

PRACTICAL PHASES OF THE LABOR PARTY CAMPAIGN

By JAY LOVESTONE

THE situation in Minnesota, involving the Party tactics in our Labor Party campaign, is a matter of importance far beyond a district scale. In countries like Great Britain, where our comrades have had years of experience with the Labor Party as a mass movement, such problems appear more acute. In America, where we do not yet have a Labor Party movement of mass character, our problems in this field tend to be more abstract.

In Minnesota, however, we have a concrete situation, where our Labor Party tactics are tested in our every-day relations with the labor movement as a whole. Let no one propose to transplant mechanically policies from England or anywhere else in our Labor Party campaign. For instance, it is already necessary for the British comrades, because of their objective conditions being far more revolutionary than ours, to carry on a merciless fight in increasing instances against the Labor Party. In the United States, we are obviously far behind as compared with Great Britain, in the question of the Labor Party movement.

Some comrades are of the opinion that the Central Committee is proposing a change of policy in the Labor Party campaign in Minnesota which will also be different from the general Labor Party policy of the Party. This is not true. We are proposing a correct application of our policy on the Labor Party question as unanimously adopted at the Fourth Convention of our Party held in Chicago in September, 1925; as unanimously adopted in the American Commission of the Communist International in 1927, and as unanimously agreed upon in the Plenum held last February. Of course, we are now facing a new situation. Concretely, this situation involves our attitude and policies towards Shipstead, not as an individual, but as the symbol of certain class interests today, which are shaping the policies and practices and dominating the leadership of the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. The Shipstead of 1928 is not the Shipstead of 1922. The objective conditions are different. In 1922, willy-nilly, Shipstead was a symbol in a measure, of revolt against the two old capitalist parties. Today, Shipstead is a symbol of betrayal in the Labor Party movement of the country as a whole. Shipstead never really was for a Labor Party. Today he is an energetic and dangerous enemy of the Labor Party movement and of the interests of the working class and exploited farmers.

We emphasize that we are discussing the Shipstead issue, not as

an issue of the individual person, but as an issue involving the fundamental questions of relations of the Communist Party to a Labor Party. The policy the Central Committee is proposing will make clear to the masses of the country as a whole and to the workers and exploited farmers of Minnesota in particular, that we are the champions of a genuine Labor Party movement as distinct from and opposed to a third capitalist party and the two old capitalist parties, as well as distinct from a Communist Party.

The importance of the Minnesota situation can be gauged with some accuracy when we take note of the fact that the outlook for a Labor Party is steadily improving. This improvement is due primarily to the economic situation. The crisis in the coal industry, the grave situation among the agrarian masses, the general economic crisis, the increasing opposition to American imperialism, are among the basic factors making for a sharpening of the struggle of the workers, not only in the economic sense, but the deepening of these struggles sufficiently so as to give them a political character. The Central Executive Committee is optimistic regarding the prospects for development of a mass Labor Party, but the Central Executive Committee recognizes that we must distinguish between sentiment for a Labor Party and the unorganized strength of the movement for a Labor Party. There is today lots of sentiment in the country for a Labor Party, but the organizational strength of the Labor Party nationally is still far smaller than the sentiment. In Minnesota, the gap between sentiment and organizational strength of the genuine Labor Party elements is much smaller than in most of the sections where a Labor Party exists. All the more reason for our being extremely careful with our tactics.

The trade union bureaucracy, the official Labor leadership, is today far to the right of what they were in 1924, when they supported LaFollette. Very likely the dominant official trade union bureaucracy would not support officially even a petty-bourgeois party this year. They might endorse some people as individuals, just as Mr. Green recently endorsed Shipstead. But when the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. endorsed Shipstead, it emphasized the fact that it was an endorsement of him as a man and not as the representative of a Party opposed to the Democratic and Republican Parties. This endorsement by Mr. Green was one of the most dangerous blows hit at the Labor Party movement in recent years.

The Central Executive Committee considers the Labor Party campaign as a basic question of the Party. We have had no difference on the Labor Party question since this convention. Every motion has been unanimously adopted.

LIMITATIONS OF THE LABOR PARTY

To us, the Labor Party is the most effective weapon for breaking down the prejudices against independent working class political action developed among the working masses through generations by the bourgeoisie. Today, the Labor Party is a further entering wedge into great masses of workers whom we have not been able to reach for the specific purpose of improving the conditions for the building of a mass Communist Party in the United States.

We recognize the limitations of a Labor Party. To us, the Labor Party is not an end in itself. Some comrades might say that we cannot build a mass Communist Party in the United States without first having a mass Labor Party. This concept is wrong. It is too static. We cannot work effectively for the building of a mass Communist Party today without working and fighting for the building of a mass Labor Party. In fact, conditions may develop in the United States which would prevent our ever having a Labor Party on so great a mass scale as they now have in England. Will anybody then say that we will therefore never have a mass Communist Party in this country? Is there any comrade going to take that position? Of course not! Such a position would be tantamount to stating that there will be no proletarian revolution in the United States, for we cannot have a proletarian revolution without having a mass Communist Party. It is true that we cannot work effectively today for the development of a mass Communist Party without working energetically for the development of a mass Labor Party. It is not the organization of the Labor Party as an end in itself, but the movement, the fight for the Labor Party, that interests us as builders of the Workers Party.

The five main limitations which we must keep in mind in our most energetic campaign for a Labor Party are:

1. The Labor Party is not a party of the most advanced and conscious militants in the working class. The other day I conferred with a progressive labor leader whom I consider the most clever and able individual that I have met in Labor party circles here for some time. Therefore this very individual is potentially dangerous in that tomorrow his policies may be against the interests of the workers and the very prestige which he has today, as well as his ability, will only serve to equip him better for the fight against the workers' interests if he should decide to break with us. This man has every vice that MacDonalld has. He has every vice that the trained social reformers of Europe have. He has every vice which I think specifically American. Yet under the circumstances, we might have to support his candidacy on a Labor Party ticket. We enter the

Labor Party campaign with no illusions about pessimism, social reformism, political corruption. But when we enter the Labor Party campaign, we hold on to our own weapons very firmly.

We should not speak of discipline in a Labor Party in the sense that we speak of discipline in a Communist Party. Revolutionary proletarian discipline is an essential prerequisite for a Communist Party. Without it we cannot have a Communist Party. But we cannot speak of discipline in this sense in the trade unions or the Labor Party, as we speak of discipline in a Communist Party. You cannot compare the two. Of course, in a general sense, we are advocating the idea of discipline among all organizations of the working class. But let no one compare the discipline of the Communist Party with that in non-Communist Party organizations.

2. The Labor Party is a federative body of organizations, political and economic, of the working class. It is not based on individual members.

3. We should not permit ourselves the luxury of entertaining illusions that the Labor Party can or will be the organization that will seize political power. The Labor Party will bring political treason rather than victory to the working class. Yet we are for a Labor Party today, but if we should entertain the idea that the Labor Party discipline is as high as ours and of the same type, then we would inevitably fall into the error of harboring notions that the Labor Party organization will serve as the instrument of the workers for the seizure of political power. On the basis of such false premises, we would be bound to get into the most serious errors that Communists can commit.

4. We must remember that the Labor Party is merely the next big forward step in the development of our working class politically. The building of a Labor Party, the campaign for it, is of tremendous value in the building of a mass Communist Party in the United States. We must win the workers away from the Coolidges, the Hoovers, the Smiths. These spokesmen of the big bourgeoisie today have more workers following them than the Labor Party movement of this country will have for some time. Any measure which helps the development of a genuine Labor Party as we speak of it is a correct measure, provided the Labor Party is viewed not as an end but only as a next step, only as a means.

5. The Labor Party can and must be made to serve for advancing in some measure the interests of the working class, and as much as possible for impeding the political aggressiveness of the bourgeoisie. This we must keep in mind when we discuss Shipstead and whether we should support him. The Labor Party must be made to serve

the advancement of the immediate interests of the working class, and to hinder the capitalists in their rule of the workers.

These are the yard-sticks which we apply to find out whether our policies are right or wrong in the Labor Party campaign and whether an organization parading as a Labor Party, is a genuine Labor Party, or whether a candidate of the Labor Party works for or against the genuine Labor Party.

LABOR PARTY AND THIRD PARTY

There is all the difference in the world between the third party and the Labor Party. A third party as we speak of it in the United States, and as its specifically and historically American connotation indicates, is a party of the petty-bourgeoisie, expressing the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie, dominated by the petty-bourgeoisie, and serving as a weapon of the petty-bourgeoisie against the parties of the big bourgeoisie. It is true there may be Labor Party elements supporting such a party, but these elements represent a class having interests fundamentally opposed to the interests of the petty-bourgeoisie. The Communist International in 1924 corrected the Party policy towards the LaFollette ticket. The decision of the Communist International against supporting the LaFollette ticket in 1924 was not a decision against supporting the third party in principle. We were not wrong in principle. We were wrong on the basis of the objective conditions in the country and on the basis of our extremely limited Party strength.

In the prevailing objective conditions, a third petty-bourgeois party would be the greatest obstacle to the development of a genuine Labor Party movement. The LaFollette Party did more to destroy the Labor Party movement by swallowing it for some time than some of the worst big bourgeois opponents did. In fact, it was the petty-bourgeoisie who served as the club, as the very engine of destruction, of the Labor Party movement in Minnesota in 1924. The situation has changed somewhat in Minnesota. Some of the leading Labor Party workers who in 1924 welcomed in a general way the LaFollette movement, confused it with the Labor Party and looked upon it as a movement which would bring immediate success, now realize that the LaFollette forces actually destroyed whatever chances the Labor Party had of victory in Minnesota in 1924. In a conversation with one of our Labor Party leaders today, I was told: "LaFollette defeated us here in the State in 1924." You comrades know and understand that well.

The outlook for a third party is a little better than the outlook for a Labor Party, but the danger we have today is not even the im-

mediate organization of a third party. The real danger is that whatever third party sentiment we have, whatever third party leadership there is, will poison the existing Labor Party sentiment.

There have been negotiations amongst confused Farmer-Laborites looking forward to the nomination of Norris on a progressive ticket. This would be suicidal for the Labor Party movement. All such talk of Norris being honest personally is only that much balderdash. In capitalist politics, honesty is a secondary question. *The grave danger immediately confronting us* is that such elements as Shipstead who are really third party elements, or, more accurately, are nothing more than irregular Republicans—that such elements will have the leadership of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor movement.

If the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party is to become a genuine Labor Party, then such elements as represented by Mr. Shipstead must be driven out. So long as such third party elements are in the Minnesota Labor Party movement and dominate it, we cannot consider the Minnesota Labor Party as a genuine Labor Party. If we do not drive out such elements they will drive us out, even further than they have already done. You know that our Party as a Party has already been driven out in many cases. As a Party we are not affiliated with the Farmer-Labor movement. We have tended to accept this too easily. This extremely unsatisfactory condition is one of the most effective weapons in the hands of the third party forces represented by Shipstead for prevention of the development of a real Labor Party in Minnesota.

It might appear to some of us that a sharp fight against Shipstead would cause disruption in the ranks of the Farmer-Labor movement. Some of us might believe that such a fight would enable the trade union bureaucracy to denounce us as splitters. Let me say to you comrades that there is no worse blow we can help strike against the Labor Party movement, not only of Minnesota, but of the country as a whole, than our accepting Shipstead, than our failure to fight against him to a finish.

OBJECTIVES OF OUR LABOR PARTY CAMPAIGN

There are certain conditions which we must keep in mind in our participation in the Labor Party campaign. I have referred to the decision of the Fourth National convention of our Party. At this convention, we unanimously adopted a policy for a Labor Party, the basis of which is the following:

1. In all phases of the Labor Party campaign, our fundamental task is to utilize this campaign for the building of the Workers Party into a mass Communist Party. Now, comrades, this is not a

shibboleth. This is not an abstraction. Anything which we do in the Labor Party campaign which objectively tends to hinder the building of a mass Communist Party is wrong. We must not do such things. We must not take such steps. We must not follow a line in our Labor Party tactics which directly or indirectly hinders the development of a mass Communist Party. Think of the Shipstead issue on the basis of this rule.

2. Our aim is to affiliate the trade unions and the other labor organizations, as organizations, to the Labor Party. And at the same time, we strive to draw individual militant workers from all these organizations into the Workers Party. Here I must admit that our Party as a whole has not made enough effort to exploit, has not made sufficient effort to utilize the Labor Party campaign and the other campaigns for the purpose of drawing members into our Party. If you find some militant worker in the Labor Party, please do not worry about his not yet having read Lenin's *State and Revolution*. This is very important, of course. No one can be a good Party member without understanding Lenin's *State and Revolution*. But we ask you not to worry about the insufficient understanding of Communism on the part of good, honest, militant workers, who are not yet Communists. Your job is to get such workers into the Party. Your job is to get in all such workers who are ready to fight against the bourgeoisie. Once such workers are in the Party, you will be able to make Communists of them in the sense of their really understanding Communism. We must do more than that. The Labor Party must serve as a recruiting ground for the Communist Party, and especially to attract American elements to our ranks.

3. Here is a key point. If we do not do this, then we will violate a fundamental principle of Communist tactics. *We must at all times maintain our organizational independence.* We must maintain our freedom of criticism, our own press and our own literature. For the sake of argument, let us assume that you endorse even the whole Farmer-Labor Party ticket in your state. How would you carry out your campaign? You would carry on the campaign as members of the Labor Party through the organizations with which you are affiliated. But above all our Party, as a Party, should have its own platform, its own speakers, its own agitation, its own meetings and literature. And in these meetings and this literature, in all of this propaganda of ours, we must point out not only the advantages of a Labor Party, but we must make clear also its serious limitations. We must not permit any illusions about a Labor Party while we are fighting for it.

This is a hard job. It is a very hard job to put over successfully without any mistakes. But the fact that it is hard is no argument against it. We are bound to make mistakes in putting this over. The Party as a whole may have some mistakes in this field, but that does not deny the correctness of our policy as a policy. We must be very careful to prevent the development of any tendency in our ranks making even objectively for our Party losing its identity in the Labor Party campaign. When I speak of the Party maintaining its distinct position, particularly at this time in the developing radicalization of the labor movement I do not wish in any sense to exaggerate this radicalization. It is still largely local. It is not yet national. It is not yet fused on a national scale. We have radicalization in the mining industry. The trend is sharp. Likewise in the boot and shoe, in the textile, and in the needle trades. But we do not yet have a mass radicalizing development in the building trades, steel, or in the transportation industries. There are scores of industries where the workers are not yet awake to the extent they are in some of the others. Yet the process towards radicalization is here, is growing and indisputable. Therefore, especially at this time, we maintain our distinct Party position.

4. We must try to secure the Labor Party endorsement of some of our Party campaigns. I maintain our Party has not yet done that. For instance, we have a campaign against the imperialist war danger. We go to the trade unions to mobilize them for this campaign. We go to the cooperatives. We go to the exploited farmers' organizations, to the workers' benefit and educational societies, to the Labor Party. We have not yet succeeded in getting a single Labor Party local or organization to endorse this campaign. You might say that this is not necessarily a mistake. Comrades, the mistake is not to be found in the fact that we may not as yet have secured such endorsement of our anti-war danger campaign, but the mistake is that we have not tried enough to secure such endorsements for any of our campaigns. Defeat by itself is not necessarily proof of a mistake. The guarantee of success by itself is not a necessary prerequisite for the correctness of a policy. Effort in a certain direction is absolutely necessary, however. In this sense, our Party has not done enough.

5. We must carry on in the Labor Party campaigns, persistent agitation and propaganda to recruit the best members for the Communist Party. The Labor Party at best is only a means to an end. Undoubtedly if the Labor Party assumes a mass character and wins political influence, following and prestige, and our Party

grows at the same time, we will come into clash with the Labor Party on many questions. Undoubtedly, we may have to fight against it, not only in electoral campaign, but in other struggles. But today, while we are still in the stage of building the Labor Party, while we are still in the stage of being the most energetic spokesmen for the Labor Party, is the best time to use the Labor Party as a recruiting field for membership in our Party.

CARE IN LABOR PARTY PROPAGANDA

A few more words about the limitations, and then the Minnesota situation specifically. Even in our most energetic participation in the Labor Party campaign, you must always place in the foreground the fact that the Workers Party is the only Party, the only class Party, of the revolutionary proletariat. In other words, if we publish literature for a Labor Party and that literature does not emphasize the fact that the Workers Party is the only class, the only revolutionary Party that can lead the workers to victory, we are not publishing literature that is fully correct in the Communist sense.

We must avoid a very serious error. This is the following: we must not connect the Labor Party with any aims achievable only by the Workers Party. Here we may make errors from the left as well as from the right. For instance, it would be sheer folly for us to go into a Labor Party convention and there put up a Communist program for adoption. This is not Communism. Such tactics are suicidal to the development of our Party. Shall we put up a resolution for the proletarian dictatorship? No, nonsense! And from the right: remember that such slogans as nationalization of the mines, nationalization of the railways, public ownership of public utilities—such slogans are very dangerous. While we accept these slogans in a Labor Program, and do not break with the Labor Party for all that, we must at the same time, on our own platform, never fail to point out that there can be no genuine nationalization without a working-class government, without a proletarian dictatorship. It is one thing for a Labor Party to speak of nationalization of the coal mines, for instance, but it is another thing for the Communists at this time to call upon the American Government, which more than any other government in the world represents a merging of the state bureaucracy with the leaders of industry—Mellon, Hoover, Dawes, such big bourgeois figures dominate the government—to speak at this time in the imperialist stage, when we have such a gigantic government apparatus, when the government is so obviously and openly a strike-breaker, when the very men who

dominate industry and finance dominate the government directly—to speak of nationalization of basic industries under such conditions, on a Communist platform, would be ridiculous and most dangerous.

We have made mistakes in this sense in the recent past. We must avoid their repetition. Some comrades might say: What is happening to our Party? Are we swinging to the left? I want you to avoid such theories of the Party mechanically swinging here or there—now going to the right, then to the left, back again, and so forth. We are not a paper organization, blown by winds. The notion that the Party is now mechanically swinging to the left is rank idiocy. The Party is adjusting itself and its tactics to the objective conditions. We recognize the fact that there is developing a trend towards sharpening class conflicts. Yet, for us in America, to apply tactics suitable to a revolutionary situation, would be wrong, would be criminally anti-Communist. For us in America to issue slogans based either on a revolutionary situation, or even on an extremely radical situation of national dimensions, would be the most foolhardy step we could take. But for us to recognize that the government today is not what it was before it entered the world war, and to frame our program accordingly, is Leninist realism. This fact we must never lose sight of in our Labor Party campaign. From the right we must not develop illusions among the workers. From the left we must not expect from the Labor Party, Communist programs or Communist policies.

THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNIST CANDIDATES

In the Labor Party and in the election campaign, we must always remain an independent force. This means more than our own agitation and speakers. It also means that wherever possible, we should nominate candidates on our own Workers Party ticket. Wherever we can possibly run a Workers Party candidate, we should do so. Some comrades might say we should put forward a Workers Party ticket only where we have no mass support, and stand no chance of interfering with the Labor Party. Such a policy is wrong. We reject unreservedly any proposal aiming to have the Party run its own candidates only where it has no mass support. Particularly in places where we have mass support, must we run Communist candidates. In those places where the trade union movement is weak, it is also important to put forward our own candidates. Concretely, in the city of Detroit, which is probably the most highly industrialized city in the country, and where the trade union movement is desperately weak, there especially must we run our own

candidates. We should always have a Communist candidate wherever we have mass support or sufficient support.

How about Communist candidates on the Labor Party ticket? Shall we have candidates who are Communists run on the Labor Party ticket? Our object is to have as many Communists run on the Labor Party ticket as possible. When I say as possible, I speak of chances for their being nominated, elected, and aiding in mobilizing masses. We do not proceed mechanically. We do not put forward this proposal with the objective of trying to grab offices. This is not our interest in the superficial sense. If you want to ask me, should we, under the specific objective conditions in Minnesota, with the present weakness of our Party forces here, put up a Communist candidate as our first choice in opposition to Shipstead as United States Senator on the Farmer-Labor Party ticket, I would say no. I say no, not because I do not want a Communist, but simply because we do not have any Communist who can mobilize enough masses and strength to defeat the Shipstead nomination in the primaries, or in this convention. I wish we did have such a comrade, and that our party had already so much influence that we could make a fight to have a Communist run on the Labor Party ticket for the United States Senate, because he would at this time get greater mass support, reach a wider field, than our own Party ticket. Of course, if we cannot find a genuine left-wing or progressive trade union worker to oppose Shipstead for the candidacy of Senator either in the convention or in the primaries, then we should contest Shipstead's nomination through an energetic support of the Communist candidate in the Labor Party primaries. If we fail in the Labor Party primaries then we must put up a Communist Party opponent against Shipstead.

Let me emphasize at this point that we go along with the Labor Party despite all its shortcomings. I repeat that because I do not want the comrades to get the notion that the Central Executive Committee is proposing to drop the Labor Party because it emphatically points out the shortcomings and mistakes of this movement.

THE SITUATION IN MINNESOTA

1. In Minnesota, our Party must prepare at once to put our Communist presidential candidates on the ballot. The Party must make every effort to get on the ballot in Minnesota as a distinct Party without delay. I am not speaking now of the state ticket. Satisfactory arrangements may be made whereby we would support—except for Shipstead or any other third party type—the rest of the state Farmer-Labor ticket. You must keep in mind all the

technical requirements set down by your state laws in filing the Communist Party ticket. The Central Committee has decided that insofar as the election laws require the declaration by our Party of its national presidential candidates, the districts are to place on the ballot Comrades Foster and Gitlow, the same as in 1924. If later on there should develop a genuine Labor Party ticket or a united labor ticket, we would then be in a position, if necessary, to withdraw our candidates, but the Party as a Party must be on the ballot in as many states as possible. Our influence in the Labor Party, in the working class as a whole, particularly in a country like the United States, is influenced in a substantial degree by our Party being on the ballot in as many states as possible. I could even cite states where the Party's being on the ballot has helped us maintain our right to work in the open.

Of course, it would be folly to think that merely being on the ballot is an insurance against being outlawed by the bourgeoisie. When the class war is so sharp that the bourgeoisie want to outlaw us, and we then do not have enough strength in the labor movement to prevent our being outlawed, our being on the ballot is not going to be worth two cents. But today, it is still a factor, and it would be very bad for the Party if in a state like Minnesota, where we really have influence and are a force, we should not be on the ballot. The recognition the Communists are receiving in Minnesota is not a personal matter, but is due entirely to the fact that our Party has some political power and influence in this state. This policy does not mean a dropping of the Labor Party ticket, or the slackening of our efforts for a united Labor Ticket. Quite the contrary. We must increase our efforts. But we must always be prepared to put our own candidates on the ballot and to campaign for them.

A few words about the collection of signatures to place the Party on the ballot. We believe that not only every state, but every city where we have a Party organization, must work to place the Party on the ballot. The signature campaign is a real campaign. It is not a paper campaign. It is all right if a worker says: "I will sign your petition, but I am not for Communism." We don't say to him: "We do not want your signature until you are for Communism." But we do not stop with him when he signs. We deposit a packet of literature with him. We talk to the worker. We talk to him in a way calculated not to irritate or insult him, but to draw him nearer to us and to convince him. Nine out of every ten workers may not respond, but the tenth worker may listen and may join the Party. The

ten signatures are welcome, though only one of the ten signers may immediately join our Party.

The signature campaign, the petition campaign, can be made a genuine mass campaign. It can serve to increase the number of members participating actually in our Party work. It should involve every member of the Party. It should give us the opportunity to assign to every member of the Party a definite task of Communist propaganda.

2. If there are any candidates on the Farmer-Labor ticket who are objectionable to us, then we must vote against them. Some comrades seem to have the impression that if we are in the Labor Party, we must accept all candidates put up by the Labor Party. This is fallacious. This is not the Party policy. At best, even when we support the Labor Party candidates, we do so qualifiedly.

3. To us, the Labor Party movement is not a movement of abstractions. We want our comrades in the local labor organizations, or wherever nominations are to be made for the Labor Party ticket, or in the primaries. We want to have as many as possible of our leading active comrades, those who have standing in the labor movement, to be on the Farmer-Labor ticket. Party members who are members of the Labor Party representing other Labor organizations than the Party, must resolutely fight for their rights for nomination for public office on the Labor Party ticket, the same as any other Labor Party members. If nominated, our comrades will of course wage a Communist campaign.

This is a very hard proposition. It may entail serious difficulties for our comrades. In Great Britain, it has entailed expulsions. The British Labor Party has time and again adopted clauses aimed at the Communists. Yet somehow or other, the Communists manage to make their presence and strength felt in the Labor Party of England.

The question of Shipstead: How shall we handle the Shipstead situation? First of all, we do not propose that you should enter into a name-calling campaign. We do not ask that you call him "crook" or "traitor," but fight against his being in the Labor Party on the basis of his concrete acts of omission and commission.

The major attack against Shipstead is that he is an enemy of the Labor Party and the working class. We are not asking you to fight Shipstead because he is not a Communist. We are asking you to fight Shipstead because he is more a Republican than anything else, because he is obviously an enemy of the Labor Party movement. We must fight Shipstead as good members of the Labor Party. We fight Shipstead because we represent the interests of the

working class in the Farmer-Labor Party bloc of Minnesota. There is lots of talk of Shipstead filing on the Republican ticket, or as an independent. This talk is significant. Shipstead is a careerist. He is a petty-bourgeois adventurer who is knifing the interests of the working class at every opportunity he gets. That is precisely the reason why he has had and still has nothing to do with the Labor Party. His latest claim is that he represents the people and not any one party of Minnesota. The campaign against Shipstead must be waged, along the following lines:

1. His brazen and persistent opposition to the development of a genuine Labor Party in Minnesota and nationally.

2. His continuous association with and repeated support of the reactionary Republican caucus dominating the Senate. Recall the fact that Shipstead, along with the so-called insurgents, voted for Wall Street's Old Guard in the organization of the Senate. Shipstead has been enjoying the luncheons with the oily President Coolidge.

3. His outright surrender to the imperialists on the question of Nicaragua. Shipstead as a member of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee voted along with Borah and the regular Republicans and Democrats for the maintenance of the American marines in Nicaragua to "supervise the elections." Here we must especially draw your attention to the fact that Shipstead has received far more than the ordinary confidence of the Sandino forces resisting American imperialism. Yet this is his reply.

4. We must point out the fraudulent character of the much-vaunted anti-injunction bill introduced by Shipstead and approved by Messrs. Green and Woll. This is a fake anti-injunction bill. Even such a notorious open-shopper as ex-Governor Grosback of Michigan, now attorney of the State Federation of Labor of Michigan, has declared that this bill introduced by Shipstead is in reality not an anti-injunction bill.

There can be nothing better happening in Minnesota towards the development of a genuine Labor Party than Shipstead's being thrown out of and by the Labor Party, rejected, or his running on the Republican ticket or as an independent. The best thing that Shipstead could do for the Labor Party is to leave it. The best thing that we can do for the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota is to repudiate and drive out Shipstead and all the third party elements.