

The Communist

20¢

JULY

1943

NATIONAL COMMITTEE
PLENARY MEETING ISSUE

HOLD THE HOME FRONT!

EARL BROWDER

EUGENE DENNIS • ROY HUDSON • JOHN WILLIAMSON

GILBERT GREEN • JAMES W. FORD

WILLIAM SCHNEIDERMAN • ARNOLD JOHNSON

RESOLUTIONS AND DOCUMENTS

New Half-Million Edition!
Complete at Only 10 Cents!

VICTORY—AND AFTER

By Earl Browder

The hundreds of thousands who have read Earl Browder's great war program for the nation and have been inspired by it to greater efforts for victory, will hail the new half-million "Victory-in-1943 Edition" of his book, **Victory—And After**, complete and at the price of only 10 cents a copy. This mass edition makes it possible to deliver a shattering blow against the home front conspiracy of defeatist and appeaser forces who are obstructing the opening of the Second Front and the smashing of Hitler in 1943.

Here is the most searching and realistic analysis of the road to victory. Here is a message that is vibrant with the will to win through over every obstacle to the utter defeat of the common enemy and the triumph of the United Nations. Here is a book that meets the vital needs of the present crucial moment of the war, for as the author states in his introduction to the new edition: "The book has stood the test of time and criticism and proved itself sound, as much today as it was when it was written."

Victory—And After is a book written for the American people. It has special significance for labor, which is the backbone of the nation's support behind Pres. Roosevelt's victory policies. That is why **Victory—And After** must become a powerful weapon in the hands of labor to push forward all other sectors of the population toward victory this year.

128 Pages, Complete
"Ten Copies for a Dollar!"



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER



CONTENTS

Hold the Home Front!	<i>Earl Browder</i>	579
Victory and the 1944 Elections	<i>Eugene Dennis</i>	599
Crucial Problems Before Labor Today . . .	<i>Roy Hudson</i>	613
Gearing Organizational Forms and Methods to the War Effort	<i>John Williamson</i>	624
The Dubinsky Social-Democrats	<i>Gilbert Green</i>	633
The Negro People Unite for Victory . . .	<i>James W. Ford</i>	642
California and the Coming Elections . . .	<i>William Schneiderman</i>	648
The Fight Against Defeatism in Ohio . . .	<i>Arnold Johnson</i>	653
Resolutions and Statements of the National Committee Plenum		657
The Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance		662
On the Anniversary of the Soviet-American Agreement		665
Historic Documents		668

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

NEW AND FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS

- The War of National Liberation II \$.15
By Joseph Stalin
- Congress and You10
By Frank Ryhlick
- Policy for Victory15
By Earl Browder
- Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity . . .05
By William Z. Foster
- Behind the Polish-Soviet Break03
By Alter Brody
- Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings . .25
With an introduction by Dr. Philip Foner
- The Heritage of Jefferson10
by Claude G. Bowers, Earl Browder and Francis Franklin
- Karl Marx: His Life and Work15
Reminiscences by Paul Lafargue and Wilhelm Liebknecht
- Whither Germany?10
By Paul Merker



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

In view of the extraordinary importance of the Plenary Meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, held in New York on June 11-13, this issue of THE COMMUNIST is presented as a special Plenum number.

We are publishing the full report of Earl Browder; the sub-reports (abridged) of Eugene Dennis, Roy Hudson, and John Williamson; the Plenum Resolutions and Statements; and the speeches (abridged) of James W. Ford, Gilbert Green, William Schneiderman, and Arnold Johnson.

HOLD THE HOME FRONT!

BY EARL BROWDER

I. Our Task Today

THE decisive phase of the war has arrived. The preconditions for the defeat of the Axis have been created by the unprecedented victories of the Red Army in the winter campaign and the merging of the Soviet offensive with the actions of the British and American forces in Africa and the air attacks upon Germany from the West. Today, British and American forces are preparing to open up major actions on the continent of Europe. For the first time the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition will be exerting its combined forces in full coordination against Hitler on the main field of battle. The road to victory lies straight and clear ahead, but victory must still be won in battle.

The road will be difficult, and every advance must be paid for.

Our task today is, in unity with all other forces in the country who place victory above all other considerations, to weld unbreakably the home front, in order to guarantee that the blows delivered against the enemy by our armed forces shall have the full force of the nation behind them.

Hitler and his associates are fully aware that the hour of decision is approaching. And they are acting upon that knowledge, feverishly mobilizing all their reserves to throw into the balance. It would be an unforgivable mistake to underestimate Hitler's remaining power. Above all, we must not underestimate Hitler's fifth column in the United States. Axis hopes are now

centered upon creating diversions behind the main battlefronts, in order to create divisions among the Allies, disrupt our internal unity, sap our strength and prevent it from reaching the battlefields. To hold the home front line is now of equal importance to holding the battle line.

The home front must be protected from Hitler's diversions. Events have already demonstrated that this is our most vulnerable point, that here we are least prepared for the enemy's advance. That is why we must concentrate our attention in this period on the home front, safeguarding national unity, upholding our Commander-in-Chief in the direction of the war, securing maximum and uninterrupted production, mobilizing the masses for most efficient application of all war measures—rationing, war savings, civilian defense, etc.—perfecting the structure of our war economy, and, above all, unmasking the hidden enemy within, the Copperheads, the defeatists, the advocates of a negotiated peace, the profiteers, the black-marketeers, and all their agents and accomplices.

II. *The Nature of Our Alliance With the Soviet Union*

One of the most effective weapons for disrupting the unity of the nation for the war and for undermining our unity with our Allies still remains the legend that the Soviet Union was not our ally but our enemy until June 22, 1941, and that only then did the Soviet Union, by accident, as it were, become our

friend and ally. We saw this legend repeated just a week ago in the *New York Times* editorial in reply to my letter regarding the anti-Communist bogey, and it is constantly repeated in discussions of the war in many circles. It is time that we make an issue of this question and bring some new clarity in the public mind on the nature of our alliance with the Soviet Union and its foundations. So long as false conceptions of this issue are prevalent and unchallenged, so long is our home front most seriously in danger. This, therefore, is a first, key problem in consolidating the home front.

June 22 will mark two years since the Nazis began their invasion of the Soviet Union, almost six months before the United States entered the war as a belligerent. In these two fateful years the destiny of humanity lay in the hands of the Red Army, the Soviet peoples, their socialist system and their leadership—first of all, Joseph Stalin. On the Eastern front the tide of world affairs was at last, after years of threatened complete collapse of civilization, turned toward victory of the peoples, victory of human culture, progress and democracy.

In spite of this evident and undeniable fact, powerful forces in this country still consider it a rebuke to a person to say that he changed his attitude toward the war after June 22, 1941. In the light of history it has become clear that those Americans to whom June 22, 1941, was not a decisive turning point are themselves guilty of the most light-minded carelessness re-

garding the fate of their own country. For at that time the United States was drifting relentlessly into the world storm without regard to the main condition for riding that storm to victory—the condition of having by our side as an ally the Soviet Union.

If we now have a clear perspective for victory in the war this is due, not so much to any American wisdom, but to Hitler's stupidity and to the underlying relation of forces which arose above all such transient factors to impress its character upon the war. The prospect of victory is based, first of all, upon the mighty achievements of our Soviet ally, whose friendship we so cavalierly repulsed for years, whose might we so blindly underestimated, whose profoundly democratic and progressive contributions to world history we so childishly denied. Our country has indeed much to learn still from the lessons of June 22, 1941.

Those who try to perpetuate the prejudices which before June 22 took the place of thought are doing an ill service to our country. There was not a moment since 1935, to go back no further, when the United States could not have had complete friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union for the preservation of world peace. All it required was a sincere demonstration of a friendly approach based upon acceptance of the Soviet Union as an equal. We reached that relationship, however, only after the eleventh hour, and the delay cost humanity dearly—a cost we will long have to pay.

That mistake is still being per-

petuated. It lingers in the legend repeated in some of our most respectable newspapers, that before June 22, 1941, the Soviet Union was an ally of Nazism. That malicious slander is used to conceal the great historic fact that it was the very existence of the Soviet Union as a neutral which saved the British Isles from Nazi invasion in 1940, a hundred times more so than the moral and material support then being given by the United States to Britain. That lie is used to obscure and hide the truth, so vital to the United States, that it was the Soviet Union which, by its very existence, held back the Japanese militarists from striking at the United States until December 7, 1941, after Hitler had invaded the Soviet Union. It hides the fact that the Hitler invasion of the Soviet Union was a factor which made inevitable the Japanese attack upon the United States. It hides the fact that we must understand, for our own future sake, that the Soviet Union was always a power on our side, even when we rejected its friendship; that invasion of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, was the signal of inevitable invasion of the United States as well, unless the Axis was first destroyed.

So long as the United States does not understand to the full this basic political truth, we are not fully prepared for all of the tasks required for victory. For it still remains true that correct policy, based on knowing our friends and not confusing them with our enemies, is more important than armaments. Our country is still in the first

stages only of its alliance with the Soviet Union. It will be exceedingly difficult to deepen that alliance, as it must be deepened, so long as our country is influenced by the Hitlerite lie that the Soviet Union was our enemy before June 22, 1941, and was only pushed on to our side by a sort of accident, and is therefore, since June 22, only an adventitious friend. It is much closer to the truth to say that the United States only awakened to the historic necessity of that alliance, of which the Soviet Union was long conscious, by June 22, 1941, followed so quickly by December 7, and Pearl Harbor.

Almost all Americans are ready today to join in the universal glorification of the Red Army. That is good as far as it goes, but more fundamental and more important for the victory which must be won is to gain an understanding of our great Soviet ally. We must understand how and why it was that the Soviet Union was the United States' friend and protector in the Pacific even when we were behaving in a most hostile manner and repeating the worst lies about friends. We must understand how the Soviet Union was our greatest friend in Europe and fighting our battles for us even when we were helping Baron Mannerheim and slandering our friend with the epithet "Communazi." We must understand June 22, 1941, as marking the destruction of those old myths and legends and opening our eyes to the truth and not as the occasion for perpetuating Hitler's lies today in a new form.

That is the central thought which we must press home to our country on the occasion of the anniversary of June 22, which will mark two years of the Eastern Front as American boys prepare to open the Second Front in Europe. Let us use this truth to weld our national unity, defeat the fifth columnists and deepen our alliance with the Soviet Union and our other Allies for the more severe battles to come.

III. *The Lewis Insurrection*

The most acute and difficult of our problems are epitomized in the Lewis insurrection against the war. It has become clear that we must characterize the campaign of John L. Lewis and his long list of helpers in these past weeks as nothing less than an insurrection against the war. John L. Lewis has become the key figure and the spearhead of the anti-war diversion, and for this he is manipulating the miners' union, of which he has, over the years, become the unchallenged autocrat. There is not the slightest doubt that Lewis is working and has worked during the past two years at least, as an integral part of the pro-Nazi fifth column, aiming at a negotiated peace with Hitler at the expense of Britain and the Soviet Union, and, in a deeper sense, at the Nazi subjugation of the United States itself. There is no doubt that the miners' strike was developed consciously as a part of that conspiracy. There is no doubt that this is treason against the miners, against the labor movement, against our own country and against the United Nations.

The day on which Lewis called out the miners the last time, the *Chicago Tribune* put out the slogan "Remove Roosevelt." That was approximately the same day on which the *Völkischer Beobachter* in Berlin published a eulogy of Lewis' activities, showing that this strike was no mere carry-over of prewar concepts of trade unionism. This is no mere trade unionism as usual, no mere matter of a certain lag in development, a failure to catch up with the problems of the day. No, it is a distinct intervention in the war, on the side of Hitler, against the United States and the United Nations, and has behind it a whole strategy whose aims we can describe in detail.

This movement aims, first of all, to break down the war economy of our country, to smash the President's economic policies and administration by canceling labor's no-strike policy. It aims to draw the whole labor movement into an unrestrained wave of strikes and struggles of all sorts, throwing the country into chaos and giving the reactionary majority in Congress the pretext to enact anti-trade union legislation. It aims at seizing the leadership of the C.I.O. through Lewis' stooges by discrediting Murray and the responsible leadership and then triumphantly moving into the A. F. of L. to take over the whole labor movement in line with Hutcheson and Woll. This movement aims, by achieving these ends, to halt the American-British plans for the invasion of Europe in 1943. Or, if that is impossible, to weaken its force so that it can-

not press the war to a conclusion. This movement aims at nothing less than the seizure of power in Washington either by forcing the surrender of Roosevelt or, if that proves impossible, by defeating him in 1944, by throwing the country into chaos and blaming the chaos upon the President.

Lewis personally has hopes of being the next President of the United States. And he is encouraged in these hopes by powerful capitalist circles in the United States. That is the outline of the conspiracy which comes to a head in the Lewis strike movement.

This conspiracy has widespread tentacles. We have already noted various manifestations of it over the past several months. To these can now be added the anti-Mexican riots in Los Angeles, which are one of the sharpest expressions of this planned, organized and financed diversion movement aimed to break up the unity of the country and destroy the war morale. We have to mention also the deliberately organized and incited anti-Negro riots and provocations in Detroit, in Mobile, in Newark and many other places. Finally, there is the wave of anti-Semitic agitation which, in the most sinister fashion, is sweeping this country, with very little organized resistance.

These are all the supporting movements of the conspiracy against the war, the conspiracy to establish John L. Lewis as Hitler's Gauleiter in charge of our country. Lewis is by no means alone. He has a most impressive list of helpers. There is an unprecedented concen-

tration of forces giving open aid to Lewis and all sorts of concealed aid, uniting those groups and individuals who for any reason are opposing Roosevelt's war policies and who place their special interests above victory in the war. Chief among these Lewis forces we can note the following:

First, without exception and everywhere, that political grouping which identified itself before the war under the title "America First," headed by the Hoover, Wheeler, Vandenberg, Nye, Taft coalition of political figures.

Second, the Southern poll-tax politicians who are in coalition with the reactionary Republicans in Congress and who are preparing behind the scenes a coalition for the 1944 elections of the same nature against Roosevelt and his policies.

Third, the coal operators who have long had a close and confidential relationship with Lewis. Typical of their spokesmen, and of their whole course, is an expression printed in the *Wheeling Intelligencer*. This newspaper, published in Wheeling, W. Va., and directly connected with the coal industry, said editorially in its issue of June 1 in summing up the situation at the moment when the miners were on strike:

"For our part we would rather see John Lewis at the head of labor in the United States than any other man. His very strength is what we need. We consider him not only the strongest but the safest labor leader in the nation."

And these gentlemen are doing

their best to put Lewis at the head of all labor as the American version of Hitler's Robert Ley.

Fourth, the newspapers. The only papers that are excited about the situation and are making a campaign are fighting tooth and nail for John L. Lewis. The others are supporting Lewis with a few words of criticism or gently reprimanding him. In the United States newspaper field, however, you cannot find a single paper conducting a militant campaign against John L. Lewis except the *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*. Day after day, political commentators deal with this whole question in such a way as to build up Lewis as a hero—labor's hero—while at the same time using his diversions to justify anti-labor legislation and prepare the ground for crippling the labor movement.

Fifth, the Hutcheson, Woll, Dubinsky clique, long actively conspiring with Lewis, and in effective control of the A. F. of L. Executive Council. William Green is nothing but their megaphone now. At the very moment when William Green was formally reiterating the A. F. of L. no-strike policy, he expressed pleasure at Lewis' bid for reaffiliation, although the miners were on strike at that moment; and no top leader of the A. F. of L. has denounced that strike.

It is a matter of common gossip that the arrangements have already been completed by the top leadership of the A. F. of L. to bring Lewis into the A. F. of L. at the October convention, and Lewis has promised the A. F. of L. leaders that he is going to bring in with him the

United Auto Workers and the Rubber Workers.

Sixth, the Reuther-Carey grouping in the C.I.O., super-ambitious young men who have been led up to the mountain-top and shown the land over which they will be given command, and who are speculating on a Lewis victory. These men have affirmed their connections with the conspiracy through the medium of David Dubinsky and the Social-Democratic Federation.

And finally, we must mention in this combination all that maze of anti-Soviet groupings in the United States, the professional anti-Sovieteers, the professional anti-Communists, all of whom have been very actively enlisted in this conspiracy and all of whom are making their contribution very energetically. This includes the emigrés of the Second International, the Social-Democratic Federation with its *New Leader* and the *Forward*, the Lovestoneites, Norman Thomas — to whom the latest edition of the *United Mine Workers Journal* devotes almost a half page of eulogy and who in turn eulogizes John L. Lewis—the Trotskyites, the Coughlinites, the Ku Klux Klan and many others.

These are the forces that seized on the Ehrlich-Alter case as a political preparation for the Lewis strike movement. The connection between these two and the meaning of this grouping of all these anti-war forces are shown by a bit of evidence that came to my hand in the shape of a magazine in the Russian language published in New York. It is called *Za Svobodu*,

meaning *For Freedom*. It is the organ of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, old-time emigrés from Russia, professional anti-Sovieteers. The leader of this party is called Victor Chernoff. Victor Chernoff was an honored guest on the platform of the meeting in which Dubinsky launched the Ehrlich-Alter provocation and he was introduced to the audience. Victor Chernoff's magazine for the month of May has in it a very interesting news item. The editor of this magazine, Mr. Zinzinoff, is reported as delivering two public lectures to the New York group of the Socialist Revolutionary Party. One was on "American Magazines on Russia," a survey for the last three months; and the other "A Voice from the Underground," a review of an article by Ivanov Razumik in the Berlin Russian paper *Novoye Slovo* of September, 1942, on the spiritual life in the Soviet Union.

Note that Mr. Zinzinoff, the editor of Victor Chernoff's paper, has in his hand the magazine published by his Berlin associates and is able to deliver a public lecture on that magazine here in New York, the subject being the "Underground," not against Hitler, but against the Soviet Union. How do you think Mr. Zinzinoff is able to get the magazine from Berlin? How are they so closely informed about the activities of their party associates in Berlin? How is it that the S.R.'s in Berlin are able to function so freely?

For that we get the answer in the May 2 news dispatches from Stockholm, which report that Hitler is

organizing a Russian army against the Soviet Union with the assistance of the old emigrés who have long operated in Berlin against the Soviets. These gentlemen are in active military collaboration with Hitler in Berlin and their activities are reported immediately and in detail to their agents in New York who are so bold as to speak about it publicly on their platform, and publish it in their paper.

From this we can understand much better the significance of the Ehrlich-Alter case. And these are the gentlemen most actively fighting for John L. Lewis today. And David Dubinsky boasts to the newspaper reporters how six months ago he made plans for Lewis to go back into the A. F. of L. Is it not plain from these related facts that we are dealing with a widely ramified conspiracy, of which the strike movement is a part? These facts expose the clumsy legend that, in this strike movement, we are dealing with militant trade unionists whose only fault, if there is one, is an excess of zeal.

Do We Support All Strikes?

Lewis' stooges, especially the Trotskyites and Norman Thomas Socialists, the Social-Democratic Federation and the George Sokolskys, have raised the cry that strikes must always be supported, and especially by the Communists. They are trying to convince us that we are renegades from the principles of Lenin and Stalin in condemning the strike movement; that it is against the laws of nature for Com-

munist to be against strikes. Yes, they go so far as to quote Lenin against us and for John L. Lewis. Such references to Lenin are beneath contempt and are an obvious cover for treason to trade unionism as well as to the nation. Even in the days when strikes were in the main progressive acts and to be supported, Lenin never failed to warn, and on this he had the agreement of all sound trade union leaders, that not all strikes can be supported, that the consequences of a strike must always be taken into consideration before a strike is advocated, planned, carried out or supported. The consequences of an act are the determining factor of the class attitude toward it. That is a basic rule of all sound trade unionism. Way back in 1902 Lenin had occasion to criticize a program that had been advocated by one of the organizations in Russia and which extolled strikes as the best means of struggle. The strike, Lenin replied,

“. . . is only one of the means, not always even one of the best. It is enough to indicate the necessity to give leadership to economic struggles in general; sometimes this leadership must be expressed by restraining strikes.” (*Collected Works*, Vol. V, p. 130, Russian edition.)

Today in the United States it has become an imperative duty of all sound labor leadership to restrain strikes and to do everything to dissolve the strike movement. You cannot have strikes and win the war.

Today it is the anti-war capital-

ists, the admirers and friends of Hitler, those who want to bring Nazism to the United States, that want strikes; the strike policy is their policy, and they do not hesitate to use strikes freely to prepare their way to power.

Do you think employers are universally against strikes? That is just as foolish as to think Communists are always for them. There are employers who like to use strikes and like to have the labor movement in a condition where they can provoke strikes when and where they please. David Dubinsky helped to pave the way for Lewis when he staged the stoppage of the dress-makers in New York, despite the fact that he and the employers had already agreed on a settlement. There was a deliberate purpose behind that move; it was to spread the idea that strikes during wartime are legitimate.

John L. Lewis betrayed the miners months ago when he blocked every effort to lay the foundations for settlement of the needs and grievances of the miners before the expiration of the contract. Way last summer, Ickes proposed to Lewis and the coal operators to put the miners on a six-day basis, give the miners time and a half for the extra day, increase production for the war, and alleviate the manpower shortage. We must not allow the miners to forget that Lewis joined with the mine operators to reject this, although in May, in the first strike, when this was imposed upon the industry, the Lewis forces hailed it as the first victory for the strike, when it could have been had six

months before the contract expired.

In general, Lewis has stubbornly refused to permit the union to take up the problem of production, or to relate the miners' income to production. Lewis has connived with the employers to place all possible solutions of the economic issues of the mining industry in such a form that to settle them would require granting higher profits to the operators, thereby smashing the economic policies of the Roosevelt Administration.

The Incentive Wage

This line, and especially the line of preventing the linking of the workers' income to production, has been followed by all anti-war elements. It is the platform of the defeatists' conspiracy inside the labor movement as well as outside. This has come to the fore in the issue of the incentive wage. The question of incentive wage is the question of unifying the economic interests of the workers and the economic needs of the war, so that they act not to defeat one another but to help and supplement one another.

By linking the workers' wage income to production and productivity it is possible to stimulate production for the war enormously and at the same time give the workers the increased wage income which they desire and need without in any way undermining the existing economic relationships or causing a general shake-up or initiating an inflation spiral. Much headway

has been made in the understanding of this question on a mass scale, a question which we first raised in November, 1942, when we stressed the basic importance of the production problem. But not much headway has yet been made in applying the program of incentive wages, especially upon the scale required for the war. The problem before us is to carry the issue of the incentive wage over from the stage of discussion to the stage of action, by having it applied in life by the trade unions in collaboration with the government and with those sections of the enlightened employers who are ready to welcome it. It is necessary to break down the resistance and sabotage of this issue within the labor movement which come from people with special interests, most of them linked up with Lewis, and to overcome that section of the employers whose resistance is based upon shortsightedness, greed and inertia, as well as that section of the employers whose resistance is political, caused by their connection with the defeatist conspiracy.

In general, we can sum up our tasks in relation to the Lewis insurrection against the war in a few simply stated aims which we must set for all conscious and honest men in the labor movement and outside. These provide the key to the solidification of the home front for the next crucial period in the military struggle.

We must expose the Lewis conspiracy and isolate it in the labor movement on the basis of rejecting his strike policy, laying bare his

anti-war alignments and purposes and rallying every patriotic element in the population against him, showing his attempts to wreck the Roosevelt Administration not as narrow personal partisanship but as fascist partisanship for Hitlerism. We must make it politically impossible for the American Federation of Labor to carry through its contemplated coalition with Lewis.

Second, in those unions where Lewis has promised that his stooges are going to bring them along with him, like the Auto Workers and others, we must force those agents into the open or force them to break with Lewis and his policies not only in words, but in deeds. We know who some of these people are. Reuther is one. Carey is another. And anyone who refuses to speak out against this Lewis insurrection can be looked upon as a probable member of the conspiracy, only awaiting the moment when he will be called into action.

We must unite the C.I.O. behind the leadership of Phil Murray and his clear and correct program for the labor movement, and we must work with every honest leading element who goes along with Murray in the fullest collaboration, giving them our confidence and support without any regard to possible past or present ideological differences.

We must bring the healthy leading elements of the American Federation of Labor and the C.I.O. into working collaboration with the consciousness of the task that faces them, on a state and national scale, looking toward the real unity of the

labor movement, not a unity which consists of consolidating the anti-war elements in control at the top, but a unity of labor to win the war and win it against the Lewises or any other pro-Nazi provocateur.

We must build the unity of all anti-Axis elements for the war now, and for the 1944 elections, which are already a practical issue today in the course of the conduct of the war.

IV. *The 1944 Presidential Elections*

The preparations for the 1944 election campaign are not formal and traditional preparations. They bear all signs of the development of a major battle for power between two fundamentally irreconcilable trends of policy. The question of the President's succession involves the determination of whether the United States goes forward in the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition to the unconditional surrender of the Axis and all its works, with the reconstitution of the world order on that basis, or whether the U. S. shall dissolve the coalition and embark upon a course of salvaging the Axis powers and combining with them against our present Allies, Britain and the Soviet Union. That is the issue of the 1944 elections.

This issue is being fought out in both major parties. In the Democratic Party it is the dividing line between the pro-Roosevelt and anti-Roosevelt groupings. In the Republican Party it is represented in the Willkie camp versus the regular Republican machine. The struggle is complicated by the fact

that the only clear hope of a straight Republican Party victory in 1944 lies in the nomination of Willkie. That, however, would represent a defeat for the reactionary coalition second only to Roosevelt's re-election or the election of a person standing for everything that Roosevelt does. And the anti-war coalition will fight against Willkie with almost the same fanaticism they display against the President.

Thus it is that the main current of thinking in the defeatist camp turns in the direction of securing a three-way division of the electoral vote that will deny a majority to any candidate, thus throwing the election into the House of Representatives, which is controlled by the reactionary coalition. To bring about such a result, the reactionary coalition must first split the labor support of Roosevelt in the North, create economic chaos and social struggle on a broad scale, thus carrying the North at least in the majority; second, splitting the Southern poll-tax states away from Roosevelt or Roosevelt's candidate, behind a rival Democratic candidate named by a rump convention which will keep Roosevelt off the ballot in the poll-tax states. For this they aim at all costs to prevent the repeal of the poll tax.

For the labor and progressive movements, as for all who put victory above all other considerations, preparations for 1944 are therefore an integral part of the home front of the war effort which must be made now, not next year. Special political groupings and organizational efforts have a positive value

today only as they are formed under the sign of unity for victory, under the slogan of holding the home front. The dominant issue is not Right wing versus Left wing; it is not the New Deal against the Old Deal; it is not the keeping of the status quo; it is not anything but for victory against the defeatists.

And in this whole struggle, whether it be electoral alignments for 1944 or the daily questions of life today in the development of the war, our friends and our allies are not determined by any ideological considerations, or any formal political alignments. We are partners and allies with every American who is ready to fight the defeatists at home and prosecute the war to victory at all costs. That is our political platform today and next year; along that line we must carry on without deviation. That is the line of struggle for the next period of the war, and the line for the 1944 elections.

V. Problems of the War Economy

A few words about our war economy. The tempo of construction of an all-out war economy in the U. S. has been distressingly slow. The chief obstacle has been the policy of appeasing the defeatists' opposition. Even the elementary and minimum seven-point program enunciated by President Roosevelt in April, 1942, has not been carried out. Most of the disturbances of national unity could have been avoided or controlled by full application of the seven-point pro-

gram. Most of the C.I.O. minimum program, still to be fought for and achieved, is merely the concrete enforcement of that seven-point program the President enunciated. The deeper problem of organizing the national economy for war is only now being seriously approached.

A few days ago the President by executive order set up an Office of War Mobilization. Thus there came into being essentially that structure of authority which had been put forward in the Tolson-Kilgore-Pepper Bills with the support of labor and a large part of the other classes.

This is progress, but everything now depends upon how quickly this centralized authority which has been created takes up its tasks, whether it really begins at once to produce centralized all-out plans for the national economy. You cannot have such plans without having the centralized authority to produce them. But the existence of the authority does not automatically produce the plans and now it is necessary that the country shall make it known to the Office of War Mobilization that it expects order to be brought out by the economic chaos—not by the adjustment of differences and quarrels by an umpire, but by the prevention of differences, quarrels, bottlenecks, breakdowns by means of planning and direction of economic life according to plan.

Agriculture for War

We must begin to give this more emphasis now also in relation to

agriculture, to which the country is beginning to turn its attention. Price fixing can be maintained only by the firm establishment of planned production. That applies to all phases of the war economy, industry and agriculture. We must insist that the economic plans shall cover not only production of war material, but also industrial production for the civil population, and agricultural production for industry and for food.

In agriculture, there are two features of the war economy which require over-all planning and administration. These are, first, the system of production subsidies. It is clear to all who accept the necessity for the maintenance of the present price structure that the only way in which the pressing problems in the field of food production can be met is by production subsidies. Herbert Hoover's elaborate platform for the removal of all ceilings on prices of agriculture is merely another attempt to wreck the economic program of the Administration with a political objective. All of the enemies of production subsidies in the food production program are enemies of the all-out prosecution of the war. It is necessary that we make this clear to the country, to labor, as well as to the farmers, and win general support to the concept of production subsidies for food.

Second in the development of agricultural production are the technical aids to production. Some beginnings have been made in the way of providing through a national economic apparatus the necessary

technical aids to production. Such aids on a proper scale must include an organized system of machinery rental and repair stations adjusted to the type of agriculture in each section, auxiliary transportation services which are required to replace the breakdown of private transportation, and a labor army for seasonal demands in agriculture which cannot by any means be taken care of on the basis of individual employment, even if organized and protected by governmental agencies. The labor question in agriculture clearly will require a national organization of labor to supplement the labor of the individual farmer and the individual hired worker.

VI. *The Dissolution of the Communist International*

It is necessary for me now to pass on to a few words on the significance of the dissolution of the Communist International. We have published the decision of the Presiding Committee of the Comintern, as well as many documents from various countries and from our own party, in relation to this action. It is not necessary for me to review these documents with you here. We can assume that you are familiar with them, that you have studied them, and that you already have a common body of opinion as to their significance.

The action taken on May 15 and completed on June 10 cancels the organizational association of the various national Communist Parties. Thus is closed an era of the devel-

opment of the world's working class movement. It is quite clear that we have a most profound, positive estimate of the role of the Communist International during this past period. Especially we must emphasize that in this period, and due above all to the role of the Communist International, there has finally been realized that coalition of all the progressive forces in the world that gives us the guarantee of the final elimination of fascism and Nazism from the world. That is a tremendous achievement. We must further emphasize that in this period now closed, under the guiding hand of the Communist International, there has developed in most of the major countries—and many of the smaller ones—mature Marxist working class parties, in most cases under the name Communist, which are playing, and will continue to play, a most vital role in achieving the tasks of this war, which are the supreme tasks of this historic epoch, and of guaranteeing an ordered world development after this war is over.

Our party, the Communist Party of the United States, being without international affiliation since November, 1940, is not called upon to participate in the decision which has already been finalized. This is an event, however, which demands our political evaluation and conclusions to be drawn, since it profoundly influences the national and international life within which we work.

The Axis was brought into existence as an anti-Comintern, manipulating the spectre of Commu-

nism, to prevent the effective coalition of the democratic states jointly to resist aggression. With the disappearance of the Comintern, this Axis weapon has been to a very great degree rendered harmless to the cause of democratic unity. It has destroyed the legend that Communist Parties in the various countries act upon any other basis than the interests of their own nation; it thereby facilitates the unity within our nation of all patriotic forces, as well as the unity of the various nations, for the joint struggle against the Axis.

The dissolution of the Comintern has further cleared the boards for the emergence of higher forms of international solidarity, which must find expression also in international trade union unification, first of all in the Anglo-Soviet-American trade union council, to parallel the coalition of governments and peoples.

There are special questions relating to our own party and the relations of our party to national unity. The dissolution of the Communist International creates new and more favorable conditions for the integration of the Communist Party of the United States into our own American democratic life and national unity. It is true that our party, already in 1940, had dissolved its affiliation and had taken all programmatic steps requisite to the proper adjustment of our relations to the democratic national front. But all circles in America who were infected with Hitler's anti-Comintern bogey in any degree denounced our disaffiliation and other move-

ments as a fraud, insisting that so long as the Communist International existed there could be no disaffiliation except by renegacy and fighting against the Communist International.

Now that the Communist International is no more, this argument has lost even a semblance of plausibility, and the Communist Party has a more advantageous position and a better atmosphere in its struggle to secure full citizenship on our own merits, and without the fear of ghosts.

To begin the process of the immediate utilization of these more favorable conditions, I wrote a series of letters, with the agreement of our Political Committee, to the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune*. These have been republished in *The Worker* of June 6.

As was to be expected, considering its confused and vacillating position on the war, the first reaction of the *New York Times* was swift and angry refusal to consider as open to discussion the position of the Communist Party in the United States. This was evidently not based upon any new thought in the light of the new stage in world history, but was a mechanical hangover or carry-over from the past. The *Times*' editorial reaction to my second letter was still stubborn, but already in a defensive tone, and conceded the legality of the Communist Party.

The editor of the *Times* was evidently uncomfortably aware that his defense of the appeasement of Japan, which he described as oppo-

sition to Japan short of war, was exactly the formula of Chamberlain and Daladier at Munich and contrasted sharply with the Communist Party declaration of 1937 to support war if necessary to halt Japanese aggression.

Also the editor evidently began to realize that his pet formula, the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States, raised more problems from his approach to the question than it settled, although he could not yet find any new ground for continuing the discussion. Although the *New York Times* is by no means a decisive organ of public opinion, on the whole, we must take these reactions as symptomatic and, considering the source, not unfavorable to the prospects of a further broad discussion which we will take to the entire country and which will finally place the problem of the Communists in America in a new light entirely.

It is not without significance that the *Herald Tribune*, a more objective and realistic organ, even if equally prejudiced, did not rush in to print with a ready-made answer, but withheld its comment. These letters addressed to the *Times* and *Herald Tribune* are, of course, in reality directed to all Americans, including the responsible governmental leaders of our country and of the war. We sincerely hope and expect that our approach will receive the response in the same spirit of national unity for the war in which those letters were written. This discussion is by no means closed. It is only opened.

It is necessary for the war, for

victory, for national unity, that our country shall understand anti-Communism as a defeatist political instrument of the same order as anti-Semitism, just as harmful, and no more a private problem of the Communists than anti-Semitism is a problem only for the Jews. Both are equally weapons for Hitler. You don't have to be a Jew to know the damage of anti-Semitism. All you have to be is a decent democrat. The same thing is true, for the same reasons, of anti-Communism. Both are obscurantist political witchcraft. And only at the price of complete exposure and rejection of these ideologies is it possible to have any kind of sane, healthy, democratic life in our country. The presence and continued operation of anti-Communism and anti-Semitism and the other features of Nazi ideology are destructive of all clear thinking, of all sound political relationships; they are destructive of national unity and are productive of defeatists in the war. To clear the air of these bogeys is a common duty of all democrats. Of, course, this is not to deny that we Communists have our own special duties in breaking down the walls of suspicion and distrust that have been built up against us and against national unity by years of repetition of lies and slander. We must be patient and persevering and never allow ourselves to be provoked by these lies into hot words or hasty actions. Only complete calmness and collectedness and persistence in bringing forward the truth against these lies will meet this problem from the point of view of Com-

munist participation in this task.

VII. *Communists and the Trade Unions*

One angle of our work becomes of greater importance every day—namely, our relations to the world of trade unionism. We must emphasize especially what is true generally of the relationships of our party to mass organizations, that it is the duty of the Communists, and we must school the Communists in this duty, to so conduct themselves as to convince all their honest fellow citizens, even the prejudiced ones, that there is no truth whatsoever in the fairy tales that the Communists want to dominate or to capture the trade unions, or any other mass organization. We have no such program. We have no such desires and we want to prove it by our smallest act and word. To this end it has become more necessary than ever now that we clean up in the odd corners of our party whatever remnants may be hanging around of old methods of work, carry-overs from the days when we were a persecuted minority in which the main stream of public life was not developing along the lines that we supported and in which fractions and fractional methods of work were used to some extent in trade unions and mass organizations. Some years ago we put an end to this as a system of work in our party. A recent inspection of our work in the field disclosed that some remnants of this old approach still continued, in spite of the declared policy of our party. Let us here make it clear

that we want to sweep out all those remnants completely. In the trade unions Communists need no special organizational forms of any kind. Everything that we have to do, our tasks and aims, we share with the great majority of the trade union members and leaders; and we must make that clear beyond any question and we must establish that in the practical life of our party so that no one can doubt it.

Communists can and must work in a most free and democratic manner in trade unions and other mass organizations with all other honest patriotic forces under the one main banner which unites us all, of unity to win the war, to hold the home front firm. There is not and there must not be any special discipline among Communists in the trade unions. The party, of course, will continue to demand of its members their complete adherence to trade union decisions and policies democratically arrived at, as well as the full support of our national war effort, to which everything else must be subordinated.

The Communist Party has its own special discipline in the sense of demanding these things of the member. But this is no discipline which in any way runs contrary to or crosses the discipline of the trade unions, which are autonomous organizations to which the Communists subordinate themselves in the same way that all other members of the trade unions do. There are no special demands in the interests of the Communists, no special interests of the Communists; we demand only equal democratic rights.

And even this is not merely for ourselves. It is a firmly established historical fact that when equal democratic rights are denied to the Communists that is the beginning of the loss of democratic rights for the entire population. And in fighting for our democratic rights, we are fighting not for a special interest, we are fighting for the democratic rights of every man and woman in America.

We must warn all of our party leaders that they will often be faced with temptations when non-party people approach the party in a friendly way and say, we want to discuss with you about the conditions in the trade unions, this or that union, this or that problem. Of course, we have the right and duty to discuss with every one all public questions, including trade union questions, which are not matters of indifference in the general political life of the country, but we must never fall for the temptation of party leaders discussing with other party or non-party trade union leaders detailed questions of trade union life in any way which pretends or assumes to commit Communists in the trade unions to follow a particular line. These decisions are not made by our party in consultation with anybody in the trade union movement. Those decisions are made only inside every trade union by the members of the trade union, including the Communists, of course, and are never made by party representatives on the outside. And let us make sure that that understanding is carried to the whole labor movement, and espe-

cially that it is enforced in the practice of our party.

VIII. "The Internationale"

At the time the dissolution decision was published, the Associated Press called me up and asked me for a statement as to what American Communists were going to do about the song "The Internationale." Without having had any preparation for such a momentous question, my reaction was to laugh at it and reply I really couldn't say. We never had any party decisions about songs, and I didn't suppose there were going to be any, that without party decisions we sang the "Star Spangled Banner" and I supposed we'd still continue, and I don't see any reason for changing our singing programs, which include "The Internationale."

I am afraid, however, that I took this question too lightly when I answered the Associated Press over the telephone. Thinking the matter over afterwards, I realized that while this question of songs has never been a matter of party decisions but merely of customs, to the outside world these things assume a great importance, especially as the spotlight is turned by enemies of ours and of the war effort upon precisely such small questions as that. Thinking further over the situation I had to admit that perhaps we made a mistake in not having party decisions about questions of songs because, if we had had party decisions, I'm sure that the American party would never have decided to change the words of "The Interna-

tionale," making our American version of it different from that used in any other part of the world. You know that in America we have for many years been singing a refrain of "The Internationale" as the "International Soviet." That's not done anywhere else in the world. That's a special Americanism. Some very zealous, very sectarian worker in the cultural world gave it to us and we thoughtlessly accepted it and it became an established custom. We never even reviewed it. We never even discussed it. Suddenly, without discussion, on the initiative of one person, the American Communists began to sing about the "International Soviet," where all the rest of the international labor movement sang about the "Internationale." It's a small difference, but it's a difference which has been exaggerated into a programmatic question in America by our enemies. Perhaps we'll have to break a long-standing tradition of having no decision about songs and officially change the American version of the "Internationale" back to the international version. I cite this as just one example whereby, by becoming more international, we will adjust ourselves closer to American realities. This was an Americanism that separated us from the American people.

IX. Conclusion

I must bring my remarks to a conclusion. I have concentrated this report upon a few outstanding questions which seem to me to be key to the central questions of the

day upon which there must be main concentration. This very narrow selectivity is not in any way to belittle the importance of other questions. It is to serve mainly as a matter of establishing the proper emphasis and the proper relation in terms of programmatic development of our daily work.

We can sum up what we have to establish in the Plenum, that our main task today is the struggle for the solidity of the home front and the political education of the American workers and the masses of the American people in the course of the struggle.

The task that we have before us is the most revolutionary task of history, the task of extirpating the Axis from the face of the earth. Nothing could be more revolutionary than that. In this revolutionary task we have the collaboration of the broadest circles that are subjectively not revolutionary at all and who object to the use of the word "revolution" because they see something sinister and subversive about it, although they agree wholeheartedly and completely with our revolutionary aims of the extirpation of the Axis.

Our special task as Communists is the political education of the millions, to bring deepened political understanding in the course of the struggle. The masses are learning from life.

Lenin wrote, way back in 1902, some words that I think are advantageous for us to remember at this moment, over forty years later, in a quite new historical situation. He said:

"The strength of the proletariat consists in this, that its number and compactness grow as a result of the process of economic development itself, at the same time as among the big and petty bourgeoisie there is growing disunity and disintegration of interests. In order to register this natural advantage of the proletariat, the political party of the working class must attentively observe all conflicts of interest among the ruling classes, using these conflicts not only to get fractional benefits for one or another stratum of the working class, but in order to educate the working class as a whole and also with the purpose of extracting a useful lesson from each new social political upset."

With the proper adjustments to the period of history in which we are living, that thought expresses our most profound central special task which only we can carry forward in the midst of this general struggle for victory.

Another quotation from Lenin:

"In the history of revolutions the contradictions ripening during decades and centuries come to the surface. Life becomes tremendously rich. On the political scene appear as active fighters the masses, who hitherto remained always in the shadow and therefore were ignored and even despised by superficial observers. These masses learn through their experience, trying their first steps, groping for the road, formulating their tasks, checking themselves and the theories of their ideologists. Those masses are exerting heroic efforts to reach the heights of gigantic world tasks imposed upon them by history and no

matter how big may be some defeats or how enormous the flow of blood and number of victims, nothing can equal the importance of this direct education of the masses and classes in the process of revolutionary struggle."

What Lenin said forty years ago of that stage of the revolutionary struggle is fully true today in that supremely revolutionary task in which we are engaged with the

broadest masses of our country and others, the extirpation of the Axis. While giving complete and full leadership and energy to the main task which we share with the broadest democratic camp, our special task is, at the same time, to guarantee the political education of the working class and the toiling masses of our country, preparing them for their future historical role.

VICTORY AND THE 1944 ELECTIONS

BY EUGENE DENNIS

IN THE new stage of the war which is now taking place—as crucial battles approach on the decisive Soviet-German front, and as Anglo-American offensive operations are being extended to the European continent—it is clear that the sharpening inner political struggle within the United States and the fight to achieve the greatest unity and common action of labor and all other win-the-war forces in support of the Commander-in-Chief will play an extraordinary role in influencing the course, the duration, and the outcome of the war. This is especially true today in respect to resolving whether or not the victory policies of the Roosevelt government will be more fully and speedily realized, especially so that America will exert its full strength and resources in time and in coordination with the Soviet Union and Great Britain for utilizing the present favorable situation to help deliver decisive blows against Hitler Germany this year.

In analyzing the political situation and alignments within the country, special consideration should be given to the approaching 1944 elections. To begin with, we

must understand that next year's national elections are not a post-war problem and not a problem to be resolved solely in 1944. Just as present military-political developments will decisively affect the outcome of the 1944 elections, so, too, the preparations and alignments now under way for the elections will directly affect the conduct of the war now. For this, if for no other purpose, we must concern ourselves with helping influence and shape all events and regroupings which will determine the results in the primaries and in November of next year. Further, we must say, it is time for labor and other win-the-war forces to prepare now to intervene more actively in the pre-election alignments and preparations; otherwise we may have a repetition of the Congressional elections of 1942, only with far more serious and disastrous consequences for the nation and for victory. . . .

Therefore, in this situation and in view of the decisive phase which the war is entering upon, it is essential that everything be done to strengthen the anti-fascist unity of the nation as never before.

This is vital to ensure victory in the war and victory in the 1944 elections. All obstacles to strengthening the camp of national unity must be broken down. All difficulties and impediments to advancing labor's unity of action, which is the backbone and core of national unity, must be overcome. All hesitations and vacillations in waging an uncompromising struggle against the defeatists within certain governmental circles, within both major parties, as well as within the labor movement, must be resolutely swept aside—with the focal point of this stage now being to smash the Lewis conspiracy.

This is the approach, the main orientation and the strategical line which must be mapped out and concretized in order to rout the defeatists and to guarantee that the existing prerequisites shall be utilized for speeding victory in the war as well as the triumph of the democratic camp in the 1944 elections.

It is from this viewpoint that we must give maximum consideration to the role and grave responsibility of the American working class and people. The American labor movement needs confidence in its own strength. It needs unity of action to consolidate and exercise its own power. It needs a united front on a national and international scale to fortify and further develop the world coalition of states and peoples against Hitlerism. And within our country it needs to extend and forge the most active militant unity of the working class and its trade union movement. For working class unity is the center of national

unity. And national unity in each anti-Axis nation is the chief weapon for achieving victory over Hitlerism and Hitler's Axis. . . .

High among the tasks for obtaining labor's united action lies the need of smashing the reactionary policies and activities of John L. Lewis, of the Trotskyites, and Social-Democrats. Similarly, the united action and patriotic role of labor require that the most advanced sections of the working class, together with other win-the-war forces, should further clarify all war issues, should make clear the anti-fascist nature and objectives of the war, and should help guarantee that labor resolutely fulfill its independent and united responsibilities.

* * *

In considering some of the most urgent and practical tasks that face labor and the trade unions, and therefore the Communists, for advancing the common action of labor and reinforcing national unity, I should like to concentrate on a number of urgent problems and tasks, limited primarily to the question of how to strengthen labor's role and united action on the political, legislative and electoral fronts.

Recent experience has proved that one of the most important channels for developing labor's united action and influencing political developments is in the formation and activity of joint labor legislative committees. Within the past month united labor political action committees and people's con-

ferences involving the C.I.O. and important A. F. of L. organizations and the Railroad Brotherhoods, have been established in many key industrial centers in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, California, Wisconsin, etc. These have been organized chiefly around Congressional and state legislative issues dealing with anti-labor legislation, the President's seven-point program and questions of production and manpower. However, most of these conferences and movements have also adopted a clearcut position and program of action in support of the Casablanca decisions for speeding the invasion of Europe and for strengthening American-Soviet collaboration.

It is vitally urgent that these forms of common labor and people's action be consolidated and extended everywhere, locally and on a state and national scale. This is possible and necessary and remains one of the foremost instruments for enabling labor to develop the most suitable and effective forms of mass action, for exerting mass pressure on Congress, for implementing the government's policy, and for promoting labor's unity of action as well as labor's collaboration with other win-the-war forces. What is necessary, however, is that greater initiative and alertness be displayed in reacting to new events and issues, such as coping with the new strike provocations, the current struggle over O.P.A. and subsidies, the new phase and tactical problems of the anti-poll tax fight, etc., as well as combating the pro-Hitler and appeasement poli-

cies of the Wheelers, Tafts and Chandlers. It is necessary that, in addition to adopting a general win-the-war program, attention be given to seeking out one or two of the most burning issues, particularly so as to find those specific and single issues which can unite the widest forces, which, for instance, could facilitate the involvement of broader sections of the A. F. of L., which could reach the miners' organizations and which could also draw the farmers, the Negro people and middle-class groups into cooperative win-the-war action. It is necessary that, in organizing the struggle on vital wartime legislative and political issues, the main fire be directed against the defeatists and obstructionists, while against the weaknesses and mistakes of the Administration and its war agencies only the weapons of criticism should be used. It is necessary, further, that greater consideration be given to help create a broader and more representative leadership in these committees and movements. Finally, it is necessary that these committees and conferences called around given political-legislative issues do not become an end in themselves but a fulcrum for organizing systematic and broad mass actions in the unions, shops, communities and Congressional Districts.

Organically connected with the question of organizing joint labor political action, it is extremely important that the proposals of the national C.I.O. for organizing community and Congressional District conferences and legislative commit-

tees be developed and multiplied by organized labor. For this program of action affords new and great possibilities for rallying and unifying labor and the people, for influencing Congress and for bringing about a broader win-the-war alignment and evaluation in the various Congressional Districts and states. The New York experience, where twenty such conferences and committees have been organized, should be studied, as well as vastly improved upon. And here it should be emphasized that it is necessary to overcome those practices that tend to convert the C.I.O.'s Congressional legislative activity into activities limited only to the C.I.O. and in certain instances into movements limited chiefly to the so-called Left-wing unions within the C.I.O. What is projected in the decisions of the C.I.O.'s national board, according to its national spokesmen, and what is required, is that the C.I.O. membership be organized and activated on a Congressional District basis in conjunction and unison with mobilizing A. F. of L. and non-labor forces to support and participate in the organizing of broad, non-partisan and people's legislative committees, conferences and mass movements.

In this connection it is also important to stress that the joint legislative and political action committees should not be approached as a substitute for the responsible functions and political activity of the trade unions. Simultaneously, while working to extend the existing network of united labor legislative and electoral commit-

tees, it is essential that far greater emphasis be placed on mobilizing the majority of the national, district and lower trade union organizations and councils, as well as to reach and influence the trade union membership directly at their places of work. All questions of policy and action need to be carried more effectively into the established organizations of labor—A. F. of L. as well as C.I.O.—and into the key centers of employment and working class community life.

This is essential because the center of political struggle for labor and national unity rests primarily among and within the trade unions, factories, and working class communities. This is essential because of the changes in the composition of the working class and the new strata of workers being drawn both into industry and into the trade union movement. This is also essential because powerful and decisive American trade unions and councils are becoming one of the principal mediums of mass independent working class political action and organization, which can involve broad masses of workers who formerly kept aloof from political life. Moreover, to the extent that hundreds of A. F. of L. organizations and miners' locals, similar to the C.I.O. unions, directly engage in political-legislative activity, and are influenced to take a position on, and participate in, movements for effecting economic stabilization, for stepping up production, for guaranteeing the fulfillment of labor's no-strike pledge, as well as in active support for the govern-

ment's military decisions and plans for opening a land front in Europe, etc., to that extent it also will be possible more speedily to isolate and defeat the Lewises, Wolls, Hutchesons and Dubinskys, and more rapidly to extend and fortify labor's unity and the unity of the nation.

* * *

Another important problem is that of the autumn mayoralty elections, as well as the coming primaries for electing party committeemen and delegates. Key mayoralty elections are due to take place shortly in San Francisco, Cleveland and Milwaukee, as well as in a series of other communities, and these will have a big effect on both the Administration and Congress and the alignments for 1944.

Insofar as the general tactical line which we must pursue, it is clear that we must approach each and every municipal election from the angle of its political effects nationally, from the angle of strengthening the democratic camp of national unity in support of the Commander-in-Chief. And as a corollary of this, we must work in such a way as to promote united labor and people's action as part of and in collaboration with a wider win-the-war coalition. It is further necessary to help activate and unite the win-the-war Democrats and Republicans, and to reach and win over the important middle-class sections of the population. Together with this, it is necessary to link the local election issues with the main national win-the-war problems, with mobilizing concrete

support for the government and its war program. This must be the guiding line and tactical orientation for developing our municipal election policy.

* * *

In considering the forms and avenues for developing the independent political action of labor within the framework of national unity, the question arises—what about forming Labor or Farmer-Labor Parties? This is not an academic question, for in the past six months efforts have been or are being made in such states as New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and Michigan to launch Labor Parties. Even Mayor La Guardia has made a public statement urging the building of the A.L.P. on a national scale.

The political initiative for these movements to crystallize Labor Parties has stemmed chiefly from the old-guard Social-Democratic forces connected with the Dubinsky leadership in the American Labor Party. These movements have also been encouraged by various pro-Lewis and Norman Thomas elements, such as in Michigan. And without exception the Dubinsky-Norman Thomas - Mazze - Lewis forces are now endeavoring to organize so-called Labor Parties as a means of dividing the labor movement, of trying to break labor's alliance with the Roosevelt Government, and to disorganize the camp of national unity.

However, in relation to these moves, and to similar steps now being undertaken in a number of

other states (such as in West Virginia and Southern Illinois, where the old Labor's Non-Partisan League organizations are controlled by Lewis forces) it is necessary to recognize the fact that there exists an influential current of honest labor sentiment which favors some form of independent labor or third party political organization and activity. This is particularly true in relation to a number of states now controlled by Republican administrations and where the local Democratic Party happens to be in a state of demoralization or passivity.

What should be our approach to this question, to the issue of forming local or state Labor or Farmer-Labor Parties at this time? Generally we consider that it is premature to organize such parties. Moreover, we believe that in most states the formation of such parties now would result in dividing the camp of national unity, in accentuating the breach in labor's ranks and in abetting the divisive, anti-war policies of the Social-Democratic and pro-Lewis elements.

Of course, we do not oppose the formation of Labor, Farmer-Labor or third parties in principle; what we must do is to gauge the situation concretely and to determine whether major C.I.O. and A. F. of L. forces are or could be involved in these movements, as well as other popular forces. We must further view the question as to its possible effect on labor's relations with the win-the-war forces in the major parties. Also, we must take into account the state electoral laws

from the angle of whether it is possible for candidates to run simultaneously on two party tickets or ballots, as in New York.

But so far the conditions have not matured for the formation of state labor or Farmer-Labor Parties (and here I do not refer to the New York or Minnesota situation, where such parties are already in existence—parties that can play a key role if they adhere to a consistent anti-Hitler program, if they pursue an electoral tactic based on a policy of national unity and coalition, and if these organizations put an end to artificial Right and Left-wing divisions and broaden their mass base and leadership).

However, if the prospects were that Roosevelt could be defeated in the Democratic Party in 1944—which is possible though not probable—and if the Willkie forces likewise were to be defeated in the Republican Party, then the situation would alter. But in such an event the labor movement, together with the win-the-war forces in the Democratic and Republican Parties, would then be faced with the task, and the conditions would quickly materialize for organizing a broad anti-fascist party coalition and alignment much broader than a Labor or Farmer-Labor Party.

While opposing the launching of a Labor or Farmer-Labor Party in the various states at this stage, we cannot be and are not indifferent to the question of strengthening labor's independent political action, as well as its independent political organizations within the camp of national unity and as a

means for strengthening national unity.

Therefore, while opposing proposals for the launching of Labor or Farmer-Labor Parties at this time, we do consider it essential to examine the political situation in each state from the viewpoint of developing new and more varied forms of united labor, people's and other win-the-war legislative and electoral organizations and activity. For instance, we consider it timely to explore the possibilities in certain states for creating political organizations of a federation type or of the type of United Labor Committees in Philadelphia and St. Louis. Furthermore, there is undoubtedly considerable merit to the proposal being advanced by certain labor leaders who want to strengthen the national war coalition, to bring together influential labor and other popular forces on a state basis, as well as nationally. This might be important, though not from the viewpoint of rushing or even trying at this time to crystallize new political organizations. However, such gatherings could play a positive role if they were called for the purpose of involving influential and representative leaders of the labor and people's movements, collectively to survey the political situation, including the approaching 1944 elections. Such gatherings could help clarify the key win-the-war issues. They could give an independent lead and stimulus to unify further the anti-fascist forces everywhere. And they could help influence current political alignments in the direction of promoting the establish-

ment of a broader anti-Axis coalition within the country and firmer national unity around the Commander-in-Chief.

* * *

As the 1944 elections draw closer, more and more there is being injected into the political scene the issue of the fourth term. Defeatist as well as other anti-Roosevelt forces in both the major parties are bringing forward the question of the fourth term both from the angle of mustering support to prevent the renomination and re-election of the President, as well as to engender a national controversy designed to obstruct and oppose the Administration's war program today. On the other hand, within the labor movement there is a growing demand, such as expressed by A. F. of L. state conventions in Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, that the President should run for a fourth term. Many local machines of the Democratic Party, those which are most closely allied with and support the Roosevelt Administration, such as in Chicago and New Jersey, are also actively mobilizing support for a fourth term. Moreover, the recent poll conducted by Roper and published in the May issue of *Fortune* clearly indicates that over 64 per cent of all strata of the population favor a fourth term for Roosevelt if the war is still on.

What should be the position of labor on this question? This is a simple question, and yet it is complex. It is simple because, first of all, the national interest requires that the anti-Axis, anti-Hitler war

policies of the Roosevelt Government should be continued and developed further, for winning victory and for the post-war period. From this basic consideration it is necessary to lend the most active support for the developing movement for a fourth term for the President. This of course is important not only because of post-war considerations and the future problems of collective security for peace, based on the closest friendship and alliance of the American-Soviet-British anti-Hitlerite coalition; it is also extremely important in terms of the immediate war situation. The stronger the movement develops throughout the country in the trade unions, among the farmers, within the Democratic Party, and among all sections of the people—this will weaken the position of the defeatists. It will have a tremendous influence on Congress and will help strengthen the President's hand in the conduct of the war. It will also have a direct influence and bearing in the fight for control of the Democratic Party, in enabling the Roosevelt forces more effectively to isolate and defeat the reactionary southern Bourbons and the Farley clique.

Therefore, support should be given to the proposals of various labor leaders that, in the state A. F. of L. and C.I.O. conventions now taking place, appropriate action be taken to reaffirm labor's support and endorsement of the Roosevelt war program and leadership, and on this basis take a positive position on the fourth term. Furthermore, labor and other win-the-war forces

should speak out and condemn the defeatist inspired anti-fourth-term movement.

In relation to the position of labor on the fourth-term issue, it is necessary to warn against the activities and policies of the Dubinsky Social-Democrats, who are also voicing support for the fourth term.

Here it is significant to note that the *New Leader* Social-Democrats are trying to present and make the issue of the fourth term one of a continuance of the New Deal in the post-war period. But this is not and cannot be the issue. Everything needs to be done to avoid an artificial division on the basis of pro or anti-New Deal. The vital issue is that of mobilizing support around the Commander-in-Chief, to back his victory policies, and to guarantee that the 1944 elections shall result in the continuation and extension of the anti-Hitler and democratic policies advocated by the President.

Moreover, it should be noted that, in placing the fourth-term issue supposedly as one of preserving the New Deal, the Social-Democrats are thereby seeking to exploit the pro-Roosevelt labor sentiment as a means of screening, as well as enlisting support for, their reactionary, disruptive and anti-Soviet policies. And in placing the question of the fourth term as one of preserving the New Deal, they are also seeking a means, a bridge, for establishing working relations with Republican forces and administrations in a number of states who they allege are following a progressive,

a so-called New Deal labor and social policy.

There are, of course, other and more complicated aspects of the fourth-term issue. The question is more complex in relation to how the two-party system and the deep-rooted partisan interests now operate, and the more damaging role which partisan differences may play in hampering national unity during the 1944 wartime election campaign.

Therefore, for instance, the question of the movement for a fourth term has to be considered from the angle of its effect on the Willkie forces and other non-defeatist sections of the Republicans, including those who hold public office in Congress and the states.

Taking this important question into account, and it must not be overlooked, it is necessary that the movement in support of a fourth term should not, and cannot be made as a partisan commitment. Among other things, the task of support for the victory policies of the President, now and in the elections, should not be confused or tied in with giving endorsement or official support for the Democratic Party and its candidates as such. Labor must make it clear that insofar as Congressional and state candidates are concerned, its position will not be influenced by party labels and partisan considerations; that it will approach the question of a new Congress and of all candidates from the angle of their stand on the government's war program, on their contributions to forging national unity around the Commander-in-Chief, for victory.

Closely connected with this problem is the question of labor's position toward Willkie and the Willkie forces within the Republican Party. And here it is not only a matter that labor will lend its active support to help ensure the defeat of the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg combination within the Republican Party and political life and definitely favor a victory for the Willkie policy and forces within the Republican Party. *The bigger question is how labor can exercise its influence so as to bring about a greater degree of collaboration between the Willkie forces and the Roosevelt Administration.*

One thing that has to be studied is how to influence Willkie and his adherents to take not only a general but a forthright position and an active one on a whole series of specific issues both in the sphere of international policy and particularly on domestic questions, including the question of Lewis' strike movement and anti-war conspiracy. And here the objective should be not so much to put these people "on the spot," though it is necessary to get them to take a clear public position and to show in deeds as well as words where they stand; rather the objective is to influence defeatists within the Republican Party and Congress to take a correct position, one that will bring them closer politically and into cooperative relations with the Roosevelt-labor alliance.

This is necessary and possible in connection with a host of current war policies, both foreign and domestic; and this is extremely urgent both for strengthening na-

tional unity now as well as to help shape the new realignments within the country on the basis of consolidating and broadening the camp and coalition of all anti-Axis and anti-fascist forces.

* * *

In connection with the political alignments now taking place and the outlook for the 1944 elections, it is necessary to take into account the fact that defeatist reaction, while operating in Congress through a bipartisan coalition, and while endeavoring to split the Democratic Party in the South away from Roosevelt and the national organization—these forces, the pro-fascist circles among the monopolists, are concentrating on establishing complete control in the Republican Party nationally, with the objective of using it as its main political vehicle through which to operate in 1944. It is true that there are defeatists and reactionaries in both parties, but this must not obscure the fact that already in the National Committee of the Republican Party, in the majority of its Congressional delegation, in the Republican Committee on Post-War Problems, the Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg and McCormick forces hold the upper hand and have a much better control of the party machinery nationally and in most of the states than do the Willkie forces. Moreover, it is clear that the defeatist elements among finance capital, operating through the du Pont clique in the N.A.M., and in the coalition with the Southern Bourbons in the so-called Farm Bloc, and through the

Lewis-Woll-Hutcheson clique in the labor movement, as well as through the organization of such fascist groups as the K.K.K. and the America First Party of Gerald K. Smith, are planning and counting upon converting the Republican Party into its main electoral instrument. Also, from an examination of the character and line which are being developed by Spangler, Landon, Bricker, etc., in the preliminary pre-election campaign, such as in their attacks on the Roosevelt Government as "New Deal National Socialism," as the "internationalist party," etc., it is clear that it is through and around the Republican Party that pro-fascist reaction is making its strongest bid to come into political power.

It is necessary to raise this question now, in orientating toward the 1944 elections, and in order to avoid any mistakes in the attitude between labor and other win-the-war forces and a number of Republican governors and state administrations, such as in California, New York, Michigan and Minnesota, where the Republicans are maneuvering skillfully and demagogically, where they are trying to improve their relations with labor, and avoid, and sometimes oppose, openly reactionary legislation.

In pointing this out, however, we must not come to the conclusion that the defeatists already have complete control of the Republican Party. For instance, it is by no means a settled question as to whether Willkie can be eliminated in the Republican primaries and nominating convention. Moreover,

it would be a mistake to conclude, on the basis of the estimate we have made, that the Republican delegation in Congress and Republican office-holders in the various states are one reactionary mass, for this does not correspond to the facts.

What is necessary to signalize at this moment is to show the *main* point of concentration of reaction on a national scale insofar as the two major parties are concerned; secondly, to bear this in mind in the working out of our tactical line in the important mayoralty elections and to approach each local situation from the viewpoint of the war and its effect on political alignments nationally; and thirdly, bearing in mind the objectives and strategy of reaction in respect to the Republican Party, to work out a differentiated approach in regards to the Hoover-Taft forces and to those win-the-war conservatives and vacillating forces within the Republican Party who are often influenced by them, especially on so-called domestic policies; to concentrating our main fire against the defeatists and criticizing the conciliators and politics-as-usual elements.

* * *

And here it is necessary to note, even if only in passing, that it is likewise vitally necessary to work out a differentiated tactical approach in respect to the Southern Democrats. It is necessary to understand that not every opponent of the Anti-Poll Tax Bill, H.R. 7, is a defeatist, as symbolized by the position on foreign policy of such people as Senator Hill of Ala-

bama. It is necessary to consider that important progressive changes are taking place in the South, not only in the labor movement, in liberal circles and among the Negro people, but also within the Democratic Party itself, such as in Georgia, North Carolina and Florida. Moreover, it is necessary, in organizing the anti-poll tax fight in the South, that far more attention be given to mobilizing the white masses and their organizations; also to conduct the struggle in such a way that the anti-poll tax issue is not placed as a pro- or anti-Administration fight, but as an urgent war measure which can contribute greatly to victory, which can strengthen American democracy.

* * *

Of crucial importance in the fight for national and labor unity, especially now as the struggle against Hitlerite Germany is entering a decisive phase, is and will be the political influence and initiative exerted by our party as a unifying and guiding center for helping organize the broadest anti-fascist unity of the nation.

Already the role of our party as an indispensable force for victory over Hitlerism is being recognized far and wide. Our contributions toward victory are indelibly established in our struggle for the Second Front, for achieving a unified military strategy of the anti-Hitler coalition, for strengthening the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, for establishing a fully centralized war economy, for obtaining maximum and uninterrupted war pro-

duction, and for solving a host of other vital war tasks. Moreover, the independent win-the-war efforts of our party are exemplified in our activity to help forge labor's joint action, in helping cement labor's ties with the Administration and labor's collaboration with the farmers, the Negro people and the national groups and with all other patriotic forces.

In the sharpening political struggle now taking place within the country, and in preparation for victory in the war, as well as for victory in the 1944 elections, we have new and greater responsibilities. Our party, especially in the key industrial states, has a unique role to play, second to none.

Aside from the key questions which we have already dealt with, what are some of the special tasks that confront our party to strengthen national unity, for coping with the new and supreme war tasks which now arise with the approaching decisive battles?

For one thing, it is imperative that we understand the perspectives for continuing and developing anti-fascist national unity as a prerequisite for obtaining victory over the Axis *and* as a means for guaranteeing a durable and just peace. On the basis of wartime developments, and noting certain other factors which were signaled in the historic decision of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Comintern in proposing the dissolution of the International, we can conclude that the perspectives have become more realistic and probable for continuing the anti-Hitler coal-

ition, not only as a war alliance for securing victory, but as a long-time coalition and international alliance for insuring collective security and a lasting peace. We can also conclude that the possibilities have become more certain of realization for creating democratic, anti-fascist governments and republics in a number of countries, based on the national liberation fronts which have arisen in the struggle against the Hitlerites. We can correctly conclude that the road toward achieving broad national working class Marxist parties in the various countries will proceed at a rapid tempo, though in varied forms, such as through the establishment of united working class parties, perhaps, for instance in France; or in the affiliation of some Communist Parties to existing broader working class organizations, such as in Britain; while in certain other countries there may take place a fusion or merger of various militant working class and anti-fascist groups together with the existing Communist Parties.

As for our own country, it is reasonable to expect and necessary to understand that the task of consolidating and enhancing the unity of our nation, and of forging the anti-fascist unity of the United Nations, is not only a current tactic, is not only a win-the-war task—it is also a long-range objective, a task which requires to be carried over and developed in the new conditions which will arise in the post-war period, especially in the big political struggles which will take place to preserve and extend Amer-

ican democracy and liberties against the onslaughts of the most reactionary and pro-fascist circles of American finance capital.

To the extent that we establish clarity in our own ranks and make clear the long-range view and possibilities of maintaining and forging the democratic camp of national unity, to that extent we shall also succeed now in reinforcing the anti-Axis unity of the nation for accelerating victory.

In addition to this general estimate and guide to action, which Comrade Browder already projected in his book *Victory—and After*, there are a number of pressing questions which demand solution, questions concerning which we are now able to make important contributions to further welding national unity and to integrating ourselves more fully within the national win-the-war coalition.

For instance, in the common problem facing all patriots of smashing Hitler's secret weapon, the bogey of Communism, there are a number of specific tasks which we alone can perform. We can and must make further clear that this question, especially insofar as it concerns the establishment of the full citizenship and democratic rights of our party in the win-the-war coalition and national public life, is not a partisan question, nor merely a question of guaranteeing the constitutional and civil liberties of the Communists. It is rather and first of all, a question of *establishing the national unity of all anti-fascists and the international collaboration and united fronts of*

all opponents of Hitlerism, regardless of political or religious beliefs. It is thus a major war task upon which the course of victory itself is conditioned.

While bearing in mind that the solution of this problem, the liquidation of the bogey of Communism, requires more than a consistent political-ideological struggle against fascism and reaction—important as this is—and while understanding that this task cannot be solved unilaterally by decisions solely on our part, we must nevertheless recognize that there are a number of things which we can do to help resolve this vexatious problem.

For example, it is necessary and possible for us to hasten the process of ending the false conception prevailing in our own ranks and in many labor circles regarding the obsolete conditions which continue to exist in the form of artificial divisions in many trade unions, the A.L.P., etc., on the basis of so-called Right and Left wings and organizations. It is necessary and possible that we help to solidify and establish more normal, closer and firmer working relations with the Murray forces in the C.I.O., as well as with the Hillman and R. J. Thomas forces. It is necessary and possible that we take the initiative to help broaden out the representation and basis of the leadership in a whole number of C.I.O. national unions and councils, as well as in a number of A. F. of L. bodies and various people's organizations. It is likewise necessary and feasible to change our forms of organization and methods of work in most fac-

ories, where our structure and practices often create obstacles to closer relations with the rest of the labor movement. And further, it is both possible and essential that, pending steps which we may take to broaden our party, to strengthen our party as a mass national working class political organization, already we should proceed to incorporate into our ranks and leading bodies hundreds of advanced anti-fascist trade union and progressive leaders who have moved to a Marxist viewpoint.

Simultaneously, we need to explore all possibilities and carefully work out ways and means of enhancing the independent political role and the mass work of our party, to come forward more effectively and boldly in the public life and war activities of the nation, particularly in many broad win-the-war conferences and mass movements of a united and national front character.

In the present situation and in view of the greater political responsibility which the struggle for victory imposes upon us, as well as in order to meet the new and complex tasks which will arise in the future—it is especially urgent that our entire party redouble its efforts to master and apply more effectively the science of Marxism-Leninism.

This requires, among other things, that we learn to think more deeply and dialectically, taking into account in time the big and rapid political and historical changes which are now taking place and maturing internationally and within our

country. This also applies to a whole series of tactical questions.

This means that we must use the compass of Marxism-Leninism to know our country, our history and our people more thoroughly and concretely than ever before, and to be able to ascertain what is new and decisive in the situation and events. And this also includes the necessity to examine and resolve the most suitable forms and methods for building our party into a mass Marxist American working class political organization, as an organic part of and together with our efforts to help forge a broader and national coalition for victory over fascism.

This also includes the task of undertaking to develop further a number of Marxist theoretical propositions, such as regarding the character of the peace and the relations of forces in the post-war period which can arise from this people's war of national liberation, as well as to study the new possibilities that may open up for the transition to socialism in a number of countries, including the United States.

But today, in the forefront of all our thinking and action, we must be guided above all by the realization that to insure and hasten victory, much depends on how our party succeeds in helping to rally labor and all other national win-the-war forces in a broader and firmer fighting front against Hitlerism and the Axis and against the internal enemies of our people.

CRUCIAL PROBLEMS BEFORE LABOR TODAY

BY ROY HUDSON

A CRUCIAL period in the war lies ahead. The American people will face grave responsibilities which will require greater effort, greater sacrifices, greater determination and greater unity. In this period our nation must not only continue to build up its armed power and increase its production of war material but it must use its strength to a maximum to deal death blows to the Axis and especially to strike with all our weight in the decisive front against the heart of the Axis, through the invasion of Europe. Such action on the part of our nation and Great Britain, merging with the attack of the Red Army on the Eastern Front, and supported by the rising liberation movement of the peoples in conquered Europe, can mean victory in 1943.

The policy of our government, calling for the invasion of Europe to bring about the unconditional surrender of Hitler and his allies, has committed our people to this course. However, Wheeler, Chandler, and all the other "negotiated peace" forces openly challenge the victory program of our government. By launching attacks on every aspect of the war program, they seek to reverse or obstruct the decisions

of the government. Only the active support of the people, united as never before behind the Commander-in-Chief, will enable the President to secure the execution of these policies upon which the fate of our nation and all other countries waging war against Hitler depends.

Therefore, at this moment in the war, the American working class, as the backbone of the nation, has the twofold task of rendering its united political support to the policies of the government and of guaranteeing at all costs that there shall be no interruption in production and that production shall be increased in order to meet the increased demands that will be required by the invasion of Europe and offensive action in the Pacific. Failure to maintain and increase production would both jeopardize the military offensive and the nation's unity. Initiative by labor in actively combating all defeatist and fifth-column forces is essential to rallying all the people to crush the forces of negotiated peace and bring about a strengthening of the nation's unity. What organized labor does on these two fronts will be decisive in determining whether or not the nation will have the strength and ability to carry forward the prosecution of the war to

victory, or whether America will be prevented by the defeatist forces from throwing its full weight into the scale of battle, thereby jeopardizing the efforts of all the United Nations, and making it possible for Hitler and his allies to save their skins through a "negotiated peace."

* * *

Has labor been fulfilling its role as backbone of the nation? Is it already fully prepared to meet the even greater tests that the further prosecution of the war is bound to place? The answer to these questions is yes and no.

The defeatist forces have succeeded in provoking situations in which the course of the war effort and the future of the Roosevelt Administration have been dependent upon the stand of labor. If the President of the United States had been unable to rely upon the patriotic support of important sections of organized labor it would have been impossible for the government to even begin to cope with the coal crisis. However, the handling of the coal situation by the President might have been firmer if the entire labor movement had spoken out immediately against the coal strikes and Lewis' treasonable policies. If the treasonable action of Lewis in repudiating labor's no-strike pledge had resulted in provoking a sweeping strike movement in many industries, as it was intended to do, then the nation's unity would have been shattered, the economy of the country disorganized, and an irreparable crisis created. If the defeatist forces had succeeded in under-

mining the leadership of Philip Murray, and in diverting the C.I.O. from its win-the-war program, then Lewis' allies in the A. F. of L. undoubtedly would have been able to carry through an open break with the Roosevelt Administration. Thus the conspiracy of the defeatist forces to create a break between labor and the Roosevelt Administration and to isolate labor from the other win-the-war forces, all of which would have made it impossible for the Roosevelt Administration to command the necessary support for the execution of the "unconditional surrender" and "invasion of Europe" program, has not succeeded. When the showdown came, the main and overwhelming sections of organized labor recognized its responsibilities as the backbone of the nation's unity. In the gravest crisis our country has yet faced, in the face of tremendous attacks against its win-the-war program, labor held to its course, even though at critical moments it failed to act with the speed required.

But the fact that the threat to the nation's unity still exists and that the defeatists were able to provoke these crises, that these questions were posed for decision, shows that labor was inadequately prepared to fulfill its role with the clarity, unity and decisiveness that the war demands. The fact that all of labor did not quickly adopt a correct position on the crucial Executive order on the roll-back was a major weakness that opened the door for the defeatist drive to shatter labor's support for the war. The fact that the coal miners twice permitted

Lewis to lead them into strikes, the fact that subversive elements have been able to provoke stoppages in the automotive industry and in such important industries as rubber, shows the existence of confusion among sections of the workers and a weakness in leadership which enable the defeatists to provoke the workers into action harmful to their own interests and the war effort. Even though in the end they met defeat at the Cleveland Conference, the fact that defeatist forces found it possible openly to challenge the program of the C.I.O. and its leadership must not be ignored, because it reveals weaknesses and shortcomings that can be fatal if not overcome. Finally, the fact that the maneuvers of Hutcheson and Woll to strengthen the domination of the defeatist forces in the A. F. of L. by readmitting Lewis have not already met with wider protest from the affiliates of the A. F. of L. is further proof that greater clarity and unity of the win-the-war forces in the labor movement are necessary in order to bring about the complete defeat and isolation of the agents of the fifth column in labor's ranks.

Thus, labor has met this situation only by beginning to overcome weaknesses that the crisis revealed. These weaknesses arose from the fact that many labor forces, while supporting the war, have not yet fully grasped the full meaning of the war and what is required to win it and what the duties and tasks of labor are. There is no question about the patriotism of the mass of workers and their leaders. But some workers were provoked. In

certain sections there was and still is uncertainty on questions of policies and consequently slowness in taking up the fight against those who challenge the win-the-war program of labor. But if all labor fully felt that *everything* depends on victory over fascism, if it felt that victory is possible *only* if every nation, and all the people in every nation give *everything* possible—then it would be impossible to provoke important groups of workers into strike action—nor would there be uncertainty as to what policy should be pursued in the war, or slowness in meeting attacks against the established policies of the labor movement.

Also, if the trade union movement had the same experience and ability in exercising its political strength as it has in exercising its economic strength, then the defeatist forces would have been unable to raise the question of repudiating the no-strike pledge. Today, the trade union movement, having voluntarily pledged to relinquish the strike weapon during the war, must rely upon its political strength and initiative as the *sole* means of being able to protect its members and realize its policies. Compelled to go beyond its previous understanding, experience and methods, it is still developing the most effective forms of struggle for its correct win-the-war policies. It is important to note that those forces who did the best jobs in organizing, and conducting strikes and in giving expression to the militancy of the workers during peace time have also been the most effective in or-

ganizing the fight for union policies under conditions of the war. But in too many cases there is still a big gap between the policies adopted and the organized struggle for these policies. Where there is not a quick enough mastery of the new forms of struggle, unsolved problems accumulate, and then doubts arise as to the correctness of policy and the ability of labor to make a maximum contribution to the war effort and at the same time prevent the employers from attacking the unions and worsening the conditions of the workers.

Thus, these experiences emphasize anew the need constantly to explain and explain the character of the war and what is required for victory. They pose more sharply than ever the need to enable the working class to think politically and to act as an independent political force and to learn how speedily to find the ways and means of organizing its activities effectively so that its full strength may be exerted in rallying and uniting all the people for those policies and measures necessary for the prosecution of the war and the needs of labor.

The defeatist forces have been held back from gaining the main objective of their attack. While they have suffered setbacks, they have succeeded in dealing serious blows to the war effort and their attack still has to be crushed and defeated. In beating back the attack, by overcoming the weaknesses, the relationship between the main sections of labor and the government is not weaker, but stronger, and the C.I.O., in decisively rejecting the position

of those who sought to bring it in line with the defeatist policies of John L. Lewis, has hammered out a firmer unity and deeper understanding of its basic policies than it had hitherto achieved. Undoubtedly, as a result of these experiences, the understanding of most A. F. of L. members has also been deepened.

But the win-the-war forces are in a stronger position only in the sense that issues are now more clear, there exists a greater understanding and the beginning of a firmer unity, which creates more favorable conditions for taking the fight to the masses who, in the main, still have to be won for an organized and active struggle for all win-the-war policies. Labor and all other win-the-war forces must utilize to the full these more favorable conditions in order to smash the sinister attempt of the Lewis-Hutcheson forces to regain lost ground and achieve their objectives by openly combining forces through the entry of Lewis into the A. F. of L. and thereby bring about a change in the relationship of forces that will enable them to carry forward their attacks on the government's war program, to suppress and thwart the true desires of the A. F. of L. members, and to promote disunity and splits in the C.I.O.

Likewise the plot to weaken the war effort by enactment of the anti-labor Smith-Connally Bill must be defeated at all costs.

It is in the light of the continued grave threat to the nation's unity, in the light of these conclusions and lessons that labor must approach

the tasks that arise out of the present moment in the war. Greater clarity and unity are needed in order more effectively to apply labor's win-the-war program. To combat and defeat the Lewis-Hutcheson combination, labor must also struggle against all those who carry through, or are influenced by, those policies that are promoted by the defeatists and the fifth column.

* * *

The slowness of the labor movement in reacting to the anti-Soviet incitements initiated with the infamous Alter-Ehrlich case, and the insufficient struggle developed against the Dubinskys and other anti-Soviet Social-Democrats who launched the campaign, would be fatal if repeated in the coming period when greater and more desperate attempts will be made to split the United States away from its allies. Can any one today doubt that these anti-Soviet incitements were attacks against the war effort, which allowed the defeatists to take the initiative, and by creating confusion and passivity make possible their further attacks against the war efforts and labor's policies? For twenty-five years these miserable vermin have dreamed and worked for the downfall of the Soviet Union and they still cling to their vain hopes, even though destruction of the Soviet Union would endanger the existence of every nation, the future of the labor movement and make possible the continued existence of Hitler fascism.

If labor is effectively to defend the policy of the United Nations,

then it must combat and isolate these forces who specialize in anti-Soviet propaganda and attacks, who, under the cloak of being "labor leaders," have made a lifelong profession of wielding the Hitlerite weapon of Red-baiting. Every force in the labor movement must unite to put an end to the disruptive paralyzing influence of the Dubinskys and other *New Leader* anti-Soviet Social-Democrats, the Norman Thomas "Socialists," the Trotskyites and the whole "revolutionary" wing of the Hutcheson-Lewis-Hoover-Coughlin conspiracy. And this also requires that labor purge itself of all the poison that these gentlemen have injected into the labor movement and the nation. As long as any trade union continues to carry discriminatory clauses against the Communists, or permits government rules and regulations that deprive Communists of their rights, then it means that the defeatists still have a chance to raise the cry of the "menace of Communism" without fear of rebuke.

Passivity continues to be one of Hitler's chief allies. When the trade union movement fails to concern itself with every issue affecting the war, or when it endorses the policies of President Roosevelt but fails to organize the fight for these policies—then it becomes possible for the defeatists and obstructionists to promote confusion and carry forward their attack on the nation's war program. They seek to cover up their treasonable activity and at the same time provoke labor to break with the Roosevelt government by placing the responsibility

for all weakness and inadequacies in the execution of the war program on the government. In order to expose and defeat these maneuvers, labor needs to acquire a greater feeling of responsibility for determining the policy of the government and the manner in which it is executed. Labor not only supports the Roosevelt Administration, it is in a true sense part of the Administration. The existence of the Roosevelt government and its war program depends first of all upon what labor says and does. Therefore labor should have an active position on all issues and should more firmly insist upon being adequately represented in all war agencies and in the Cabinet. This is all the more necessary in view of the fact that wages, conditions and relations with the employer are not determined by direct negotiations with the employers alone, but on the basis of the established policies of the government and the manner in which they are applied by government agencies—all of which must be determined in the end by the position of the great majority of people. Therefore, all those tendencies, arising out of a lack of understanding and "unionism-as-usual," that limit the activities of the unions to questions of wages, conditions and collective bargaining, need be more effectively combated and overcome. The coming period is one in which the greatest possible political and organizational initiative upon the part of labor is required, if all the people are to be rallied to strengthen national unity, convert Congress into a victory Congress, and insure

the unhampered prosecution of the war.

The initial efforts of the defeatists to provoke labor into abandoning its no-strike pledge have so far failed. But greater efforts upon their part to disrupt the nation's unity and disorganize the economy of the country by provoking class against class and race against race must be expected. In order to discredit the policies and leadership of the labor movement, their agents seize upon every issue to foment "outlaw strikes," in which the workers are not given an opportunity to discuss the issues but are confronted with a picket line or a stoppage in a bottleneck that shuts down the entire plant. The workers are slyly told that their leaders favor such strikes but cannot sanction them. The Packard strike in Detroit and the Mobile strike are warnings that subversive elements will resort to more desperate efforts to inflame race prejudice and to incite white workers to oppose the full utilization of Negro manpower. Anti-Semitic propaganda becomes more and more prevalent in all industries. All these activities will test the leadership of the labor movement.

The nation cannot and will not tolerate any action that hinders production, whether it be strikes or prejudices that prevent full utilization of manpower. Labor must help guarantee uninterrupted and maximum production, on the basis of its own policies and discipline. Otherwise the defeatists and anti-labor forces will utilize the failure to do so in order to cripple labor with the passage of anti-labor legisla-

tion, isolate it from other win-the-war forces and thereby weaken the war effort. The anti-labor Smith-Connally Bill is proof of this. What is required is that labor have a clear-cut program and that firm, effective leadership be forthcoming. Where such policies and leadership existed they were upheld by the rank and file, even when the initial efforts of subversive elements to incite the workers were momentarily successful. This has been true in a number of cases, as, for instance, in the automotive industry. Where there was hesitation on the part of the leadership, however, such as occurred in the rubber strike, it required firm action on the part of the government to make the issues clear to the workers. Even workers who have been provoked into harmful action, once they find themselves in conflict with the government they support, will call to account leaders who fail in their duty to give leadership. The leadership of the labor movement has the duty of preventing the defeatists from exploiting grievances of the workers, by more effective application of the policies of the unions, thus insuring a quicker and better solution to problems affecting wages, enforcement of contracts and settlement of disputes. Also, the advances made in breaking down Jim-Crowism must be not only maintained but extended. This requires greater educational work on the part of the unions and a more determined effort to break down each and every barrier that deprives Negroes of their Constitutional rights.

The question of labor unity be-

comes more urgent in view of the Lewis-Hutcheson-Dubinsky maneuver that is aimed at widening the breach in the labor movement. Does the move of Hutcheson, Dubinsky and Co. openly to combine forces with Lewis reflect the fact that the membership of the A. F. of L. is moving in the direction of an anti-war, anti-Roosevelt position and that the movement for unity with the C.I.O. in support of the war effort is disintegrating? The fact that the Executive Council felt it necessary formally to reaffirm its no-strike pledge is due not only to the defeat suffered by the pro-Lewis forces in the C.I.O., but also to their need to take into account the stand of the majority of the A. F. of L. unions. Furthermore, many A. F. of L. unions throughout the country condemned the violation of labor's pledge when Lewis provoked the stoppage in coal. And what is of decisive importance is that the movement for unity of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. on a state scale continue unchecked, embracing large numbers of unions and assuming new and more effective forms. An instance of this is the recent joint conferences of representatives of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. from five states in the midwest. Therefore, the move to bring Lewis into the A. F. of L. is aimed at strengthening the anti-war Republican forces in the Executive Council and placing them in such control of the top machinery that they can dare openly to flaunt the sentiments of the membership by dictating an anti-Roosevelt policy and by breaking up all forms of united action with the

C.I.O. in support of the war policies of the government.

To carry through this maneuver, however, the defeatist forces in the A. F. of L. have had to expose more clearly their real policies and in what direction they are seeking to lead the A. F. of L. The conflict between their position and the needs of labor and the war becomes more clear. The rank and file want to maintain the no-strike pledge, and they see Hutcheson and Co. entering into relationship with Lewis, who has violated this pledge. The majority of the A. F. of L. is pro-Roosevelt, and they see the anti-Roosevelt forces in the Executive Council seeking to combine forces with Lewis, the Republican America Firster. The membership of the A. F. of L. desire unity with the C.I.O., and they see the anti-C.I.O. elements in the Executive Council seeking unity with John L. Lewis, who split from the C.I.O., in an effort to break up and split the C.I.O. The A. F. of L. rank and file see that the same forces who have prevented the A. F. of L. from affiliating to the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee are now attempting to deepen the split in the American labor movement as part of their conspiracy against the war effort. Thus, fundamental issues are raised and brought out into the open. This cannot but increase the difficulties of the small clique in the Executive Council who have been aided in dictating the policies of the A. F. of L., by preventing issues from coming into the open. That top maneuvers alone can no longer enable the Hutcheson-Woll clique

to control all affiliates of the A. F. of L., and compel submission to their autocratic will is to be seen in the disaffiliation of the powerful Machinists Union.

Thus, the main body of the A. F. of L. tends to go in one direction, and a section of the leadership tries to form new combinations in order to pull the A. F. of L. in a different direction. This fluid situation exists because the clique of reactionaries and defeatists are no longer able to dictate their policies in the old way, old lines are cracking, and a regrouping of forces is in the process of developing. The fact that the struggle can no longer be confined to top bodies because fundamental issues are raised means that these issues are coming out into the open for settlement by the masses. Because these issues are of fundamental importance, because the intervention of the masses can be more effective, the differences among the top leadership of the A. F. of L. are bound to become more clearly defined and result in all forces taking a stand on the issues of for or against the war, for or against support of the Roosevelt Administration, for or against a united labor movement on the basis of strengthening labor's support for the war and preservation of the gains of labor.

In view of these developments, a tendency can already be noted for the local, central and international bodies of the A. F. of L. to react more to questions of national policy. Certainly, there are far greater thinking and concern among the membership concerning ques-

tions of national policy. The struggle is bound to sharpen, making all issues more clear; thus the perspective is one in which every A. F. of L. affiliate is bound to feel directly affected by each and every development. Thus, the basis already exists for securing a much broader, effective and quick reaction by the A. F. of L. to events and major issues. Every voice that speaks out, that gives a clear lead on issues, will be listened to and supported, because the majority of the A. F. of L. members are thinking about these problems but do not express themselves because they feel the absence of leadership and a program that expresses their desires sufficiently. To rally the membership of the A. F. of L. behind the win-the-war policies, in order that their true voice may be heard at the coming state, international and national conventions, is a task of major political importance. The organization of a broad protest movement against the Lewis-Hutcheson maneuver, and for labor unity to strengthen the war effort, is imperative. All possible efforts to strengthen and extend every form of united action between the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhoods are essential. The demand for affiliation to the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee should ring out from every union of the A. F. of L.

The struggle for labor unity cannot be advanced unless the A. F. of L. membership effectively challenges and repudiates the conspiracy hatched by the defeatist bloc in the Executive Council. Equally

essential, however, is maintaining and strengthening the unity of the C.I.O. behind its program and the leadership of Philip Murray who, more than any other single force in the trade unions, enabled labor to beat back the attack of the defeatists. The exposure and complete isolation of any pro-Lewis forces in the C.I.O. will strengthen the ability of the C.I.O. to make its maximum contribution. Greater initiative on the part of the C.I.O. in promoting joint action with the A. F. of L. in every industry and locality will help to achieve more quickly and effectively the unity of the A. F. of L. win-the-war forces who, in collaboration with the C.I.O., can defeat the conspiracy of Hutcheson and Woll to weaken the war effort and deepen the split in labor's ranks.

The miners and their great organization have a place in the ranks of a united labor movement. Neither labor unity nor the interests of the miners will be served, however, on the basis of a Hutcheson-Woll-Dubinsky-Lewis combination. The miners must face the fact, however, that Lewis' policies lead the miners into conflict with the government, and jeopardize the just demands of the miners. They must face the fact that if disaster was avoided, and if the opportunity still remained for securing a settlement of their demands, it is due only to the policies of the government and the support of the organized labor movement. If the miners face these facts, then they must draw the conclusion that they have a duty to themselves and to organized labor

to put an end once and for all to the ability of John L. Lewis to exploit their organized strength in order to attack the war effort and discredit the labor movement and the miners. No doubt many miners already have reached these conclusions and as a result the gamble of Lewis has resulted in a weakening of his control of the miners' union. But this fact will not bring about the downfall of Lewis. Initiative on the part of the progressive miners, however, will enable all the miners to draw these lessons and to crystallize quickly a broad anti-Lewis movement that will guarantee that there will be no more stoppages, that will finally result in the settlement of the miners' demands, and that can bring about changes in the policies and leadership of the Miners Union that will enable it to be once again a powerful weapon in the fight for labor unity and for strengthening the war effort.

* * *

Old formulas and methods, no matter how applicable to peacetime conditions, are hindrances to labor in meeting and solving wartime problems. In no case is this more true than in connection with questions of production. Labor has made enormous contributions to increasing production; but in many industries the question of relating wages to production is still a matter of debate. This has been the weakest phase of the work of most progressive trade unionists. They too have been held back by old formulas, have been slow in raising the question of incentive wages, and have

too often taken a defensive position on the question. However, experience itself is beginning to make more clear that an incentive wage policy is the key, at this time, to increasing production, defending wage standards, and to unmasking and isolating pro-Lewis and defeatist elements. That is why, for instance, in such industries as auto some of the opponents of incentive wages have found it necessary to retreat from their former position which more and more tended to expose them in the eyes of the workers. The experiences of the United Electrical Union in working out incentive wage policies, the position of the C.I.O. and the approach of Philip Murray, have helped to make this question a matter of wide discussion among the auto workers, steel workers, and shipyard workers. A bold and energetic pressing of this issue should result in bringing the struggle on this issue to a quick decision.

The attacks of Lewis and Co. on the established policies of the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. all show that these policies must be made the property of the rank and file, who must fully understand them and be organized to fight for them, if they are to be defended and made effective. Where the necessary understanding does not exist among the rank and file, a fertile field exists for the defeatist forces. These experiences raise anew the importance of clarifying and activating the trade union membership. If this has not been accomplished to the extent necessary it is because the trade unions have not sufficiently

taken into account the tremendous changes brought about during the war and worked out the necessary steps to meet the problems these changes create. The expansion of industry and increased need for manpower have increased the size of the working class. These new recruits can be organized and be made an effective source of strength to the trade union movement and their contributions to the war effort increased only if the trade unions work out a correct approach to these workers and through organized educational work enable them to achieve that degree of understanding and "trade union consciousness" that most trade unionists have acquired under different conditions and as a result of years of practical experience. Unless these workers are made at home in the unions and fully absorbed, they become an obstacle to the adoption and carrying through of correct policy. Under these conditions, such a body of workers, reflecting the tendencies and ideology mainly of the petty bourgeoisie, can become the instrument through which the fifth column spreads moods of defeatism and disruption in the trade union movement.

Further, the trade unions can activate and clarify the membership, both old and new, only if they take into account the swing shift system, the longer hours of work, the transportation difficulties and the fact that in many families both husband and wife are working. Under these conditions reliance upon local union meetings as the main means of

reaching the mass of members and involving them in the life of the union will not and cannot do the job. Greater emphasis must be placed upon reaching the mass of workers through shop and department meetings, steward councils, the trade union press, and other forms. If new forms of trade union democracy are not developed to meet wartime conditions—then only a handful of workers engage in the life of the union and determine its policies. The mass of workers begin to lose the feeling that they are the union—because they are not the ones that pass upon all questions directly. A growing gap develops between the policies of the union and the thinking of the mass of workers who do not directly help formulate policy and therefore must have greater difficulties in understanding the reasons for the decisions of the union. Where such a situation exists the leadership will find, in a critical situation, increased difficulties in convincing the workers as to how such a situation should be met. In peacetime every active trade unionist knows that the union cannot effectively enter into collective bargaining or a strike unless it can rely upon the active conscious support of the mass of workers. In wartime the need for such active support of the rank and file is not less but greater, and it is also more difficult to achieve because different forms of activity are required and the organized strength of the workers exerted in a new manner, especially in greater political initiative and activity.

GEARING ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS AND METHODS TO THE WAR EFFORT

BY JOHN WILLIAMSON

TO GUARANTEE our maximum and most effective contribution to the victory of our nation and the United Nations over the Axis, our party should secure a full and equal place in the democratic war camp. The securing of such a position will mean a firmer integration of our party in American democratic life and the removal of the barriers to our full political citizenship.

This is primarily a political task, and all questions of organizational expression can and will confront us only to the extent that there is an understanding and agreement of all the win-the-war forces as to our role in the camp of national unity.

However, there are a number of things that we can and should do now which will contribute toward making easier the attainment of the objectives necessitated by the present situation.

* * *

Approaching these matters generally, we must emphasize the need of establishing proper relations between our party and the mass organizations, especially the trade unions. All fear by trade union

leaders or other leaders of the war camp as to the consequences of party growth must be dispelled by proving in life that the Communist Party's growth, especially among trade unionists in all important industries, contributes to strengthening the organizations and the unity of the trade unions and to strengthening the leadership of all democratic unions.

This demands of us an understanding, and resulting actions, showing that the relationship between our party and the trade unions is a political one, in which there is no interest or desire organizationally to interfere in trade union affairs, and that our political objective is solely to strengthen the role and effectiveness of the working class and its trade unions in the war and the life of the nation. It also makes imperative the complete liquidation of all fractional methods of work in the trade unions, and methods of leadership in trade union work whereby a District Organizer or any other party leader becomes a broker or middleman between the trade union leaders who are party members and other, non-party, trade union leaders. While all party leaders should establish

the closest relationship with the broadest group of trade union leaders and other leaders in public life, it should be on a political basis and not as intermediaries or substitutes for party trade unionists.

All Communists who are trade union leaders or leaders in any other mass organization or movement must be encouraged to exercise initiative based on political understanding, and to represent themselves and their membership on the basis of their own standing and leadership.

Above all, our organizational forms should approximate the usually accepted forms and methods of American public life. It is clear that our party is an American political party of the workers. Its policies grow out of the conditions and needs of our working class and our nation and are conceived to represent the best national interests of our country. Our leadership is firmly rooted in American life and stems from the American labor movement.

However, our methods and our terminology do not always correspond to American practices. As much as possible there should be no such differences in our organizational forms and methods; it is in its political content that the party's specific role and character should be expressed. Furthermore, we have not yet mastered the art and science of basing our educational work and our school curricula on American conditions, while making use of all international experiences and contributions, and being guided by the science of Marx-

ism-Leninism, understanding at all times its living and creative character and steering clear of all dogmas and mechanical transference of experiences.

Let us examine more specifically a few questions that are still unsolved. In some cities we have Industrial Sections or Divisions. These were necessary and important at one stage of the development of our relations to the trade union movement. It would appear that in the main they have outlived their usefulness. The New York comrades have called attention to an incident that emphasizes this. Their Industrial Division has some 4,000 members, all trade unionists. There are another 11,000 trade union members scattered throughout the county branches. Today these 11,000 party members in the trade unions get little political guidance on trade union developments from their branches. This is not just the fault of the branch leadership. We cannot allow such tendencies as neglecting the struggle against the Lewis strike provocation on the grounds that this is a "trade union problem" which belongs in the Industrial Division. We see here, first of all, a misconception about the character of Lewis' defeatist activities—its consideration as a special trade union question instead of a broad national war question—and, secondly, the failure on the part of party functionaries to realize that they had a responsibility to create clarity and arouse the entire population against the sabotage of Lewis and the operators.

Branches and sections must be-

come politically qualified to give adequate guidance on all questions of broad policy on trade union developments.

We must study further the present-day role of shop and industrial branches. In the early days of organizing the unorganized and in the preceding period, the shop and industrial branches fulfilled a necessary function and made great contributions to the historic task of unionizing the American workers, especially in mass production industries. Today we must recognize, despite our intentions and efforts to the contrary, that some of these shop and industrial branches at times still tend to function as fractions. Today, more than ever, there is need of avoiding organizational forms that impede our relations with the trade union leadership or that tend to substitute the party for the trade union. From the viewpoint of establishing proper relations with the trade unions and their leaders, of avoiding organizational forms that tend to make our party a substitute for the trade unions, of Americanizing our forms of party organization, and, above all, from the viewpoint of the urgent needs of uniting all trade unions and other win-the-war organizations and forces in community political work, we should give consideration to the need of the vast majority of our members belonging to or working through community branches.

Another reason for seriously considering forms of party organization in respect to shop and industrial workers, is the misrepresenta-

tion of the role and purpose of party shop and industrial branches by reactionary forces and the utilization of their existence by the K.K.K., Christian Front, Trotskyite and reactionary circles in the Catholic hierarchy in the attempt to justify their own honeycombing of the unions with secret shop cells, whose activity is seditious and defeatist. On April 30 of this year there appeared in the *Catholic Review* a four-page article by Father Cronin, entitled "Second Front Menace." This article distorted the role and purposes of Communist activity and called for the organization of secret shop cells aiming at the "capture of the shop stewardship" and of the annual local union elections. Supposedly aimed against the Communists, this movement is in reality directed against the trade unions and the national war effort. The article declared: "Among the tests [in determining the strength of the Communists] are constant political agitation, particularly for the Second Front and against the Dies Committee; policies paralleling those of the *Daily Worker*; the stirring up of Negro and minority groups, etc." After elaborating on the need of organized espionage, the article further declared: "Independent and dissident groups should be sought out and deals made for trading votes" in capturing local elections. Further, the article declared: "All this should be done in collaboration with union officials from Right wing unions" in the A. F. of L. or the C.I.O. Chicago, Detroit, Peoria, Waterbury, Hartford, and Baltimore were cited as instances where this

technique is giving "real results."

It is significant that the war as the all-decisive issue does not enter once into this leading article. Who are the dissident groups with whom these people want to cooperate? Obviously the anti-war, pro-Hitler Trotskyites and Norman Thomas Socialists, whose main aim, in conjunction with all other defeatist forces, is to interrupt production necessary for the war against Hitler.

By removing organizational forms and practices of our own that can serve as obstacles to the maximum unity of the labor movement for the war effort, we shall take away from these defeatist forces of our nation, who are also anti-labor forces, a means with which they are trying to cover up their anti-war and anti-labor activities. We can then more convincingly emphasize the need of unity of all forces—Catholic and Protestant, Negro and white, Jew and Gentile—committed to a program that subordinates everything to the winning of the war. We shall thereby emphasize that we consider it necessary to come to an agreement with all forces, irrespective of their political affiliation or religious faith, in support of the elected trade union officials committed to the war program of the government and the C.I.O. Executive Board decisions. There can be no organization in the war plants except the trade unions. A united union—basing itself on a win-the-war program—must struggle against, and liquidate all Nazi, K.K.K., Trotskyite or Catholic Action secret organizations within the

trade unions, within the factories and wherever else they raise their head. Into positions of leadership—whether as local union executives or shop stewards—should be elected the most active, devoted and clear-headed unionists, irrespective of whether they be Catholic, Protestant or Jew—Communist, Democrat or Republican.

To defeat within the trade unions these anti-war and pro-Hitler underground activities of the K.K.K. and Gerald L. K. Smith's America First Party in Detroit, or the small but insidious group of Catholic Action forces in Baltimore or Connecticut, or the Christian Fronters in New York, or the Nazis in New Jersey, is a necessary task in uniting the entire trade union movement for the only decisive question of the moment—the defeating of the Axis and fascism.

* * *

Irrespective of what our final decision on organizational structure may be—and we should discuss it fully and frankly—we must put an end to anything which could be interpreted as interference with the normal functioning of the trade unions, including those with Left and progressive forces in the leadership. This doesn't mean that we are not interested in the role and contributions of the trade unions. It doesn't mean that we shall not concern ourselves with problems that affect the working class and the trade unions. But in any such discussions we want our trade union comrades to consider how

they, with their Communist understanding, as trade unionists, can help the trade union movement within its framework, without replacing the normal and democratic functioning of the trade union. Within the party, our main consideration should be politically to equip our trade union comrades to use their own initiative and react and find the answers to all specific problems. This means raising the quality of branch leadership to handle all such problems. It also means that every party trade unionist should read the *Daily Worker* each day and become a better student of Marxism-Leninism.

Irrespective of our final decision, it is clear that we must avoid overnight, abrupt changes in organizational structure. We should move in the direction of our final decision with the ground well prepared politically, with the membership convinced, and with organized guidance. As a beginning, some members of shop and industrial branches should already now—while retaining their membership in these branches—begin community activity around specific war issues or on the basis of Congressional Districts, and try to unite C.I.O., A. F. of L. and Railroad labor unions and other community organizations into active joint committees with community activities.

Irrespective of what organizational forms the political developments may dictate, meanwhile, in the course of all activities outlined before, we on our part should carefully survey each specific situation and, where conditions permit, have

comrades who are trade union leaders come forward as Communists, and everywhere, whether openly as a Communist or not, everyone should defend the right of the Communist Party to its rightful place in the democratic war camp with full and equal opportunity to make its contribution to the nation and the winning of the war over the Axis.

* * *

In the past two meetings of the National Committee, we placed sharply the entire question of organizing large community branches which will become a political factor in the community. Some progress has been made. In New York City there exist more than 100 such clubs with an average membership of 140, some having a membership as high as 300. The experience gained so far emphasizes the correctness of our decisions, and all cities should proceed more quickly with the establishment of such clubs, with attractive club headquarters and appropriate community political activities.

Experience has already brought to the fore a few urgent questions that should be taken note of:

1. There is sometimes a tendency to become enamoured of the club form and forget the central question of utilizing this form to do more effective community political mass activity—to rally the community for all forms of war activity—whatever the issues may be.

2. With 100 to 300 members in a branch, it is possible to give political guidance on only the most general issues at the club meetings.

Even then not all the members attend. It is indispensable to organize activity committees of groups of members active in specific phases of work, with the branch executive giving direct guidance to such committees. Above all, large membership committees are a requirement, with a visit to each member at least once a month. During such visits, the membership committee should discuss party policies, hand out literature and, where necessary, try to convince the member to read the *Daily Worker* each day, collect dues, etc.

In some cities the organization of these large club branches has rendered the old Section Committee obsolete, and county committees have direct contact with the large branches.

In the light of these developments, we have made our recommendations for different types of branch meetings, adding the conception of the quarterly meeting. We recommend that the first of these quarterly meetings take place in July, and that they be well prepared in order to guarantee their success.

* * *

In conclusion, on this question of organizational forms and methods: Some may ask, "Why didn't we think of these things five or ten years ago?" Some may approach our discussion as just another "re-organization" or lightly look upon it as a new "fad." Such ideas should be rejected. We do not approach these questions of organizational forms and methods

as abstract questions. We know that different stages in development—with different conditions—dictate different organizational forms and methods. Not only the shop and industrial branch, but the trade union fraction and the shop papers, which we have long ago liquidated, all fulfilled a specific need under different conditions; without them our party would not have been able to make the great contributions it has made.

The essence of the decision of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, in recommending the dissolution of the C.I., emphasized precisely this question when it declared:

"The entire course of events for the past quarter of a century, as well as the accumulated experiences of the Communist International, have convincingly proven that the organizational form for uniting the workers as chosen by the First Congress of the Communist International, and which corresponded to the needs of the initial period of the rebirth of the labor movement, more and more outlived itself in proportion to the growth of this movement and to the increasing complexity of problems in each country; and that this form even became a hindrance to the further strengthening of the national workers' parties."

The same approach applies to our finding the best organizational forms and methods of work that correspond to the needs of the present situation. True, certain organizational forms may tend to con-

tinue their existence even after they have become obsolete. This is true in all forms of life. But precisely because we are the kind of party we are, we are more alert to the danger of that phenomenon, and raise for discussion all necessary changes—not only in policy—but also in organizational forms and methods, in time to prevent their becoming an obstacle.

* * *

Another question that needs attention is the deepening of the democratic processes of our party and the normalizing and regularizing of the election of officers and issuance of financial reports.

In life we are the most democratic of all political parties and mass organizations in the country, even though we have not always observed the full forms of such democracy. Party democracy is not merely the right to vote. It is the raising of the political understanding of the membership so as to guarantee their maximum initiative and fullest contribution to the hammering out of policy and its enrichment and extension in the course of its execution.

It is true that party democracy is at an uneven level throughout the party. Thus, we have a district in one of the most important industrial states where the State Executive does not meet for five or six weeks at a stretch, during which time, we presume, guidance is by decree. We have another district that convenes regular meetings, but there the leading members of the executive have so little

confidence in other Bureau members, not to speak of State or Section Committee members, that they run themselves sick by visiting scores of branches and substituting for everybody else.

A weakness common to nearly all districts is the tendency, after the State Executives have made good decisions, to underestimate and sometimes even by-pass the party force that is the key to the masses—namely, the membership organized in the branches. More time must be spent and better methods must be found to acquaint the membership with the policies of the various State Executives. Above all, the membership should be involved in the working out of policies and in finalizing their application. The State Executive and State Committee should work out the direction of policy, without crossing every “t” and dotting every “i.” Too often the present method is just to hand down decisions as something the top committee has hatched out of its own exclusive understanding, to be given to the party branch as a sacred matter in the execution of which they may not vary by a hair’s breadth. Such an approach does not help develop the initiative of comrades below, nor does the party get the maximum contribution from its own members. If the branch is not encouraged to finalize the generally correct directives of the state executive, we run the risk of its not having its most intimate roots in the local soil.

As part of the process of deepening the democratic practices, we should regularize the election of all

party committees and officers in accordance with the party constitution and insist upon the preparation of financial reports by all party committees from top to bottom.

* * *

Drawing lessons from the E.C.C.I. Presidium decision, which makes possible higher forms of organization, we are out to build a broader American working class party—a Marxist party, not only in our own way as we have known it, but in any way the development of history makes possible. It is possible that the further strengthening of our party can be achieved, not only by our own growth, but also by additional means, including the rapid development of certain strata of the working class that may be ready to join with us. We must stimulate all moves in that direction.

However, we must help this possible process by strengthening the party as it is today and by integrating it with the mass movement. That is why the overcoming of all inner weaknesses—political or organizational — contributes to the building of the party.

To exclude these possibilities and allow them to pass us by would be unforgivable. But to sit and wait for them to happen and not build our party today would be even worse. Let us be clear that we can already begin *now* to broaden our party further, by recruiting new tens of thousands of members and by recruiting as many prominent individuals into the party as are ready today. Everything done now

will facilitate anything more far-reaching.

With this understanding, we propose the following perspectives to be acted upon:

1. To prepare during the summer for an autumn party membership campaign for 30,000 new members.

2. To continue mid-year recruiting at approximately fifty per cent of the tempo of the party building drive.

3. To tackle more fundamentally the campaign to integrate politically and activate the new members, recognizing that the key is the organization of a membership apparatus to contact the new member, and to promote the regular reading of the *Daily Worker* and party literature.

4. To fulfill successfully the present campaign to increase *The Worker* circulation by 35,000 readers.

All of this means aiming at a party of 100,000 by the end of the year. It is not an easy task. We feel the conditions are here if the National Committee and the State Committees are ready to fight for the realization of this task in the course of the mass activities outlined in Comrade Browder's report.

Irrespective of what organizational adjustments may be necessary in the course of maximum fusion with the democratic war camp, we must never forget that we are a Marxist party—a workers' party of a special kind.

Every district should have a center of gravity, which can influence and carry forward its policies among masses of workers. That is the essence of concentration policy.

For Detroit to have any other center of gravity than automotive workers would render our party there impotent. Similarly, in Pennsylvania and West Virginia the center of gravity must become coal mining, and these district leaderships, together with the National Committee, must find a new approach to the solution of the scandalous situation in which, in an otherwise splendid campaign, less than 100 coal miners out of 15,000 new members were recruited. This is a challenge to us to see to it that the defeatist activity of Lewis shall imperatively be met and mastered. In all districts, a point of special attention must be the hundreds of thousands of new women shop workers. The fact that only 1,196 shop women were recruited, with half of these from New York City, shows that we have not yet tackled the problem seriously.

In all fields of activity, our policies will be as effective as the capacity of party leadership and member participation in the localities and branches permit. On January of this year 18 per cent of the men comrades in the party were on leaves of absence, and were in the

armed forces of the nation, loyally and able defending our country. By now the number has increased considerably. This has temporarily stripped us of many experienced functionaries—a contribution to our nation we gladly make. However, there is not yet sufficient boldness in the promotion of shop workers and trade unionists to leading committees and posts. While progress has been made in the promotion of women comrades, many of these women comrades feel that they are treated too much as apprentices and are most often assigned exclusively to administrative functions. In the branches particularly, even new members should be carefully promoted into leadership. Activization of some of the new members in branch executives and committees—especially membership committees—will contribute to a more successful integration and activization of the 15,000 new members. The question of guiding cadres and the development and promotion of new cadres—while always a decisive one—merits today the most systematic and steady attention of every State Committee.

THE DUBINSKY SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

BY GILBERT GREEN

IN THE state of New York the struggle against the Dubinsky-*New Leader-Forward* wing of Social-Democracy is of utmost importance in the struggle to smash the anti-war conspiracy in the ranks of labor, to bring about labor unity and to win the state for Roosevelt in the 1944 elections.

The struggle against this disruptive wing of Social-Democracy has been on our agenda for some time. But today we can no longer tarry. We can no longer retreat from it. We must prepare to wage it to a finish.

In the state of New York American Social-Democracy finds its ideological and organizational center. From here its corroding ideology and influence spread through the fibre of the nation as a whole.

The Dubinsky-*Forward* clique occupies many strategic positions of leadership. First, it controls a number of unions, the most important of which is the I.L.G.W.U. Through these unions it exerts an influence on the trade union movement as a whole and in New York on such important industries as aircraft and shipbuilding.

Secondly, it controls the state leadership of the American Labor Party—the party that polled 400,000

votes in the last gubernatorial election and is the balance of power in the state. This party is today being used as a political football for the intrigues and double-dealings of David Dubinsky who, at the same time that he invites Henry Wallace to speak at an A.L.P. dinner, becomes the champion of John L. Lewis' fight against the Administration and continues to have back-door agreements with Tom Dewey and the reactionary Republicans in the state.

Thirdly, these Social-Democrats have strong positions among the Jewish people through their control of needle trades unions, the *Forward*, and such organizations as the Workmen's Circle.

Fourthly, this groups wields considerable influence upon all sorts of petty-bourgeois liberal circles—the *Nation* and *New Republic*, the Union for Democratic Action, the various refugee relief committees, such as the Kingdon Committee. Through these spheres it influences the thoughts and actions of the would-be intellectuals in our colleges and universities, not alone in New York State but in the nation as a whole.

Ideologically and politically, the Dubinsky-*New Leader* wing of So-

cial-Democracy is allied with the Trotskyites, Lovestoneites and Norman Thomasites. Even though there is a division of labor in this coterie insofar as their public position toward the war is concerned, in practice they see eye to eye on most questions and collaborate closely. This gang has also received numerous reinforcements through the recent arrival in this country of thousands of Social-Democratic emigrés from Europe. Most of these emigrés hope to turn the United States, and first of all New York City, into the new international center for their divisive activity, using sections of the American labor movement to finance their special anti-Soviet, anti-unity so-called underground movements in Europe.

* * *

What explains the renewed brazen activities of this clique? It would be a major error to believe that this arises from a feeling of greater strength on their part, or from favorable objective conditions. Of course, there are certain objective factors that do help them. But this is not true in the main. Much of what they are doing today arises from their conscious realization that the main forces of history are moving against them. In desperation they are trying to stop and reverse the wheels of history.

Before June 22, 1941, the *New Leader-Forward* gang supported the war. They did so in the firm belief that in time the war would become transformed into a holy crusade against the Soviet Union. For

a period of time after June 22 they were certain that the Soviet Union was going to be defeated and hoped and worked toward that end. When the Soviet Union, despite their wishful thinking, did not fall, they still clung to the hope that at the very worst the war would end with a great weakening of the Soviet State internally and as a world power.

It has since dawned upon these gentlemen that they badly miscalculated. Not only is the Soviet Union not going to be defeated, but it will emerge from the war as an even greater world power. This is the fear that haunts this gang every day. They are more frightened by this prospect than they have ever been by that of a Hitler victory, and it is this fear that unites them today with the defeatists and reactionary forces in the country. They see only one ray of hope left, the prolongation of the war, the development of war weariness among the masses, and the consummation of a "negotiated peace" with Hitler.

Nor are they oblivious to what is happening in occupied Europe. They know full well that in such countries as France, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, powerful national fronts are being forged. In these fronts the Communist and Social-Democratic workers are fighting shoulder to shoulder. The *New Leader* gang fully understands that the Social-Democratic leaders who are today participating in the school of the anti-Nazi struggle are learning quite different lessons from those taught by the so-called emigré leaders in the Rand School and in the

New School for Social Research. Most of these Social-Democratic emigrés are not only men without countries—they are leaders without followers. Their one hope for leadership in their homelands lies in the expectation that the Bullitts and Berles in our State Department will be in a position artificially to manufacture the governments of post-war Europe.

In this country, too, they note with dismay and alarm the sympathy, respect and admiration so widespread for the Soviet Union. That is why they are compelled to laud the Red Army and the Soviet people, while trying to make a distinction between these and the Soviet Government. How fearful they are of an enlightened public opinion can be seen by the vehemence with which they are attacking the film "Mission to Moscow." For, if the American workers learn the truth about the Soviet Union, where will poor little David Dubinsky be?

* * *

What, however, explains the ability of these people to attack our most important ally without being rebuked by the important win-the-war sections of public opinion and the labor movement? What explains some of their partial successes?

We must first note that they are receiving considerable encouragement and support, not only from the defeatist crowd, but also from reactionary circles in the win-the-war camp, who, too, fear the growing strength and influence of the Soviet Union. These reactionary circles

have ties even within the Administration itself, as represented by the Berles, the Bullitts and the Biddles.

It is no accident that the Social-Democrats hesitated for a while before organizing their Ehrlich-Alter meeting in New York. This hesitation ceased, however, after Dubinsky had taken a trip to Washington and found that he had support there and that those who would not support him would refrain from attacking him.

Moreover, Dubinsky was able to exercise his control of the A.L.P. state leadership as a political club over the heads of such win-the-war figures as Senator Mead and Mayor La Guardia, getting them to speak at this shameful anti-Soviet, and therefore anti-war, spectacle.

But the main reason for their temporary successes is to be explained by the weakness and hesitation of the conscious win-the-war forces, especially in the ranks of labor, who did not speak up promptly and vigorously enough, exposing this plot to break Allied unity. The Alter-Ehrlich case was viewed by these win-the-war forces as some isolated flare-up which would soon blow over, and not, as explained time and time again by Comrade Browder, as part of a whole pattern connected with the new stage in the war and representing Act I in a well-conceived conspiracy.

This weakness is also associated with the weaknesses of the progressive forces in a number of important industries. These forces are relatively weak in the I.L.G.W.U., the main base of the Social-Democrats in New York. The fight against

Dubinsky in his own union is second in importance to none, if the win-the-war forces are to isolate and defeat the Dubinsky wing of Social-Democracy. There are considerable win-the-war forces in this union, but there is not as yet any movement of serious proportions threatening Dubinsky's ruinous policies. While it is true that these forces stymied Dubinsky's efforts to get his own local unions to support his stand on Alter and Ehrlich, it is likewise true that the progressive forces have not been able to get a single union or shop in New York to adopt a resolution condemning his policies.

Furthermore, the work of the most advanced and consistent win-the-war forces is weak in the basic industries, especially in shipbuilding and aircraft. In the A. F. of L. the strength of the Left-progressive forces lies in only a few industries and is weak not only in the I.L.G.W.U., but is even lower in such decisive unions as the teamsters, the longshoremen and the I. A. of M.

These weaknesses have a two-fold effect. First, certain forces that desire to move in a consistently win-the-war direction hesitate and fear taking public issue with Dubinsky because they do not have confidence in the strength of their own position among the masses. This is especially true of the Hillman forces in this city. Hillman wants to fight Dubinsky, but he is afraid to join hands with the Left-progressive forces. Such leaders as John Green of the shipbuilders and Kerrigan of auto, too, would prefer doing the

right thing, but often vacillate in the direction of the Social-Democrats because it is from that side that the main pressure comes.

The second effect is that the most conscious and most consistent win-the-war forces in the New York labor movement often feel themselves isolated from the other sections of the labor movement and for that reason frequently hesitate to speak up promptly and vigorously, as was the case at the time of the Alter-Ehrlich incident. Yet, the ability of these forces to move the labor movement as a whole in the correct direction depends greatly on their taking the lead and thereby encouraging like actions on the part of other win-the-war forces. If Hillman finally did come out with a public denunciation of John L. Lewis, it is in no small part due to the lead that had been taken by the Communists, and by other progressive forces.

* * *

The problem of strengthening our positions in a number of key industries is not the simple problem of numerical growth, important as that is. Most important of all, it calls for the pursuit of such broad policies as will unite all honest anti-fascist and patriotic forces. It is oftentimes possible for the Dubinskys and Antoninis to get support from people who do not agree with them on their fundamental policies. This is so because many such people, even though they hate Dubinsky, feel, all too wrongly, that on one count he is correct, namely, that the Communists are to be feared.

It is true that even people who appreciate our role in the labor movement today, who know that this role is essential for the war effort, fear the possible consequences of our continued growth and influence. Hillman and the forces around him respect us, know the important role we are playing, yet fear us. Some of the Murray people react in the same way. We know that among some people there was a certain uneasiness at the success of our party recruiting drive. Hence, a mere quantitative increase in our strength is not enough. This by itself may even complicate some of our problems.

What is it that these people fear? They fear that we Communists are out to capture and control the labor movement. They believe that we tolerate them today only because we are not strong enough to be intolerant. They believe that the stronger we become, the more precarious will be their positions in the labor movement. It is upon this fear that the Social-Democrats thrive. They nurture and cultivate it.

What does this arise from? Certainly not out of the issues of the day. It represents the remnants and the carry-over of the issues and divisions of yesterday, especially the divisions between Right and Left. There is no basis for such a division in the labor movement today. There is only one division today and that is between the win-the-war and the lose-the-war camps.

Yet we must admit that the old approach of Left versus Right has not been completely eradicated

even in our own thinking and approach. We occupy strong positions in the labor movement in New York City. But it is true that the section of the labor movement that we influence is often separated by a Chinese wall from other progressive win-the-war unions and leaders. This is true of the C.I.O. Council itself. This is reflected in the failure of the most advanced trade union leaders to work closely with, and influence, the John Greens, the Kerrigans and others. And yet the more we influence and the closer are our ties with the Hillmans and the John Greens, the more possible will it be to influence the masses who are today following the leadership of the *Forward-Dubinsky* clique. This same dangerous separation exists, not only between unions, but often within unions as well.

The dissolution of the Communist International emphasizes the need for eradicating the remnants of old divisions and the lowering of all artificial barriers that continue to separate us from other decisive sections of the labor movement. To help accomplish this we must also remove all obsolete forms of party organization, which help to perpetuate the fear on the part of non-party masses of the aims and objectives of the party in the trade unions.

* * *

Another obstacle to our arriving at closer relationship with other forces is that we have not yet clearly enough spoken out on our per-

spectives for the post-war world. Labor leaders such as Hillman will continue to have reservations and doubts, as long as they fear that once the war is over the old divisions in the labor movement will reassert themselves and that there can be no perspective for long-time collaboration with the Communists.

One of the main reasons for the weaknesses of the advanced win-the-war forces in the I.L.G.W.U. is the waging of the fight along the old lines of Right versus Left. This is also a major obstacle to winning the fight in the American Labor Party against the policies of Dubinsky and Counts. The majority of the workers in the I.L.G.W.U. and the majority of the 200,000 enrolled voters in the American Labor Party are neither Right nor Left. They are simply progressive trade unionists who want to win the war. As long as the fight is conducted on issues and divisions that have become obsolete, the progressive forces will only play into the hands of the Dubinskys.

This must especially be borne in mind during the heat of the present A.L.P. primary fight. How does the Dubinsky clique hope to win a majority? It intends to do so by avoiding present-day issues and by reiterating the charge that the Communists are out to capture the party. This is attested to by their many letters and leaflets issued in the past weeks.

It must be said that on the part of some of the progressives there is a tendency to bite at this bait and to help Dubinsky make the issue that

of control instead of that of policies. In one piece of literature issued in the Bronx, the progressives appealed for support to drive the Dubinskys out of the A.L.P. Such an appeal has all the earmarks of a factional plea for power. The progressives do not want to drive anyone out. They want to unite the A.L.P., to win it for correct policies, to make its leadership and its ranks more representative of the labor movement in this state and therefore to build it into a more powerful and influential party than it now is.

Instead of fighting on the false issues placed by Dubinsky, the progressives must fight on the real issues of today. They must ask: Why is Dubinsky allied with John L. Lewis in the fight against the President? Why has that great union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, been forced to withdraw from the A.L.P.? Why is the great C.I.O. movement of this city excluded from the A.L.P. and its leadership? Why did Dubinsky join hands with the reactionary anti-Semitic Polish government-in-exile against the Soviet Union? Why did Dubinsky try to block the campaign for the Marcantonio anti-poll tax bill? And these questions must be answered in such a way as to show the workers where Mr. Dubinsky really stands on the war and why he must be defeated. The fight must not degenerate into an unprincipled struggle for power.

Among the Jewish masses in the city the fight is also too great an extent still viewed as Left versus Right. Many new positive develop-

ments are taking place in the direction of Jewish unity which will help obliterate these old lines; but the fact that they still remain is a major source of difficulties.

* * *

Our recent renewed offensive against the Dubinskys has been interpreted by some of our old-timers as taking on where they left off some years back. Of course, there is a relationship between the theory and practice of Social-Democracy historically and its position and role today. *But everything today depends upon our ability to see the developing differences and contradictions, the fissures and divisions in the ranks of Social Democracy.* To view Social-Democracy as a unified, homogeneous mass is to fail to deepen the divisions in its ranks and in effect to unite the camp of Social-Democracy instead of breaking it up.

Precisely because we are conducting open warfare against the Dubinskys, we are in duty bound to be more careful than ever in pursuing a policy of differentiation, of separating the sheep from the goats. We must not resort to name-calling. We must always be sure of our facts. We must always concentrate our fire on the conscious leaders of this conspiracy, being ready to modify our attitude and extend a helping hand to those who are temporarily influenced by Dubinsky and Company, or who for one reason or another are ready to desert them.

In a mass union such as the I.L.G.W.U., a real movement con-

ducted on broad lines will shake up the leadership itself, create rifts in its ranks and bring many lower officials into the struggle against Dubinsky's policies.

We see this happening in District 9 of the painters. By correct policies, the forces around Louis Weinstock have helped break up the Social-Democratic opposition in the union to the extent that we can report today that despite the desires of the *Forward* clique, the Social-Democratic group will for the first time in the history of that union not put its own slate in the field. It is now possible in this union to wipe out the old divisions of Right and Left and to establish a united union and a united leadership.

Another example of the correctness of this approach can be seen among the Negro people. A year ago the Randolphs and the Crosswaiths held the initiative. Today the reverse is true in the city of New York. Many of those who followed Randolph a year ago and who spoke at his March-on-Washington meeting in Madison Square Garden are today fighters for win-the-war policies, collaborating with the Communists, and were among those who helped make the Negro Freedom Rally on June 7 the great memorable demonstration that it was. Here the win-the-war forces did not hesitate to take the initiative. But they also knew how to pursue the broadest kind of policy, one that brought the greatest unity.

* * *

A few words on the ideological struggle against the Dubinsky-*New*

Leader stripe of Social-Democracy.

To a certain extent the appeal of Dubinsky to the masses is even more dangerous than the Lewis appeal. Why? Because the Dubinsky-*New Leader-Forward* wing of Social-Democracy cloaks its appeal in win - the - war and anti-fascist phrases. This gang even indulges in a certain "Left" criticism of the President, of both his domestic and foreign policies.

It is this demagogic cloak that enables these people to mislead many honest anti-fascists, especially among the Jewish people. But this demagogy can be transformed into a double-edged sword because it arises out of a fundamental contradiction in their position. This is expressed in the fact that while they are doing all in their power to obstruct the war effort, divide the United Nations and harm American-Soviet relations, they dare not come out in their true colors, because the masses that they lead are solidly behind the war.

It is this contradiction which is the Achilles' heel of the Dubinsky wing of Social-Democracy. If this contradiction is exposed, it can bring their complete isolation and defeat. Their effort is to make the issue that of Communism. We must not permit that to happen. We must make it impossible for them to influence people into thinking that their stand on Alter and Ehrlich was only an anti-Communist act instead of one to break the unity of the United Nations and to obstruct the entire war effort. That is why Comrade Browder's charges against Dubinsky and

Chanin were so effective and created such consternation in their ranks, because he tore their mask off, made the war the issue and exposed their real position toward the war.

The contradiction in their position is seen also in the way they treated the miners' strike and Lewis' effort to re-enter the A. F. of L. Antonini, in an article in *Justice*, did not dare support the strike as such, but without a word of criticism of the strike or of Lewis leveled his main attack against the Administration and the Communists, and then added: "We cannot say that the miners were wrong in fighting for their right to a decent living." Note the hypocrisy here. He gives support to the strike by beclouding the real issue of the strike and the war with the false one of the right to a decent living. Likewise, Dubinsky defended his efforts to bring Lewis into the A. F. of L. by glibly talking about this being a step toward greater labor unity, and denying that Lewis was an enemy of the war effort. To the extent that we can expose these moves as directed against labor unity and the war effort, to that extent can we win the masses in opposition to Dubinsky's policies.

* * *

In conclusion, let me warn that despite the most favorable objective conditions for the isolation and defeat of the Dubinsky-*New Leader-Forward* gang, everything depends upon our ability to wage a consistent and all-sided struggle against

it, one that will enlist the support of all progressive labor.

Unless this is done, there is grave danger that this group of Social-Democracy will be able to win a new lease on life; will penetrate and influence new sections of workers and will win new positions of power. The Social-Democrats are today the leading force in the so-called American Labor Congress on International Affairs—a committee that has as its real objective the defeat of every move toward genuine unity among the United Nations and international trade union unity. We must note that this committee has the cooperation of many

labor leaders who do not yet understand its real intent.

If the Dubinskys, the Wolls and the Hutchesons are successful in getting John L. Lewis readmitted into the A. F. of L., this combination will constitute a great obstacle to labor unity and the prosecution of the war, and may become the reactionary Republican spearhead to break labor from the President in the 1944 elections.

That is why the fight against the reactionary wings of Social-Democracy is not our concern alone; it is the fight of all the conscious win-the-war forces in the ranks of the labor movement.

THE NEGRO PEOPLE UNITE FOR VICTORY

BY JAMES W. FORD

THE movement registered by the Negro Freedom Rally in New York City on June 7 was an outstanding development in the struggle to forge American unity for victory over Hitler and Hitlerism at the moment of the imminent invasion of Europe by American and British forces.

The rally represented basic features of organized opinion and unity of action of the Negro people in support of the win-the-war policies of our government. It was a tremendous political demonstration. There were at least 30,000 people at the meeting, 75 per cent to 80 per cent Negro. This created a political effect that will long remain in the memory of the people of New York.

It was a magnificent demonstration of Negro and white unity. It was a powerful expression of the desires of 13,000,000 colored Americans for the creation of united action for the support of the war and for the elimination of all obstructions to the full participation of the Negro people in the prosecution of the war.

This huge demonstration was organized by the Negro Victory Labor Committee, the People's Committee of Harlem, and the Victory Committee of Brooklyn. The forces of

collaboration and sponsorship represented support from the trade unions—the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and independent unions; from religious, civic, business, and fraternal organizations among Negroes; from political parties and groups, including Communist, Democratic, Republican and American Labor; and from a very wide representative list of Negro and white leaders.

National interest in the meeting was evidenced in the wide coverage by nearly every influential Negro weekly newspaper in the country, and also by the metropolitan daily press. The *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, America's leading daily and Sunday labor papers, gave most mature political coverage. The *Daily Worker* and *The Worker*, in helping to make the meeting the huge success it was, rendered a signal service to national unity and the fight for Negro rights.

* * *

The Negro Victory Labor Committee, the central guiding force behind the meeting, was organized a year ago in a conference of trade union, civic and religious organizations in the City of New York. It was a conference of Negro people, but there was in attendance a large

representation of white delegates. Of all groups represented, the trade unions constituted the most decisive and influential section. The most powerful stimulus for the organization of the Negro Victory Committee was the need for Negro unity following the Axis declaration of war on the United States, which created among the Negroes intense consciousness of the menace of Hitler and fascism.

A year ago the March-on-Washington group, which was considerably influenced by the Socialist Party, was creating confusion and dangerous moods in the ranks of the Negro people and utilizing their justified grievances as a weapon of opposition to the Administration's war program and was following tactics that would lead to the isolation of the Negro people from their most important allies, the progressive white population and the organized labor movement.

On June 16, 1942, the March-on-Washington group held a mass meeting at Madison Square Garden. The general tenor of the speeches was anti-Administration and anti-white. This caused great concern among many people regarding its dangers to the war effort and to the rights of Negro people. The progressive forces among the Negro people and the forces of labor were more than ever convinced of the need of taking steps to unite the Negro people for support of the war and for winning greater rights.

The conference of the Negro Labor Victory Committee sharply criticized Jim Crow and job discrimination, but at the same time

sought collaboration with Administration forces to end discrimination and to take steps to integrate the Negro workers in the war industries. Together with the People's Committee, it organized a mass meeting in Harlem, attended by more than 4,000 people. Paul V. McNutt, newly appointed Manpower Administrator and government spokesman, outlined the policy to be followed by the Manpower Commission in placing Negro workers in jobs. The Negro Labor Victory Committee incorporated in its program of action the eight points of Negro grievances brought forward by the March-on-Washington group and additional points of its own, including the unequivocal support of the war, the destruction of Hitler and friendship with the Soviet Union.

During the course of its activity, the Negro Labor Victory Committee secured thousands of jobs for Negro workers. The organization of the Negro Labor Victory Committee undoubtedly was an important step to unity among the Negro people and for winning their support for the war. It projected and set to work to organize the victory rally at Madison Square Garden.

* * *

The Negro Freedom Rally was the climax of a year's struggle for Negro unity and the rights of colored citizens in New York, and was an expression of similar struggles throughout the nation. It was the culmination of a year's struggle to counteract confusion among the people in regard to the war and the Administration. It was the culmi-

nation of long and hard work against those who claimed that this was a white man's war and not the war of the colored people. It climaxed a year's struggle to bring clarity among the Negro people in regard to the basic groups that must be joined together to win the war and to win equal rights for all minority groups. It was the highlight of a year's struggle to bring closer unity between the Negro and white peoples, to prevent the isolation of the Negroes from their vital and natural allies.

It symbolized a year's struggle against the appeasers and defeatists, those forces who would seek a "negotiated peace" with Hitler to the detriment of the nation's interests, and a "peace" that would bring about the bestial enslavement of the Negro people. It symbolized a year's struggle to draw the attention of the most decisive forces of the government to the need of taking bold steps to wipe out Jim-Crowism and fully to integrate the Negro people into the war effort of the nation.

The task now is to consolidate these gains resulting from that struggle. The Negro people must be mobilized to assist the nation in every way possible for the invasion of the continent of Europe and to facilitate the closest collaboration between our nation and its chief allies in the United Nations coalition, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China.

At the same time, the results of the Negro Freedom Rally must serve further to unite the Negro people and to help our country in solid national unity, to join with all

freedom-loving peoples to wipe Nazism and fascism off the face of the earth.

The second important lesson to be drawn from the Negro Freedom Rally is that ways must be found to wipe out all artificial barriers and obstructions to the unity of the Negro people, of labor, and of all the win-the-war forces—that complete national unity must be placed in the forefront for victory over the Axis.

With the imminence of the second front, the appeasers, defeatists, and Negro-baiters are intensifying their efforts to create divisions between the Negro people and the win-the-war forces generally, aiming to isolate the Negroes from the Roosevelt Administration, and to cause confusion leading to the prolongation of the war. The defeatists are already encouraging armed clashes against Negro soldiers in Mississippi, Georgia, and other southern states.

The Ku Klux Klan is stimulating race clashes in the Detroit war industries. In Newark fights between Negro and white high school students have resulted in fatalities. Armed gangs are still operating there against Negroes. They use the cover of black-outs to attack Negroes with lead pipes. Undoubtedly Hitlerite Bundist and K.K.K. elements are behind these attacks in New Jersey.

In Mobile, Ala., economic issues were at the bottom of the shipyard riots against Negroes. Nevertheless, one cannot fail to see that pro-Hitler forces operated to cause a race clash. An incentive wage policy must be the main instrumentality for overcoming the grievances of

both Negro and white, at the same time that up-grading of Negro workers is carried forward.

* * *

Three things that took place at the time of the Negro Freedom Rally are indicative of the trend toward the greater integration of the Negro people in the national war effort, not only in the United States but also in Africa.

The first was the re-establishment of the Fair Employment Practices Committee by President Roosevelt, giving the new committee more and stronger powers "to promote the fullest utilization of all available manpower, and to eliminate discriminatory employment practices."

Second, on the day before the Rally, the War Labor Board rendered its historic decision equalizing wages affecting hundreds of thousands of Negro workers. This decision, written by Dr. Frank Graham, white liberal Southerner, together with the new F.E.P.C., indicates that in the course of the war tremendous gains are being made by the Negro people.

Thirdly, the rally hailed the momentous meeting between President Roosevelt and President Edwin Barclay of Liberia, who was returning the visit of Roosevelt to Liberia on the occasion of his home route from the Casablanca Conference.

This conference followed recent conversations between President Roosevelt and Premier Churchill in which additional steps were undoubtedly taken to invade the continent of Europe. The North African victory and the tremendous

resources of Africa, including Liberia, make rapid invasion of Europe a possibility, and promise success for this decisive action.

At a dinner in honor of President Barclay, in New York, on June 11, Judge Goldstein said, "If we had heeded Ethiopia's call in 1935, the war probably would not have occurred." He said further, "Let us not forget that Ethiopia was the first state to lose its independence. But it was the first state to regain its sovereignty. Let us now hasten the fight so that all nations will be free soon and at once, so that all nations will be set free and fascism wiped from the face of the earth."

This statement of Judge Goldstein is a token that recent history has not passed without its lessons. The statement gains in significance when we bear in mind that Liberia and Ethiopia are in a great association of nations, fighting to win the war and freedom after victory.

Let us take another example of this trend. Felix Ebone, Negro Governor-General of French Equatorial Africa, when asked in a recent interview how he had come to the historic decision in 1940 to join the French National Resistance Movement led by de Gaulle, replied:

"If I had stopped to rationalize, I probably would have sat tight. I switched to de Gaulle at a time when the future looked anything but rosy for the democracies. Continental Europe was under Hitler's thumb. The R.A.F. was waging that epic battle which later evoked from Winston Churchill the ac-

knowledge that never in history was so much owed by so many to so few. No Allied statesman could foresee in those days that America would be sucked into the conflict before another year went by."

Another example of these significant developments in Africa is the following news item in the press of June 2.

"Belata Ayela Bavre, Ethiopian Minister to Great Britain, proposed today that a picked group of Ethiopian 'commandos,' fully equipped with long knives and a long-standing vengeance, be allowed to spearhead an Allied invasion of Italy. 'The fascist blood would turn to water,' he said."

* * *

A further indication of the trend toward unity behind the war effort was the regional conference of the National Negro Congress in Detroit, on May 30-31, attended by 300 delegates from Illinois, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Michigan. Sixty per cent of the representatives were from trade unions. Two million people were represented. The conference was strong in trade union representatives, but weak in representation from the established Negro organizations. The conference took a stand against the policy of John L. Lewis. The recent regional conferences of the National Negro Congress have stimulated organization among the Negro people and contributed to creating clarity on the war.

There also took place a conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peo-

ple, on June 6-7, in Detroit. This conference, as contrasted with previous conferences of that organization, was called on the basis of a pro-war program. The speech of Walter White, Executive Secretary, was in support of the war. The N.A.A.C.P., however, was wrong in calling for President Roosevelt to take over the Packard plant. It was the task of the pro-war forces and the trade union leaders in Detroit to settle the strike directed against Negro workers.

The N.A.A.C.P. is becoming a powerful organization among the Negro people, with 200,000 paid up members, with a bulletin circulating in 200,000 copies, with a treasury of from \$75,000 to \$100,000 and with locals throughout the country. There has been an effort on the part of the National Negro Congress to establish closer relationship with the N.A.A.C.P.

* * *

Comrade Browder reported that reactionary forces are trying to bring John L. Lewis forward as Presidential candidate for 1944. We are not without instances of this move among the Negro people. Let me quote the prominent Negro George S. Schuyler, columnist in the *Pittsburgh Courier* of June 5. We find him writing:

"A union of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O. and the Big Four Brotherhoods, and then an association of this group with organized farmers for political purposes would be ideal for victory, and the nomination of John L. Lewis as its politi-

cal standard bearer would make that victory certain."

There we have an expression of the sinister move to which Comrade Browder has pointed to bring John L. Lewis forward, to disrupt national unity, and defeat the war effort.

* * *

There is much talk, too, about a "solid Negro vote" which will decide the 1944 elections. The Negroes do represent a powerful bloc in American political life. They are moving, and have moved, in the last decade, forward in the progressive advance of the political life of our country. They must be mobilized, not as a bloc in isolation from the pro-war and labor forces, but jointly with these forces to sustain the win-the-war policies of President Roosevelt. This is our most important task in connection with the decisive role of Negroes in the 1944 elections. The Negro workers must and will repudiate Lewis and his conspiracy against labor, against the government, against the war program.

The Negro people must become more aware of the fact that their greatest friend in the trade union movement today is the great leader of the C.I.O., Philip Murray. He is a defender of the rights of the Negro people, as he is of the white workers. He has a long record in the struggle for the rights of the Negro people. The policies for Negro rights have become deep-seated in the ranks of the C.I.O.

The Southern poll-tax Democrats

are trying to defeat Roosevelt in 1944 and, in alliance with reactionary Republicans, to eliminate Willie. The poll-taxers are trying to bring about an alignment of forces between reactionary Democrats of the South and North and reactionary Republicans, to the detriment of the war and the Negro people and for the prevention of the passage of the Anti-Poll Tax Bill.

In the South, however, there are developing progressive liberal forces among the whites. The Atlanta Conference of liberal whites extended its hand of friendship and collaboration to the Durham Conference of Negroes held in October, 1942. There is, furthermore, the Southern Negro Youth Conference which has done great work in organizing the youth of the South for support to the war.

In the 1944 election the Negro people must be flexible and move with all currents that are uniting the pro-victory forces behind President Roosevelt for defeat of the appeasers.

The Pearl Buck Committee set up to fight for the rights of the Negro people must be taken into account. It has been endorsed by Wendell Willie. It raises the question of the rights of the Negroes; and, although there are disruptive forces within this committee, those forces must be defeated and the movement pushed forward in support of the war and of unity of the Negro people with the win-the-war policies. All these developments for 1944 must have as the central aim the continuation of national unity to achieve victory.

CALIFORNIA AND THE COMING ELECTIONS

BY WILLIAM SCHNEIDERMAN

IN CALIFORNIA we already witness the preparations for the 1944 elections in full swing. The win-the-war forces have not yet fully recovered from the defeat suffered in the election of Governor Earl Warren, which has placed the initiative in the hands of the reactionary forces and placed the labor-progressive pro-war forces on the defensive.

But, in order to win the election, Warren had to commit himself publicly to a number of pro-war measures, and even to ostensible support of President Roosevelt. He could not follow an openly defeatist line toward the war in the face of the powerful pro-war, pro-Roosevelt sentiment in California. In the conduct of the State Administration and in the Legislature, he has had to adopt a "non-partisan" course on the surface, with liberal and pro-war pretensions. But Warren's tactics from the beginning have been aimed, first, at consolidating the victory of the Republican Party; secondly, at demoralizing the weakened Democratic Party, pro-Roosevelt forces; and, thirdly, at disarming and demobilizing the labor movement. He made a bid for labor support by appointing an A. F. of L. representative to his cabinet, by

favoring a "truce" between capital and labor on anti-labor legislation, and by supporting a number of war measures in the Legislature. He made a bid for the pension vote by supporting an increase in pensions to \$50 per month.

But all these gestures are aimed at carrying California for the Hoover Republicans in 1944. Himself mentioned as a possible Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate, Warren will undoubtedly line up with the defeatist forces around Hoover, Taft, and Bricker in the Republican Party against the war policies of President Roosevelt. While trying to avoid too close association with the openly defeatist forces, he has been conducting a campaign for so-called "states' rights," using this issue as a political platform against the war program of the government and against the various Federal war agencies.

For example, in the midst of a whipped-up hysteria against the agricultural manpower policies of the Federal Government, the legislature passed a bill to set up a state Farm Production Council. This council has no program other than to attack and discredit Federal war agencies, exploiting their weaknesses and mistakes. The council is controlled

entirely by the notorious "Associated Farmers," and has neither labor, nor small farmer, nor any other representation. Although Warren has attempted to disassociate himself from the openly defeatist bloc controlling the legislature, he signed this bill, and never once rebuked the legislators who, on the floor of the Legislature, had openly spoken in a manner tantamount to rebellion against the Federal Government.

We have repeatedly called on Warren to break with the reactionary bloc in the legislature, and have criticized his silence on national issues of the war, by which he attempts to conceal his tie-up with the defeatist forces in the Republican Party. We have also publicly criticized the pro-Roosevelt leaders of the Democratic Party for failing to speak up in defense of the President's policies in the face of the reactionary offensive, and for leaving the pro-war progressive forces in the Democratic Party practically leaderless.

This situation has been contributed to by labor's insufficient initiative in regard to national political issues and in regard to the struggle against the defeatist anti-war forces. Labor has been slow to react to the critical situation created by the reactionary offensive in Congress, and to see the dangers to the war effort and to the labor movement itself. The trade unions have not sufficiently concerned themselves with the broader issues of the war. While some have spoken out on the Second Front, on supporting the Casablanca decisions, and on

American-Soviet relations, the unions have concerned themselves mainly with state legislative questions, and specifically with the fight against anti-labor legislation. There is a tendency in the unions to judge Warren solely on his attitude toward labor legislation, and not to look behind this to see his carefully concealed tie-up with the forces fighting against the government's war policies. These tendencies arise from the failure to see that there is a division of labor between Warren and the more openly outspoken foes of the Roosevelt war policies, so that Warren need not take full responsibility for their attacks on national unity and the war effort.

Secondly, the unions, absorbed with production problems, price control, and wage stabilization, do not sufficiently relate these questions to the national political issues before the country. Thirdly, while labor has excellent relations with the Democratic Party, since the election defeat the trade unions have not exerted their influence to revive and unify the Democratic Party as a vital pro-war force.

Since the last election, the Democratic Party has been paralyzed by inertia and fractional divisions, with its leaders either remaining silent or tagging along behind Warren, and letting reactionary Democrats like State Senator Jack Tenney, head of the "Little Dies" Committee, take the initiative in state political affairs by promoting obstructionism, labor-baiting, and Red-baiting. The "Little Dies" Committee succeeded in railroading through the legislature the Dilworth Bill,

aimed at further restricting free elections by striking at the right of minority parties, especially the Communist Party, to be on the ballot. This law, signed by Governor Warren, and passed in the face of vigorous opposition by progressive labor and by Democratic Party circles, confronts the pro-war forces in California once more with the task of organizing a fight to preserve the right of free elections, as part of the fight for national unity and winning the war.

But despite these unfavorable developments, the Democratic Party has a tradition in California of putting into motion mass people's movements. It is still the main channel of political expression for the labor movement and the whole win-the-war camp. If it can unify its ranks, eliminate factionalism, and show some real leadership on war issues, it can revive and re-activate the Democratic Party rank and file for taking the counter-offensive against the defeatists and winning the broad masses for an active struggle in support of President Roosevelt's war policies. There is a growing realization among the pro-Roosevelt leaders of the Democratic Party, and in labor ranks, that this must be done; but it has not yet taken organized form. Labor can play the greatest role in influencing the Democratic Party to hasten this process.

* * *

The recent municipal elections showed the possibilities of rallying the pro-war forces in California, in spite of general apathy and the in-

difference of most unions toward these elections. In San Diego, now a huge aircraft industrial center, the united labor movement, together with other pro-war forces, elected a candidate for Mayor who ran against and defeated the "America First" leader of San Diego. In Los Angeles, the elections for the City Council strengthened the representation of progressive pro-war forces in the council against a reactionary bloc that formerly had had complete control.

In Oakland, where no possibilities existed for a pro-war coalition ticket, the party put forward for the City Council in one district its own candidate, Tom Farrell, who polled 12,000 votes, one-third of the total, carrying 68 out of 300 precincts, and tying the vote in 28 more precincts.

In San Francisco, a special bond election on the transportation problem resulted in defeat for the Rossi administration, which is facing a mayoralty election this fall, in which the pro-war forces face the task of achieving unity around one candidate if they are to elect a genuine win-the-war city administration.

In all the municipal elections, the party played an active part in rallying labor and all pro-war forces for a correct policy, for more active participation in the elections, and for placing the war issues in the forefront of the election campaign. In San Francisco, the party was practically the only organization that backed a practical plan for solving the transportation bottleneck affecting war production, by proposing that the Office of Defense

Transportation use its emergency powers to merge the two street-car systems for better transportation service—a plan, incidentally, that is finally being given serious consideration by the O.D.T.

The municipal elections generally indicate that the reactionary offensive of the defeatists can be beaten back if labor and all pro-war forces realize the dangers to the war program and take effective steps to unify and mobilize all forces of the people to hold the home-front line to back up the battlefield.

* * *

That this can be done is evident from the reaction of the labor movement in California to the Lewis insurrection. Although the reactionary forces backing the Lewis conspiracy succeeded in creating some temporary confusion in the ranks of the labor movement, labor's patriotism and awareness of the issues headed off all attempts to provoke a strike movement. A Pacific Coast Metal Trades Conference of all the A. F. of L. unions in the West Coast shipyards was confronted with a resolution following the line of John P. Frey, calling for withdrawing labor's no-strike pledge, and threatening "direct action" if wage adjustments were not forthcoming. After a heated two-hour discussion, this resolution was defeated by a vote of 75 to 31. Only a week after the Michigan conference of the U.A.W. had voted to support the Lewis mine strike, a U.A.W. conference in Los Angeles voted to condemn Lewis' policies and to reaffirm labor's no-strike pledge. The

convention of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, on the recommendation of Harry Bridges and other international officers, voted to condemn Lewis as a traitor, and reaffirmed its support to President Roosevelt and his win-the-war policies.

Nevertheless, the labor movement is not yet sufficiently aroused to all the sinister implications of the plot hatched by the Lewis-Woll-Hutcherson gang. Many A. F. of L. officials who are against Lewis' strike policy are still reluctant to speak out publicly against Lewis and his attempt to seize the leadership of the A. F. of L. These issues have to be taken up and explained in the local unions to the membership, and where the majority of the members do not attend local union meetings, other means have to be found to reach the workers, particularly in war industries. We have heard of one instance in which the workers in one plant initiated a petition to reaffirm labor's no-strike pledge, with 60 out of the 61 workers signing.

* * *

The fight for labor unity is one of the important aspects of the mobilization of labor for the war and against Lewis' disruptive policies. Jurisdictional disputes on the West Coast have always been one of the sore spots that served as an excuse for some people to prevent unity between the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. It is therefore very significant that the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union and the

Teamsters Union, which have had numerous jurisdictional disputes on the West Coast, have recently reached an agreement in the Los Angeles area to solve some of these disputes.

In Los Angeles, the policies of Buzzell, secretary of the Central Labor Council, have been an obstacle to labor's full participation in the war effort. But these policies suffered a defeat recently, when the council voted to reverse its previous position of refusal to be represented in war agencies where C.I.O. representatives were present, with Buzzell casting a lone vote against the rest of the council.

These favorable developments indicate that the workers in the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. can achieve greater unity in spite of all obstacles, and that Left-wing and progressive elements in the unions, including the Communists, can work in full collaboration with all honest forces in the labor movement, including the most conservative, on the issue of

winning the war. The timely warning of Comrade Browder against division of the labor movement into Right and Left groups should be heeded by all pro-war forces in the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. The political unity established between the California State Federation of Labor and the C.I.O. on legislative questions should be extended to all important war issues and to the political preparations of labor for the 1944 elections. The splendid example of the C.I.O., under the leadership of Philip Murray, in formulating correct win-the-war policies must be extended to the entire labor movement, so that labor can fight with increasing effectiveness for the interests of the nation.

The June plenum of our party will give a tremendous impetus to the fight to rally the labor movement and the whole win-the-war camp against the defeatists, and to make labor a decisive force for national unity and victory in the 1944 elections and in the war.

THE FIGHT AGAINST DEFEATISM IN OHIO

BY ARNOLD JOHNSON

IN EXPRESSING full agreement with Comrade Browder's clear and penetrating report, I want to deal with certain developments on the role of the defeatists and to say a few words on treason and the development of the fascist conspiracy in Ohio.

Certainly, the recent mine and rubber strikes were outstanding examples of overt acts of treason and showed the development and tie-up with other forces, particularly with Governor John Bricker, the defeatist N.A.M. governor. The Lewis fascists are now trying to start a new campaign, a movement among the miners who have been purchasing war bonds—to stop the buying of war bonds, and are intensifying the campaign to “get rid of the President.” In this situation, Governor Bricker's Unemployment Compensation Commission announced in the last few days of the strike that it was going to send in a special staff to help the miners make claims for unemployment compensation, thereby encouraging the miners to stay out longer. It is in this sense that we have a right to infer that Governor John Bricker, who aspires to be a Presidential candidate, was giving encouragement to the miners to continue the strike.

The mine strike witnessed a full mobilization of the reactionary elements in support of this anti-war conspiracy. Likewise in the rubber strike, the combination of the Lewis men and the Trotskyites, who included on the picket line at least a few known and recognized professional stool pigeons who had tried to break strikes and the unions in the past, showed that the Hitlerite elements include all the dregs and degenerates of society. Again, there was not a single action of the Bricker forces to encourage the men back to work. But, on the other hand, Republican Congressman Rowe, whom Lewis praises in the current issue of the *Mine Workers' Journal*, became a spokesman for the strikers in Washington. And Mr. George Boss, the Lewis leader in Akron and collaborator of the Trotskyites, successfully forced even the Democratic Party and the pro-Roosevelt George Hartner at least temporarily to give support to the strikers. The very fact of the strike and the manner in which the action was conducted again demonstrated that powerful pro-Hitler forces, exploiting economic grievances, were at work to destroy the labor movement and the war agencies of the government and to aid Hitler.

Certainly, the fact that Lewis now promises to bring the rubber workers with him into the A. F. of L. shows the rubber strike to have been a Lewis action against the C.I.O. Right on the first day of the strike, May 22, the Ohio newspapers carried the report that Lewis favored Bricker for President in 1944, while from powerful corporations came no effort to halt the strike conspiracy of the Lewis-Trotskyite elements—as was the case among the coal operators in the mine strike—and these corporations gave no guarantee that workers who reported would continue to work. They were part of the conspiracy. Thus we in Ohio have a major task in conducting an intensive campaign against the Taft-Bricker - Lewis - Crawford (of N.A.M.) and Trotskyite agents of the Hitler conspiracy.

* * *

As yet, the people of Ohio are not aware of the full implications of the treason that is being developed. The native-born American who has gone through our schools is not able to grasp as yet the role of traitors in America. I think that there is a certain ideology instilled into the American mind that native Americans are not traitors, but only people of differing opinions. The school boy and girl get the idea that all Americans are loyal patriots and that they are rewarded with high offices and positions of influence and power because of their patriotism. They carry this idea into adulthood.

When most of us came out of the

schools we did not think that in every critical period of American history there were traitors who shouted false allegiance of patriotism. I think that we should consider this as a factor in the present situation. The average American today knows only a little about Benedict Arnold. He does not know about the Tory traitors in the Continental Congress. He does not know that Aaron Burr, a Vice-President, was a traitor in the time of Jefferson. He does not know that Congressmen, Senators, Governors, and Mayors were leaders of the Copperheads in the period of the Civil War. Thus today the people have difficulty in grasping the fact that the Tafts, Brickers and Lewises are traitors.

I think that we need to place the present political developments in the background of our own history and in relation to present events, to educate people as to the role of traitors in the past and how the masses of people, once aware of the character of the treason, organized and acted to smash treason in every critical period of American history. Also this present period, with the native Quislings in our own and other countries, demands a thorough analysis and understanding of conspirators. A signal service in this direction is the excellent film "Mission to Moscow," showing the conspiracies of the Trotskyite-Nazi traitors in the Soviet Union. We must specifically show by the great amount of evidence the character of the traitors, the treason and the consequences, as Comrade Browder has so well done in his report to

this meeting and in his writings.

In this sense, as we approach the municipal elections and the 1944 elections, our task in Ohio must become one to guarantee that traitors are not on the ballot and that the people are given the opportunity to vote for the best victory candidates and that labor shall influence all such candidates. We must be ever more sharp in our characterization of the defeatists and at the same time more firm in uniting and working with all the win-the-war forces and in helping to mobilize these forces to participate in all campaigns.

* * *

While Ohio has suffered from a certain rise in the role of the defeatists, it is also true that the win-the-war forces have won certain major fights and strengthened their forces. While the Governor and Taft have been making national news, their forces are being split in Ohio. The Ohio Legislature is just completing the most bankrupt session in its history. The Governor has again demonstrated his complete incompetency. The Governor and the N.A.M. were able to get through a few bills to gouge the public. They created a big slush fund for their ulterior purposes. On the major bills they were defeated by a united labor movement organized in a regular weekly meeting of labor, composed of the A. F. of L., C.I.O., Railroad Brotherhoods, and United Mine Workers, in Columbus on a state scale. United labor influenced both parties in the

legislature. Labor put backbone in the Roosevelt Democrats and split the Republicans.

The vicious N.A.M. anti-labor bill known as the French Bill is apparently finally defeated after separate labor conferences of A. F. of L. and C.I.O. and a series of mass delegations of all united labor which were able to keep the bill in committee. After labor was able to get Republican Congressman George Bender to speak out against it, thus further splitting the Republican forces who are otherwise in complete control of the legislature, the bill is conceded as being defeated.

While Bender continues in the impossibly confused policy of support to Willkie's program and at the same time of support to Bricker to advance his own personal political career, when he acted against the French Bill he immediately became the subject of a Scripps-Howard smear.

From the experience of the strength of labor unity on a state scale, as expressed on legislation, labor in the various cities has become more practical and positive in participating in the forthcoming municipal elections and in establishing political action committees. Labor is moving toward more mass campaigns, especially on such issues as the roll-back of prices. In practically all cities organized labor political action is developing within the two major parties, with the outlook of involving far greater masses in campaigns. While united action is developing, at the same time separate unions are conducting their own campaigns. Labor is learning

of Lewis' role, as was demonstrated by the declarations of both the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. leaders in Ohio against the Lewis strike. While not all spoke out publicly, there was, however, definite expression within their own circles against the Lewis program as "treason," to use their word as well as ours.

Ohio has some powerful forces to defeat. With Bricker's star waning, the N.A.M. and Lewis begin to pin more hope on Taft, who wants to discuss whether we should be at war.

We cannot be satisfied that we have yet done everything we should have in either the rubber or the mine strike, or in the election campaign. While in the mine strike our independent role was more to the forefront, we were weak in the rubber strike.

Our own mass work as a party needs to be strengthened, especially in our relations to the many new forces who today work with us, not only in the labor movement but also in municipal politics and in neighborhood actions. At the present time, Mayor Lausche of Cleveland,

a Roosevelt win-the-war Democrat who follows an ever more consistent Victory policy of uniting the people, constantly gains a greater following. His unifying win-the-war policies are so marked that at the present time the Republican Party has been unable to find a candidate in Cleveland to run against him, although a candidate may soon be forthcoming. The strengthening of a complete coalition around the mayor in Cleveland will undoubtedly be a blow to the defeatists in the state. At the same time, in regard to the Councilmen, the support of the Mayor does not permit the local Farley-Miller forces to exploit the coalition for narrow partisan purposes. Lausche's campaign will strengthen full support to the Commander-in-Chief.

Our own role today as a party in relation to the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. is also greatly improved, and we are in a good position to carry out the policies as emphasized in Comrade Dennis' remarks and in the excellent report of Comrade Browder.

RESOLUTIONS AND STATEMENTS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

RESOLUTION ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

1. THE Communist Party of the United States, through its National Committee, declares its full approval and agreement with the proposal of May 15, 1943, by the Presiding Committee of the Communist International for the dissolution of the International. The C.P.U.S.A. discontinued its international affiliation in November, 1940, and is therefore not called upon to participate in the decision. The proposal is, however, of the greatest political importance, since it profoundly influences all political relationships, promotes the unification of the anti-Hitler coalition, disarms the Axis of its most potent weapon of disruption—the anti-Communist bogey—and opens the way within each nation toward more complete national unity in the prosecution of the war to victory. It also clears the way for the continuance of the democratic unity in the post-war period, and thus adds to the momentum of the war effort. It facilitates the emergence of more effective forms of international unity of labor, which begins with the immediate task of completing the Anglo-Soviet-American trade union unity corresponding to the coalition of peoples and nations.

2. Within the United States this new stage of world relationships places new and urgent emphasis on many tasks of the day. High among these is the common duty of Communists and all other responsible groups and leaders within the democratic camp to abolish the remnants of the “bogey of Communism,” which continue to be a weapon against national unity and the war effort. To this end it is necessary to secure the full acceptance of the Marxist workers’ party within the national framework of American democratic institutions, thus safeguarding in harmony with the war effort the general right of free political association. The C.P.U.S.A. pledges its full effort to this task and welcomes all cooperative efforts to this end from any and all sections of the democratic, patriotic, anti-Axis camp of the American people.

3. The Communist Party of the United States will continue to fight with all its strength, as it has in the past period, for the complete unity of the United Nations, for international labor unity, and for national unity within our country, to win the unconditional surrender of the Hitler regime and its allies, Japan and Italy, and an ordered and peaceful world when victory is achieved.

RESOLUTION ON THE SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

FROM the Congress of the United States, supported by a bipartisan coalition of defeatist and reactionary Congressmen and every anti-war force within our country, comes the Smith-Connally Bill. This piece of legislation is a blitz attack upon the unity of the nation. It is destructive of the trade union movement, destructive of national morale and therefore to the growing solidarity of the home front.

The Smith-Connally Bill is a menace to the democratic forces and to victory. It is an aid to the Axis and to the insurrectionary conspiracy of John L. Lewis and the whole crew of American fifth columnists who desperately strive to weaken the productive capacity of the country in order to nullify the historic decisions of Casablanca, and who seek to bring about a negotiated peace to prevent the unconditional surrender of the Axis.

The Smith-Connally Bill aims at punishing labor for the insurrec-

tionary acts committed by John L. Lewis. It also aims to weaken labor's prestige before the nation and to destroy its constructive role in the camp of national unity. Those who have formulated the bill have been foremost in giving irresponsible support to the head of the miners' union. But organized labor has kept faith with the nation, has kept the wheels of industry turning, has actively supported our Commander-in-Chief. Labor is the great patriotic and unifying core of national unity.

The Smith-Connally Bill must not become a law of our land. The best interests of the country, of the national war effort, demand this bill's repudiation. The entire labor movement must take this occasion to establish unity of action to speed victory, to reaffirm the support to the President and to its no-strike policy and appeal to the President upon this basis to veto the Smith-Connally Bill.

STATEMENT ON THE NEW ARGENTINE GOVERNMENT

THE overthrow of the Castillo regime in Argentina on June 4 aroused the hopes of all lovers of freedom among Argentina's neighbors in Latin America, and also among the friends of Latin America's freedom in this country—and on every battlefield in this world-wide peoples' war of national liberation. Every fighter for freedom in every part of the world hoped that this coup might mark an end to the policy of sheltering military

and naval agents of Germany in Argentina under cover of a so-called "neutrality" which enabled the fascist Axis openly to operate within the Western Hemisphere for the furtherance of Hitler's plans of world enslavement, which include the aim of early military attempts on the soil of South America.

It was earnestly hoped that Argentina would at last join the camp of democratic world solidarity in the peoples' war of liberation by

becoming a member of the United Nations; that it would for its own security bring to power within its own country a democratic regime expressing the national will of Argentina. Such a development would have won for the new government of Argentina the full support of all people and nations who, engaged in the struggle for survival, consider unity for victory over the Axis as the prime test of all relations.

But to win this confidence the Ramirez Government still should see the necessity to erase the heritage of pro-Axis practices left by the Castillo government it replaced; and to oust from its borders the enemies of the peoples of all America, to break relations with the Axis, which has organized its fifth column in Latin America.

First among such steps which all true democrats demand is the immediate release of the imprisoned Argentine anti-fascist leader, Victorio Codovilla. American public opinion is outraged at reports that Codovilla is being held by the special police preparatory to deporta-

tion to certain death in Franco Spain. His immediate release will be a measure of the worth of the pledge of the Ramirez regime for establishment of a democratic government. All freedom-loving peoples will judge the new government in generous measure by the steps it may take to restore democratic rights of the people and the trade unions, and guarantee the functioning of all patriotic political parties loyal to Argentina, while suppressing the Nazi fifth column. World democracy will judge the new regime by whether or not it lifts the ban on the Communist Party of Argentina, loyal supporter of Argentina's patriotic cause and leader of the working class in struggle for unity against Nazi fascism.

The interests of all the American peoples require the completion of Hemispheric unity in alliance with the rest of the United Nations. It is on this basis and in full solidarity with the Argentine people that the National Committee of the C.P. U.S.A. makes this declaration on the recent events in Argentina.

RESOLUTION ON LUIS CARLOS PRESTES

TO President Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

The American people are eagerly awaiting the freedom of Luis Carlos Prestes, one of the outstanding

democrats and anti-fascists of the Americas. We urge his immediate release as a vital contribution to hemisphere and world anti-Axis unity.

GREETINGS TO DON PEDRO ALBIZU CAMPOS

THE meeting of the National Committee of the American Communist Party extends its heartfelt fraternal greetings to Brother

Don Pedro Albizu Campos and wishes him early recovery from his illness.

The people of Puerto Rico unani-

660 RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE PLENUM

mously demand the right of self-determination, which is one of the aims of this peoples' war. This they have demonstrated through the unanimous vote in the Legislature and in the broad People's Congress recently held in Puerto Rico.

Through Brothers Pedro Albizu Campos and Juan Antonio Corretjer, the leaders of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico, we pledge our full support to the Nationalist Party and to the complete unification of all the people of Puerto Rico and their various parties around the supreme task of achieving full nation-

hood. We will fulfill our pledge by rallying the people, and particularly the labor movement, of our country to Puerto Rican independence, as a necessary precondition to correct relations with all Latin America, and as an acid test of the Atlantic Charter.

Puerto Rico must and will be free!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Communist Party, U.S.A.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER,

Chairman.

EARL BROWDER,

General Secretary.

REPLY OF PEDRO ALBIZU CAMPOS

June 18, 1943

New York City

MR. EARL BROWDER, Secretary General, Communist Party of U.S.A., New York City.

My dear friend:

I deplore, due to my illness, not to be able to take you, personally, this reply to the moving message of greetings and fraternal wishes for my early recovery, adopted at the meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party of U.S.A., on June 14, 1943, attended by its leading members in this country.

In an unprecedented gesture of good will, characteristic of your valiant sincerity, you delivered the transcendental document to me, at my bedside. Personally, you are to me a brother of most comprehensive solidarity in the cause of the freedom of all peoples. Your presence means a profound joy, which is the privilege of those devoted to the

realization, in perfect understanding, of common aims for human good, attainable only by supreme sacrifice for the sake of posterity.

So far as my health is concerned, the fraternal wishes expressed in the Resolution and by you personally, I'm glad to say, have been already answered. I feel better and confident of an early recovery. Grateful as I remain for the concern of yourself and of the party in my welfare, I must say that my paramount interest has been focused on the pledge of the Communist Party of U.S.A., which reads as follows:

"Through Brothers Pedro Albizu Campos and Juan Antonio Corretjer, the leaders of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico, we pledge our full support to the Nationalist Party and to the complete unification of all the people of Puerto Rico and their various parties around the supreme task of achieving full nationhood. We will fulfill

our pledge by rallying the people, and particularly the labor movement of our country, to Puerto Rican independence, as a necessary precondition to correct relations with all Latin America, and as an acid test of the Atlantic Charter.

"Puerto Rico must and will be free!

"With the warmest greetings on behalf of our entire party and its leadership, I am

"Fraternally yours,
 "EARL BROWDER,
 "General Secretary."

There is a common task of demolition to be performed of worldwide imperialist slavery, national serfdom, peonage, chronic unemployment to impose involuntary servitude, degradation and death.

Puerto Rico has been fulfilling their historical duty to mankind and especially to the nations of the Western Hemisphere by facing squarely, under the most difficult odds, the attempts of United States imperialism to destroy their very existence as human beings and as a nation.

The issue plainly is whether, after the great wars for independence fought successfully against the European Empires, the curse of colonialism shall be reimposed by an American Power against another American nation.

The attempt has failed and the signs of the times give ground for a reasonable optimism for a peaceful withdrawal of the armed forces of the United States from our national territory with recognition and respect of the complete independence

of Puerto Rico. The New World, which is destined to be the great haven of mankind, will enter its era of freedom for all humanity.

The solidarity of the Communist Party of U.S.A. at this particular crucial moment is the first effective organic expression in this country of the revulsion against an intolerable situation. I hereby make formal recognition of that fact, pledging to you and to the Communist Party of U.S.A. our national and personal gratitude.

The Secretary General of the Nationalist Party, Don Juan Antonio Corretjer, will hold in the archives of the nation the document you nobly placed in my hands, as a certain hope of the realization of the dream of the generations who laid down their lives for the independence of the Americas: No slavery within the nations of the New World; no imperialism over any nation of this Hemisphere, from within or from without; the Americas open to all Humanity.

May I reiterate my gratitude to the entire Communist Party of U.S.A., to its stalwart leadership, especially to you and to Mr. Foster, its Chairman.

I look forward to the privilege of meeting men and women to whom sacrifice and valor constitute not a norm but life itself.

Don Juan Antonio Corretjer, the Secretary General, will deliver to you this letter.

Fraternally yours,

(Signed)

PEDRO ALBIZU CAMPOS.

THE ANGLO-SOVIET TREATY OF ALLIANCE *

THE conclusion of an Allied treaty marked a historic turn in the relations between the U.S.S.R. and Britain. It was an event of great international significance for all the freedom-loving peoples that are taking part in the struggle against Hitler Germany.

Soon thereafter, in June, 1942, during Molotov's visit to the United States, an agreement was concluded between the U.S.S.R. and the United States which is a valuable complement to the Anglo-Soviet Treaty and bound with it by unity of purpose.

World public opinion justly estimated the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Allied Treaty and the Soviet-American agreement as events signifying the strengthening of the fighting alliance of the freedom-loving peoples.

The past year was a year of stubborn and severe struggle against predatory German imperialism, a year of grave trials and glorious victories for the freedom-loving peoples. And shining in the crown of these victories will forever be the unfading star of that great battle at the walls of Stalingrad, a symbol of the selflessness and heroism and of the high military skill of the Red Army; and of the

genius of its generalship and of its leader, Stalin.

This was a year of convulsive efforts by the Hitler brigands to realize their vile aims by force of arms and by weapons of deception, on the fields of battle and in the dark jungles of provocation and blackmail. All these attempts met with disgraceful collapse.

During the past year the fighting alliance of the freedom-loving peoples, led by the great democratic powers, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States, withstood a serious historic test in the fire of greatest battles. The hopes of the Hitlerite gamblers on the disintegration and weakening of the fighting alliance of the freedom-loving peoples have completely failed.

In his report of November 6, 1942, Stalin showed that the entire historical situation, which created the direct threat of the destruction and enslavement of the freedom-loving peoples by predatory Hitlerite imperialism, "imperatively indicated the necessity of joint action among the members of the coalition in order to save mankind from reversion to savagery and medieval brutality."

Stalin then formulated a program of action of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition which met with the widest response, support and approval of all the Soviet people

* Editorial in *Pravda*, May 27, 1942.

as well as of the people of Great Britain, the United States and all freedom-loving peoples. The subsequent course of events confirmed Stalin's words.

During the winter offensive of 1942-43 on the Soviet-German front the Red Army inflicted serious defeats upon the Hitler troops, destroying a tremendous number of men and vast quantities of equipment, liquidating two enemy armies at Stalingrad, taking prisoner more than 300,000 enemy soldiers and officers, and liberating hundreds of Soviet towns and thousands of villages from the German yoke. This was a staggering, crushing blow at the Hitler war machine which never before had suffered such a severe defeat.

Simultaneously the Allies developed successful operations in Libya and Tripolitania. During the winter the victorious troops of our Allies smashed the Italo-German troops in North Africa and destroyed them in Tunisia. The Germans tasted devastating blows from the valiant Anglo-American air forces, struck in the war industry centers of Germany and Italy and heralding the opening of a second front in Europe against the Italo-German fascists.

"Thus for the first time since the war began the blow struck at the enemy from the east by the Red Army merged with the blow from the west delivered by the troops of our Allies into a single common blow," stated Stalin in his May First Order of the Day.

This united, common blow at the

Hitler war machine echoed in the hearts of the freedom-loving peoples as a harbinger of victory over the Hitlerite beast and awakened hope for salvation among the millions of people under the yoke of the German invaders; it rang the deathknell for the fascist scoundrels.

The Hitlerite gamblers began to howl about a war crisis. The crises in the fascist camp were expressed in the desperate maneuvers of the Hitlerite veteran provocateurs calculated on deceiving the freedom-loving peoples fighting for their country, honor and freedom.

Sensing the approach of coming disaster the German fascists are more and more often talking about peace, hoping that someone will fall for this bait. The provocative overtures of the Hitlerites arouse the contempt of all the freedom-loving peoples in all the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition. The members of the anti-Hitler coalition are unanimous in their agreement that only the complete rout of the Hitler armies and the unconditional surrender of Hitler Germany can lead Europe to peace.

The freedom-loving peoples are faced with the task not only of winning the war, but also of winning the peace. Post-war problems arouse legitimate interest among the broad masses. For the second time in the life of one generation German imperialism has plunged the world into an abyss of bloody, devastating war. The peoples are filled with the determination not only to pursue the war to complete victory over the common enemy, but also to ensure such post-war

organization of the world which would preclude the possibility of a repetition of bloody aggression.

In this post-war organization a noble and honorable mission will fall to the lot of the great freedom-loving powers at the head of the anti-Hitler coalition, and primarily to the lot of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States.

The Anglo-Soviet Treaty of May 26, 1942, determined our line of action jointly with Great Britain also for the post-war period.

But this treaty is undoubtedly called upon to play an exceptional role—as has already been proven by the first year of its operation—not only in the development of Anglo-Soviet relations. As emphasized by Molotov in his report to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on June 18, 1942, this treaty is of great political significance for the further development of international relations in Europe in their entirety. This agreement is one of the most important instruments insuring a just post-war organization of the world.

But the problem of a just organization of post-war Europe is not only impossible to solve but even to put on the order of the day without first crushing Hitler tyranny, without the defeat and destruction of predatory Hitlerite imperialism, which imposed the shameful yoke of German fascist slavery on the millions of enslaved people groaning under the weight of the Hitler occupation.

The successful solution of post-war problems, their solution in the interests of all progressive mankind

and in the interests of security and of a lasting, just peace, is possible only on condition of the complete rout of the Hitler armies and the unconditional surrender of the German-Italian coalition. Only when the Hitler state, which is the principal means of the realization of Hitlerite tyranny, is completely routed and destroyed can there be the confidence that the freedom-loving peoples will not once again fall prey to the German invaders. An important step on the way to the successful solution of this problem is the treaty of May 26, 1942.

Ahead lie decisive battles against the predatory Hitler hordes. These battles will demand no mean sacrifices, privations and blood. It is necessary to mobilize all forces and possibilities to smash the enemy and thus pave the way to peace.

Tremendous endurance and iron fortitude will be demanded of the people of the Soviet Union and of the Red Army, as well as of our Allies and their armies. The struggle ahead is grim and hard. The members of the anti-Hitler coalition are going forward to these battles with unbending determination and unwavering confidence in victory. They have the initiative in their hands. Their might is growing daily.

New and trenchant blows being prepared will place brigandish Germany between two fires. We are confident and we know, as Stalin said, that "the time is approaching when the Red Army in conjunction with the armies of our Allies will break the back of the fascist beast!"

ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOVIET-AMERICAN AGREEMENT *

SOVIET-AMERICAN friendship corresponds to the historical traditions of the two great people, who have a mutual sympathy and respect for each other. The Soviet people highly appreciate American efficiency which, as Stalin put it, is that invincible force which recognizes no barriers, the efficient persistence of which sweeps away all and every obstacle, which invariably finishes that which has been started.

It is precisely these characteristics of American efficiency combined with high patriotism, the example of which the Soviet people and their Red Army are daily displaying to the whole world, that are needed more than ever in the present war of the freedom-loving peoples headed by the U.S.S.R., England and the United States against Hitlerite Germany.

The American people, like all the other freedom-loving nations, cannot but realize the mortal danger to their freedom and life represented by bloody Hitlerite fascism, which strives to dominate the world. Under the conditions of present-day development of military technique even such a natural barrier like the Atlantic Ocean is not an insurmountable barrier for the arro-

gant adventurists who are not deterred by the most monstrous crimes.

And if the thunder of the war is at present far from American territory, this is thanks to the fact that the Hitlerite war machine, after crushing France, was unable to score a success in the struggle against England, and in eastern Europe encountered the heroic presistance of the Red Army and the Soviet people.

Not only has the notorious myth about the invincibility of the German army been scattered to the four winds in the fighting on the Soviet-German Front; not only has the Hitlerite program of "Blitzkrieg" been frustrated, but also the necessary prerequisites for the utter destruction of the armed forces of Hitlerite Germany and its vassals have been created.

For two years the Soviet people and their Red Army have been bearing the brunt of this war, the violence and scope of which are unparalleled in history. In these two years the British Empire has strengthened its navy and formed a land army and powerful air force, formidable for the enemy. The United States of America has formed an army of many millions provided with all types of arms and supplied

* Editorial in *Pravda*, June 11, 1943.

with all types of modern fighting equipment.

During the last year a considerable part of American troops crossed the Atlantic and are stationed at initial positions to assault Hitler's notorious "European fortress." Shoulder to shoulder with English and French troops the American soldiers and officers successfully carried out the campaign in North Africa which ended in utter defeat and destruction of the Italo-German troops. American aircraft jointly with the R.A.F. has inflicted and continues to inflict hammer blows at the military and industrial objectives of Germany and Italy.

Having received their baptism of fire the American troops have already passed through their training in preparation for the battles in which the backbone of the German fascist beast must be broken.

The Americans used the time placed at their disposal, thanks to the self-sacrificing resistance offered by the Soviet Union, to develop the production of all types of arms and ammunition at a tempo unprecedented in history. The output of military equipment in England as well as throughout the British Empire has considerably increased. The Soviet Union, for its part, has successfully coped with the task of developing its war industries under incredibly difficult conditions of war against a perfidious and cunning enemy.

The Soviet people, displaying great self-sacrifice and organization and ability, transferred their war industry to the east and expanded the production of arms and muni-

tions on a scale corresponding to the gigantic scale of the military operations of the Red Army.

No matter how many million foreign slaves Hitler drives into Germany's war plants, no matter what brutal measures he resorts to in order to force the industry of the occupied countries of Europe to work for the German war machine, Germany cannot win the contest with the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition in the sphere of war production.

In keeping with the Soviet-American agreement and within the framework of the Lend-Lease Bill, the United States is rendering military and economic assistance to the Soviet Union in the struggle against Hitlerite Germany. The Soviet people are well aware of the supplies, arms, provisions and other materials arriving in the U.S.S.R. from the great overseas republic. The Soviet people not only know of these supplies but highly appreciate the support given by the American people as one of the expressions of fighting collaboration in the mortal struggle against the common enemy.

But it should never be forgotten that if in peacetime technique is dead without the people it is incomparably more so in conditions of war. The fate of war is decided by men able to apply military technique, who know the art of warfare against the enemy, who courageously and boldly face danger and death.

The Soviet army, steeled in the fierce and bitter battles that have been in progress these past two

years, possesses these qualities to a high degree. Examples of such high military qualities were displayed also by the armies of our Allies which routed the Italian and German troops in North Africa and which by their victory prepared the conditions for further successful blows at our common enemy.

The unity and mutual understanding between the participants in the anti-Hitlerite coalition have been greatly strengthened in the course of the common struggle against Hitlerite Germany. This unity is based on understanding the need of strengthening the common efforts of the freedom-loving people for the struggle against the Hitlerite war machine, already shaken to its foun-

ation but still strong and dangerous.

Hitler is now trying at all costs to gain time in preparation for new desperate military and diplomatic adventures. To upset these calculations of Hitler, to prevent him from healing the wounds inflicted by the first Allied blow struck from east and west, to organize a powerful common onslaught of Soviet, American and British armed forces against the German fascist enslavers, and thus deliver the oppressed people from the fascist yoke—to do this means to hasten the desired day of victory, the day of return to peaceful, creative labor for the well-being of mankind.

HISTORIC DOCUMENTS

PROPOSAL OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL FOR THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

THE historical role of the Communist International, organized in 1919 as the result of the political collapse of the overwhelming majority of the old pre-war workers' parties, consisted in that it preserved the teachings of Marxism from vulgarization and distortion by opportunist elements of the labor movement. In a number of countries it helped to unite the vanguard of the advanced workers into genuine workers' parties, and it helped them to mobilize the mass of toilers in defense of their economic and political interests for struggle against fascism and war, which fascism had been preparing, and for the support of the Soviet Union as the main bulwark against fascism.

The Communist International revealed in good time the true significance of the "Anti-Comintern Pact" as a weapon in the war preparations of the Hitlerites. Long prior to the war the Communist International tirelessly exposed the base, undermining activities of the Hitlerites in foreign states, who masked these with outcries about alleged interference of the Communist International in the internal affairs of these states.

But long before the war it had already become increasingly clear that to the extent that the internal as well as the international situation of individual countries became more complicated, the solution of the problems of the labor movement of each individual country through the medium of some international center would meet with insuperable obstacles.

The deep difference in the historical roads of development of each country of the world; the diverse character and even the contradiction in their social orders; the difference in level and rate of their social and political development, and finally, the difference in the degree of consciousness and organization of the workers, conditioned also the various problems which face the working class of each individual country.

The entire course of events for the past quarter of a century, as well as the accumulated experiences of the Communist International, have convincingly proven that the organizational form for uniting the workers as chosen by the First Congress of the Communist International, and which corresponded to the needs of the initial period of

the rebirth of the labor movement, more and more outlived itself in proportion to the growth of this movement and to the increasing complexity of problems in each country; and that this form even became a hindrance to the further strengthening of the national workers' parties.

The world war unleashed by the Hitlerites still further sharpened the differences in the conditions in various countries, showing the deep line of demarcation between the countries which became the bearers of Hitlerite tyranny and the freedom-loving peoples united in the mighty anti-Hitler coalition.

Whereas in the countries of the Hitlerite bloc the basic task of the workers, toilers and all honest people is to contribute in every conceivable way toward the defeat of this bloc by undermining the Hitlerite war machine from within and by helping to overthrow the governments responsible for the war, in countries of the anti-Hitler coalition the sacred duty of the broadest masses of the people and first and foremost of the progressive workers is to support in every way the war efforts of the governments in these countries for the sake of the speediest destruction of the Hitlerite bloc and to secure friendly collaboration between nations on the basis of their equal rights.

At the same time it must not be overlooked that the individual countries which adhere to the anti-Hitler coalition also have their specific tasks. Thus, for instance, in countries occupied by Hitlerites and which have lost their state inde-

pendence, the basic task of progressive workers and broad masses of people is to develop the armed struggle which is growing into a national war of liberation against Hitlerite Germany.

At the same time, the war of liberation of the freedom-loving peoples against Hitlerite tyranny, which set into motion the broadest masses of people who are uniting in the ranks of the mighty anti-Hitler coalition irrespective of party or religion, made it still more evident that the national upsurge and mobilization of the masses for speediest victory over the enemy can best and most fruitfully be supplied by the vanguard of the labor movement of each country within the framework of its state.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International, held in 1935, taking into consideration the changes which had come to pass in the international situation as well as in the labor movement—changes which demanded greater flexibility and independence of its sections in solving the problems facing them—already then emphasized the need for the Executive Committee of the Communist International, when deciding upon all the problems of the labor movement, “to proceed in deciding any question from the concrete situation and specific conditions obtaining in each particular country and as a rule to avoid direct intervention in internal organizational matters of the Communist Party.”

The Executive Committee of the Communist International was guided by these same considerations

when it took note of and approved the decision of the Communist Party of the United States of America in November, 1940, to leave the ranks of the Communist International.

Communists, guided by the teachings of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, have never advocated the preservation of those organizational forms which have become obsolete. They have always subordinated the organizational forms of the labor movement and its methods of work to the basic political interests of the labor movement as a whole, to the peculiarities of given concrete historical conditions, and to those problems which arise directly from these conditions.

They remember the example of the great Marx who united the progressive workers into the ranks of the International Workingmen's Association. And after the First International had fulfilled its historical task, having laid the basis for the development of workers' parties in the countries of Europe and America, Marx, as a result of the growing need to create national workers' mass parties, brought about the dissolution of the First International, inasmuch as this form of organization no longer corresponded to this need.

Proceeding from the above-stated considerations, and taking into account the growth and political maturity of the Communist Parties and their leading cadres in the individual countries, and also in view of the fact that during the present war a number of sections have raised

the question of the dissolution of the Communist International as the guiding center of the international labor movement, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, unable owing to the conditions of world war to convene a congress of the Communist International, permits itself to submit for approval by the sections of the Communist International the following proposal:

To dissolve the Communist International as the guiding center of the international labor movement, releasing the sections of the Communist International from obligations ensuing from the constitution and decisions of the congresses of the Communist International.

The Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International calls upon all adherents of the Communist International to concentrate their forces on all-round support and active participation in the liberation war of the peoples and states of the anti-Hitler Coalition in order to hasten the destruction of the mortal enemy of the working people—German fascism and its allies and vassals.

Signed by the members of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International: Gottwald, Dimitroff, Zhdanov, Kolarov, Kopenig, Kuusinen, Manuilsky, Marty, Pieck, Thorez, Florin, Ercoli.

This resolution was endorsed by representatives of the following parties: Bianco (Italy), Dolores Ibarruri (Spain), Lehtinen (Finland), Pauker (Rumania), Rakosi (Hungary).
May 15, 1943.

THE LETTER OF JOSEPH STALIN TO HAROLD KING, REUTER
CORRESPONDENT, IN REPLY TO A QUESTION WITH REFERENCE
TO THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

DEAR Mr. King:
I have received your request to answer a question referring to the dissolution of the Communist International. I am sending you my answer.

Question: "The British comment on the decision to wind up the Comintern has been very favorable. What is the Soviet view of this matter and of its bearing on future international relations?"

Answer: The dissolution of the Communist International is proper and timely because it facilitates the organization of the common onslaught of all freedom-loving nations against the common enemy—Hitlerism.

The dissolution of the Communist International is proper because:

A. It exposes the lie of the Hitlerites to the effect that "Moscow" allegedly intends to intervene in the life of other nations and to "Bolshevize" them. An end is now being put to this lie.

B. It exposes the calumny of the adversaries of Communism within the labor movement to the effect that the Communist Parties in the various countries are allegedly acting not in the interest of their people but on orders from the outside. An end is now being put to this calumny too.

C. It facilitates the work of the patriots in the freedom-loving countries for uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries, regardless of party or religious faith, into a single camp of national liberation—for unfolding the struggle against fascism.

D. It facilitates the work of the patriots of all countries for uniting all the freedom-loving peoples into a single international camp for the fight against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism, thus clearing the way to the future organization of the companionship of nations based upon their equality.

I think that all these circumstances taken together will result in the further strengthening of the united front of the allies and other United Nations in their fight for victory over Hitlerite tyranny.

I feel that the dissolution of the Communist International is perfectly timely because it is exactly now, when the fascist beast is exerting its last strength, that it is necessary to organize the common onslaught of the freedom-loving countries to finish off this beast and to deliver the peoples from fascist oppression.

With respect,

Signed, J. STALIN.

May 28, 1943.

THE STATEMENT OF GEORGI DIMITROFF, IN BEHALF OF THE PRESIDIUM OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, ON THE APPROVAL BY THE COMINTERN SECTIONS OF THE PROPOSAL TO DISSOLVE THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

AT ITS last meeting on June 8, 1943, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International considered the resolutions received from its affiliated sections with regard to the decision of May 15, 1943, proposing the dissolution of the Communist International, and established:

1. That the proposal to dissolve the Communist International has been approved by the Communist Party of Argentina, the Communist Party of Australia, the Communist Party of Austria, the Communist Party of Belgium, the Communist Party of Bulgaria, the Communist Party of Canada, the United Socialist Party of Catalonia, the Communist Party of Chile, the Communist Party of China, the Communist Party of Colombia, the Revolutionary Communist Union of Cuba, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of Finland, the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Germany, the Communist Party of Great Britain, the Communist Party of Hungary, the Communist Party of Ireland, the Communist Party of Italy, the Communist Party of Mexico, the Workers' Party of Poland, the Communist Party of Rumania, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), the Communist Party of Spain, the Communist Party of Sweden, the Communist Party of Switzerland, the Communist Party of Syria, the Communist Party of the Union

of South Africa, the Communist Party of Uruguay, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and the Young Communist International (affiliated to the Communist International as one of its sections).

2. That not one of the existing sections of the Communist International raised any objections to the proposal of the Presidium of the Executive Committee.

In view of the above-mentioned, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International hereby declares:

1. That the proposal to dissolve the Communist International has been unanimously approved by all of its existing sections (including the most important ones) which were in a position to make their decisions known.

2. That it considers the Executive Committee of the Communist International, the Presidium and Secretariat of the Executive Committee, as well as the International Control Commission dissolved as of June 10, 1943.

3. It instructs the committee composed of Dimitroff (chairman), M. Ercoli, Dmitri Manuilsky and Wilhelm Pieck to wind up the affairs, dissolve the organs and dispose of the staff and property of the Communist International.

(Signed) G. DIMITROFF

On behalf of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. *June 10, 1943.*

Two New "International" Books

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA

By R. PALME DUTT

The long-awaited book by Britain's distinguished Marxist, generally regarded as the most authoritative and comprehensive study of India today. The author, for over twenty years the editor of the *British Labor Monthly*, has cabled a new introduction for the American edition, clarifying the problem of Hindu-Moslem unity in the light of India's struggle for national unity and independence in the interests of victory over the Axis.

Price \$1.50

LABOR AND THE WAR

Prepared by Labor Research Association

A handbook on labor problems in connection with the war, containing a veritable arsenal of valuable information on production and conditions in the basic war industries, manpower problems, war economy, the various war boards and commissions, trade union organizations, labor relations and labor legislation, international labor unity, etc. Prepared as the sixth volume in the *Labor Fact Book* series, it is indexed for handy reference.

Price \$1.25

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

"In this great conflict against the Axis, there are fundamental philosophic issues at stake. Indeed, all our ethical values are involved in the outcome. Dr. Selsam's book is a notable contribution to the understanding, the philosophic understanding, of both ourselves and our allies. It is the most complete and careful treatment of socialism and ethics that has been written by anyone at any time."—CORLISS LAMONT.

SOCIALISM AND ETHICS

By Dr. Howard Selsam

What is ethics? From what do men derive their judgments of right and wrong, good and evil? Is ethics concerned primarily with individual virtue or with economic, social and political institutions? How can capitalism and socialism be morally evaluated—democracy and fascism? Are there eternal moral questions? What is the true relation of the individual to society? What is freedom, what is progress? What is the role of the working class in the determination and achievement of freedom and progress? How should one morally evaluate national unity in the war of the United Nations against the Axis?

In this new book, just published, the author of **What Is Philosophy?** examines capitalist society in its historical development and in its present form and shows how and why Marxian socialism conforms with and embraces the highest moral ideals of the ages.

Socialism and Ethics is a fundamental contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory in a field long neglected. It is a book that belongs in every Marxist library.

224 Pages. Price \$1.90

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.