with the fascist leaders march the hated big landlords, "casiques", bishops, who have fattened on the poverty of the people, the case-hardened politicians like Lerroux, corrupt bankers like Juan March. It is true that the political representatives of the Spanish petty bourgeoisie did not immediately take up their present Jacobin position. They wavered. After the fall of the monarchy they supported the policy of coalition. When entering the People's Front movement they stubbornly refused to include in the program of the People's Front the demand for the confiscation of the land. Even after February 16, the Azana government, which rested on the parties of the People's Front, showed irresoluteness in the matter of cleansing the apparatus of state and the army from fascists. Many representatives of the petty

bourgeoisie sought for a compromise, trying to avoid an open struggle against fascism.

But the cruel and treacherous attack of the fascists on the lawful government caused an outburst of indignation in the ranks of the urban petty bourgeoisie and overcame a considerable part of their vacillations. Under the pressure of events the Republican leaders took the path of a determined and consistent struggle against the fascist rebels.

"What was left for us to do", stated Azana, "when the greater part of the army had broken its oath of loyalty to the republic? Should we have abandoned defense and submitted to a new tyranny? No! We had to give the people the possibility of defending themselves." The Republican petty bourgeoisie consented to use plebian methods in the struggle against fascism, agreed to give arms to the workers and peasants, supported the organization of people's revolutionary tribunals, which are acting no less energetically than the Committee of Public Safety at the time of Robespierre and St. Just. This means that the urban petty bourgeoisie in Spain are playing a role which differs very greatly from that played by the petty bourgeoisie, for example, in Germany and Italy on the eve and at the time of the advent of fascism to power, and we must take into account this special feature when we characterise the present stage of the Spanish revolution.

THE BOURGEOISIE

Finally, the bourgeoisie. Being interested in the restriction of feudal privileges, they took a fairly active part in the overthrow of the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera and the monarchy. The industrial bourgeoisie expected to receive from the republic more favorable conditions for their development. The bourgeois parties tried to achieve this aim by a compromise with the privileged feudalists and the semi-feudal castes, and, unfortunately, for over two years they drew the republican petty bourgeoisie and even the Socialist Party along this path. The policy of the coalition government caused profound disillusionment among the masses of the people. Fascism utilized this weakening of the position of democracy and took up the offensive, gathering together and mobilizing all that is most reactionary in the country.

This strengthening of fascism gave rise to a recognition among the masses of the necessity for barring its path. The masses rose in defense of the republic (October, 1934). The process of differentiation in the ranks of the bourgeoisie increased and a crisis began in the traditional bourgeois parties. For example, the Radical Party of Lerroux, this party of political corruption which reflected all the weakness and vice of the Spanish big bourgeoisie, rapidly fell to

pieces, and after the 1936 elections disappeared from the political scene. From this party a group was formed which, led by the present chairman of the Cortes, Martínez Barrio, took part in the organization of the repulse of the fascists and entered the ranks of the People's Front. The considerable success of the party of Martínez Barrio at the elections cannot be explained otherwise than by the anti-fascist sentiments of part of the bourgeoisie who were not interested in the realization of the reactionary plots of the fascists and their ally Lerroux. From the first day of the formation of the People's Front, Martínez Barrio took an active part in it. At the moment when there was a tense situation at the front after the fall of Toledo, he was chairman at the October session of the Cortes, devoted to the task of the defense of Madrid.

In the various republican governments formed after the elections of February 16, 1936, there were elements which were undoubtedly representatives of certain strata of the bourgeoisie. These people remained on the side of the republic when the fascist insurrection broke out—Jose Hiral, member of the Left Republican Party and minister in the present government, a fairly big landowner whose estates had come under the action of agrarian reform even in the first years of the republic; Francisco Barnes, Casares Quiroga, Enrico Ramos and Manuel Blasque Garzon—industrialists and landowners who formed part of the Ministry of Jose Hiral, *i.e.*, were members of one of the governments which organized the defense of the republic against the fascist rebels. Had the development of events been different it is possible that some of these people would have sought for a compromise with reaction. But the fascist rising, depriving them of this possibility, showed them the necessity for defending the republic and democracy by all means, linked up their fate with that of the fighting masses of the people.

Numerous groups of the bourgeoisie in the nationalities oppressed by Spanish feudalism are also acting on the side of the republic. There are districts in Spain where the whole population has fought for centuries to throw off this national oppression. First and foremost they are the Catalonia and the Basque provinces. The bourgeoisie in these districts cannot support the fascists and sympathize with them, as they know perfectly well that the victory of the fascists would destroy the possibility of any national independence or autonomy whatever. This victory would signify a return to the old regime of national oppression.

In Catalonia, the so-called Catalan League and its reactionary leaders have disappeared from the scene of struggle. But in the ranks of the Left Catalonians—the Esquierres—there still remain a number of representatives of the industrial bourgeoisie who occupy prominent places in the Catalanian government. And there is no doubt that

in Barcelona, as throughout all Catalonia, the rebellion of the fascist generals was put down more rapidly than in other districts not only because big masses of the Spanish proletariat are concentrated there, but also because almost the whole population enthusiastically took part in crushing the rising and even some bourgeois circles sympathized with this.

As regards the Basque provinces, the Basque National Party, whose representative, Manuel Irujo, is a member of the Madrid government, is taking an active part in the struggle against the fascists. Manuel Irujo is a big industrialist who has always fought for the national liberation of the Basques. He was against the *coup d'état* of Primo de Rivera, and was a determined opponent of the monarchy. In the first days of the fascist revolt he personally led military operations against the fascist officers in Bilbao. All his relatives, including his 70-year-old mother, are being held as hostages by the fascists. This Catholic and industrialist is acting loyally in defense of the republic, and declares that his party is fighting "for a regime of liberty, political democracy and social justice". The Basque National Party, of which he is the leader, is a party of the Catholic bourgeoisie which has been fighting for the national independence of Biscay over a number of years. This party to a considerable extent consists of priests. Not so long ago the French reactionary, Dr. Kerillis, expressed his surprise at the fact that the representatives of the priesthood in the Biscay provinces are carrying on a heroic struggle against the reactionary gangs of General Mola. But there is nothing surprising in this. The role of these groups of the Basque bourgeoisie, who with arms in hand fought side by side with the heroic defenders of Irun, St. Sebastian and Bilbao, is undoubtedly a more progressive one than the part played by those leaders of the British Labor Party who are dragging at the tail of the British policy of "non-intervention". We have every ground for applying to these groups of the Basque bourgeoisie the following words written by Comrade Stalin in 1924:

"The struggle the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of his country is objectively a *revolutionary* struggle, despite the monarchist views of the Emir and his entourage, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism. . . . The struggle the Egyptian merchants and bourgeois intellectuals are waging for the independence of their country is objectively *revolutionary*, despite the bourgeois origin and bourgeois calling of the leaders of the Egyptian national movement and despite the fact that they are opposed to socialism; whereas the fight the English Labor government is waging to perpetuate Great Britain's domination over Egypt is, for the same reasons, a *reactionary* struggle, despite the proletarian origin and the proletarian calling of the members of that government, and despite the fact that they are 'for' socialism."

What conclusion, then, should be drawn from the estimation

given of the position occupied by these groups of the Spanish bourgeoisie?

There can be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the bourgeoisie sympathize with the insurgents, and support them, but there are groups of the bourgeoisie, especially among the national minorities, who, although they do not play a leading part in the People's Front, took part prior to the revolt and are now continuing to participate in the anti-fascist People's Front. Therefore, these groups must not be left out of account in the anti-fascist camp, for by their participation in the People's Front they are assisting in extending it, thus strengthening the chances of the victory of the Spanish people. A wide social basis at a moment of such sharp struggle is one of the factors guaranteeing the success of the revolution.

In 1927, Comrade Stalin, the master of revolutionary strategy, wrote that certain tactical principles of Leninism exist, which unless, taken into account, it is impossible correctly to lead the revolution:

"I have in mind such tactical principles of Leninism as: (a) The principle of taking account, without fail, of the national peculiarities and national specific features in each separate country. . . . (b) The principle of the Communist Party of each country making use, without fail, of the slightest possibility of ensuring that the proletariat has a mass ally, even though temporary, shaky, unstable and unreliable. (c) The principle of taking account, without fail, of the truth that propaganda and agitation alone are not sufficient for the political education of millions of people, but that this requires the political experience of the masses themselves."

THE SPANISH PEOPLE'S FRONT—ITS COMPOSITION AND CHARACTER

Guided by these principles, the Communist Party of Spain has carried on the struggle not only to bring about united action by the working class, but also for a broad anti-fascist People's Front, which represents the peculiar form of the development of the Spanish revolution at the present stage.

This front embraces the working class and its organizations, namely, the Communist and Socialist Parties, the General Workers' Union, the Syndicalist Organization of Pestana; it is supported now by the Anarchist National Confederation of Labor; further, it covers the petty bourgeoisie in the shape of the Republican Party of Azana, and the Catalonian Party of Escer; it includes groups of the bourgeoisie represented by the party of Martinez Barrio—the "Republican League", by the Basque nationalists; it is supported, apart from the Catalonian "Rabassaires" organization, by millions of Spanish peasants who have no party of their own, but who hate fascism and are hungering for land. The Spanish anti-fascist People's Front, as a specific form of the unification of various classes in face

of the fascist danger, differs for instance from the French People's Front. The Spanish People's Front is operating and carrying on the struggle in circumstances of a revolution, which is solving its bourgeois-democratic tasks in a consistent democratic way, in circumstances of a civil war which is demanding exceptional measures so as to ensure victory for the people.

In the same way it does not explain the real character of the Spanish People's Front to define it simply as the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry". Firstly, the People's Front in Spain bases itself not only on the workers and peasants, but on a wider social basis. Secondly, under the pressure of the civil war, it is adopting a series of measures which go somewhat further than the program of a government of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship. And at the same time the peculiarity of the Spanish People's Front consists in the fact that the split in the ranks of the proletariat, the relatively slow pace at which the masses of the peasantry are being drawn into the armed struggle, the influence of petty-bourgeois Anarchism and of Social-Democratic illusions which have not yet been outlived, and expressed in the striving to leap over the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, are creating a series of additional difficulties in the struggle of the Spanish people for a democratic republic.

The democratic republic which is being established in Spain is not like a bourgeois-democratic republic of the usual type. It is being born in a civil war, in which the leading role is being played by the working class, in a situation where socialism has been victorious in over one-sixth of the earth's surface, while in a number of capitalist countries conservative bourgeois democracy has already been destroyed by fascism. A distinctive feature of this new type of democratic republic is the fact that fascism, which has taken up the struggle against the people, is being suppressed by the armed might of the people, and that there will be no place for this chief bloody enemy of the people in this republic. Should the people be victorious, fascism will never be able to enjoy there such liberty, for instance, as in France, the U.S.A., or England, where it makes use of bourgeois democracy and the rights provided by it, to destroy democracy and establish a regime of arbitrary rule. Secondly, the material basis of fascism will be smashed in this republic. Even now all land and enterprises belonging to those participating in the fascist revolt have been confiscated and handed over to the Spanish people. Even now, in conformity with the military situation, the Spanish government has been compelled to establish control and the regulation of the economic apparatus in the interests of the defense of the republic. And the more stubbornly the insurgents carry on the war against the lawful government, the further will the Spanish govern-

ment be compelled to go along the road of strictly regulating the whole economic life of the country. Thirdly, should the people be victorious, this new democracy cannot but be alien to all conservatism; it possesses all the prerequisites for its further development; it provides guarantees for further economic and political conquests by the working people of Spain. And it is precisely for this reason that all the forces of world reaction desire the defeat of the Spanish people.

German and Italian fascism not only organized the revolt of the Spanish generals, but are now giving wholehearted support to the insurgents and are striving to bring about the defeat of the republic. All the parties of extreme reaction and war in all the capitalist countries are sympathetic to the insurgents and are ready to support them. Thus the fighting people of Spain are faced not only by the insurgent generals, but also by the front of world reaction. Hence, the difficulties against which the Spanish people are coming up in suppressing the revolt. These difficulties are being further increased by the fact that there are parties in the capitalist countries which formally stand for bourgeois democracy, but which in fact under the mask of "neutrality" are supporting the fascist intervention. This second camp which covers, for instance, the British conservatives and the French Right Radicals, is in essence allied with world reaction. This camp has, in fact, the support of certain reactionary Social-Democratic leaders as well.

Finally, the opposite camp, namely, the camp of the working class, the camp of democracy. The foundation of this camp is the international working class, with all its sympathies on the side of the Spanish people. This camp includes all honest anti-fascists, all true democrats, all those who understand that if the Spanish republic is allowed to be crushed, then this means allowing a blow to be dealt to the entire international anti-fascist front, and encouraging fascism to make further attacks on the working class and democracy.

FASCISM PLAYING WITH FIRE

Fascism is playing with fire. It is setting the war machine into motion not only against a people of distant Africa, but is attacking one of the peoples of Europe. It cannot now cover up its bandit action by cries about Versailles; it is not Versailles that it is tearing up, but liberty and independence of the Spanish people, and it is letting loose against itself a new wave of hatred among the toiling people. Fascism is thereby preparing for a new advance of the anti-fascist wave throughout the whole world. When German fascism came to power in Germany, it also counted on intimidating the peoples by the Leipzig trial. It achieved the opposite results. The wild frenzy of fascism in Germany assisted in the formation of the

People's Front in France and Spain, and let loose the movement for the People's Front throughout the world.

But the Italian and German fascists are pursuing imperialist and aggressive aims as well. They want to crush the Spanish revolution so as to seize part of the colonies of Spain, to occupy part of its territory and to transform it into a base for the preparation of their further onslaughts on the people of Europe. The insurgent generals are agents of foreign imperialism, which is threatening the independence and integrity of the country.

In 1919, in connection with a reference to the Brest Treaty, Lenin said: "The difficulty in the situation with us was that we had to bring Soviet Power into being against patriotism."* The struggle of the people against the insurgent fascist generals in Spain bears the character of a national struggle in defense of the country against foreign enslavement, and this still further extends the basis of the revolution. The People's Front is not only continuing the revolutionary traditions of the Spanish people, but also continues the glorious traditions of the struggle carried on by the people of Spain to rid the country of foreign oppression and barbarism.

Thus, we are faced in Spain with a situation where, in the fire of revolutionary struggle, confirmation is being provided of the historic correctness of the political line outlined by the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. It is being confirmed not only by the scope of the anti-fascist struggle which has developed in Spain, but also by the part being played in this struggle by the young Communist Party of Spain. At the Seventh Congress Comrade Dimitroff said:

"We want the Communists of each country promptly to draw and apply *all the lessons* that can be drawn from their own experience as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. We want them as *quickly as possible to learn how to sail on the turbulent waters of the class struggle*, and not to remain on the shore as observers and registrars of the surging waves in the expectation of fine weather."

In the turbulent waters of the class struggle, the Communist Party of Spain is being transformed into the stalwart helmsman of the fate of its people. With every day that passes it is winning authority among the masses by its selfless devotion to the cause of the revolution, by its high adherence to principle, by its steadfastness at the front and in the rear, by the discipline of its commanders and fighters, and by its profound conviction of the correctness of the path outlined.

Organizer and inspirer of the People's Front, the Party is fighting, fully conscious of its historic responsibility, for the final victory of the People's Front over fascism.

* Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXIV, p. 219, Russian edition.

Index—Volume XV—1936

	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Page</i>
AMTER, I.		
Organizational Changes in the New York District of the Party	May	465
New Party Organizational Forms Prove Their Value ..	June	537
The Elections in New York	Dec.	1141
BENJAMIN, HERBERT		
Unity on the Unemployment Field	Apr.	327
Six Months of Unity of the Unemployed	Nov.	1056
BERRY, A. W.		
Review of <i>The Negro Question in the United States</i> , by James S. Allen	June	573
BERRY, A. W. and JAMES W. FORD		
The Coming National Negro Congress	Feb.	139
BIMBA, A.		
Review of <i>The United States Since 1865</i> , by Louis M. Hacker and Benjamin B. Kendrick	Jan.	94
Review of <i>I Break Strikes!</i> by Edward Levinson	Apr.	380
BITTELMAN, ALEX		
Review of the Month	Jan.	3
Review of the Month	Feb.	99
Review of the Month	Mar.	195
Review of the Month	Apr.	291
Review of the Month	May	387
Review of the Month	June	483
Review of the Month	July	579
Review of the Month	Aug.	675
Review of the Month	Sept.	803
Review of the Month	Oct.	899
Review of the Month	Nov.	995
Review of the Month	Dec.	1091
BRAUN, ERNST		
The Nuremberg Circus	Nov.	1026
BROWDER, EARL		
The Party of Lenin and the People's Front— <i>Speech at the Lenin Memorial Meeting, Madison Square Gar- den, Jan. 20, 1936</i>	Feb.	120
Review of <i>After the New Deal—What?</i> by Norman Thomas	Oct.	988
BROWN, F.		
Building the Party During the Election Campaign	Oct.	966
BROWN, GEORGE		
Railroad Workers Raise Struggle Against Consolidation	Aug.	698
BUCK, TIM		
Canadian Capitalism Reshapes Its Line	June	542
BUDENZ, LOUIS F.		
A. F. of L. Unity Is Threatened by the Executive Com- mittee	Sept.	845
Review of <i>The Labor Union Racket</i> , by Edward Dean Sullivan	Nov.	1084

	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Page</i>
CHILDS, MORRIS		
Forging Unity Against Reaction in Illinois.....	Aug.	769
COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE		
Draft Charter of the United Party of the Proletariat of France	Feb.	171
Unity for Victory and Its Conditions	Apr.	359
COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN		
For a Democratic Spain!	Oct.	914
COMMUNIST PARTY OF U.S.A.		
For a Powerful United A. F. of L.— <i>Statement of Central Committee</i>	Mar.	281
For a United Front May Day!— <i>Statement of Central Committee</i>	May	405
On the Communist Approach to Zionism— <i>Statement of the Jewish Bureau</i>	July	666
The Communist Party on the Results of the Elections	Dec.	1104
DAVIS JR., BEN		
The Negro People in the Elections	Oct.	975
DAWSON, HENRY		
Reaction Bids for Farm Support	Oct.	956
DEAN, JOHN		
The Socialist Administration in Reading and Our United Front Tasks	Jan.	84
DENNIS, GENE		
The Wisconsin Elections and the Farmer-Labor Party Movement	Dec.	1125
DOONPING, R.		
Japan, Outer Mongolia and the Chinese Liberation Movement	May	448
DUCLOS, JACQUES		
Unity for Victory	Jan.	58
ERCOLI, M.		
Specific Features of the Spanish Revolution.....	Dec.	1168
FORD, JAMES W.		
The National Negro Congress	Apr.	316
Political Highlights of the National Negro Congress	May	457
Build the National Negro Congress Movement	June	552
FORD, JAMES W. and A. W. BERRY		
The Coming National Negro Congress	Feb.	139
FOSTER, WILLIAM Z.		
The Crisis in the Socialist Party	Oct.	919
The Crisis in the Socialist Party (<i>continued</i>)	Nov.	1032
The Crisis in the Socialist Party (<i>continued</i>)	Dec.	1154
GANNES, HARRY		
Wall Street Faces the Far East	Jan.	35
The United States Supreme Court and the Specter of Fascism	Mar.	230
Review of <i>Rulers of America</i> , by Anna Rochester	Apr.	376
GEBERT, B. K.		
Our Tasks in Developing Activities Within the Com- pany Unions	Jan.	47
The United Mine Workers' Union Convention	Mar.	211

INDEX

1183

	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Page</i>
The Steel Workers Give Their Mandate for Organization	June	498
Smashing Through Barriers to the Organization of the Steel Workers	Aug.	759
GEORGE, HARRISON		
Close Ranks! Forward!	Apr.	346
The War Threat and the World Peace Conference	Aug.	692
On the Inter-American Peace Conference	Sept.	865
GREEN, GIL		
Towards Youth Unity	Sept.	855
GREENFIELD, E. C.		
The Housing Question	Sept.	873
HATHAWAY, C. A.		
Problems in Our Farmer-Labor Party Activities	May	427
Fighting for Democracy in Spain	Sept.	829
The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Victory	Dec.	1112
HUDSON, ROY		
The Fight of the Seamen for Militant Unionism	Mar.	220
HUTCHINS, GRACE		
Review of <i>Creative America: Its Resources for Social Security</i> , by Mary van Kleeck	July	671
JEROME, V. J.		
Review of <i>What Is Communism?</i> by Earl Browder	Mar.	270
The People's Front Strikes From the Shoulder	July	618
France Goes Forward With the People's Front	Aug.	721
KALININ, M. I.		
The Stalinist Draft of the Constitution	Aug.	737
L.		
The Peace Policy of the Soviet Union	Apr.	353
LABORDE, HERNAN		
Toward the People's Anti-Imperialist Front in Mexico	Jan.	72
LANG, P.		
The Trotsky-Zinoviev Assassins Before the Bar of the Working Class	Oct.	939
LENIN, V. I.		
The Great Initiative	Jan.	19
The Decree on Peace	Feb.	143
The Working Class and Neo-Malthusianism	May	474
LESLIE, IRENE		
Lenin on the Woman Question	Mar.	245
MINOR, ROBERT		
Left Trends in the Socialist Party	Feb.	147
Left Trends in the Socialist Party (<i>continued</i>)	Mar.	253
MONTES, A.		
The Struggle for the Liberation of Luis Carlos Prestes	Nov.	1071
NOVICK, PAUL		
Palestine—Land of Anti-Imperialist Struggle	June	508
OLGIN, M. J.		
The Soviets on the Threshold of the Twentieth Year	Nov.	1009

	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Page</i>
PATTERSON, WILLIAM L.		
British Rule in South Africa	Sept.	885
RAMSEY, DAVID		
The A.A.A.—and After	Feb.	130
Platforms and Issues in 1936	July	600
Roosevelt and the Democratic Platform	Aug.	707
REINSTEIN, BORIS		
Clara Zetkin at the Cradle of the Second International	June	562
REPARD, THEODORE		
Review of <i>Ethiopia and Italy</i> , by Emile Burns	Feb.	187
Review of <i>American Labor Struggles</i> , by Samuel Yellen	May	477
Review of <i>France Today and the People's Front</i> , by Maurice Thorez	Oct.	989
Review of <i>France Faces the Future</i> , by Ralph Fox	Oct.	989
ROBINSON, HARRY		
The Struggle for Puerto Rican Independence	July	629
ROCHESTER, ANNA		
Finance Capital and Fascist Trends in the United States	June	523
SHIELDS, BEATRICE		
Developing Party Cadres in the Chicago District	Feb.	165
SPARKS, N.		
The Hand of God—and the Lack of Flood Control	May	434
STACHEL, JACK		
Problems Before the 56th Annual Convention of the A. F. of L.	Nov.	1046
STALIN, JOSEPH		
Roy Howard's Interview With Joseph Stalin	Apr.	337
STEINBERG, MAX		
Problems of Party Growth in the New York District	July	643
UNSIGNED ARTICLES		
Data on the High Cost of Living	Jan.	89
Economic Trends	Feb.	181
Ernst Thaelmann, Proletarian Leader	Mar.	311
The Struggle for Workers' and Peasants' Alliances in Spain	Aug.	689
Election Campaign Outline for 1936	Sept.	819
Pamphlets in the Election Campaign	Oct.	991
Pamphlets of the Month	Nov.	1087
WEINSTONE, WILLIAM		
Advancing Against Reaction in the Center of the Motor Industry	Aug.	747
WICKS, H. M.		
Review of <i>Democracy and Military Powers</i> , by Silas Bent McKinley	Feb.	190
Review of <i>Karl Marx</i> , by Franz Mehring	Aug.	794
Review of <i>Labor Fact Book III</i> , prepared by Labor Research Association	Aug.	798
WILLIAMSON, JOHN		
Akron: a New Chapter in American Labor History	May	411
Strengthening the Trade Union Backbone of the Farmer-Labor Party Movement in Ohio	Aug.	784

Two Keys to Present-Day Questions

•
**Resolutions of the Ninth Convention of the
Communist Party**

10 cents

•
**The Struggle Against War and the Peace
Policy of the Soviet Union, by Robert Minor**
(Report to the Ninth Convention)

5 cents

•
"MUST" PAMPHLETS

FOR CAREFUL STUDY

ESPECIALLY BY LEADERS

•
Order from your bookshop or from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City

CONTINUE YOUR STUDY OF MARXISM - LENINISM

In Hundreds of Books, Pamphlets, Magazines for Sale at
These Bookstores and Literature Distribution Centers

Aberdeen, Wash.: 115½ West
Heron St.

Akron: 365 South Main St.

Baltimore: 501A North Eutaw St.

Berkeley: 2475 Bancroft Way

Boston: 8 Beach St.

Buffalo: 61 West Chippewa

Butte: 119 Hamilton St.

Cambridge: 6½ Holyoke St.

Camden: 304 Federal Street

Chicago: 200 West Van Buren

2135 West Division St.

1326 East 57th St.

Cincinnati: 540 Main St.

Cleveland: 1522 Prospect Ave.

Denver: 521 Exchange Bldg.

Des Moines: 222 Youngerman Bldg.

Detroit: 3537 Woodward Ave.

Duluth: 28 East First St.

Grand Rapids: 336 Bond Ave.

Hollywood: 1116 No. Lillian Way

Los Angeles: 230 So. Spring St.

2411½ Brooklyn Avenue

Madison, Wisc.: 312 W. Gorham

Milwaukee: 419 West State St.

Minneapolis: 812 La Salle Ave.

Newark: 33 Halsey St.

New Haven: 17 Broad St.

New Orleans: 130 Chartres St.

New York: 50 East 13th St.

140 Second Ave.

218 East 84th St.

115 W. 135th St., Harlem

1001 Prospect Ave., Bronx

2067 Jerome Ave., Bronx

61 Willoughby St., Bklyn.

369 Sutter Ave., Brooklyn

222 Utica Ave., Brooklyn

Brighton Beach Boardwalk

at 6th Street

4531 16th Ave., Brooklyn

2006 Mott Avenue, Far
Rockaway

44-17 Queens Blvd.,
Sunnyside, L. I.

Omaha: 311 Karbach Block

Oakland: 567 12th Street

Paterson: 201 Market St.

Philadelphia: 104 So. 9th St.

118 W. Allegheny Ave.

4023 Girard Ave.

2404 Ridge Ave.

Pittsburg: 607 Bigelow Blvd.

Portland, Ore.: 314 S. W. Madi-
son St.

Providence: 335 Westminster St.,
Room 42

Racine: 205 State Street

Reading: 224 North Ninth Street

Richmond, Va.: 205 N. 2nd St.

Sacramento: 1024 Sixth St.

St. Louis: 3520 Franklin Ave.

St. Paul: 552 Wabasha St.

Salt Lake City: 134 Regent St.

San Diego: 635 E St.

San Francisco:

170 Golden Gate Ave.

1609 O'Farrell St.

121 Haight St.

San Pedro: 244 W. Sixth St.

Santa Barbara:

208 W. Canon Perdido

Schenectady: 204 Nott Terrace

Seattle: 713½ Pine St.

Spokane: 114 North Bernard

Superior: 601 Tower Ave.

Tacoma: 1315 Tacoma Ave.

Toledo: 214 Michigan

Washington, D.C.: 513 F St., N.W.

Youngstown:

310 W. Federal St., 3d Fl.

Write for a complete catalog to
any of the above addresses or to

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D

New York City