
FOR CONCERTED ACTION AGAINST ISOLATION AND WAR! *

BY FRED BROWN

OUR struggle for peace is a long-range struggle. It involves the issue whether our policy will be victorious, the policy of the truly progressive forces the world over, or the policy of the fascists, of the reactionaries. It is a struggle that involves the future of the world.

The struggle for peace aims at stopping the fascist aggressors, to bring peace and maintain peace. In short, it is a struggle that aims to inflict the first deadly blow to fascism and prepare the ground for a happier future for humanity, through the maintenance and extension of democracy.

The possibilities of victory are great. We fully agree with President Roosevelt that 90 per cent of the people of the earth are for peace, which is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 per cent. The problem of the hour is how to mobilize the 90 per cent to stop Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists; how to mobilize the peace-loving masses to exercise such pressure upon their governments as will move them forward quickly and with determination to undertake con-

certed action against the war-makers, against the triple alliance of the fascist, anti-democratic bloc, which not only aims to attack the greatest democracy of the world—the Soviet Union—but the bourgeois-democratic countries as well. The problem of the hour is to bring about concerted action by the peace-loving nations, demanding the withdrawal of the invading armed forces of the war-makers, the stoppage of all supplies to the aggressors, and the enforcement of a substantial measure of disarmament that will put the aggressors on the spot.

There is no doubt that concerted action of the United States, France and Great Britain, plus the Soviet Union on the question of peace, would bring into line all governments of the non-fascist countries, would rally at once the peace-loving people of the world to exercise the most powerful pressure on the aggressors, and would encourage the forces of democracy in the fascist countries itself. Such concerted action would soon bring the aggressors to a stop, would end the attack against Spanish democracy, and against the Chinese people, would stop the wars going on and prevent the engulfing of the world

* Report made at the Plenary Session of the Central Committee, C.P.U.S.A., and National Party Builders Congress, held in New York, February 18-21, 1938. (Condensed text.)

into a new slaughter. But while the aggressors are moving quickly, desperately, we find the bourgeois democratic countries still divided, still maintaining a "neutral" position toward the democratic government of Spain, a position which helps the aggressors; still divided in relation to events in China.

CONTRADICTORY TRENDS AMONG THE BOURGEOISIE

While, on one hand, forces are at work to bring about an understanding between the non-fascist nations, other forces in the bourgeois-democratic camp are neutralizing the efforts for united action. A large current within the bourgeoisie, in fear that concerted action of the 90 per cent of the peace-loving people will be accompanied by a desire for more democracy, is testing the ground, measuring the forces of bourgeois democracy, to see if there is not a way out, by isolating the Soviet Union, by checking the mass peace movement of labor. This explains the barrage of attacks against the Soviet Union and against our Party in the bourgeois press, as well as the important role that the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites-Lovestoneites are playing as direct agents of reaction.

The bourgeoisie is taking up the allegation of the renegades that concerted action by the peace-loving people of the world, by the democratic countries, means to play Stalin's politics—the politics of the Soviet Union. For us it is clear that we cannot expect concerted action by the bourgeois-democratic governments, that we cannot expect the United States government to put into force the line of

Roosevelt's Chicago speech, unless the peace-loving masses and especially labor, will take such a stand and give such support to the line of concerted action, to the struggle for collective security, that the bourgeois-democratic governments will be forced to act. In regard to the United States, it is the task of the peace-loving masses to make of this country the standard bearer among the nations in this crusade. Here we see at once the determining role that we must play as the driving force for the mobilization of labor, of the widest masses, as the only guarantee that concerted action will be put into effect.

At this point it is necessary to stress that the whole question of American foreign policy today depends basically on the stand of the labor movement in the country. It is the labor movement that at this particular moment, by not having as yet taken a clear stand in support of Roosevelt's peace policy, is still holding back the whole peace movement, thus preventing a rapid orientation of the peace-loving masses toward collective security as the only means to keep America at peace. This makes the isolationist forces in the administration itself bolder in their opposition to Roosevelt's declaration in behalf of quarantining the aggressors.

There is no doubt that the American people have become politically more mature. Today the vast majority, in one form or another, are not only in the anti-fascist camp, against the fascist aggressors, but are definitely for peace. This is proven by the position taken on fascism by the trade unions, by peace organizations, women's organizations, by the Federation of

Protestant Churches, and even by the position of Catholic groups in relation to the persecution of the Catholic Church in Germany. This broad peace movement, however, is not yet homogeneous. The overwhelming majority of the American people are for peace, yet the largest part takes the isolation "neutrality" position as the means to maintain peace.

It is a position that, despite their intention, plays into the hands of the monopolistic forces at home and into the hands of the aggressors. A minority of the broad peace movement—a minority that is growing from day to day—understands the relation of the United States to the world situation from an economic and political point of view. This minority is becoming more and more conscious of the fascist danger. It understands that it is not sufficient to be against fascism in a platonic way, that fascism threatens a new world slaughter, that fascism is becoming a growing danger at home, that in stopping the aggressor lies the key to the problem of the preservation of democracy, that the only way to keep America out of war is to keep war out of the world.

THE ROLE OF THE PROGRESSIVE FORCES

What is the role of the progressive forces in this situation? Specifically, what is the role of the labor movement? Here we witness a most glaring contradiction: A labor movement that goes on record against fascism, and even for the boycott of Japanese goods, that understands how fascism abroad is a stimulus for the crystallization of the reactionary forces at home, for the development of fascism in our own country, but yet supports

the policy of "neutrality," of isolation, which plays directly into the hands of the aggressors, and prevents the position taken by Roosevelt in his Chicago speech from becoming the operative policy of the administration.

How can we explain such a contradictory position? It is due, first, to the fact that the labor movement traditionally deals to a minimum degree with broad international questions. While the trade union masses are, for example, greatly interested in the events of Spain and China, even the most progressive trade unions have not yet become a forum for discussions that would have broadened the outlook of the organized millions towards world events.

Because of this, we find that the false theories of the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites-Lovestoneites, and the pseudo-Socialist contentions of Norman Thomas, filter into the ranks of labor and exercise a certain influence in holding back clarification on such vital issues. Furthermore, the leadership of the trade union movement, including the leaders of the progressive section, are not yet ideologically prepared to give leadership on the front of international politics to the same degree that they are giving leadership on other vital issues confronting the movement. Here we see immediately the big responsibilities that lie before us.

It is we Communists that must raise in the trade union movement, C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions, the question of peace in the light of collective security. This is essential not only to make of the labor movement the driving force in this struggle, but for the preservation of the trade union move-

ment itself, because on the successful struggle against reaction, against war-breeding fascism, depends the security of the trade union movement and its future.

If we should fail to win the masses for the correct position that labor must take on the question of peace, we would face the danger that the gains made on the other fronts would be lost.

Wherever our forces have raised the question of collective security boldly, without hesitation, proving conclusively that the peace of America is connected intimately with peace on a world scale, the reaction of the masses was most favorable. This proves that the weakness of our position in the trade union field on the issue of peace is not due to lack of understanding of the working class as to its own interests, but mainly to the fact that we have not yet undertaken an offensive fight, that we have not demonstrated to the masses that collective security is the real road to peace.

Wherever our forces are active in the trade unions and other mass organizations, we have to prove conclusively that those forces which advocate isolationism, that advocate the Ludlow amendment, that oppose collective security, are playing directly into the hands of the aggressive powers—Japan, Italy, Germany. This is our main political task today.

There is no doubt that if our forces had a clearer understanding of the problem and were on the alert, the hundreds of thousands of organized automobile workers would not have tolerated the resolution adopted by the Executive Board of the Auto Workers Union, a resolution that calls

for the removal of the armed forces from China, that endorses the Ludlow amendment and a general policy of isolation. This resolution condemns Japanese aggression and endorses the boycott of Japanese goods. But what does a condemnation of Japanese aggression mean, if it is coupled with an effort to prevent any action of the United States government aiming to bring about concerted action of the democratic countries, which is the only way of stopping the aggressors; when the resolution is an open attack even against Roosevelt's hesitant way of playing the role of a restraining factor on Japanese aggression? The insertion of a condemnation of Japan does not change the substance and effect of the resolution. It is a resolution that could be applauded by the Japanese militarists. When we consider who is behind the resolution, that Lovestone had his hand in the pie, it is not difficult to understand the motives that guided the drafting of such a document. The few phrases against fascism do not in the least hinder Japan from continuing its aggressive war against the Chinese people.

THE STAND OF THE U.M.W.A.

On the other hand, the resolution voted by the United Mine Workers' Convention is of a different character. Not only did it condemn fascism as the aggressor, and go on record for the boycott of Japanese goods, but, what is more important, it did not endorse the Ludlow amendment, it did not endorse the policy of isolation. What is the conclusion of the resolution voted by the miners? It reads:

"It is the expression of this convention

that the foreign policy of the United States shall not be formulated or made dependent upon the protection of the vested or property interests in foreign countries, of the large corporations in this country. But rather such foreign policy should express the whole-hearted desire of the American people for the greatest assurance of international peace."

Such a "resolve" is contained also in the resolution voted at the steel convention, as well as in the resolution of the Executive Board of the Auto Workers Union. The significant thing to note, however, is that in the resolution of the United Mine Workers' Convention, the same conclusion follows altogether different considerations. It is in this respect that the resolution of the miners, while not yet coming forward explicitly for collective security, is a step forward in the direction of concerted action. The Martin resolution, however, endorses the Ludlow amendment and a policy of isolation. The same final "resolve" in the latter resolution means to demand from the United States government a foreign policy in line with the isolationist position. In the resolution of the miners, on the contrary, because it does not endorse the Ludlow amendment, does not go on record for isolation, condemns fascism as the aggressor, endorses the boycott as a means of castigating the aggressors, the "resolve" must be understood as an appeal for a foreign policy that shall express the overwhelming desire of the American people for the greatest assurance of international peace. Certainly this resolution would have been improved if it had stated that only by concerted action of the anti-aggressor forces international peace could be maintained. It does not state

this as yet, but is clearly moving in this direction.

Here we have a resolution that opens the way in the whole labor movement for a positive attack against isolation, against the whole conception that America can remain aloof from world events, that there is no distinction between the fascist aggressor powers and the bourgeois-democratic nations like the United States.

We will be successful in rallying the masses in the trade unions, the women's organizations, the youth, the Negro people, the national groups, to the extent that we will expose the various currents of isolationism, to the extent that the progressive forces of the country will be armed with the arguments that will convince the majority of the American people that the policy of collective security is the only correct peace policy.

FORCES HINDERING THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Which are the various forces that try to keep back the true struggle for peace, that hide their counter-revolutionary content with peace phrases, "Left" phrases, but objectively or directly help the reactionary forces, the aggressors?

1. Those forces of monopoly capital which are backing the Japanese invasion of China and which favor a bigger navy, for jingoistic purposes, and aim at a deal with Japan later on, on the basis of their superior strength as compared with the strength of Japanese capitalism. These forces cover their ultra-reactionary aim by spreading the Japanese imperialist theories of over-population and of the necessity of bringing order into

China's chaos. These ultra-reactionary theories are smuggled under the cloak of an appeal for neutrality, for the purpose of gaining mass support.

2. The forces that follow the lead of the British foreign office and support neutrality, aiming at a compromise with the fascists.

3. The confused liberals and other pacifists who, while shouting against fascism, are, at the same time, boosting neutrality, who ignore completely the inner-relation in capitalist society, conceive the United States as in a vacuum, and forget just a little thing—the existence of an interdependence of the modern world, both technically and morally, which makes it impossible for any nation completely to isolate itself.

4. The counter-revolutionary Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, who block the fight against fascism, who want to bring about a revolution, not in Germany, not in the Franco territory of Spain, but a "revolution" (read counter-revolution), in the broadest democracy of the world—in the Soviet Union, and in democratic Spain. These forces are in the camp of counter-revolution, selling their counter-revolutionary theories under the cloak of "Left" phrases for the best use of the reactionary press, to boost isolation, and so supporting the invasions of the fascist aggressors.

5. The few Socialists, like Norman Thomas, that swing as a pendulum in between all currents and, faithful to their "super-objectivity," objectively and subjectively become mouth-pieces of Trotskyite counter-revolutionary theories.

Let us examine a little further these five currents and see their inter-

dependence, and what the answers are to their arguments.

Why are the reactionary forces for neutrality as against Roosevelt's policy, why do they borrow the Japanese argument of bringing modern civilization into China? The answer is simple. The reactionary forces that support Japan are the same forces that borrow fascist theories from Nazi Germany and fascist Italy, the same forces that strive to bring about fascism in the United States. At the moment when the overwhelming majority of the American people are for peace and against fascism, how could these forces come out openly in support of Japanese aggression? Japanese aggression—the war in China—is supported by them through this hypocritical neutrality, which gives an open hand to the aggressors.

There is no doubt that the main fire must be opened against these enemies of the toiling people; these merchants of death driving toward a world conflagration. In this respect our struggle for peace must be closely connected with the struggle for the immediate demands of the masses at home, which will help in defeating reaction and broaden out the democratic front of the masses.

The second current in the Tory camp is typified by the policies of Landon, Knox, and other reactionaries which find expression in *The New York Times*. It is the policy of "parallel action" as against the policy of collective security, the policy that aims at parallel action with Great Britain under the present Tory government, that ignores France, the Soviet Union and other democratic countries. This policy is motivated by

fear of the Soviet Union, of the growing democracy in Spain, of the People's Front in France, and of a China fighting for independence. It is a policy that has in view agreements, compromises with the fascist nations, aiming to divert the attacks of the fascist nations in the direction of the Soviet Union. As we see, both these Tory currents are bitter enemies of collective security.

The third category is no less dangerous. Their arguments, seasoned by all kinds of "scientific" expressions, are in their "liberal" way as dangerous as the arguments of the reactionaries.

THE "LIBERAL" ISOLATIONISTS

This type of "liberal" is today symbolized by Professor Charles A. Beard, who lately has become the spokesman of isolationism among the confused liberals in America. What is the position of Professor Beard—in his reply in the *New Republic* to Comrade Browder's article on collective security? Professor Beard, who has, from a liberal point of view, analyzed the causes and forces which have brought about the development of present society in the United States, all at once forgets even his analytical historical method. For Professor Beard there is no difference between bourgeois-democratic countries and fascist countries. More than that, his heart is even bleeding for Japan, Italy and Germany because they have no access to the markets and raw materials of the "haves."

Furthermore, since he is completely unaware of the role that British, French and American labor can play in the struggle for peace and democracy, it is understandable

why he comes to the conclusion that the probabilities of the outcome of a conflict between the bourgeois-democratic countries and the aggressors would be universal fascism rather than universal democracy.

What does Beard propose to stop the aggressive wars going on and to prevent the expansion of these wars? Seemingly he proposes nothing. In reality, his conclusion is, give the pocketbook to the thief to avoid a struggle. Seemingly, the sentiments that lead this type of liberal are very human ones. They want to keep clear of bloodshed. In reality, however, they are contributing to the preparation of the next world slaughter. They allow the slaughter to go on in China and in Spain, and their arguments help to disarm the masses at home.

In regard to the fourth current, it is not necessary to argue on their counter-revolutionary position and counter-revolutionary role. One thing stands out today: the reactionary forces use the Trotskyites and the Lovestoneites as their mouthpieces in the campaign against us, against the struggle for peace. Outstanding examples are the Stolberg articles and Mr. Martin's utterances. What is their main line? That everything that is done by us, to bring about a united democratic front, a world front of the democratic powers and including the Soviet Union, for collective security, is done to boost the Stalin foreign policy.

The same arguments are to be found today in the *Herald Tribune* and other reactionary papers. Here we see clearly how reaction is utilizing the Trotskyite and Lovestoneite stooges to combat our position, to

create confusion among the masses, to prevent the labor movement from supporting the Roosevelt policy.

What is the Stalin policy? It is the peace policy of the Soviet Union consistently pursued since the October victory, the policy—of which the Soviet Union has given innumerable proofs—motivated by determination to preserve peace. Can there be a difference between the true peace policy of the peace-loving people of the world and Stalin's policy? There can be no difference. There is no difference. Then what is your policy, gentlemen of the *Herald Tribune*, of the Liberty Leaguers, Mr. Stolberg, Martin, Lovestone? What is the policy of all these opponents of Stalin's policy? Undoubtedly, it is a policy of war, disguised under cover of isolationism.

At this point let me say that we cannot take a defensive attitude toward such attacks. We must come out openly before the masses and say, "Yes, we are for the defense of the Soviet Union, not only as a bulwark of peace, but as the country of socialism." We are for the defense of the Soviet Union and are ready to throw ourselves into this struggle with all our might. But at the same time, we say also that it is in the interest of the people of the world over that we are fighting for collective security. And when we speak of the peace-loving people the world over we speak especially of the people of the United States. It is now when the aggressors are attempting the subjugation of China, are penetrating Latin America, Canada, are nearing the Philippines, that they must be stopped.

The policy of isolation is only aiding the fascists. It is destructive of the

interests of the American people, because it is this policy that sooner or later would involve the United States in a war. It is out of the policy of isolation that the "neutrality" law derives, the law that is defended by the conscious jingoists as well as by the confused pacifists, the law that has played directly into the hands of the aggressors.

"NEUTRALITY" IN PRACTICE

How does the neutrality law work in practice? Loyalist Spain, for example, can buy nothing in the United States with which to defend itself against fascist aggression. The supporters of neutrality, of course, object that neither can Franco buy anything to carry on war against Loyalist Spain. But who doesn't know that Hitler and Mussolini are behind Franco? That Italy and Germany are free to buy any raw material they want which in a very short time can be transformed into deadly weapons against democratic Spain? Japan can buy cotton, steel, scrap iron, anything necessary for the building of battleships, of planes, for making munitions. Certainly China can do the same—Our isolationists say: Good! but who does not know that Japan has a big navy, that Japan has extended a blockade of all Chinese ports? Furthermore, who does not know that while Japan has an industry that can transform raw materials into instruments of death, China has none? It is no accident that the fascists support the neutrality law.

We must come before the masses and state very openly that, unless a policy of collective security, of quarantining the aggressors, of concerted

action by the democratic nations against the fascist bandits is instituted, we are going to become involved in war; that collective security is the only way that can keep the United States out of war. More than that, we must state that the danger is such that concerted action must be brought about in the quickest possible time. We must not forget that war is already going on, that this war may engulf the whole world in a new world slaughter.

Now, as to the question of how to mobilize the Party to the last man, as well as our friends in the labor movement and among the progressive forces. First of all, it is necessary to bring thorough clarification on this problem, so that we shall be able to speak effectively to the broad masses.

More than that, our comrades must intensify their activities on all fronts. To begin with, we must further strengthen the campaign in support of Spanish democracy, the campaign in support of the Chinese people. In this movement we are not isolated. The problem before us is how to utilize the widespread sentiment of the American people in support of Spanish democracy, in support of the Chinese people, so as to bring them into the struggle for collective security. In brief, the big problem before us is how to orientate the powerful mass sentiment for peace into the stream for collective security, how to make this the real peace movement of the day.

STRENGTHEN THE AMERICAN LEAGUE

One of the main tasks before our Party today is the strengthening of the American League for Peace and

Democracy. While the Party is no longer affiliated to the League, yet it fully supports its program, in the same way that we support the line of Roosevelt's speech against the aggressors. The American League for Peace and Democracy has proved at its Pittsburgh Congress to be one of the main instruments in the hands of the progressive forces of the country in the struggle for peace and democracy.

The American League is not content with its present strength. It strives to bring into its ranks more organizations, tens of thousands of individual members, to strengthen its existing branches, to build new ones, to become thus a more powerful instrument for the mobilization of the masses of the labor movement, of the church movement, of the fraternal organizations, and of the masses in the neighborhoods. We must see to it that thousands of our Party members take their place in the ranks of the American League to serve as loyal members of this organization. More than that, we must bring the appeal of the American League into every progressive organization, so that from this source tens of thousands of new members will stream into the League.

A powerful American League for Peace and Democracy will help tremendously in the development of the forces moving in the direction of a democratic front. The strengthening of the American League means the strengthening of the struggle in support of Spanish democracy, means the strengthening and coordination of the boycott movement that is gaining impetus all over the country.

We must not only break the resistance of the Tory forces, of the theore-

ticians of pacifism through isolation. At the same time we must break the passive resistance of large numbers of people who have not yet been brought into the movement to fight for a conscious peace policy. A powerful movement in the United States, a bold policy by the United States government will have a tremendous effect upon the peace-loving masses of the world. It will have a great effect in stimulating the struggle of the masses in Great Britain, against the Tory government which more and more openly pursues the line of cooperation with the fascists, aiding them consciously as it is doing in Spain.

INTENSIFY THE CAMPAIGN FOR SPAIN

The strengthening of the American League will be of the greatest help to the campaign for material aid to democratic Spain. This campaign for material aid must be spurred on. We must make up our minds, however, that no matter how costly it may be in energy and in material support, broadening out the campaign for Spain for a much more substantial raising of funds for food, for taking care of the children, for medical aid, is one of our main duties.

It is our task, simultaneously with the strengthening of the American League, to give all the necessary help to the Chapters of the Medical Bureau and the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy spread all over the country.

At the same time, we must give the utmost attention to the development of the Friends of the Lincoln Brigade as an organization. It is necessary that the various committees, which have specific tasks to perform in re-

gard to aid to Spain, shall not interfere with each other. It is difficult to draw a clear line of division. The solution of this problem lies in involving broader masses. The Friends specifically from now on must assume bigger and bigger obligations. Its duty is not only to continue the sending of material aid to American fighters in Spain, but at the same time to take care of the many disabled veterans who have returned or will return. It is an enormous task that requires enthusiasm, energy, correct organizational approach for involving in this phase of aid to Spain, not only the Party and the largest number of sympathizers, the families and friends of the fighters, but the progressive forces in the trade unions and other organizations as well.

The newly-formed organization of Spanish veterans is becoming one of the instruments which will not only aid in strengthening the Friends of the Lincoln Brigade, but through which the American people can be reached with the truth on Spain, and can be of great help in developing all phases of the campaign in support of Spanish democracy! This has been clearly demonstrated by the achievements of the Veterans Convention in Washington, which is a step forward in the struggle for the amendment of the neutrality law, in support of the O'Connell Bill, which is a vivid proof of the esteem in which the American fighters for democracy are held by the American public. That the American people appreciate the deeds of the Americans fighting for democracy in Spain is proved by the enthusiastic way the reports of the veterans are accepted, and the wide publicity they

have received in the press. Comrade Nelson's tour was an outstanding example. In spite of the fact that his meetings were restricted to close circles, Comrade Nelson's reports were printed with favorable comments in the press. The American people are becoming more and more proud to have such sons fighting the battle for world democracy, on the Spanish battlefields.

Our responsibility in building the Friends of the Lincoln Brigade, to assist the fighters in Spain, to help the disabled, cannot be too highly emphasized. We must act quickly, energetically.

**WE MUST BECOME THE DRIVING FORCE
IN THE CAMPAIGN TO AID CHINA**

Simultaneous with the campaign to aid democratic Spain, we must become the driving force in the spreading of the boycott of Japanese goods, of the campaign to aid the Chinese people. In this respect, we cannot be satisfied. While it is true that the boycott of Japanese goods has spread considerably (in this respect credit is due to the good work of the American Friends of the Chinese People), yet we have not responded sufficiently to the appeals for food, clothing, for aid to the tens of thousands of Chinese orphans.

The spreading of the boycott is worrying the reactionary forces, and they are not idle. With the direct help of Japanese agents and Japanese money, they are conducting a counter-campaign. The silk manufacturers are trying to put through a real sit-down strike. Hundreds of thousands of dollars, that certainly do not come from the pockets of the silk manufac-

turers, are being spent to stop the boycott. Let me quote from a circular letter sent to the hosiery stores from one of the centers of the counter-boycott campaign:

"The hosiery department which is lazy about recognizing the dangerous potentialities and unwilling to take any active part in discouraging a threatened boycott of the main raw material of its merchandise is sure to see a quicker response to it, and a surer falling off of dollar volume than the one which gets busy early to educate both personnel and customers away from the silk-boycott notion.

"Obviously this can't be done boldly, with counter signs or advertising, for the reason that the signs and the advertising messages would be seen by women who have never given a thought to foregoing silk hosiery because of a war between two Oriental nations or because of any reason. And, since a threat of this type grows almost as fast by negative as by positive suggestion, the less said about it, by print or spoken word, to women who are not always boycott-minded, the better."

Later on in the same circular when it deals with the method to be used to dissuade women from the boycott it states:

"But, when the customer mentions lisle or rayon, and then follows the request with the statement that she is buying it because she has determined not to wear silk that comes from a warring country, then the hosiery saleswoman is counted on to explain to her, courteously and informatively, with figures to back up what she says, that the customer is hurting herself, American industry, economic recovery, and her own appearance a great deal, and the habitat of the silkworm comparatively little, because the silkworm has no fatherland [this is a good one] when she buys substitutes for silk hosiery."

After giving instructions in regard to this "education," the circular states:

"So far these women represent a very

small percentage of our clientele, but with every showing of motion picture newsreels depicting college girls throwing silk stockings into ash-cans, and so on, the percentage grows."

Yes, even the enemies of the boycott, the agents of Japanese imperialism, admit that the boycott is spreading. It is our task, the task of the progressive forces all over the country, to make of it one of the most powerful weapons against Japanese aggression. It should be an immediate task of the trade unions to get on the job and mobilize the salesclerks against the vicious intimidation of the hosiery bosses. But this is not sufficient. The campaign to aid the Chinese people must be extended.

An American medical unit is already on Chinese soil today. But this must be considered only as the beginning. In the same way we responded in support of Spanish democracy, we must plunge into the campaign in support of the struggle of the Chinese people. The campaign for the boycott of Japanese goods, the campaign in support of the Chinese people, cannot be viewed as a competitor in regard to our duties to Spain, but as an aid. To the extent that we develop both of these campaigns, the American people will understand more clearly that the only way to stop the aggressor, to stop the massacre of thousands of non-combatants, to stop the bombing of open cities from the air, is concerted action by all the peace-loving peoples of the world, will understand that the United States can play a tremendous role in this respect.

There is one thing that we must keep in mind at all times, that the campaign for aid, whether for demo-

cratic Spain or the Chinese people, will be successful to the extent that our Party, the various committees functioning for the specific purposes of aid, the progressive forces of the trade unions and others, will develop a powerful agitation to mobilize the American masses behind the masses of democratic Spain and China, who in their heroic struggles are fighting for the cause of world democracy. Such a campaign will move every American, every lover of democracy, proud of the American traditions of liberty, to contribute his pennies toward this cause. Such a campaign will also prove to the American people that the Communists are the driving force in the struggle for peace and will put our Party in touch with new millions.

* * *

Comrades, the latest developments emphasize the importance of strengthening and intensifying the struggle for peace. The drive of the Nazis in Germany for complete control of the army and of the economic life of the country, while exposing the serious friction existing in the ranks of the reactionary bourgeoisie, indicates above all an acceleration in their plans of aggression. It is clear that Hitler is encouraged and abetted in his aggressive schemes by the capitulatory policy of the British Tory government. One immediate result was the blackjacking of Austria into submission to Nazi domination. Hitler's next step, the subjection of Czechoslovakia, the last bourgeois-democratic state in Central Europe, has already virtually received the consent of the Chamberlain cabinet. All of this is to be crowned, if the fascist-Tory schem-

ers will have their way, by a negation of the Franco-Soviet pact and the isolation of the Soviet Union in preparation for the long-planned fascist attack on the Socialist Republic.

This situation calls for the utmost vigilance by the proletariat and toiling masses the world over.

COMRADE STALIN'S WARNING

It is in the light of these developments that we can fully appreciate the significance of Comrade Stalin's warning—a warning of the imminent danger of an attack on the Soviet Union and the need of preparedness on the part of the people in the Soviet Union and the working class in the bourgeois countries. The wisdom and timeliness of Comrade Stalin's warning were proved by the now open plans of the Chamberlain cabinet for capitulation to the fascist powers. Obviously, this policy is directed against the Soviet Union. In the long run, however, an agreement with the fascist aggressors, if realized, would inevitably prove a costly boomerang for all the bourgeois democratic countries as well. This is why Eden, Winston Churchill and similar elements in Great Britain and other capitalist countries favor the policy of collective security.

We must note, in passing, the attacks on Comrade Stalin's letter in the press of the American bourgeoisie, including such self-proclaimed liberal papers as Mr. Stern's *New York Post* and *Philadelphia Record*. This Red-baiting, which takes Comrade Stalin's letter as a pretext, has a twofold purpose. On the one hand, it aims as always at the isolation of our Party from the broad progressive forces, and

thus at the defeat of the People's Front movement. And, on the other hand, it aims to weaken the struggle for collective security and to strengthen the isolationist forces.

THE SOVIET UNION HAS PERSISTENTLY FOUGHT FOR PEACE

We must unflinchingly meet and defeat these attacks. We must expose these slanderers with undeniable facts. Is it not true that the Soviet Union has done everything in its power to strengthen the world peace forces and to secure world peace? Has it not repeatedly proposed disarmament? Has it not, time and again, shown readiness to join in concerted action to stop fascist aggression in Spain, China and elsewhere? What was the answer of the non-fascist powers? Is it not a fact that the British Tories have persisted in their intrigues which helped the fascist attack on democratic Spain? Is it not true that the "anti-Comintern" triple alliance is directed against the Soviet Union in the first place, that Hitler has never missed an occasion to reiterate his adherence to the line formulated in *Mein Kampf*, the line of aggression against the Soviet Union?

What should be the attitude of the Soviet Union if all its efforts to secure world peace through concerted action are sabotaged by the Tories against the will of the masses, if the fascist powers show clearly that they are getting ready for an attack on the Soviet Union? Surely, in the face of all this, the people of the Soviet Union have a right to appeal for support to the toiling people the world over and to warn them to be on the alert.

An attack against the Soviet Union cannot be conceived as anything else but an attack against world peace, against the toiling people the world over. Comrade Stalin did not say that the efforts to achieve collective security are at an end. On the contrary, his is a warning to the peace-loving peoples of the world to act quickly in order to bring about collective security, while he points out at the same time that the Soviet Union will not await an attack with folded arms, that it will teach the fascist aggressors a good lesson when and if it should become necessary.

Comrades, we are entering a decisive stage in the struggle that involves the future of the world, a struggle that demands the fullest mobilization of our forces. An essential part of this struggle is the fullest ideological clarification of the Party membership on the question of collective security.

DISSIPATE ALL CONFUSION

We must dissipate all confusion and all doubts in the minds of our comrades and our friends, confusion that is responsible of all kinds of "iffy" questions, such as, "What if collective security should fail?", or "Why do we oppose a larger navy, which, with the development of the People's Front, might some day serve the interests of the people?"

The problem today is not the consideration of all conceivable hypothetical situations. Our problem today is to fight determinedly, without any doubts, to achieve collective security through concerted action of the bourgeois-democratic countries jointly with the Soviet Union against the

fascist aggressors, to develop such a powerful struggle that will force the governments to take concerted action in behalf of peace.

This is also the basis for our position on the question of a big navy. It is the isolationist position that leads to a big navy. If the fascist aggressors are allowed to have their way, if they are allowed to "get away with it" piecemeal with their aggressions, can there be any doubt that the broad masses of the American people would favor a big navy to secure themselves against fascist encroachments?

Apart from the fact that we have not got a People's Front government, that we cannot take it for granted that the navy would be used in the interest of the people, our position is that peace can be secured, not through a big navy, but through concerted action that would stop fascist aggression. But while opposing a big navy, we place the responsibility where it belongs. It is the fascist aggressors that are today responsible for the armament race, as they are responsible for the breaking of international peace. Secondary responsibility for the big navy building program rests with the isolationists, who fight against concerted action to check the fascist aggressors, the only policy that can secure world peace.

It is collective security through concerted action that must be brought about to stop the aggressors, and to deliver the first deadly blow to fascism.

This is the line on which we must concentrate, for which we must mobilize all our forces. At the same time, we must understand that the struggle for collective security is part and parcel of the struggle for democracy, that

the struggle for peace is intimately linked up with the struggle against reaction and fascism at home.

It is in the unfolding of this struggle that the Party must strive to anchor itself firmly among the masses,

to become a real mass Party, and to be enabled to play a more powerful role as the vanguard of the working class in fulfilment of its mission to lead the masses to a happy future, to socialism.

ERRATA

November issue, "Unite the Negro People."
p. 1039—the paragraph reads: "The Party
will be equal to its task" of building the
People's Front and winning the Negro
people for support to it "only if it fights
for the equal status of the Negroes"
(Dimitroff).

This should read as follows:

"Such a Party [a Workers' and Farmers'
Party—the American form of the People's
Front] will be equal to its task . . . only
if it fights for the equal status of the
Negroes." (Dimitroff.)

While in no wise neglecting the independent activity of the Party for Negro rights, the task of the Party is to bring the fight for the special demands of the

Negroes into the broad People's Front movement.

We must rally the broad masses in the fight against all discrimination, against the exclusion of Negroes from industry, and against the attempts of the reactionaries and the employers to stir up racial animosities between Negro and white workers (in the auto, steel, and other industries).

February issue, "The Storm Center of the
Cuban Crisis." Footnote on p. 139 should
read:

Since this was written the Spanish government cabled that it will carry out this request of the Cuban people.