

The Communist Party of the United States, the People's Front, and the Democratic Front during the 1930s

Nobuyuki KAWAUCHI *

Introduction

Immediately following the beginning of the Great Depression, the Communist Party of the United States could exert a considerable influence in various fields (unemployed individuals' movements, black people's movements, and so on). However, partially due to directional issues stemming from the 6th Congress of Communist International and the 10th Plenum of the Communist International Executive Committee (social fascism, dual unionism, etc.), the Communist Party of the United States could not expand its popular support base. Furthermore, while in the 1932 presidential election the Democratic Party's candidate Franklin D. Roosevelt received over twenty-two million votes, the Communist Party candidate received just over hundred thousand.

In the 100 days immediately after Roosevelt assumed office, he continuously initiated New Deal measures. From around 1935, while unemployed individuals, laborers, farmers, and black persons began unorganized mass movements that sought more wide-reaching social policies and systematic reforms based on the view that the economic policies of the Roosevelt administration were inadequate, criticism of the restrictions on industry under the New Deal policies by monopoly capital and "big business" was growing. Thus, facing a presidential election in 1936, the Roosevelt administration was pressed to respond to new issues and make new choices.

Meanwhile, the Communist Party had considerably changed its policy line by reflecting on the inadequate results of its past direction and (more significantly) the formulation of the Popular Front at the 7th Congress of Communist International. The Communist Party devised a plan to unify with the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and to participate in individual democratization movements. However, in the United States, where the danger of fascism did not exist (at least not in the same way as it did in Europe), the Communist party's "People's Front" movement could not oppose the anti-fascist Roosevelt administration in any major way.¹

This paper focuses on the Communist Party of the United States during the latter half of the New Deal period. It examines the circumstances in which the Democratic Front arose from the Popular Front, along with the direction of mass movements in terms of New Deal policies and the Roosevelt administration's approach.

Part 1 The Popular Front Movement and the Communist Party of the United States

1. The 7th Congress of Communist International and the Communist Party

The 7th Congress of the Communist International created the Popular Front and pushed the extreme policy lines of the communist parties of various countries in the direction of a wide-ranging mass movement centered on a united front against fascism. Georgii M. Dimitrov

* Department of International Studies, College of International Studies, Chubu University

stated that in the United States, the Great Depression had forced millions of people to act; furthermore, the masses had begun to drift away from bourgeois parties and were now standing at a crossroads due to the failure of the New Deal's plan to rehabilitate capitalism. Dimitrov also noted that while American fascism was not a direct threat, there would be the danger of it becoming a real threat in the very near future if it succeeded in permeating amidst the masses disappointed in old bourgeois parties. After making these remarks, he then called for the formation of a Farmer-Labor Party, a special form of a mass Popular Front in the United States to resist the political parties of trusts and banks as well as the growing fascism.²

At the November 1935 Central Committee meeting of the Communist Party of the United States, Secretary General Earl Browder presented a report entitled "The United Front: The Key to Our New Tactical Orientation." In this report, he stated that the practical duty at present was to fight fascism and engage in unified action with the Socialist Party of America.³ Furthermore, at the 9th Congress of the Communist Party, which began on June 24th, 1936, Browder announced that to eliminate the fascist threat they would make all the necessary sacrifices in the presidential election to ensure the loss of the Republican Party nominee Alfred M. Landon.⁴ Thus, the Communist Party of the United States was influenced by the 7th Congress of the Communist International, and it began looking for a way to cooperate with the progressive powers within the New Deal Regime as it viewed the Republican Party as a hotbed of fascism.

As a first step to realize their plan of forming a Farmer-Labor Party, the Communist Party focused on local parties and movements, such as the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party (MFLP), the Wisconsin Progressive Party (WPP), the North Dakota Non-Partisan League (NDNPL), and the American Labor Party (ALP) as possible partners.⁵ In other words, the Communist Party conceived of creating farmer-labor parties by joining forces with these organizations and movements. In New York and other places, the People's Committee for the Formation of Farmer-Labor Party Clubs was established, and Farmer-Labor Party Clubs were created as oversight organizations. Within the ALP, which was established in New York to help Roosevelt get re-elected, these clubs established independent American Labor Party Clubs that distributed many leaflets and held meetings. Therefore, the direction adopted at the 7th Congress of the Communist International expanded the power base of the Communist Party of the United States as indicated in the party's New York district meeting report.⁶

In 1937, quite unlike at the beginning of the Great Depression, the Communist Party came to view the MFLP, the WPP, the ALP, and so on positively as early forms of farmer-labor parties.⁷ For example, Browder even praised the American Labor Party for implementing election measures similar to the Popular Front.⁸

2. The Communist Party's Movement for Individually United Fronts

While the Communist Party's Trade Union Unity League (TUUL) originally chose to engage in activities outside of the AFL so as to split it, they proposed to the AFL in September 1934 that their labor unions unify, and TUUL unions began unifying with progressive unions in various industrial sectors. At the beginning of 1935, the TUUL's steel manufacturing, automobile, and textile industry labor unions decided to join the AFL as a general rule and have members join individually when their unions could not join as a group. The TUUL then held a special congress from March 16th to 17th, and by changing its name to the "Committee for the Unification of the Trade Unions," it moved toward having its various remaining unions join the AFL.⁹

In February 1936, the Communist Party actively participated in the founding of the

National Negro Congress (NNC) in Chicago. The NNC was a very wide-reaching unified front organization comprised of white and black people. It included a wide variety of individuals, from Republicans to Communists, who were mass movement leaders and religious-, welfare-, and race-issue activists. With the NNC's founding, the Communist Party reconsidered its approach to other black organizations and came to view the National Association for Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the American Civil Liberties' Union, the Workers' Council of the Urban League, and so on as important wings of their united front.¹⁰

The Communist Party's National Unemployed Council (NUC) (leader: Herbert Benjamin), which possessed quite wide-ranging organizational power since the beginning of the Great Depression, declared the Roosevelt administration's program for helping the unemployed as inadequate and aimed to unify unemployed individuals' organizations to advance mass action.

From January 5th to 7th, 1935, the NUC held the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance in Washington. This Congress was centered around the movement for worker's unemployment and social insurance, and it is said to have received the support of millions, including that of AFL regional branches, the Railroad Brotherhood, independent unions, TUUL unions, farmers, retired military personnel, black people, youth organizations, 60 city and county councils, and so on. Furthermore, based on the experience of this Congress, the NUC proposed the formation of the Joint National Organizing Committee, finally deciding to unite with other organizations for the unemployed. At the time, such organizations included the group of A. J. Muste—who had been aiming to organize workers in the Civil Works Administration—called the National Unemployed League and the Workers Alliance of America (WAA; created with the Socialist Party's support; national committee head: David Lasser). These groups also discussed joining together and/or unifying. In April 1936, the WAA's convention decided to unite with the National Unemployed League under its own name. David Lasser was chosen as its committee head and Benjamin as its organizational secretary. The WAA, with approximately five hundred thousand members, unified various organizations of the unemployed; it could then exert its influence in 45 states.¹¹

The following organizations and movements also reflected the success of the Communist Party's mass movement: the American Youth Congress, the American Student Union, the American Writers Congress, the American Artist Congress, the Southern Negro Youth Congress, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, and the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy.¹²

Based on their promotion of unifying organizations for the unemployed and of individual united front movements, the Communist Party gradually began to move toward the creation of a new united front within the New Deal Regime.¹³ In other words, with the threat of fascism increasing internationally and the international communist movement being directly faced with the issue of creating an anti-fascist Popular Front, the Communist Party of the United States also began focusing on halting fascism's rising influence instead of attacking the New Deal policies and the Roosevelt administration, taking its own party-specific issues as the direct objectives of the struggle. However, while there were the Share-Our-Wealth movement of Senator Huey P. Long (who was anti-New Deal and anti-Roosevelt); the Union Party, formed out of various "Panacea" movements under the lead of Father Charles E. Coughlin and others; and parent "fascist" groups that sought the establishment of a national regime similar to that in Germany and Italy through various demagogic means,¹⁴ the threat of American fascism was minor under the Roosevelt administration, which had been re-elected by an unprecedented

number of votes.

Part 2 The Communist Party and the 1936 Presidential Election

As is shown by the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act (The Wagner Act), the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and the Social Security Act as well as the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board and Works Progress Administration, the government's industry regulations and societal control were strengthened under later period New Deal policies. Organized workers also became beneficiaries of New Deal policies owing to the support for the Wagner Act. This was exactly the kind of partnership sought by the Roosevelt administration between the industry and government, along with a New Deal Regime that harmonized the interests of various economic groups and created a new societal balance. At this point, the Roosevelt administration's broker function (of accommodating various interest groups for regime stability) assumed a complete and firm form, and a governmental direction and policy course for exerting strong authority for new social policies and systemic reform emerged.¹⁵

While the Roosevelt administration consistently prioritized economic recovery and stability, its switch from early period New Deal policies (which attempted to obtain the support of a wide swath of the nation, including "big business" and monopolistic capital) to later period New Deal policies (which criticized "big business" and attempted to make the so-called forgotten people—such as unorganized laborers, farmers, and unemployed persons—into system beneficiaries) received the public's overwhelming support as a development of the New Deal Regime. This was vividly shown in the 1936 presidential election through the formation of the Roosevelt Coalition and Roosevelt's being reelected by a margin never before seen in United States history.¹⁶

Facing the 1936 presidential election, the Communist Party held its 9th Congress from June 24th to 28th in New York, and it announced that it would fight the Republican Party, the American Liberty League, and the Hearst alliance considering democracy vs. fascism as the central issue of its election activity; it also focused all the powers of workers and allied forces to crush the plans of this alliance in the 1936 election. The Communist Party nominated Browder as its presidential candidate and announced a party policy platform that stood in contrast with the programs of the Socialist Party, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, and the Union Party and covered various fields, from social welfare to labor conditions, finance issues, diplomacy issues, and so on. The Communist Party understood the following points of contention that the parties used to appeal to the nation in the presidential election and that they compelled the nation to make choices about:¹⁷

- Republican Party: capitalism or socialism
- Democratic Party: defeating "*economic royalists*"
- Union Party: Roosevelt or ruin
- Socialist Party: socialism or capitalism
- Communist Party: democracy or fascism

While the Communist Party criticized the Democratic Party's policy program, its main target of attack was the Republican Party nominee Alf Landon. The Communist Party asserted that fascist reactionary forces were planning to implement their aims through him and also that the American Liberty League (ALL), which had been attacking the Roosevelt administration's

policies, was aiding his forces.¹⁸

The Communist Party commented that Roosevelt would probably not stop leading the country toward fascism because monopolistic capital and “big business” formed the basis of his administration’s support.¹⁹ However, the Communist Party also stated that Roosevelt was advocating the reclamation of the pure American democracy school from the swamps where the coasts’ oligarchic politics were lurking and opposing rule by a minority of power holders. They also claimed that Roosevelt was reinterpreting United States history based on the perceptions of his own era, as well as defending its democratic tradition, symbolized by many pioneers and presidents such as Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln.²⁰

To defeat fascist Republican Party powers and join forces with progressive ones within the New Deal Regime, the Communist Party, unlike in the previous presidential election, had the idea of nominating a presidential candidate from a worker/farmer organization ; it actively called for cooperation from groups such as the Minnesota Farmer-Labor party (MFLP), the Wisconsin Progressive Party (WPP), and the North Dakota Non-Partisan League (NDNPL). This was because the Communist Party saw the MFLP, the WPP, and the like as representing a budding form of the Popular Front in the United States; it was, while taking solidarity with these organizations as a basis, attempting to organize a movement that aimed to form a Farmer-Labor Party.

In May 1936, in response to calls from the MFLP, a congress to choose a joint candidate and advance the farmer-labor movement was held in Chicago, with the Communist Party, Socialist Party, the WPP, the AFL, and the Committee for Industrial Organization (CIO) in attendance. However, due to conflicts of interest and distrust between the participating organizations, the meeting ended without a joint presidential candidate being decided; furthermore, no path was opened to realize the Communist Party’s aim of forming an independent Farmer-Labor Party for the upcoming presidential election.²¹

The Communist Party then proposed to the Socialist Party that they choose a joint candidate. However, Socialist Party leaders, such as Norman Thomas and others, could not engage in concrete joint actions due to ill feelings within the party, which were remaining from the last presidential election, and the fact that power party-holders had moved to “left-wing” groups such as the Militants.²²

After the Socialist Party’s rejection of their proposal, the Communist Party chose Browder as their nominee; they were more focused on defeating the Republican Party, which they saw as fascist, than proposing their own course for the country and attacking the Roosevelt administration. Although the Communist Party did not officially support Roosevelt during the 1936 presidential election, their election movement was in accordance with the party’s general approach toward the New Deal Regime, and they ended up supporting Roosevelt indirectly.²³

Inside the American Labor Party, a movement emerged toward the Social Democratic Federation, which had joined the former after leaving the Socialist Party and fighting with the Communist Party for Roosevelt’s reelection.²⁴ This was considerably influenced by Browder’s attitude, who was the Communist Party’s secretary at the time. As early as 1934, Browder asserted, “communism is 20th century Americanism,” and from 1935 onward his tendency to present “communism” as an extension of American democracy gradually grew more pronounced.²⁵

Regarding the presidential election results, the Communist Party released a “Statement of the Central Committee” on November 7th, 1936 stating that the overwhelming support for Roosevelt was a reflection of new forces and a new movement that represent a wide range of workers and farmers. It declared a massive victory over the fascism-linked Union Party, the

American Liberty League (ALL), and “Wall Street.”²⁶ The Central Committee also listed the CIO, the Labor’s Non-Partisan League (LNPL), the MFLP, the WPP, the ALP, the Washington Commonwealth Federation, the End Poverty in California movement, and so on as having contributed to Roosevelt’s great victory.²⁷ They particularly saw the MFLP, the WPP, and the like as a unified people’s movement comprised of workers, farmers, socialists, and so on; they praised them as proving the significance of the Popular Front movement. The Central Committee’s statement closed with a call to unite under the flag of 20th-century Americanism that is communism, without touching on their party’s activities or election results at all.²⁸

The Communist Party only received just over eighty thousand votes in the 1936 presidential election—much lesser than in the previous one. However, Roosevelt’s major victory showed that their Popular Front movement had greatly contributed to the formation of the Roosevelt Coalition, which was viewed as resisting fascist forces.

Part 3 The Soviet Union’s Communist International and the Communist Party of the United States

Facing the 1936 presidential election, organizations comprised of the intelligentsia (intellectuals, writers, etc.) who supported the Communist Party did not go so far as to present a united front as they had in the previous election with the publication of *Culture and Crisis*. However, the attitude of the Soviet Union and Stalin around the time of the 7th Congress of the Communist International led to significant changes in the Communist Party’s course.

First, in July 1934, Stalin met with the English writer Herbert G. Wells, and the former’s high regard for Roosevelt opened a path for the Communist Party of the United States to greatly alter its direction. A big factor in Stalin’s adoption of such an attitude was that the United States had recognized the Soviet Union in November of the previous year out of economic hopes and international politics-related considerations. After the Communist International formed the Popular Front in 1935, partially because the leadership of the Communist Party of the United States passed from William Z. Foster to Browder, it was compelled to take a position on later period New Deal policies and the 1936 presidential election.²⁹

Browder visited Moscow in early 1936, and Stalin called upon him to support Roosevelt’s reelection effort during the presidential election. Thus, in June 1936, at the 9th Congress of the Communist Party, held in New York, the party adopted the slogan “Communism is 20th Century Americanism”; it deemed the Republican Party, the American Liberty League, and the Hearst alliance a reactionary block and asserted that their primary election activity would be to defeat it. Since Browder had become the party’s presidential nominee, he clarified, on more than one occasion, that he would not support Roosevelt. However, Thomas, of the Socialist Party, criticized him and noted that Communist International had ordered the Communist Party to indirectly support Roosevelt. However, in reality, despite Stalin and Communist International officially asking Browder to support Roosevelt in the election, the turbulent Communist Party of the United States did not entirely follow this route and chose Browder as its nominee.³⁰

After the November 1936 presidential election, the disorder in the Communist Party of the United States’ direction increased further. While Browder had said he would sound out the possibility of splitting the two major parties and forming a third one until December 1936, by June 1937, he began to think that the two major parties could protect workers’ and farmers’ movements and could cast off their skin and become political parties that encompassed the latter. Thus, the Communist Party of the United States finally abandoned its plan to form

newly by rallying together democratic movements and organizations into a Farmer-Labor Party that would differ from the two major parties.

Part 4 The Communist Party's 10th Congress and the Democratic Front Proposal

While considering the 1935 to 1936 presidential election movement as an opportunity to advance its efforts of establishing a Farmer-Labor Party, the Communist Party began to look for a way to realize the Popular Front plan in the United States. To do so, it called for the development of the likes of the MFLP, the WPP, the WCF, the ALP, and the LNPL; it further indicated that it would actively engage in joint action and mass movements with these groups.³¹

At the congress of the Massachusetts Communist Party held on September 19th, 1937, Browder praised President Roosevelt's Constitution Day speech and stated that he generally agreed with its outlook and direction. He announced to the Communist Party and its supporters that the issues that they do not agree on are not ones that require practical solutions for the time being. He argued that a large foundation for joint struggle can be found within Roosevelt's views.³² Furthermore, at the Political Bureau's expansion meeting held on November 18th and 19th of the same year, Browder stated that the CIO's legislative program, announced in Atlantic City, and the attitude of collective security expressed in Roosevelt's October 1937 Quarantine Speech meant that the Popular Front's program had been developed.³³

Foster, the Communist Party leader, who collapsed due to a heart attack at the height of the 1932 presidential election, viewed the American masses as having developed a Popular Front movement throughout the course of their history before the emergence of such a concept in Europe. He asserted that since such a front had been deeply rooted in the American tradition for a long time, it was not as necessary in the United States as it was in the countries of Europe.³⁴

Thus, both Browder and Foster, reflecting on American history, considered the populism of the end of the nineteenth century, the Chicago Farmer-Labor Party of the 1920s, the 1922 to 1924 Conference for Progressive Political Action, and so on as early forms of the Popular Front movement; they also understood the New Deal Regime as having inherited this tradition.³⁵ Another reason for this was the Communist Party leadership's prioritization of the question of how communist and socialist movements would be ensured to take root in the United States; in other words, they focused on how concrete movements and routes for the Americanization of communism could be established. Thus, the Communist Party had to appeal to the social reform tradition, which dated from the country's independence, and to the historical significance of American democracy. By taking such a bold step, they were attempting to open up a new chapter in the development of a mass movement and the expansion of their support base.

From February 18 to 21, 1938, the Communist Party's Central Committee meeting and the National Party Builder's Delegates Conference were held in New York. James W. Ford gave a presentation entitled "Rally the Negro Masses for the Democratic Front" and officially proposed the Democratic Front plan for the first time through it. Ford strongly supported groups such as the National Negro Congress, the Committee of One Million, and the Harlem Legislation Conference; he also called for the establishment of an anti-lynching law in support of the New Deal policy and the development of a black people's movement that would inherit the tradition of Lincoln and Frederick Douglass.³⁶

Gene Dennis, in an article entitled "Some Question Concerning the Democratic Front," stated that the Democratic Front's primary aim was joining together with all the progressive

forces and movements to defeat the financial capital attack and block the path to fascism.³⁷ Furthermore, Dennis also called for a democratic bloc to be formed in which all workers and the progressive and democratic forces who fought reactionaries and fascism and worked toward protecting and developing the democracy would act jointly.³⁸ He emphasized that if this bloc became widespread, fluent joint action involving several organizations and forms of practice would further develop.³⁹ If, as a result, Dennis stated, the likes of the CIO, the LNPL, the AFL, the ALP, and the Non-Partisan Political League engaged in unified action, a labor movement and mass movement based on a strong Democratic Front would probably emerge.⁴⁰

At this time the Communist party considered the Democratic Front as a step toward the Popular Front. Dennis explained that the former was not a rejection of the latter but rather a present measure that would open up a path for the establishment of an anti-fascist Popular Front and thus ensure democracy's victory over fascism.⁴¹ Dennis also listed the ALP, the CIO, the AFL, the Federation for Political Unity (California), the LNPL, the Townsend movement, the EPIC movement, the WFC, and so on as organizations and movements that were in solidarity with the Democratic Front.⁴²

Entering 1938, the Communist Party viewed the American tradition of democracy and farmer-labor movements very positively according to its Democratic Front plan and pushed to an extreme its approach of drawing close to people of all classes, including the petit bourgeoisie. However, intense opposition from the Communist Party's general members continued to emerge in response to this major change in course toward communism's "Americanization." Considering that there was unrest within the party even regarding the plan of the 7th Conference of the Communist International, due to the party's adoption of an extreme policy line around when the Great Depression began, it was only natural that intense debates arose regarding the Democratic Front.⁴³

With the 10th Congress ahead of them, the Central Committee held a discussion meeting to prepare for it and presented resolutions for the Congress to its members. Members responded with the following questions: What would be the relation of the movements aiming to establish a Popular Front and a Farmer-Labor Party with the Democratic Front? Would the Democratic Front mean a fundamental change to the party line? There were other questions along these lines as well.⁴⁴ The Central Committee responded that the efforts to achieve a Democratic Front were the first step toward a Popular Front; the former differed from the Popular Front as they considered it impossible to organize this wide-ranging mass movement into a new party; and the Communist Party's original objective of forming a Farmer-Labor Party had been shelved.⁴⁵

Considerable debate arose between the general membership and the Central Committee with regard to the Democratic Front proposal. However, a resolution was finally adopted that viewed the struggle for a Democratic Front as the correct tactical course, which would—within the American political context and its institution of elections—lead to a Popular Front.⁴⁶ The party thus faced its 10th Congress.

The 10th Congress of the Communist Party was held from May 27 to 31, 1938 in New York; approximately seven hundred party representatives were in attendance. At the Congress, it was proposed that the party move forward with the reconstruction of American socialism by organizing and developing a Democratic Front. Furthermore, it was resolved that while implementing concrete measures that had been carried out in later New Deal policies (securing basic worker's rights to organize and strike, raising wages, shortening working hours, thorough implementation of compulsory education, protection of black people's rights, creating social security, etc.), the Communist Party would aim to develop a mass movement and expand

its power base. In other words, as could be observed through Browder's congress report, this congress confirmed that the Communist Party of the United States would, while highly valuing the American democratic tradition and the historical significance of its social reforms, push forward with the Democratic Front movement under the New Deal Regime.⁴⁷

While this did lead to the expansion of its power base in some mass movements and the like, it also led to a tendency to individually overvalue the labor movement's leaders (the United Textile Workers of America's Philip Murray, United Mine Workers' John L. Lewis, etc.), and this overestimation of the CIO also led to the breakup of Communist Party factions within labor unions and the elimination of the workplace newspaper institution in some cases. This proved that the Communist Party's policy line could not develop a party-specific movement with regard to the New Deal Regime that functioned as a "broker."⁴⁸

Conclusion

As seen from the abovementioned information, the Communist Party, which sought to establish communism in and apply it to the United States, tried to expand and develop a wide-ranging Popular Front by proposing a Democratic Front. However, this change in the party line also resulted in the party losing sight of its aim to reform the New Deal Regime in a socialist fashion; furthermore, it led to considerable disorder in the party line and its activities. For example, Browder's approach—which stated that an unchanged Jeffersonian democratic thought could be implemented as the Communist Party platform and that the traditions of the American labor, farmer, and black people's movements would naturally develop into socialist movements—was later called Browderism and deemed to be the greatest error in the party's entire history.⁴⁹

The Communist Party of the United States, with the Communist International emphasizing the threat of fascism and the protection of democracy, favorably evaluated later period New Deal policies and the Roosevelt administration. It began to rapidly draw close to the New Deal Regime and was thus buried within it. This was because the Communist Party, under the influence of the Communist International's direction, became too focused on the threat of fascism and was dragged along by New Deal policies and the Roosevelt administration. For example, when the American Liberty League embarked on its major anti-Roosevelt and anti-New Deal campaign, the Communist party criticized it as being in danger of becoming fascist as it viewed the New Deal Regime as the complete opposite of fascist regimes. However, if one considers that, although Browder was the party's candidate in the 1936 presidential election, the party indirectly supported Roosevelt against the Republican Party in getting re-elected, it appears that they could not fully determine an adequate organizational direction with regard to the fundamental problem of how the New Deal Regime that was supported by the Roosevelt Coalition could be evaluated.⁵⁰

Furthermore, when the later-period New Deal turned leftward in its social policies and institutional reforms, the "democracy" advocated by the New Deal Regime strengthened the tendency to look for enemies on the outside, thus externalizing fascism. In other words, the time during which anti-fascism and the protection of democracy was emphasized internationally at the 7th Congress of Communist International and the time of the left turn of the later-period New Deal (after part of it had been judged unconstitutional) overlapped. The Communist Party of the United States could not fully respond to such changes in the New Deal Regime.

Regardless, the Communist Party adopted a too-simplistic perspective that saw the threat of fascism existing within the United States as it did in Europe. Particularly during the later period of the New Deal, industry, which resisted state control and labor regulations, strengthened its support of the ALL. However, as before, the ALL considered Long's Share-Our-Wealth movement and Europe's fascist regimes as dangers. Furthermore, in the United States, monopolistic and financial capital clashed with or used the Roosevelt administration and did not place their hopes in fascist regimes.

Therefore, after Long's assassination, when the Union Party was formed and the leaders of "Panacea" movements joined forces to fight in the presidential election (Gerald L. K. Smith, the successor to Long; Father Charles E. Coughlin, who formed the National Union for Social Justice; Doctor Francis Townsend, who advocated the establishment of a unique elderly pension system; etc.), they were crushingly defeated as they could not obtain the public's support. In other words, as can also be seen by the 1930 Fish Committee and the 1934 McCormack Committee, right-wing and fascist movements and organizations were rejected as un-American in the United States.⁵¹

Considering the fact that the later-period New Deal framework spread and an overwhelming number of Americans came together to form the foundation of the Roosevelt Coalition, the New Deal Regime itself could embrace a wide swath of people. Thus, New Deal liberalism was so powerful that it could incorporate socialist thought and movements into this regime. Therefore, with regard to the Communist Party's policy line, which was subordinate to the New Deal Regime, it is inadequate to merely focus on the responsibility of individuals within its leadership or point out directional flaws and limitations. We must also consider this policy line as having been influenced by the New Deal policy framework and the New Deal Regime's comprehensive socioeconomic system.

Furthermore, there were various institutional constraints on and regulations regarding a party like the Communist Party engaging in election activities on a local level in the United States. Thus, under the country's two-party system, the primary problem was how Republican and Democratic parties could exert political leadership. It was very difficult for a third party with a specific ideology to grow on a national scale.⁵² Furthermore, the American labor movement had a strong tendency of attempting to eliminate socialist ideology and diminish the Socialist Party. To secure supporters for Roosevelt's reelection, the leadership of CIO unions formed the Labor's Non-Partisan League (LNPL); however, this league rejected the Communist Party's proposal for it to develop itself into an independent political party as it was focused on staying within the New Deal Regime.

Notes

1. This study has used original materials preserved at Syracuse University's George Arents Research Center, Emory University's Robert W. Woodruff Library, New York University's Tamiment Library, the New York Public Library, as well as other institutions. Also, see Kawauchi Nobuyuki, *The New Deal as a Social System: American Society under the Great Depression* (Tokyo: Gakujutsu Shuppankai, 2005), ch. 10, 11.
2. Georgii M. Dimitrov, *The United Front Against Fascism*, trans. by Sakai Nobuyoshi and Murata Yōichi (Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1970), pp. 55-57; William Z. Foster, *History of the Communist Party of the United States* (New York: International Publishers, 1952), pp. 320-323; Earl Browder, "The Results of the Elections and the People's Front," *The Communist*, XVI-1 (January, 1937), pp. 18, 40-41; Earl Browder, "The Communists in the People's Front," *The Communist*, XVI-7 (July, 1937), pp. 599-601.
3. Earl Browder, "The United Front-The Key to Our New Tactical Orientation," *The Communist*, XVI-12 (December, 1935), pp. 1075-1029; Martin Ebon, *World Communism Today* (New York: McGraw-Hill

- Book Company Inc., 1948), pp. 284-285.
4. I. Amter, "The Elections in the New York," *The Communist*, XV-2 (December, 1936), p. 1146; V. J. Jerome, "Charting the Course of the Democratic Front," *The Communist*, VII-4 (April, 1938), pp. 342-343.
 5. C. A. Hathway, "Problems in Our Farmer-Labor Party Activities," *The Communist* XV-5 (May, 1936), pp. 430-432; Nat Ross, "The People's Mandate in Minnesota," *The Communist*, XVI-6 (June, 1937), pp. 534-544; Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *The American Communist Party* (New York: Frederick APraeger Publishers, 1962), p. 329.
 6. I. Amter, *op. cit.*, pp. 1147-1148; Max Steinberg, "Problems of Party Growth in the New York District," *The Communist*, XV-7 (July, 1936), pp. 643-664.
 7. Earl Browder, "The Results of the Elections and the People's Front," *op. cit.*, p. 31; Nat Ross, *op. cit.*, p. 544; C. A. Hathway, "Trotskyism in the United States," *The Communist*, X VI-3 (March, 1937), p.276. The following studies comprehensively cover the Minnesota Farmer's Party and the Wisconsin Progressive Party (WPP): Donald R. McCoy, *Angry Voices: Left-of-Center Politics in the New Deal Era* (New York: Kennikat Press, 1971); George H. Mayer, *The Political Career of Floyd B. Olson* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1951); Richard M. Valelly, *Radicalism in the States: The Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party and the American Political Economy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); Millard L. Gieske, *Minnesota Farmer-Laborism: The Third-Party Alternative* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979); Lester F. Schmidt, "The Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation: The Study of A 'United Front' Movement among Wisconsin Liberals, 1934-1941," Ph. D. dissertation (University of Wisconsin Press, 1954); George M. Stabler, "Wisconsin Farmer Movement: A Quantitative Approach," Master's thesis (University of Wisconsin Press, 1993); David Nass, ed., *Holiday: Minnesotans Remember the Farmers' Holiday Association* (New York: Plains, 1984).
 8. Earl Browder, "The People's Front Moves Forward," *The Communist*, XVI-12 (December, 1937), pp. 1095-1096.
 9. William Z. Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 303-304; Editorial, "Lessons of Economic Struggle, Tasks of the Communists in the Trade Unions," *The Communist*, XIII-5 (May, 1934), pp. 470-472.
 10. William Z. Foster, *ibid.*, pp. 308-309; James N. Ford, "The National Negro Congress," *The Communist*, XV-5 (May, 1935), pp. 457-464; James W. Ford, "Build the National Negro Congress Movement," *The Communist*, XV-6 (June, 1936), pp. 552-556, 560-561; Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *op. cit.*, pp. 356-357.
 11. Herbert Benjamin, "Six Months of Unity of the Unemployed," *The Communist*, XV-11 (November, 1936), pp. 1057-1063; Herbert Benjamin, "Unemployment an Old Struggle under New Conditions," *The Communist*, XVII-5 (May, 1938), pp. 422-423; Herbert Benjamin, "Extending the Unity of the Unemployed Movements," *The Communist*, XVI-8 (August, 1937), p. 766.
 12. James O Neal and G. A. Werner, *American Communists* (New York : E. P. Dutton Co., Inc., 1947), p. 253; Daniel Bell, *Marxian Socialism in the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 170; Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *op. cit.*, p. 358.
 13. Daniel Bell, *ibid.*, p.140.
 14. Earl Browder, "The Results of the Elections and the People's Front," *op. cit.*, p.22. Dimitroff considered Long's Share-Our-Wealth movement as being facing the most risk of turning fascist. Georgi Dimitroff, "The Threat of Fascism in the United States," *The Communist*, XIV-10 (October 1935); Alan Brinsky, *Voices of Protest: Huey Long, Father Coughlin, and the Great Depression* (New York: Knopf, 1982); Abraham Holtzman, *The Townsend Movement: A Political Study* (New York: Bookman, 1963); Charles J. Tull, *Father Coughlin and the New Deal* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1965); T. Harry Williams, *Huey Long* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969); Sander A. Diamond, *The Nazi Movement in the United States, 1924-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974).
 15. Barton Bernstein, "The New Deal: The Conservative Achievements of Liberal Reform," in Barton Bernstein ed., *Toward a New Past* (New York: A Division of Random House, 1969), pp. 263-288.
 16. Donald B. Johnson & Kirk H. Porter, eds., *National Party Platforms 1840-1972* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1937), p.360-365. Hirata Miwako, "The Formation of the New Deal Alliance," *International Relations Studies Research* 13 (1987).
 17. William Z. Foster, *op. cit.*, p.333; Editorial, "Election Campaign Outline for 1936," *The Communist*,

- XV-9 (September, 1936), pp. 821-827; David Ramsey, "Platforms and Issues in 1936," *The Communist*, XV-7 (July, 1936), p.613; Donald B. Johnson & Kirk H. Porter, eds., *op. cit.*, pp. 350-360, 370-373, 375.
18. David Ramsey, *ibid.*, pp. 600-607; William Z. Foster, *ibid.*, p. 327.
 19. David Ramsey, *ibid.*, pp. 612-613.
 20. *Ibid.*, p. 614.
 21. Editorial, "Statement of the Central Committee, C. P. U. S. A. issued November 7, 1936," *The Communist*, XV-12 (December, 1936), p. 1108; William Z. Foster, *op. cit.*, p.336; Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *op. cit.*, pp. 327-330; Martin Ebon, *op. cit.*, p. 285; Earl Browder, "The Result of the Elections and the People's Front," *op. cit.*, p.25.
 22. William Z. Foster, *ibid.*, p. 335; Earl Browder, *ibid.*, pp. 32, 41-42; David Ramsey, *op. cit.*, pp. 615-616; David A. Shannon, *The Socialist Party of America: A Critical History* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1967); Frank A. Warren, *An Alternative Vision: The Socialist Party in the 1930's* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974); Elmer A. Becker, *The Sewer Socialist: A History of the Socialist Party of Wisconsin, 1897-1940* (Madison: Westburg Associates, 1982); James R. Green, *Grass-Roots Socialism: Radical Movement in the Southwest, 1895-1943* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978).
 23. Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *op. cit.*, pp. 329-331; William Z. Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 332-334.
 24. David A. Shannon, *op. cit.*, p. 245; Daniel Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 145; Earl Browder, "The Results of the Elections and the People's Front," *op. cit.*, p. 40.
 25. Editorial, "Statement of the Central Committee, C.P.U.S.A., issued November 7, 1936," *op. cit.*, p. 1104; Earl Browder, "The Results of the Elections and the People's Front," *ibid.*, pp. 23-25.
 26. Editorial, *ibid.*, pp. 1104-1105; Earl Browder, *ibid.*, pp. 23-25.
 27. Editorial, *ibid.*, pp. 1104-1105; Earl Browder, "The Communist in the People's Front," *op. cit.*, p. 598; William Z. Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 332.
 28. Editorial, *ibid.*, pp. 1108-1110.
 29. Stalin and Wells' meeting was announced three months after it actually happened, in October 1934. It is said that during Wells' interview of him, Stalin stated that Roosevelt was an outstanding leader within the world of capitalism in terms of his talent as a politician and power to unify people. Harvey Klehr, *The Heyday of American Communism: The Depression Decade* (New York: Basic, 1984), p. 179.
 30. Harvey Klehr, *ibid.*, p. 195; W. A. Swanberg, *Norman Thomas: The Last Idealist* (New York: Scribners, 1976), pp. 133-135.
 31. Earl Browder, "Democracy or Fascism," in Allen Guttman & Benjamin Munnzieglen, eds., *Communism, the Courts and the Constitution* (Boston: D. C. Heath Company, 1964), pp. 14-19; William Z. Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 337-338; Earl Browder, "The Results of the Elections and the People's Front," *op. cit.*, pp. 17-23.
 32. Earl Browder, "The People's Front Moves Forward," *op. cit.*, pp. 1092-1093.
 33. *Ibid.*, pp. 1092-1093.
 34. William Z. Foster, "American Origins of the People's Front," *The Communist*, XVI-12 (December, 1937), pp.1103-1104.
 35. William Z. Foster, *ibid.*, pp. 1104-1105.
 36. James W. Ford, "Rally the Negro Masses for the Democratic Front," *The Communist*, XVII-3 (March, 1938), pp. 266-270.
 37. Gene Dennis, "Some Question Concerning the Democratic Front," *The Communist*, XVII-6 (June, 1938), p. 535.
 38. *Ibid.*, p. 535.
 39. *Ibid.*, p. 535.
 40. *Ibid.*, pp. 538-540.
 41. *Ibid.*, p. 538.
 42. *Ibid.*, pp. 535-536, 538-540.
 43. Kawauchi Nobuyuki, "The Communist Party of the United States During the Early New Deal Period," *Shien* 122 (1978). Cf. Kawauchi Nobuyuki, "The Communist Party of the United States Before and After the Outbreak of the Great Depression," *Contemporary History Research* 28 (1976).
 44. C. A. Hathway, "Building the Democratic Front," *The Communist*, XVII-5 (May, 1938), pp. 404-405.

45. *Ibid.*, pp. 403-404.
46. C. A. Hathway, *ibid.*, pp. 404-407. Cf. Sean D. Cashman, *America, Roosevelt, and World War II* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1989), ch. 7.
47. Earl Browder, "Summation Speech at the Tenth National Convention," *The Communist*, XVIII-7 (July, 1938), pp. 595-598; Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *op. cit.*, pp. 332, 339, 341; Jacques Duclos, "On the Dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States," *Political Affairs*, XII (July, 1945); Robert F. Hall, et al., "Problems of Building the Democratic Front," *The Communist*, XVII-7 (July, 1938); William Z. Foster, *History of the Communist Party*, pp. 381-382.
48. Irving Howe & Lewis Coser, *op. cit.*, pp. 331-332, 335-336; William Z. Foster, *ibid.*, pp. 336-337, 380-382.
49. Rita J. Simon, *As We Saw the Thirties: Essays on Social and Political Movements of a Decade* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967); Fraser M. Ottanelli, *The Communist Party of the United States: From the Depression to World War II* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991).
50. George Wolfskill, *The Revolt of the Conservatives: A History of the American Liberty League, 1934-1940* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962); John W. Davis, "Principles," *Vital Speeches*, (October 20, 1936); Greta Palmer, "The Spirit of '76," *Today*, (April 11, 1936); George Creel, "The True Friend," *Collier's*, (December 14, 1935); Alva Johnston, "Hundred-Tongued Charlie," *Saturday Evening Post*, (May 30, 1936).
51. Roger Griffin, *International Fascism: Theories, Causes and the New Consensus* (London: Oxford University Press, 1998). Shinkawa Kenzaburō, "The New Deal and Fascism," *Social Thought Quarterly* 2-3 (1971); "A Study on the New Deal: In Relation to Fascism," in *The 1930s in World History*, ed. by Eguchi Bokurō (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten, 1971). Miyake Akiyoshi, *American Fascism: Long and Roosevelt* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1997). Tsuchida Hiroshi, *The Phantom President: The Life of Huey Long* (Tokyo: Sairyusha, 1984). Saitō Makoto, "Huey Long and New Deal Politics: Political Dynamics under Mass Democracy," in *Movements and Resistance*, ed. by Tōkyō Daigaku Shakai Kagaku Kenkyūsho, *Fascism Period States and Society* 7, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1979).
52. Steven J. Rosenstone, et al., *Third Parties in America: Citizen Response to Major Party Failure* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); J. David Gillespie, *Politics at the Periphery: Third Parties in Two-Party America* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1993); Earl R. Kruschke, *Encyclopedia of Third Parties in the United States* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 1991); James M. Youngdale, ed., *Third Party Footprints: An Anthology from Writings and Speeches of Midwest Radicals* (Minneapolis: Ross and Haines, Inc., 1966). According to the present US Communist Party site, "The Communist Party does not endorse candidates from other parties, but we are deeply involved in mobilizing people to participate in the elections." <www.cpusa.org>

*Acknowledgment

I would like to express my gratitude to Chubu University for the special research grant awarded to conduct this study.