

7-
TEHERAN

and

AMERICA

by Earl Browder

TEHERAN
AND
AMERICA

Perspectives and Tasks.

By EARL BROWDER

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS • *New York*

NOTE

This pamphlet contains the main report and concluding remarks of Earl Browder, General Secretary, at the plenary session of the Communist Party National Committee, held in New York, on January 7-9, 1944.

CONTENTS

I. The Significance of Teheran	5
II. The Extension of the Coalition Unity Into the Post-War Period	12
III. National Unity in the War and Post-War Periods	16
IV. The Coming Presidential Elections	29
V. Problems of the Organization of Communists	38
Marxism Arms Communists to Meet and Solve Issues Today	43

I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF TEHERAN

ANY realistic dealing with national and world problems today must begin and end with an evaluation of the Teheran meeting of Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt, and the auxiliary conferences of Cairo and Moscow. The answer to all other questions will depend, in the final analysis, upon the judgment made of Teheran and its consequences.

Before Teheran, the world faced two central questions which had not yet been answered: Was it possible for Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States to bring their full combined power to bear against the main enemy, Nazi Germany, in full coalition warfare, and thus ensure the quickest and least costly victory in the war? Would this coalition, after the destruction of its common enemy, break up into its component parts, each going its own way, and thus open up immediately a new period of revolutionary upheavals and international wars that would inevitably culminate in World War III?

From Teheran the chief leaders of the three powers gave clear and definite answers to both questions. Since their declaration is of a conciseness that is characteristic of the greatest documents of history, I will quote the entire text. It says:

"We, the President of the United States of America, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of the Soviet Union, have met in these four days past in this the capital of our ally, Teheran, and have shaped and confirmed our common policy.

"We express our determination that our nations shall work together in the war and in the peace that will follow.

"As to the war, our military staffs have joined in our roundtable discussions and we have concerted our plans for

the destruction of the German forces. We have reached complete agreement as to the scope and timing of operations which will be undertaken from the east, west and south. The common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.

"And as to the peace, we are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace. We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the nations to make a peace which will command good will from the overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world and banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations.

"With our diplomatic advisers we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own people, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they may choose to come into the world family of democratic nations.

"No power on earth can prevent our destroying the German armies by land, their U-boats by sea and their war plants from the air. Our attacks will be relentless and increasing.

"Emerging from these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all the peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences.

"We came here with hope and determination. We leave here friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose."

That is all. It is enough to answer the main questions, and to give in the most realistic form a new perspective to the world.

There is but one way to understand the Declaration of Teheran. That is to take it at its face value. It means what it says, and it does not mean something else. All commentators who have attempted to decipher some mysterious and hidden meanings behind the open and frank words of this Declaration have as a consequence proceeded from one confusion and blunder to another. There are deep implications in the Declaration, but they can be unfolded only as we start unconditionally from the premise that the words mean what they say.

Complete agreement as to the scope and timing of military operations from east, west and south, reached between the High Command of the three great Allies, has long been understood by all serious persons as the sole guarantee of victory. The Nazis have long known this to be the sure doom of the Third Reich. The only thing that was not certain was whether that complete agreement could be reached. The Nazis based all their hopes upon that complete agreement being blocked by differences among their enemies, whipped up and played upon by their friends within Britain and America. All anti-fascists based their word and deed upon contributing everything to bring that complete agreement into being. That was accomplished in Teheran.

In the nature of things the details of that agreement will be known only as they unfold in action. For the world outside the active military command, the only important thing is the existence of the agreement. Given this agreement, the rest of us have no reservations to the motto, "Leave it to the experts," which we opposed only when it was used to block the agreement rather than to find and execute it.

The guarantee of victory is not, however, the substance of victory. The guarantee is operative only in battle, and for the United States the serious fighting on a large scale is only now about to open up. Only now do the American people begin to pay the price of victory in casualty lists of dead, wounded and prisoners that will exceed our normal peace-time blood-letting in highway accidents, the price of automobile transport.

Our irresponsible American newspapers have done and are still doing serious harm to the morale of the people by the constant spread of illusions, in the most varied forms, that victory will come without any heavy price in American lives. That is the only reason why the seditious speculations of a Wheeler, a Nye, and a Taft-Hartmann-Norman Thomas "Peace Now" movement, can offer a serious threat to our country's supreme war effort now about to open. For the American people are essentially sound and practical, as re-

vealed in past moments of national peril, and if not confused by the daily din of the newspapers would fully understand that victory comes only through battle.

THE FULL MOBILIZATION OF OUR ALLIES

Consequent upon the complete agreement on the scope and timing of the main military forces of the three great Allies, there has finally been started the process of mobilizing our other allies for the struggle as a joint task of the coalition. The line of policy this takes is exemplified by the Moscow Conference Declarations on Austria and Italy, and by the current steps being taken in support of the Government of Marshal Tito and Ivan Ribar in Yugoslavia.

I will not repeat here the extended discussions in which we have engaged on these questions during the past year and a half. They have been rather fully reported in our own press. How fully correct we were throughout the whole discussion has been established by events. It is only unfortunate that so few of those who now see the truth about Yugoslavia are yet aware that it was the deadly anti-Communist prejudice which blinded them for so long.

There is excessive delay in putting into application the policy laid down on Italy. This delay is costly in a military sense, causing the loss of many additional American lives. In my recent speech in Cooper Union I pointed out that the anti-Communist prejudice of the Antonini-Pope gang, exerted upon Charles Poletti (ranking American officer in AMG), was doubtless responsible for this delay. In the interests of the balanced view, I must now add that Mr. Poletti is not the highest official in AMG in Italy, that his chief is a Britisher, Lord Rennell of Rodd.

It is of more than passing interest to learn that this Lord Rennell of Rodd, who is primarily responsible for the sorry record of AMG in Italy, has the most intimate connection with the old Cliveden Set and the Oxford Movement of pro-Hitler notoriety. His son is married to Nancy Freeman-Mitford, whose sister Unity Freeman-Mitford emigrated to Ger-

many to live near her idol, Hitler, and who shot herself when she was discarded by Der Fuehrer. A second sister is the wife of Sir Oswald Mosley, the head of British fascism, whose recent release from confinement raised such a storm in England. This Lord Rennell is very close with the Polish anti-Soviet circles in London. The ardor of this whole circle in the war against Hitler is to be measured by their current slogan: "Nazism is only a pale copy of Bolshevism."

Clearly, with such men in position to determine the application of policy, we will not succeed in mobilizing our allies and potential allies in Europe. In every country of Europe the mobilization of the people against Hitlerism requires the united front that includes the Communists, on the model of the Yugoslav Liberation Army and Government. Men like Lord Rennell of Rodd, who require smelling-salts to keep from swooning when the word Communist is mentioned in their presence, are entirely incapable of applying the policies of the Moscow and Teheran Conferences.

The speed with which the Yugoslav situation is being clarified in these days should serve to give us hope that the same sort of progress will be made everywhere. The Cliveden Set Lords and the Antonini-Pope groups in America cannot for long hold back the full application of the principles embodied in the Teheran Conference, which alone will mobilize our allies for the full war against Hitlerism.

In the declaration of the Cairo Conference, signed by Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek, is a very comprehensive outline of the military goal against Japan, and of China's place in the post-war world. This is of basic importance, and goes far toward laying the ground for an Asiatic political strategy paralleling that for Europe. There is still no official intimation, however, that any direct help has been offered to solve the inner crisis in China, which threatens heavy disasters to the Allied cause in the Far East.

How deep and threatening is the crisis within China is revealed for the first time in the documents published in the current issue of *The Communist*. Our traditional diplomacy has caused this to be covered up by the war censorship, and

the only way we are meeting a dire menace to American lives is the ostrich policy of sticking our heads in the sand. (Incidentally, it is denied by authorities that even the ostrich is so stupid as to meet a menace by covering his eyes; that story was invented by men who did not like humanity to present the only example of such stupidity.) I have for years been calling public attention to this sore spot in the Far East. Such able persons as Edgar Snow, Agnes Smedley and Major [now Lieutenant-Colonel] Carlson have thrown much light on it in many books of general circulation. The time has passed when this matter can be allowed to drift further toward disaster. It is the clear duty of the United States Government to establish consular and military representation in the China Northwest Autonomous Border Regions, whose armies are carrying half the military burden of the war against Japan on Chinese territory; to insure that a proportionate share of American lend-lease aid reaches those armies; and to undertake, in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter, to assist the Chungking regime to avert the menace of civil war in China.

It is a danger signal that at the moment when the Axis was being held or driven back with huge losses, in Asia and Europe, that it could make two bold advances in the Western Hemisphere. The Ramirez military dictatorship in Argentina has now been followed by a similarly-inspired and organized coup in Bolivia. It is further known that agents of the Bolivian pro-fascist military conspiracy which has seized power there, were long working within agencies of the United States Government, and enjoyed the confidence of the highest circles in this country. All they had to do, to gain entrance into the most confidential official circles, was to demonstrate their anti-Communist prejudices. At the same time powerful forces in the U. S. are openly instigating and backing up the Sinarquist movement in Mexico, an anti-United Nations and pro-Axis movement, without rebuke or hindrance from the government. The U. S. foreign services are honeycombed with Trotskyites, every one of whom is an actual or potential agent of Hitler. Thus we see danger arising in relation to Latin America similar to that in China.

VICTORY OVER HITLER IN 1944

General Eisenhower, Commander of the Anglo-American forces for the coming invasion of Western Europe, has given the official military perspective for victory over Hitlerism in this year of 1944.

The gigantic victories already won by the Red Armies, the heroic exploits of Marshal Tito's forces in the Mediterranean, the breaking of the U-boat blockade in the Atlantic, and the overwhelming accumulations of war materials in America and England, all serve to create a setting in which the Anglo-American officers and men can very soberly and realistically set the goal of victory for this year.

Military forces can carry out even the most realistic plans, however, only if they are solidly backed up by the home front in each country, and if the coalition of nations is welded solidly together.

There remain serious dangers on these fields, to which I next propose to direct our attention.

II. THE EXTENSION OF THE COALITION UNITY INTO THE POST-WAR PERIOD

CHURCHILL, Stalin and Roosevelt in Teheran expressed the determination to "work together in the war and in the peace that will follow."

Dealing with the war and the peace thus in a single sentence was surely not accidental. It reflected the insuperable difficulties in waging a joint war without having a joint perspective for the peace to follow, and the impossibility of any perspective for a long peace unless the war is jointly fought and jointly won.

Both phases of this declaration must be taken with equal seriousness. We cannot accept one and reject the other. They stand together in their very nature, like Siamese twins who, if severed, are in the gravest danger of immediate death.

When Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt can say they "have surveyed the problems of the future," and that they "are sure that our concord will make it an enduring peace"; when they hold out a perspective of a future which will "banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations"—then we may be sure that these three men have found a path to which, as realists, they expect to win not only the great majority of their own people, but the "overwhelming masses of the peoples of the world." They were not playing with diplomatic phrases. They were projecting a practical policy.

The difficulties which stood in the way of such agreement are not secrets. The whole thinking world knows what they were. And knowing this, we can begin to formulate for ourselves on a much more extensive scale than the official communiqués give us, the nature of the common policy, the "concord," which was begun in Teheran.

Not so widely appreciated as the difficulties, there was operative in Teheran a motive for agreement for the post-war period equally as forceful as the motive for agreement on the joint war.

Where the over-riding consideration for a joint coalition

war against Hitlerism is the alternative of a Hitler-dominated world, which means the extinguishing of civilization for generations to come, it must be recognized that for the coalition peace, after Hitlerism has been destroyed, there is the equally strong motive that without it the alternative is the spread of civil wars over vast areas, culminating finally and inevitably in a new world war between nations.

Those who have said, lightheartedly, that it was Hitler who forced the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition but as soon as Hitler is gone the coalition will fly apart overnight, were but shallow thinkers who underestimated the depth of the world crisis through which we live. Likewise they underestimated the amount of effective intelligence that has been achieved by mankind. Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill at Teheran were the representatives of the collective intelligence of mankind facing the threatening supreme catastrophe of history and determined to avert it.

What were the difficulties in the way of concord?

First, there were the differences between the socialist and capitalist sectors of the anti-Hitler coalition. Each side of this line of demarkation clearly would be happier if the rest of the world were shaped more nearly in its own image. The ruling circles in Britain and America have grown up in an atmosphere of shuddering fear and abhorrence of the socialist revolution embodied in the Soviet Union, and everything even remotely associated in their minds with it. It was this deep and unreasoning fear, indeed, which brought about the Munich policy that raised Hitler to power, and brought Britain and America to the brink of destruction—a measure of how powerfully it operated. The Soviet Union, for its part, had the sharp memory of universal hostility from the capitalist world, armed invasions to overthrow it, long-continued conspiracies to undermine it from within, and finally the Munich incitement of Hitler to his invasion which finally came in June, 1941.

These old hostilities and suspicions had to be overcome as the precondition for the Teheran concord.

British and American ruling circles had to be convinced that their joint war together with the Soviet Union against

Hitlerism would not result in the Soviet socialist system being extended to Western Europe under the stimulus of the victorious Red Armies. The men who determine Soviet policy had to be convinced that Western capitalist circles had finally learned that the Soviet Union is in this world to stay, and that hostility to it can only bring disaster to themselves as well as the rest of the world. Upon this basis, both sides could then come to an agreement as to how all particular problems should be solved by conference, conciliation and agreement, without either immediate or ultimate resort to the arbitrament of war.

Clearly, when Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill registered such basic agreement in Teheran, they were registering not alone their own personal convictions, but spoke for a growing majority in their own countries, as well as the rest of the world.

Capitalism and socialism have begun to find the way to peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the same world.

Such general agreement necessarily must show itself practically, not alone in the conduct of the military struggle, but in beginning to shape the post-war world which will emerge from it. Such agreement begins to take its form in the examples of Italy and Yugoslavia. It preserves for the war period the basic principle of private property, the basis of capitalism (and thus relieves the fears of British and American ruling circles; it frees the forces of the democratic peoples' revolution, and sweeps away all forms of absolutism, thus relieving the anxiety of Soviet statesmen of a possible re-emergence of the old anti-Soviet forces. It preserves to each nation the ultimate right to determine for itself, within this framework, the form of government and social organization it desires, without any outside pressure.

This broad over-all joint policy in relation to Europe carries with it the duty jointly to exert all influence to minimize and if possible to eliminate the use of violent struggle for the settlement of inner problems, except in the defeat of the Axis forces and their Quislings. A broad all-inclusive anti-fascist democratic camp must be established in each country, within which all relations are determined and problems

settled by free discussion, free political association and universal suffrage. Such a democratic camp of necessity must include the Communists, and this must be emphasized because in America it is still disputed even by many who call themselves "advanced liberals."

An essential part of the whole program of a peaceful post-war world is the achievement of international labor unity. The British Trades Union Congress has taken an initiative to this end, in the call for an international congress of labor to be held in London in June. The overwhelming majority of labor movements of the United Nations has approved this call. Only the leadership of the American Federation of Labor, through Matthew Woll, has come out against it. Woll and his friends have been properly rebuked by the chief spokesmen of British labor. It is to be hoped that the intelligent and patriotic majority of the A. F. of L. leadership, who will certainly receive the support of the bulk of the membership if they speak up, will force a change of attitude upon their dominant reactionary leaders. The Soviet trade unions cannot possibly any longer be excluded from the international labor movement. Woll is attempting his King Canute role too late in history for any success. He can only bring isolation upon the A. F. of L. and not upon the Soviet trade unions.

Such is the main outline of the social and political content of the joint policy upon which is based the realistic promise of a post-war world in which Anglo-Soviet-American cooperation will be continuing and which will organize the family of free, peace-loving, democratic nations of the world.

This is a policy which corresponds to the national interest of all peoples, great and small. There is no workable alternative to this policy, only the alternative of international anarchy.

This is the supreme issue before the world today.

For or against the Declaration of the Teheran Conference is the issue that separates the sheep from the goats, that determines all political alignments from now on until the policies there enunciated have been fully realized in war and peace. It is the all-dominating issue in the United States in the 1944 Presidential elections.

III. NATIONAL UNITY IN THE WAR AND POST-WAR PERIODS

NATIONAL unity in America for the successful prosecution of the war is being most seriously threatened precisely at the moment it is most needed, at the time the supreme blow is being poised by the Anglo-American forces in the invasion of Western Europe in force. Right at this moment there has been released a flood of inner strife in the country, ranging from race riots, to strike provocations, to open defeatist agitation, to the most irresponsible campaigning for the 1944 elections.

The weakest point in our wartime national unity is the widespread belief that it will inevitably, at the moment of victory over Hitler, explode in a simultaneous release of all the inner conflicts that have been held in abeyance by the war. The lack of any clear perspective of national unity in the post-war period thus serves to put the greatest strain upon wartime national unity. This is especially true when the country is authoritatively told that victory will come in 1944, that is, that the lid will be removed from all inner strife in the next months; nearly everyone, even if they are opposed to this perspective, begins to feel a compulsion to prepare, to get set for the outburst of every sort of class, sectional, group and individual conflict that has been postponed in consideration of the war. This situation furnishes the opportunity for the dangerous work of the secret friends and agents of Hitler within the United States.

In anticipation of an early victory, we are thus most seriously endangering that victory.

It would be the greatest single contribution to wartime national unity, therefore, if we could seriously establish the prospect that this unity will be continued in the post-war period, that it will not explode into a chaos of inner struggles at the moment war hostilities cease.

Further, this expectation of unlimited inner conflict threat-

ens to destroy also the perspective of international unity held forth at Teheran. If we wish to uphold and realize the Teheran perspective, we must find the way to minimize, and to place definite limits upon, the settlement of inner differences in the country by conflict in the post-war period. The perspective of inner chaos within the United States is incompatible with the perspective of international order.

These two basic considerations are sufficient to establish the supreme responsibility upon all who support the Teheran policy, to work for such policies within the country that will lead toward, and give realistic promise of, the continuation of national unity into the post-war period for a long term of years.

This is admittedly a goal difficult of attainment. There is a growing accumulation within our country of strains, contradictions, conflicts, antagonisms and unsolved problems of all sorts, which in the absence of clear policy directed toward their control and amelioration—a policy with an effective majority of the country firmly united in its support—will surely cancel the Teheran perspective and bring us again face to face with disaster.

We must face all these difficulties frankly and with full realism. Wishful thinking and illusions will not help us through this grave period of history.

But we must face the difficulties with the full determination to overcome them. We cannot tolerate today the slightest tendency toward defeatism, hopelessness and fatalism.

Everything necessary to win the war in the quickest possible time, and to establish a stable peace—that is, to realize the perspectives of Teheran—must and will be done. Since this includes first of all the consolidation of national unity in our country, and its extension into the post-war period—this also must and will be accomplished.

POST-WAR PLANNING AND NATIONAL UNITY

In the summer of 1942, I wrote on behalf of our party, in my book *Victory—and After*, the following regarding post-war planning:

"Victory for the United Nations over the Axis will bring us face to face with the problems of the post-war reorganization of the world. Many persons and organizations are busily preparing blueprints in anticipation of that day. That is a pastime in which I cannot join. I have no blueprints for the post-war world."

That position remains valid today.

Our post-war plan is national unity for the realization of the perspectives laid down in Teheran.

National unity in the United States cannot be built upon preconceived plans, because it must be a compromise between classes, groups and tendencies which have not agreed on the shape of a plan, and which can only agree as their unity in action takes shape step by step.

Those who are enamored of planning for its own sake are sorely displeased with this approach. They join with enthusiasm in the fashionable avocation of post-war planning. They insist that we must keep up with the Joneses. If the good wife has not a new hat à la mode, she simply feels naked. So with our post-war planners.

A plan for the United States can be helpful, however, only when it has been demonstrated that it can serve the unity of an effective majority of the American people directing our country's policy on the lines of the Teheran Conference.

The greatest danger facing our country is a welter and confusion of plans among the democratic and progressive forces, while the reactionaries will be united on the single "plan" to get power in their hands and switch the nation off the rails of Teheran.

It will be necessary for us to be very harsh and unyielding to this insistent demand for post-war plans on our part. We must put a few questions, and demand clear answers to them from all who aspire to make plans for America.

The first question is, what kind of America are the plans for, a socialist or a capitalist America?

No one can suspect me of holding any prejudices in favor of capitalism, whether in America or elsewhere. I have been an advocate of socialism during all of my adult life, of so-

cialism for America. The Communist Party is the only party of socialism in this country. But I have not the slightest hesitation in declaring that any plans for American post-war reconstruction which are based upon the introduction of socialism are in effect a repudiation of the aim to unite the majority of the nation behind the Teheran policies.

It is my considered judgment that the American people are so ill-prepared, subjectively, for any deep-going change in the direction of socialism that post-war plans with such an aim would not unite the nation, but would further divide it. And they would divide and weaken precisely the democratic and progressive camp, while they would unite and strengthen the most reactionary forces in the country. In their practical effect, they would help the anti-Teheran forces to come to power in the United States.

If the national unity of the war-period is to be extended and even strengthened in the post-war period, then we must recognize that in the United States this requires from the Marxists the reaffirmation of our wartime policy that we will not raise the issue of socialism in such a form and manner as to endanger or weaken that national unity.

This is not a new issue for us. Already in the middle of 1942, I wrote:

"The United States, if it successfully meets the cruel tests of this war and contributes its share to the victory, will almost certainly enter the post-war world as the strongest capitalist country and the political center of gravity of the capitalist sector of the world. It will have an enormously important role to play, therefore, in the family of nations.

"The central problem of this post-war world will be that of whether or not the collaboration set up for the war, in the United Nations, can be continued and extended after the war to deal collectively with the problems of economic and political reconstruction of the world. Upon the answer to this question depends all further determination of the character of the post-war world.

"If the United Nations as a center of world collaboration can be continued and extended it is possible to hold out the realistic perspective of a rapid healing of the terrible wounds of the war, and great strides forward in attaining for all

peoples those goals of cultural and economic advancement indicated in outline in the Atlantic Charter. It will then be possible to minimize those upheavals and civil wars which are generated in the course of the international war and which tend to break out on its termination; it will be possible to find a maximum degree of peaceful and orderly development for all nations." (*Victory—And After*, p. 251.)

This possible perspective is the one which was confirmed at Teheran. If we believe it is realistic and possible—and we have now the signatures of Winston Churchill, Joseph Stalin and Franklin D. Roosevelt to it—then all our plans will be directed toward making it work.

Whatever may be the situation in other lands, in the United States this means a perspective in the immediate post-war period of expanded production and employment and the strengthening of democracy within the framework of the present system—and not a perspective of the transition to socialism.

We can set our goal as the realization of the Teheran policy, or we can set ourselves the task of pushing the United States immediately into socialism. Clearly, however, we cannot choose both.

The first policy, with all its difficulties, is definitely within the realm of possible achievement. The second would be **dubious**, indeed, especially when we remember that even the most progressive section of the labor movement is committed to capitalism, is not even as vaguely socialistic as the British Labor Party.

Therefore, the policy for Marxists in the United States is to face with all its consequences the perspective of a capitalist post-war reconstruction in the United States, to evaluate all plans on that basis, and to collaborate actively with the most democratic and progressive *majority* in the country, in a *national unity* sufficiently broad and effective to realize the policies of Teheran.

"FREE ENTERPRISE" AND CAPITALISM

The most reactionary and pro-fascist circles in the U. S. have taken up the banner of "Free Enterprise" in their bid for power in the 1944 elections. They hope thereby to throw con-

fusion into the democratic-progressive camp, most of which is also committed to "free enterprise" as a synonym of capitalism.

Marxists will not help the reactionaries, by opposing the slogan of "Free Enterprise" with any form of counter-slogan. If anyone wishes to describe the existing system of capitalism in the United States as "free enterprise," that is all right with us, and we frankly declare that we are ready to cooperate in making this capitalism work effectively in the post-war period with the least possible burdens upon the people. We do not in any degree draw political lines of division for the 1944 elections on any form of the issue of "free enterprise."

It is particularly confusing, and, therefore, helpful to the reactionaries to pose the issue before the country as "the Roosevelt policies versus Free Enterprise." That is to obscure the central fact that all Roosevelt's policies have been designed for the preservation of capitalism ("free enterprise"), have in fact strengthened capitalism, whereas the policies of his reactionary opponents would have brought capitalism very quickly into as deep a crisis as that of Hoover's administration.

There has never been anything of socialism in Roosevelt's policies and every suggestion to the contrary, no matter from whence it comes, serves only to falsify the problem and confuse the issues.

As a matter of fact, Roosevelt's policies have involved but a *minimum* of governmental intervention in economic matters (state capitalism), that minimum requisite to surmount major crises, and have never posed these measures other than as "unfortunate necessities." In other words, Roosevelt is not even "state capitalist" in any programmatic sense, but, on the contrary, is "free enterprise capitalist" even as that slogan expresses opposition to the higher forms of capitalism, and not only opposition to socialism.

It is very illuminating to note that the British Tory circles, which have of dire necessity adopted a large measure of state capitalism as a long-time policy, go far beyond any measures even remotely suggested by Roosevelt. Mr. Eric Johnson, president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce and among the most vociferous champions of "free enterprise," on his recent visit to England, found himself in much sharper opposition to

the British big business men than he has been to Roosevelt, so far as programmatic questions are concerned. Mr. Johnson, in fact, seems to look upon British Tories as wild Bolsheviks.

Even under the terrific pressure of war, Mr. Roosevelt has refused to apply those measures of state capitalism clearly needed for the maximum economic mobilization, and called for by the most far-seeing representatives of American capitalism (in the Tolan-Kilgore-Pepper bills for war economy). He preferred to leave most of the problems in this field to "private enterprise," which in effect meant to leave them to the decisions of the ten biggest monopolies.

In view of Roosevelt's inability to secure Congressional support even for his mild "seven-point program" against inflation, the failure of which is chiefly responsible for the current domestic labor crisis, one cannot say with any finality that his refusal to support the Tolan-Kilgore-Pepper measure was a mistake. Perhaps he knew better than we did of the dangers of capitalist disaffection from the war effort if their prejudices were thus challenged even in their own interests!

It is clear that even a program of state capitalism will be resisted desperately by powerful circles in America. Such elementary measures as nationalization of banks, railroads, coal and steel, would obviously make American capitalist economy much stronger and more capable of solving its problems. A program calling for such measures would not, however, have even the united support of the labor movement, and much less of the middle and upper bourgeoisie, in the 1944 elections. Therefore, we cannot expect any such program as the vehicle of the broad democratic-progressive camp in the 1944 elections.

The issue of "free enterprise" is thus not in any way, shape or form the issue of the coming struggle for control of United States policy in the Congressional and Presidential elections.

MONOPOLY AND "FREE ENTERPRISE"

If it is true, as I maintain, that the democratic-progressive majority in the country cannot be united and crystallized effectively on the basis of a programmatic refutation of "free enterprise," then it is equally true that this cannot be accom-

plished around the slogan of anti-monopoly and anti-big business, by dealing with big capital as a whole as the enemy and demanding its power be drastically curbed and eventually broken.

American capitalism is monopoly capitalism. After this war that condition will be much more accentuated. The conversion of American industry to war purposes has enormously strengthened the position of the large centralized aggregations of private capital, which constitute monopoly, within the national economy as a whole. Today, to speak seriously of drastic curbs on monopoly capital, leading toward the breaking of its power, and imposed upon monopoly capital against its will, is merely another form of proposing the immediate transition to socialism—or else it is the Utopian trust-busting program of return to an earlier, pre-monopoly stage of capitalism.

National unity around a program to break the power of monopoly capital is possible only if and when the majority of the people can be united for the institution of socialism in the United States.

That time is not now, and certainly not in the 1944 elections.

Certainly, the unrestricted play of the inherent tendencies of monopoly capital has disastrous results which must be prevented, and small business must be protected, aided and given a chance to develop. But the necessary restrictions upon monopoly will, of necessity, be of a sort which will be approved by the overwhelming majority and adopted with the agreement and collaboration of at least a significant and decisive part of the capitalist class itself, of the big capitalists, the more intelligent monopoly capitalists if you please, who understand that unrestricted abuses are dangerous to their whole system.

Marxists should be the last persons in the world to deceive themselves with windy rhetoric in the style of Norman Thomas.

When we Marxists speak of breaking the power of monopoly capital, we mean to put another power in its place. That can only be the power of the working class united upon a program of socialism. When we do not have such serious and

realistic perspectives, we do not console ourselves with sonorous revolutionary-sounding phrases which have no practical meaning except that they transport us into a puerile dream-world and remove our influence from the world of reality. Let us therefore not talk about breaking monopoly capital as the program for national unity in this United States in the year of 1944!

IS MONOPOLY CAPITAL "ONE REACTIONARY MASS"?

There has been some very sharp objection taken to a point in my speech in Bridgeport on December 12. Allow me to quote the paragraph in question and discuss the problem involved somewhat more deeply. I said:

"We shall have to be prepared to break with anyone that refuses to support and fight for the realization of the Teheran Agreement and the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. We must be prepared to give the hand of cooperation and fellowship to everyone who fights for the realization of this coalition. If J. P. Morgan supports this coalition and goes down the line for it, I as a Communist am prepared to clasp his hand and join with him to realize it. Class divisions or political groupings have no significance now except as they reflect one side or the other side of this issue."

In order that we waste no time in quibbling, I now make explicit what is inherent in the thought expressed, namely, that I was not making a verbal abolition of class differences, but that I was rejecting the political slogan of "class against class" as our guide to political alignments in the next period. I spoke of Mr. Morgan symbolically as the representative of a class, and not as an individual—in which capacity I know him not at all.

In my opinion this is the only correct approach to the political alignments within the United States. We will choose our associates first and above all according to whether they are for or against the Teheran policy, and the effectiveness of their support, regardless of class differences or past political divisions.

This approach assumes that not only workers, farmers and middle classes are the supporters of Teheran, but also among

the big bourgeoisie, the monopoly capitalists, there are those who will be our allies.

Such an approach is correct even if it should turn out that we find no allies there. For if there should be no such allies, let that fact be established without any confusions about the threat of Communist hostility having driven the poor fellows into their reactionary stand. But above all, it is correct because doubtless, as a practical matter, there will be and are strong supporters in the ranks of the greatest capitalists for the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition as a long-time project, as outlined at Teheran. Even the monopoly capitalists are not one reactionary mass today.

I have been challenged to produce a list of the big capitalists on either side of the issue, and evaluate their relative weight in political matters. I have no such lists, nor can I make my political judgments on such a basis. Of one thing I am sure: That part of the big bourgeoisie which supports Teheran *can be the decisive part*—provided it joins effectively with the whole democratic-progressive camp.

The policy of supporters of Teheran must be to seek and facilitate support from all classes and groups with the working people as the main base, from the big bourgeoisie to the Communists. The whole camp of supporters of Teheran must organize themselves effectively as the controlling majority of the Country.

Without such a broad and all-inclusive approach, it is idle chatter to speak of winning the vast majority of the United States to the Teheran policies.

TOWARD AN ECONOMIC PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL UNITY

While we cannot invent programs, it is possible to begin to examine the *approach* to the common path of dealing with economic problems, on the basis of unity of different classes.

Such an economic program must be designed to win a maximum of agreement, and rouse a minimum of opposition, from at least the two most decisive groups; first, the business men, industrial and financial capitalists and their managers, who have effective direction of the nation's economy; and second, the working classes, organized labor and the farmer.

One idea seems to have crystallized in both these two main groups, and this is the impossibility that our nation be permitted, when the war ends, to plunge into a new economic crisis. Not even the most reactionary capitalist organizations are willing nowadays to subscribe to the dismal prediction made by the American Academy of Political and Social Science (*Annals*, March, 1942), which described the post-war economic situation in these words:

"The national income will drop almost overnight to one-third or one-half of its war peak. . . . There will be corresponding unemployment. . . . Any plan that fails to accept these facts is unrealistic and futile."

On the contrary, on all sides there is general agreement that the marvelous expansion of American productive economy to meet the war needs has proved, beyond question, that there is no valid reason why the same economy, including agriculture, should not produce for peace-time needs at approximately the same level, and that no plan is worth considering that proceeds from any other basis.

The Committee for Economic Development, a special institution set up by "business leaders and corporation officers" to study post-war problems, sets forth the problem in the following terms:

"The problem, as the Committee sees it, is first of all to make the transition from war to peaceful economic activity. When peace comes, the government will no longer be in the market for 85 billion dollars worth of war goods which it is spending in 1943. A minimum of seven million men in the armed services and most of the 20 million persons now in the war industries will be eager for productive work in peace-time pursuits. To provide employment to these millions of men and women, it will be necessary to offset quickly the billions of dollars of war production with an equivalent output of peacetime goods and services. Approximately an output of 135 to 150 billion dollars (at 1941 prices) will be required. This output must be reached quickly—at most within two years after peace comes—and employment must be increased by half a million jobs per year in subsequent years to take care of normal increases in available manpower"

(summarized by Lewis L. Lorwin, *Post-war Plans of the United Nations*, N. Y., 1943, pp. 27-28).

Whence will come the markets for an additional 85 billions of peace-time goods after the war? Clearly a large part of it, perhaps as much as a half, must under our economic system be foreign markets.

The Teheran Conference, for the first time, gave a realistic perspective of the quick organization of such huge foreign markets. Such huge foreign markets are unthinkable except under stable conditions, without international or civil wars of major proportions. Without such foreign markets there is no possibility to find an economic foundation to the national unity within the United States.

Most capitalist circles are vehemently opposed to large scale government intervention in economic matters. Yet even on this point dogmatic attitudes are being broken down. Thus the Post-War Problem Committee of the National Association of Manufacturers begins to face the huge problem of organizing the foreign market and "strikes a new note."

"It suggests that 'some frame-work should be established through which the political and economic relationships between nations of the world can be developed and maintained on an orderly basis.' While free enterprise is the rule of our country, the committee states, it does not follow that free enterprise will necessarily be the rule in the countries where great developments are likely to take place. But whether capital funds for the improvement of undeveloped countries should be made available through private enterprise or governmental action, 'adequate agencies should be established to insure that they are administered with due regard for whatever obligations are incurred in making them available.'" (Lorwin, *op. cit.*, p. 23.)

Obviously, there will be no unbridgeable differences of opinion on the government's role in realizing the huge foreign markets that are absolutely necessary to keep American industry and agriculture operating. We can with good conscience agree that the government should go no further in this direction than the export-capitalists themselves demand

in the interest of really getting the orders and obtaining payment therefor!

As to the expansion of the domestic market, this will be a subject of much sharper dispute. Assuming that domestic and foreign markets go fifty-fifty in absorbing the additional eighty-five billion dollar new peace-time commodities this means approximately doubling the present domestic market. It is clear the ordinary channels of industrial expansion (utilization of the twenty-four billion dollar deferred civilian spending represented in war bonds, public works, home construction, roadbuilding, etc.) cannot by any means make up even the larger part of this amount; nor can new capital investment in productive plant, which would call for an even greater expansion of the productive plan! Some extraordinary means must be found to double the buying capacity of the domestic market, and there seems no other way but to double the buying power of the individual consumer. How that shall be done we will not suggest at this time. We look forward to practical suggestions from the capitalists who must find the solution in order to keep their plants operating. We especially look forward to practical recommendations from the great labor movement.

As to the degree of governmental intervention in guaranteeing full employment and production, this most disputed point of all must be resolved somewhat along the lines of agreement that it shall be limited to that margin by which private enterprise fails to measure up to the standard of one hundred and fifty billion dollars annual national income, or thereabout.

Only the Teheran Conference gives the promise, if its policies are applied fully, to realize such an economic program of national unity. It is an unprecedented and difficult effort. But the stakes are great indeed. It is worth the effort to realize it.

We Communists are opposed to permitting an explosion of class conflict in our country when the war ends. If it happens it will not be in any way our responsibility, but that of men who did not know how to use their power in the national interest, and who abandoned the nation for private greed.

IV. THE COMING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

IN NOVEMBER of this year the country will be called upon to choose its Chief Executive for the next four years. The choice will be between two candidates selected by two nominating conventions known by the names of Democratic Party and Republican Party. These are parties only in a formal and legal sense; they are not parties in the sense of representing well-defined alternative policies. They are coalitions of local and regional interests, diverse tendencies of political thought, and institutionalized politics, from which national policy and national interest come forth in a distorted way, with much confusion, and with a maximum dependence upon the personality which emerges as leader. It is a peculiarly American system, without a counterpart anywhere else in the world.

Who will be the candidate of the Democratic Party? What policies will his candidacy represent?

There is only one certain point in finding the answers to these questions. That point is that the Democratic Convention will certainly name Roosevelt again—if he will accept the nomination. If the President should refuse, there is not the slightest assurance that the candidate will represent a continuation of the Roosevelt policies. In fact, it might well be someone much more closely resembling Senator Taft—Senator Byrd, for example. That is a highly irrational situation. But it is the reality with which we must deal. In the succession of party leadership there is no assurance of the continuation of policy; on the contrary, it is almost certain that a change in the person will represent a change in policy.

The Republican Party is equally unstable. Wendell Willkie is one of its leading possibilities. Yet his nomination is almost entirely dependent upon his Democratic opponent being Roosevelt. The moment that the Republican Convention was certain Roosevelt was not running, Willkie's stock would drop with a dull thud; the Republican delegates would select a

"regular" machine man, someone like Dewey or Bricker. Willkie is desperately trying to overcome this handicap by indulging in demagogic speeches; he is falling between two stools, trying to be as much like the President as possible, and at the same time to appear his opposite. Eventually he will find it necessary to choose which he is to be; he cannot long continue to be all things to all men.

These facts reveal how shadowy is the supposed alternative of turning from Roosevelt to Willkie and thereby gain continuity of policy by change of party.

Even admitting, for the sake of argument (what is becoming less true every day) that Willkie advocates policies closely resembling Roosevelt's, it still remains true that (1) Willkie cannot win the Republican nomination if the convention feels it can elect someone else, which means unless Roosevelt is running; and (2) Roosevelt cannot be expected to consent to be a candidate unless he is drafted by an overwhelming demand that will assure his re-election without himself neglecting the war by campaigning. Thus Willkie is out of luck either way.

It was the widespread recognition of these basic facts which led a large section of the labor movement already in 1943 to begin raising the demand that Roosevelt shall be a candidate in 1944.

The Teheran Conference has deepened and broadened that demand. Not that its policies are the property of the Democratic Party. No, they are the property of the nation, and all who support them can benefit from them. But it is incapable that the man who played such a large part in bringing the Teheran Conference together, and who led in making it a success, should be identified in the public mind with this greatest of the nation's achievements.

At the plenary meeting of our National Committee last June, I reported that "the main current of thinking in the defeatist camp turns in the direction of securing a three-way division of the electoral vote that will deny a majority to any candidate, thus throwing the election into the House of Representatives, which is controlled by the reactionary coalition . . . splitting the Southern poll-tax states away from Roosevelt

or Roosevelt's candidate, behind a rival Democratic candidate named by a rump convention which will keep Roosevelt off the ballot in the poll-tax states."

Interestingly enough, my report of the existence of this plan received public confirmation, from one of its champions, a Senator from South Carolina, on the Senate floor only a few weeks ago. At the time I spoke of it, this was a secret but really dangerous conspiracy; but by the time the Senator raised it openly as a threat it was already a movement which had fizzled out. No, the South is not going to secede from the Democratic Party in revenge for the abolition of the poll-tax, and general discontent with the progressive features of Roosevelt's administration. Even the South has begun to realize that it cannot live in the past forever, that it must begin to modernize itself and come into line with the rest of the country. South Carolina followed its Senators into the secession that started the Civil War in 1861, but that state is not going to follow its Senator in a new secession in 1944. No, the poll-taxers will have to look for other ways, more hidden from the people, to have any hope of getting away with their dirty work in the coming Presidential election.

Of essentially the same practical significance was the effort through 1943 to stampede a section of the labor movement into a "third party"; the men behind it were motivated by opposition to the war, the John L. Lewis gang, the Trotskyites, and the Norman Thomas Socialists. This diversion has also been squelched by the good sound sense of labor and the able leadership of Phil Murray and Sidney Hillman.

Now the reactionary and defeatist camp have no tricks left for the 1944 election, in which they still hope to gain power, except the fight to control the nominations in one or both of the major parties.

If Roosevelt does them the inestimable favor of retiring from the field, then the reactionaries and defeatists have high prospects of controlling the nomination in both parties. In which case the country is in for a bad time indeed!

If Roosevelt is finally persuaded by the demands of the people, against his own desires, to run again, then the only hope

of the defeatists is in the Republican Party, and even there they will then be faced with the figure of Willkie, who is not entirely their man.

These are the main outlines of the 1944 Presidential election situation, as we enter the pre-convention period.

GOODBYE TO THE "NEW DEAL" LABEL

The President was expressing the sound strategy of national unity, when he recently told the press that in his opinion the label "New Deal" to describe his Administration should be replaced by something up-to-date like "Win-the-War."

Old Guard Republican spokesman Spangler immediately rushed into print to prove Roosevelt was correct, by angrily denouncing his statement, and insisting that the Republican Party would fight the old battles all over again in 1944, and that they refused to recognize that the world had changed at all.

The Old Guard Social-Democrats also made this the occasion for widening the breach between them and the President which they have been industriously digging for these many months.

The genteel liberals of the *New Republic* underwent a genteel conniption fit and solemnly declared that never, no never, could they agree that the Roosevelt Administration should be called "Win-the-War" instead of "New Deal."

Otherwise, the country seemed to take the news in its stride, with merely a grunt of assent. Of course, why not have the labels adjusted to the changed tasks of the times. As the President pointed out, the contents of the "New Deal" period was a series of twenty-eight measures now well established, and which the most rabid anti-New Dealers hesitate to challenge—if they are running for office. They continue and will continue. But today there are new measures, and they are all bound up with winning the war.

And if anyone is interested in what the Communists think of the question, it is only necessary to repeat what we said through our National Committee last June:

"The dominant issue is not Right wing versus Left wing;

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

WAGE POLICY, STRIKES AND LABOR POLITICAL ACTION

Considerable confusion in the handling of wage policy has come to the point where the whole subject demands serious review by the Administration, and elimination of the rigid freezing technique modified only by clumsy case-to-case adjustments with no guiding policy.

This dogmatic and rigid handling of wage problems has created an open field for the disrupters and provocationists, who have used their opportunities to the full to stir up discontent among the workers and then direct that discontent against the Administration and its war effort. The worst offenders in this respect have been the reactionary element among the employers, ably seconded by John L. Lewis and his admirers, within the labor movement.

On the whole, labor, and especially the C.I.O. under Philip Murray's leadership, has a magnificent record of support of the war, of all-out production, of patience in the face of provocations, and of firm adherence to the no-strike policy. Labor has borne the burdens and sacrifices of war without complaining, has been patient when brazen profiteers were screaming insults in its ears, has understood its responsibilities as the backbone of the nation.

But labor has also understood that it is not patriotic to permit a steady deterioration of the supply of food, clothing and shelter available to the soldiers of production, when this is not the result of scarcity but only of bad management and bad faith. The soldiers of production are entitled to, and

need, as careful provision for their wants as the soldiers in the camps and on the battlefield. The only legitimate reason for reducing their standards of life, when they are working twice as hard as normal, would be an actual physical scarcity of commodities which is not the case.

Any sensible wage policy must be designed to promote maximum production. Therefore it must keep wages in relation to prices, it must constantly correct inequalities, it must strive toward equal wages for equal work, and it must expand earnings in some established relation to expanded production. Each group of workers and individual must feel that he is not the helpless victim of arbitrary caprice, but that governmental policy is constantly at work to approximate a commonly accepted standard of just compensation—which is his share of the available commodities in the light of his contribution to the national effort.

The absence of such a common-sense wage policy is no justification for strikes. Every strike today is harmful to the war, harmful to the nation, harmful to the labor movement, and harmful to the individual worker. We have made it clear to the world that we are opposed to all strikes as a matter of policy.

But we must also insist that the Congress must stop promoting and encouraging strikes, and employers must stop inciting strikes. The railroad workers, for example, were faced with a law which provided that they must take a strike vote and fix a strike date in order to obtain due consideration of their demands. Those responsible for not suspending that law are much more guilty of the trouble on the railroads than are the railroad unions and their leaders. The Smith-Connally bill, which was supposedly intended to discourage strikes, has worked—and was intended to work—as a provocation to strikes, a fact the President pointed out before it was passed over his veto.

The President's original plans for regulating the wage question were given the knockout blow by Congressional sabotage. But he cannot leave it at that, with labor to suffer the consequences. Because, with the best will in the world, labor cannot rest quiet under all this bungling and provoca-

tion, any more than a machine can operate with maladjusted parts and inadequate oil without deteriorating.

Labor has learned to expect no help in such questions from the present Congress. But labor does expect enlightened employers to take a new and more intense interest in helping solve the vexing problem of wage policy. And above all, labor expects the President to give the lead for a new over-all examination of the problem and meanwhile give emergency adjustment to some of the worst wage anomalies.

Labor in turn must begin to understand that it cannot constantly demand help from the President, without acting to strengthen the President's hand in dealing with his enemies. That is, labor must go into politics in a big way, in close alliance with all progressive forces in the country, including not only the farmers and middle class elements, but also employers and capitalists.

All of labor's present organized efforts looking toward effective political action must be deepened, strengthened and made broader and more inclusive. There must be a network of unity built up among all labor's various political committees, from the locality, to the state, to the nation. All this must culminate in a great united effort in the 1944 elections, to guarantee the continuance of Roosevelt's policies, and to change the political complexion of Congress to make it a help instead of a hindrance in winning the war and establishing a stable peace.

ABOLISH JIM CROW, THE POLL TAX, ANTI-SEMITISM
AND THE ANTI-COMMUNIST LAWS

Vicious attacks have been leveled against the Communists recently, by supposedly responsible newspapers, with the accusation that we are stirring up civil strife in the country by our support for Negro rights, our attack on the poll-tax, our exposure of anti-Semitic and other outrages by the racialists, and our demand for the abolition of discriminatory laws against the Communists. The demand is made upon us that we shall abandon these issues at least until the war is won.

We cannot yield a fraction of an inch to such attacks and such arguments. We may compromise, and do, on a hundred other questions including the basic one of postponing all radical proposals for changing the social and economic systems—but once we abandoned the basic grounds of simple democracy, then indeed all would be lost.

One cannot reconcile himself even temporarily to the Jim Crow system, to the poll-tax, to anti-Semitism, and the principle of exceptionalism directed against the Communists, without thereby surrendering the basic strongholds of democracy to the fascist enemy within and without. We cannot win this war without conducting an irreconcilable struggle to purify our democracy from all these fascist concepts.

This is only incidentally a struggle for the rights of the minorities directly involved. These systematic violations of the rights of minorities serve to poison and distort the political, social and economic life of the entire nation. The fight to abolish these abuses is the business of all decent persons, and is not a series of special interests—it is a supreme national interest.

What we are fighting for on these issues is nothing more than the application in life of the long-disregarded Amendments to the Constitution that came out of the Civil War.

On these issues we are in principle intransigent, uncompromising, irreconcilable.

That does not mean that we are rash and reckless in the choice of means in the fight. On the contrary, we have never ceased to oppose all tendencies to lead the struggle into divisive and damaging forms—witness our constant opposition to the reckless and divisive tactics of the so-called “March-on-Washington” movement led by A. Philip Randolph. We have consistently advised only the most orderly, unified, calm and well-considered form of political struggle well-established in American democratic procedure. And these measures are proving increasingly effective. Racial discrimination can be abolished *now*.

We shall remain firm on this line, and continue to press it as the only possible course for the whole democratic-progressive camp in the 1944 elections.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE ISSUE

The same fundamental issue of democracy is involved in the fight for the ballot rights of our ten million soldiers, sailors and merchant marine.

That ballot can only be provided in reality through a unified Federal plan and administration of the soldiers' ballot.

It would be far less damaging to our democracy to postpone the elections until after the war, to which no one agrees, than to exclude ten millions, the cream of our manhood, from any effective participation therein.

V. PROBLEMS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF COMMUNISTS

LAST May, when the dissolution of the Communist International was announced, the *New York Times* and other papers voiced the demand that the Communist Party of the United States should also dissolve itself and disperse. At that time I wrote a series of letters to the press in which I challenged the validity of this proposal, but expressed the readiness of the Communist Party to discuss this or any other question with any responsible spokesmen of public life, from the single standard of how best to win the war. My letters were reported to and approved by the June plenary session of our National Committee.

We received no response from anyone to discuss this or any other proposals for changes in the form of activities of the Communist movement in this country.

At this meeting of our National Committee we are faced only with the question, therefore, whether there are any changes which we ourselves, unilaterally and without discussion with anyone else, may find it expedient to adopt in the interest of the nation, of the war, and of the working class which we basically represent.

WHAT IS PERMANENT IN COMMUNIST ORGANIZATION?

Recently we have published a pamphlet entitled *A Talk About the Communist Party*, a report of speeches made by myself in Detroit and Chicago to party membership meetings. The function and role therein described for the organization of Communists, of Marxists, are permanent features of any such organization, whatever may be its name or immediate practical tasks.

Such an organization we are sure must be maintained in the United States, and must be built even stronger. We know that for the United States to be without such an organization would weaken our country internally and in its foreign relations. Internally, the organized Marxists furnish one of the

most stable points of support and orientation for the whole democratic-progressive camp; in foreign relations they furnish the nation essential experience in the necessary policies for dealing with Communists in other lands, such as China, Yugoslavia, Italy and France, where Communist cooperation is absolutely inescapable if Europe and Asia are to be reorganized in a period of relative peace and order. From this point of view alone, the practical conclusion must be drawn that the continued and growing activity and organization of the Communist movement in the United States are in the interest of the nation, of the war and of an orderly world after the war. This is a conclusion which we believe inescapable not only for ourselves but for all intelligent democrats.

There is not the same compelling fundamental reason why the organization should bear the name "Communist." It is conceivable that a situation might exist in which another name would be practically more expedient, and in several countries that has been found to be the case by the Marxists of such lands. But it is our considered judgment that there is nothing in the situation of the United States which makes such a change from the name "Communist" to something else an expedient one. It might even be detrimental, in giving an opening to our enemies to create more confusion in the country by spreading suspicions that the new name is camouflage to cover direly sinister conspiracies. At the same time, the very name itself has the highest prestige of its history, and is not to be discarded lightly and without the most serious necessity.

WHAT IS THE TYPICAL AMERICAN CONCEPT OF PARTY?

It is around the concept "Party" rather than of "Communist" that there exists today in America the most practical obstruction to our cooperative relationships with other democratic groups.

What is called the "two party system" in the United States is an old tradition which dominates most American minds. It recognizes as a "party" only that particular combination of the opposition which is an immediate alternative to take power. All lesser political groupings are contained within

ERRATUM

The sentence beginning the third line from the bottom of Page 39 should read as follows:

It recognizes as a "party" only that particular combination which is in power and the combination of the opposition which is an immediate alternative to take power.

the "two major parties," which in fact are coalitions of many groups which in most countries would be separate parties; or if the lesser group takes the name of "party," and becomes one of the so-called "minor parties," it is regarded as a sect which has withdrawn itself from the practical political life of the nation.

This "two party system" has been tremendously strengthened and buttressed against the storms of constant political changes that go on within it, by the system of direct primaries which gives all voters the opportunity to enroll under one or other of the two major parties and participate in choosing its candidates, as well as the party committees and delegates to conventions.

New York is one of the very few states in which the election laws permit coalition of two or more parties on one list of candidates; and only because of this fact has the American Labor Party been able to grow into a significant factor in practical politics. In most other states a similar organization could not function in the same way at all.

The American working class shares very largely the general national opinion that this "two party system" provides adequate channels for the basic preservation of democratic rights. How else are we to understand the fact that in 1940, *not one single organization, labor or otherwise, raised a protest against the high-handed driving of the Communist Party off the ballot by terror, intimidation and prison sentences?*

It is not only the Communists, however, that bruise their heads against the stone wall of the "two party system." In 1912 and in 1924, two major attempts to break the old pattern, made by Theodore Roosevelt and Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., made no lasting changes in the system, important as those movements were in their general political aspect.

A CHANGE FROM "PARTY" TO "ASSOCIATION"

Now our country is entering a new period, in which, with the successful conclusion of the war, all issues will be subordinated to the supreme aim of realizing the promise of Teheran, of maintaining an orderly world which will give us some generations of peace.

Obviously, to realize the promise of Teheran the broadest democratic-progressive united front must be maintained in the United States. Equally obviously, the Communists will be a part, and a small minority part, of that united front. The Communist organization will be in a long-term alliance with forces much larger than itself.

It follows from this fact, that in the peculiar American sense of the word, the Communists will not be operating as a "party," that is with their own separate candidates in elections, except under special circumstances when they may be forced to act through "independent candidates."

This is already our practical situation; and we are now extending the perspective of national unity for many years into the future. It is no longer an "emergency situation" but is merging into a "normal" situation.

All these considerations point to the expediency of a decision that the Communist organization in the United States should adjust its name to correspond more exactly to the American political tradition and its own practical political role.

Such a decision would be that, instead of being known as "The Communist Party of the United States," our organization should call itself something like "American Communist Political Association."

It is the recommendation of our Political Committee that this meeting of the National Committee should endorse such a proposal, referring it to our 1944 National Convention for final action.

Under such a name we will find it much easier to explain our true relationship with all other democratic and progressive groupings which operate through the medium, in the main, of the two party system, and take our place in free collaboration at their side.

PREPARATIONS FOR OUR CONVENTION

In view of the far-reaching nature of the decisions to be taken, the date of our convention should be advanced from its usual timing in national election years, and take place about the middle of May.

The National Committee meeting should name a National Election Campaign Committee, which should have full charge of all election policy questions until the Convention.

A Committee on Constitution should be named, and charged with the responsibility of examining all changes required in the Constitution to fully implement the policy here laid down if and when it shall be adopted by the convention, and be prepared to report on such changes to the convention when called upon.

I have purposely stripped this report down to the most essential questions on which something new has to be said. It is my opinion this will contribute to the clarity of the discussion, but it is not intended as a limitation upon any member of the National Committee who has additional questions which he thinks should be placed for discussion and decision in connection with the main problems.

THREE ANNIVERSARIES

This year marks three important anniversaries.

It will be twenty-five years since the founding of the modern Communist organizations out of which our party grew. This will be an appropriate occasion for a historical survey to better arm our party with an understanding of its origin and role.

It will be twenty years this month since the first issue of the *Daily Worker* came off the press. If this paper was always indispensable, we must now begin to understand its tenfold importance in the new period we are now entering. Its circulation must begin to grow seriously.

It is twenty years since Lenin died. Today the vast majority of Americans know that the state which Lenin founded and Stalin brought to maturity is that single indispensable force which saved us and the world from Nazi enslavement. We who always treasured the legacy of Lenin for our country have now more than ever the opportunity and the duty to make his full wisdom, which made the Soviet Union strong and great, available to all Americans.

MARXISM ARMS COMMUNISTS TO MEET AND SOLVE ISSUES TODAY*

FOR the first time we are meeting and solving problems for which there are no precedents in history and no formulas from the classics which give us the answer. Perhaps we could say that our party is fully standing on its own feet for the first time. We are seeking the answers to this new period in what, I think, we are all convinced is the right direction; and we are confident that we are really getting our fingers into these problems and beginning to control them. It seems to me that at this Plenum we have demonstrated the highest stage of maturity that our party has ever reached.

I was especially pleased with Bob Minor's contribution to the discussion because it was a living example of how to make use of the classics of Marxism for the new period, without falling into formulas and the searching for formulas.

I think we must emphasize more than ever the tremendous value of the classics of Marxism in arming ourselves to meet and solve the new and unprecedented problems. Marxism never was a series of dogmas and formulas; it never was a catalogue of prohibitions listing the things we must not do irrespective of new developments and new situations; it does not tell us that things cannot be done; it tells us how *to do* the things that have to be done, the things that history has posed as necessary and indispensable tasks. Marxism is a theory of deeds, not of don'ts. Marxism is therefore a positive, dynamic, creative force, and it is such a great social power precisely because, as a scientific outlook and method, it takes living realities as its starting point. It has always regarded the scientific knowledge of the past as a basis for meeting the new and unprecedented problems of the present and the

* Concluding remarks at the close of the meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, January 9, 1944.

future. And the largest problems today are new in a very basic sense.

We have more than ever the task to refresh ourselves in the great tradition of Marxism, completely freeing ourselves from the last remnants of the dogmatic and schematic approach. Marxism is the science of the transition to socialism.

It was Marx and Engels who transformed socialism from a utopia into a science, from an inspiring dream—grounded only in the desire for a better life—into a mighty movement powered by the material and objective necessities of social development. That transformation from utopianism has a lesson we have to relearn today in the light of the new world situation. Basically, that lesson is that socialism arises out of the development of existing society which creates certain necessities that ultimately press the great masses of people to take the path of socialism. These necessities exist independently of our thinking, but when we understand how the process works we can greatly facilitate and speed it up. In fact, our understanding and our thinking become a great and decisive factor in turning what history has made objectively possible into actual reality, but our thinking is never an independent factor; and by thinking alone we cannot change the course of history. We can guide the course of history only if we understand the basic forces of history that exist outside of our own minds.

We have to be humble and learn from history; we have to learn from facts and never try to impose our preconceptions upon history. That is one of the first lessons of Marxism, which we have to relearn afresh if we are to make the fullest possible use of this tremendous intellectual arsenal that has been given to us by the great thinkers and leaders of the Socialist-Communist movement. We cannot rise to the heights that are necessary to master this historical moment through intellectual arrogance. We must be prepared to refresh ourselves according to the necessities of the period into which history has brought us, and, above all, we must understand that history never yet has been known to follow anyone's private blueprint. The great turning points of history are in this sense always unexpected; there is always something new,

something fresh in them that has to be fundamentally evaluated. We are in such a period today.

This requires from everyone who aspires to leading functions a deep feeling of responsibility, personal responsibility for the successful conduct of the smallest tasks of daily work, such as the successful conclusion of our recruiting drive, for example, but above all, it requires intellectual responsibility, the responsibility for each one of us individually to think through and master these problems.

Fortunately even these new things in history do not present themselves unannounced; almost always they knock on the door before they come in. That is why we were not entirely unprepared in this Plenum for the decisions that we are making, unprecedented as these decisions are. True, according to all of the text books of the past, we are departing from orthodoxy, because none of our text books foresaw or predicted a long period of peaceful relations in the world before the general advent of socialism. But now we are setting our course to realize the possibilities inherent in the present situation of what would have been described in the past as an evolutionary development of the transition period—provided, of course, that we can successfully meet our responsibilities.

This is possible because the price in blood and struggle has been paid in advance in this terrific war, and because we already have a firm bastion and fortress of socialism established in the Soviet Union during twenty-six years of the most heroic and intelligent construction which the history of humanity has ever recorded.

We are not prepared to give any broad theoretical generalizations for this period. But we know, as we go into it boldly, without the slightest hesitation that we are firmly guided by the theoretical heritage of Marxism and that the Teheran Declaration which was signed by Churchill, Roosevelt and the great Marxist Stalin represents the only program in the interest of the toiling masses of the whole world in the next period. We could not do more than give general intimations of the possibilities of such a period. We could not unconditionally throw our forces into this new period while it was still merely a possibility, but now that this possibility has been confirmed

by the agreement of Teheran, we know we can feel absolutely certain that we have crossed the border-line from the past and have definitely entered the present.

When we speak of the Teheran agreement we must understand that it was an agreement among the ruling classes of three great powerful countries who today hold an almost complete monopoly of military power in the world and an overwhelming preponderance of economic power. The power behind that combination comes from its permanence, because if it would not be permanent it would not be powerful. The power of that combination can only be fully realized when we begin to study what are the alternatives to it. Many estimable gentlemen today are lightheartedly taking potshots at the Teheran agreement. But I venture to predict that they will be changing their tune, because they will begin to face the alternative to Teheran; and if they don't face it, history will begin to rub their noses into the problem and make them face it.

Imagine the problems facing the United States without the Teheran agreement. American economy has been expanded to a scale beyond the wildest dreams of any American capitalist. The American bourgeoisie today is in possession of the effective control and direction of such enormous productive powers that their imaginations cannot encompass it. Some of them have had their minds turned as a result of this power and the product is the fantasies of the "Luce-thinking" school. But what are all the fantasies of this "Luce-thinking" school worth unless they are brought down to earth and harnessed to the Teheran agreement? They will all explode from their own internal contradictions unless they are harnessed to serve the cause of world progress, harnessed in the combination of Teheran. And without Teheran the catastrophe that would come upon us and the rest of the world would be all the more certain and complete. These hard facts are the material guarantee behind the Teheran pact.

Our confidence in this Agreement is buttressed not only in our high opinion of each of the three great men who brought this pact into being, but first of all in an understanding and knowledge that there is no other way for the world and that

there is still intelligence enough left in America, despite our newspapers, to guarantee that our country will not rush headlong and blindly over the precipice of disaster that is the only alternative to Teheran. With that confidence, we can be completely sure of our course.

Our course is not easy and it will require political struggles but these must be struggles for unity in the nation, not struggles which will break that unity; struggles against the enemies for which we will have to find ever new means and forms; of unity and for uniting everyone who recognizes, even indistinctly, but enough to take the first steps, the need of going along the road of the Teheran Conference.

We are not in our new course entering any other party. The Communists are not joining the Democratic Party; the Communists are not joining the Republican Party. We are not endorsing either of the major parties, and we are not condemning either of the major parties. We are taking the line of issues and not of parties and of choosing men as they stand for or against issues without regard to party labels. This was one of the biggest arguments I developed in my book *Victory—and After*. When I say that we are not entering parties or not endorsing parties, I don't mean we have any objections to our individual members registering in one or the other of the parties when their local community life calls for it and their associates and fellows are following that course. But I mean that the Communist movement and our organization is not committed to any party label or any party organization.

We are independent, in the same way as the great bulk of America's independent voters who make up fully one-third of the total voting strength of the country and who are not committed to either of the major parties, though most of them are registered with one or the other. As a part of this independent voters' group, we may find our members registering wherever they think will best advance the progressive cause. That is one of the rights of citizenship and our organization would not think of denying to any American the full exercise of all his rights as an American citizen. But our organization is not and will not be an organization committed to

any party; and that is necessarily the case because of the nature of the two major parties. These two parties are essentially institutionalized channels, semi-governmental in their nature, through which the citizenry groups and regroups itself from election to election according to the leadership that is thrown up and the issues that are thereby developed.

In the general relationship of forces in the country, for us there can be no commitment to party because that would be to commit ourselves to an institutionalized structure which stands for nothing in particular in the political sense. Therefore we have to concentrate our attention exclusively on issues, and on men who represent issues within the various party structures, and choose freely among them on their merits without regard to party label.

This is the major point that I thought necessary to bring forward in these summary remarks, as a sort of continuation of the discussion, because it seems to me that while there is general acceptance of the course on which we are going, there is perhaps not the same complete and general understanding that this new course is not in any way an identification with any of the old party structures. If we are identifying ourselves with any general, big political grouping in the country, in the narrower electoral sense, it is with the great body of independent voters of America who in the electoral struggle will choose whom they support on the basis of their judgment of the character of men and of the issues for which they stand, and nothing else.

I have the general feeling that in these three days we have welded together such a common body of opinion so firmly grounded in our own experience, in the objective reality of the world outside, and in our capacity to understand—a collective capacity which is our great strength—that we can go from this meeting of the National Committee with a greater confidence than ever before that we will meet and solve the problems facing us with honor to our great movement, to our organization and with a full meeting of our responsibilities to the nation and to the working class.

VICTORY—AND AFTER

By EARL BROWDER

Earl Browder's book, *Victory—and After*, of which close to half a million copies have been sold in 1943, represents the views of the foremost American Communist leader, and the organization which he heads, on the most vital questions of the war.

While written during an earlier stage of the war, this statesmanlike and far-visioned work, which clearly foresaw the course of world historical development under the impact of the global conflict, finds daily confirmation as the war progresses. The validity and correctness of the Communist position have found supreme confirmation in the epoch-making Teheran Agreement, a sound understanding of which will be immensely aided by the study of *Victory—and After*.

In discussing the nature of the war, the strategy required for victory, the problems of international and national unity, and the attitude to the war effort of the various political parties in the United States, the author has applied in a living and dialectical manner the science of Marxism. Of particular interest today are those chapters dealing with the problems of the colonial countries, and relations between the capitalist democracies and the socialist Soviet Union for speeding the victory and for the tasks of post-war construction.

Price 50 cents



WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

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