



H 300

Don't catalogue

Earl Browder

Talks

to the Senators

ON THE REAL MEANING OF
THE VOORHIS 'BLACKLIST' BILL

PUBLISHED BY
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.
P. O. BOX 148, STATION D, NEW YORK, N. Y.
SEPTEMBER, 1940

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.



EDITOR'S PREFACE

On July 10, 1940, Earl Browder, Communist candidate for President of the United States, appeared at his own request before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to state his opposition to the Voorhis Registration ("Blacklist") Bill.

The Voorhis Bill had previously been steam-rolled through the House of Representatives in an atmosphere of war hysteria. The bill calls for registration and the filing of complete membership lists and other information by all organizations supposedly under "foreign control." This bill sweepingly includes as under "foreign control" all organizations which have international affiliations. It could be used therefore to clamp down on the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Communist Party, compelling them to produce their membership rolls to be used as a nationwide blacklist. Scores of other organizations with international affiliations could likewise be persecuted under this bill.

The idea for this repressive legislation was first proposed by Representative Martin Dies, chairman of the notorious Dies Committee. However, Representative Voorhis of California, who is the so-called "liberal" member of the Committee and is close to the White House, was later chosen to introduce the measure so that it would not bear the stigma of the Dies trademark.

Present at the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearing when Earl Browder testified were Senators Tom Connally of Texas, Chairman, John E. Miller of Arkansas and John A. Danaher of Connecticut.

The cross-exchange of views, questions and answers covered

not only the details of the Voorhis Bill, but also the position of the Communist Party on such issues as defense of the country, and the connection of the Communist Party of the United States with the world Communist movement.

The contents of this pamphlet consist of the official stenographic report of the hearing. Since the hearing lasted three and a half hours it has been necessary to do some cutting in order to reduce the text to pamphlet size. All the main points and arguments, however, remain. Dots (. . .) indicate where material has been omitted.

Opposition to such measures as the Voorhis Bill is part of the fight against the war drive and the destruction of civil rights on which Earl Browder and his running mate, James W. Ford, are campaigning in this Presidential election.

Notify Senator Tom Connally, Washington, D.C.; *your own Senators*, and President Roosevelt that you are firmly opposed to the Voorhis Bill or any similar measures to nullify the Constitutional rights of political minorities and of organized labor.

EARL BROWDER TALKS TO THE SENATORS

REGISTRATION OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE*

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Wednesday, July 10, 1940

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call of the Chairman, in the Caucus Room, Senate Office Building, at 10 o'clock, Senator Tom Connally, Chairman, presiding.

Present: Senators Connally (chairman), Miller, and Danaher. (The subcommittee continued its consideration of H.R. 10094.)

Senator Connally: The Committee will come to order. This is another session of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, holding hearings on H.R. 10094. I might say for the record that this hearing was called at the request of those persons who desired to appear, and the Committee has issued no compulsory process. The witnesses are here at their own invitation. I would like to know who is present this morning, wishing to appear.

Mr. Browder: Earl Browder, of the Communist Party.

Senator Connally: Mr. Earl Browder, of New York City; I believe that is right?

Mr. Browder: That is right.

Senator Connally: Is there anybody else who wants to appear? All right, Mr. Browder. Have a seat.

* Abridged verbatim report. (Ed.)

STATEMENT OF EARL R. BROWDER, GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

Senator Connally: Just give the reporter your name and official connections, if any.

Mr. Browder: Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States. . . .

Senator Connally: Are you for the bill, or against it?

Mr. Browder: We are against this bill.

Senator Connally: All right, sir. Go ahead. . . .

Mr. Browder: On behalf of the Communist Party I would like to say about this bill, H.R. 10094, the so-called Voorhis Bill, that a study of this bill has given us the opinion that it represents, together with other measures of a similar sort before the Congress, a parallel to the Alien and Sedition Laws of the administration of President Adams at the close of the eighteenth century. This basic judgment is what determines our attitude on the bill as an attitude of opposition.

It differs of course from its ancient prototype in that the original Alien and Sedition Acts were quite boldly and openly directed against the rising democratic movement of the American people which culminated in the election of Thomas Jefferson, and was quite openly to oppose the development of democracy. The present bill with its companions puts itself forward as a support of democracy, and, in the name of defending democracy, proposes to limit and hamstring the democratic processes as they have developed in this country.

Senator Connally: Would it bother you if we interrupted you occasionally with questions, or would you rather go ahead and finish your statement and not have questions?

Mr. Browder: I think perhaps, while I have no objections to answering questions, it would be more fruitful for all of us if they came a little bit later.

Senator Connally: All right. We will be very glad to accommodate you, Mr. Browder. Go right ahead.

Mr. Browder: This Voorhis Bill is a typical example of the ambiguity of these modern attempts at the limitation of the democratic processes. Ostensibly directing itself against the agencies of foreign governments operating in American political life, this bill would actually result, if adopted and applied impartially, in outlawing a principle.

Senator Connally: A principle? . . .

Mr. Browder: That is the principle of international working class organization, that principle of internationalism which Abraham Lincoln recognized and indorsed, when he said, responding to an address of the International Workingmen's Association, the First International, that (I quote from memory) —

“The ties which bind the workingmen of all lands, of all races and of all nations are and should be the strongest, second only to the ties that bind people of one family and one kindred.”

Let me make it clear to the Committee and for the record that the Communists are not opposed to the establishment of controls over foreign agents within the United States. We recognize that in the present state of the world this is a problem that faces all countries. We do, however, see in the present bill before you, and in others of a related nature, that our country is being placed in danger of doing much more damage than could conceivably be done in the way of any service by these measures.

Specifically, we see in this act a concrete example of the attempts to take the United States along the same path of policy upon which France was taken immediately before, and after,

especially, the outbreak of the present war. The sponsors of this bill have publicly cited the course of the French Government as an example which they wish to apply in their own way in America. It is therefore quite in order for us to give some attention to the significance of this course as it was applied in France, and the results of that course.

In France, there certainly were the so-called "fifth column" agents of foreign powers working within the political life of France, on a scale perhaps larger than ever seen in any other place. In fact, these so-called "fifth column" elements have seized power in France, and today constitute the effective government of that country. How did they come into power? It was not only that France was defeated in battle, because that defeat itself must be explained—and cannot be explained on military grounds. These foreign agents came to power in France first of all under the pretense that they were the leaders in the outlawing of treasonable organizations within France. They were the people who initiated the outlawing of the Communist Party of France. They were the people who suppressed, disrupted and disorganized the French labor movement. In fact, one can say the only efficient war measures taken by the French under the leadership of these so-called "fifth column" elements was the suppression of the labor movement and the Communist Party of France. Those measures, I submit to you, which are presented as a model for our country to follow, did not delay the coming to power of foreign agents within France over the French people. These measures initiated a whole course which hastened and was intended to hasten the military victory of the Nazis and the internal collapse of the French Republic.

From this concrete example, I would call your attention to the fact that Nazism and fascism of all varieties has risen to whatever degree of power it may have in any land always precisely under this flag—the suppression, outlawing of the Communist Party, first of all; second, the suppression or effective control over

the labor movement, the organized trade unions; and, from that, proceeding to the destruction of all effective organizations of the masses of the people.

Senator Miller: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the witness a question. I think I can do that without interrupting his chain of thought.

Senator Connally: All right.

Senator Miller: I just want to get the premise of your argument, there, Mr. Browder. As I understand it, you are basing or premising your objection to this bill upon the contention that the proponents of the bill may in fact be the subversive elements that will prevent the development of democratic processes in this country, is that right?

Mr. Browder: That would be a fair inference from the general line of my argument.

Senator Miller: That would follow?

Mr. Browder: Although I would not want to apply it mechanically.

Senator Miller: I know. I am applying it objectively, that is all.

Mr. Browder: In a general way.

Senator Miller: Yes. In other words, the statement that you made about France was as I understand it that the real subversive elements in France, or the "fifth column," that undermined France were operating behind the pretense that they were undertaking to suppress "fifth columnists"?

Mr. Browder: That is right.

Senator Miller: And therefore applying the same analogy to this?

Mr. Browder: Exactly, exactly.

Senator Miller: That is, that the men here undertaking to suppress "fifth columnists" or subversive activities in this country should be watched?

Mr. Browder: I think that is correct.

Senator Miller: I just wanted to get a clear understanding of your premise.

Mr. Browder: My reservation was this. . . . I think the political situation is so unclear and so confused in the United States that many honest people lend themselves to schemes, the ends of which they would by no means indorse, and which would appall them if they knew what they were doing.

Senator Miller: Yes. I understand your reservation.

Mr. Browder: I do not want to make any attacks, therefore, against any individuals. . . . Continuing with this general observation of the uniform course of the rise of Nazi and fascist forces in the world, I would point out that in every case the ideological character of these movements is to raise an intense and exclusive nationalism, the denial of any common international interests of the peoples of the world, and practically within the country to divert the political life of the country towards a struggle more and more intense against so-called "alien groups" within the country. In Germany it was first of all the Jews and the Marxians—the so-called "Marxians"—and all those who recognize common international interests among peoples.

We have had long experience in American history with such issues. This is not new to our country. I have already mentioned that in the 1790's Thomas Jefferson was denounced as an agent of the French Revolution, and the Alien and Sedition Laws of that time were based upon the theory that the rising democratic movement in the United States was merely an extension of and

an agency of the French Revolution, and specifically of the Jacobin Clubs of France, which were paralleled in the United States by the democratic clubs that founded the original party of Jefferson called the "Republican Party," and later, the "Republican-Democratic Party" of that time. In fact, the Society of Tammany was one of the organizations which were outlawed by the Alien and Sedition Acts of that time.

We have further the experience of one of the most dangerous periods in the life of our country, in the decade just before the Civil War. The whole political life of our country was distorted by the movement that was generally identified under the name of the "Know Nothing" movement, which almost created an atmosphere of civil war in the United States on very false issues, central among which was the campaign against the Catholics as agents of a foreign power in American political life. This theme has repeated itself again and again since that time. The Ku Klux Klan type of influence in American life lives upon this sort of thing, and while it is an old influence in America it is by no means comprised within that body of doctrine or ideology which is generally accepted as Americanism. It is the enemy of the best traditions of our country. This, we consider it should be pointed out, is the most dangerous influence in our country, the most to be guarded against; and this influence is not combated but rather expresses itself in the bill under consideration, and others of like nature. This trend represents not the combating of dangerous influences but the writing of their essential position into the law of the land—not the combating of Nazi influences, but the registration of a victory of Nazi influence in the political life of our country.

I know of course that it will be pointed out that this bill in its application not only strikes at legitimate political parties in the United States like the Communist Party, but that it would also create organizational difficulties for the German-American Bund, for example. . . . Any incidental embarrassment that this bill

might give to the Bund would be much more than offset by the political victory it would represent for the Nazi philosophy under which the Bund operates.

Senator Connally: Well, . . . are you assuming to speak for the Bund as well as for the Communist Party?

Mr. Browder: I am speaking as an observer of politics in America, who presumes to pass judgment on the influence of this bill upon the whole political life of our country. I speak against the Bund and against this bill as representing an identical political tendency. . . .

The next point I will direct myself towards on this bill is its ambiguity. Hypocrisy and ambiguity are the most dangerous things in the making of laws. Objects to be achieved by laws should be clearly defined. This is not the case with the bill under consideration. If this law should be enacted we would be faced with the alternative, either, first, the law would not be impartially applied . . . or, if it were impartially applied, it would create such results that I am sure the sponsors of this bill would not accept them as the legitimate consequences of their acts, because, impartially applied, this bill would make it impossible for the trade union movement as at present constituted in America to operate.

Senator Connally: There have not been any labor representatives here protesting against it. They do not object to it.

Mr. Browder: I think they assume that this bill will not be impartially applied; and perhaps the assumption is not so far-fetched. By the terms of the bill, however, it includes the whole labor movement of America, and places them under such obligations that the trade union movement of America could as at present constituted by no means, no matter how much they wanted to, comply with this law. It is an impossibility to come under the terms of this law and comply with its provisions.

Senator Connally: Well, would you mind talking more about your own Party and its objections, and why it would put you out of business, rather than the trade unions. We will look after those, later.

Mr. Browder: I think I should first speak about the trade unions, because the danger with regard to the trade unions is much greater than that with regard to the Communist Party. After all, our Party is a small, weak organization, relatively un-influential in the affairs of our country, and if our words have any importance, it is not because we talk about ourselves or our own particular position. . . . While not at all speaking on behalf of the trade unions, it is necessary for any responsible person in public life to point out that the measures before us, if impartially applied. . . .

Senator Connally: That connotes an assumption in your mind that it is not going to be impartially enforced.

Mr. Browder: I was pointing out alternatives. The first alternative is that the bill may not be impartially applied, in which case of course the bad results of it would be narrowed, because the bad results would come only where it was applied. . . . The other alternative is to assume that it would be impartially applied. . . . In that case it would render impossible the operations of the trade union movement as at present constituted. . . .

It may suffice to point out that any form of international affiliation brings an organization under the terms of this act and responsible for the fulfilling of some fourteen points of obligations to Governmental instances, . . . I challenge any organization in America to state through its responsible officers that it could possibly fulfil those fourteen points under any circumstances.

Thus, we have the ambiguous character of this bill brought before us in its most obvious form, that it attempts by indirection to accomplish what evidently is understood cannot be properly

defended directly before the Congress or the country. It creates obligations on organizations which have any form of organizational recognition of the principles of the international common interests of the working people of the world, and upon such organizations it places obligations which are impossible of fulfillment by any organization in America. There is no functioning political organization in America that could possibly meet the requirements of the fourteen points listed in this law, beginning on page 5 and ending on page 7. It is not possible to operate under that law without constantly violating the law and subjecting every leader and every member of that organization to a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for five years. . . .

Senator Miller: Mr. Browder, in reference to your objection to the fourteen points, now, I can visualize some trouble in complying with or furnishing the information required by the fourteen points, by certain organizations, but now let us see if there would be any actual trouble in furnishing the information required in the fourteen points, beginning on page 5, down to the middle of page 7, with the organizations that would be required to file the information, going back to page 3, that it is only directed first to every organization subject to foreign control.

Mr. Browder: The foreign control, if you will pardon my interrupting—

Senator Miller: Yes.

Mr. Browder:—is defined. . . . It is defined to include this. "Foreign control" means any organization which in any way has any affiliations outside of the United States. . . . "Any affiliations outside of the United States" is defined as "foreign control. . . ." That means that under Section 1 is included not only the Communist Party but the American Federation of Labor. . . .

Senator Connally: Well, it is not complaining of it.

Mr. Browder: No, it is not complaining, because it does not expect the law to be applied; but those are the terms of the law. . . .

I would have to raise very serious questions as to how such laws would be applied, because we have had the experience, if you will pardon me, Senator, of seeing excellent laws, taking them as they appeared on paper, in France, and in Germany in the early years before the Nazis came into power, laws ostensibly directed towards the rising of these anti-democratic movements, which in application were applied only to the Communist Parties of those countries; so while I would have to admit the correctness in principle of the position you have stated, I would have to put my reservations very seriously as to how those principles would be applied. . . .

Senator Connally: Would not France have been a lot better off if she had known in advance the international relationships that were going on between the "fifth column" in France and the influences in other countries, before the debacle of the French Republic?

Mr. Browder: France knew it.

Senator Connally: Well, if she knew it, she did not make any use of it.

Mr. Browder: That is the trouble. . . . The Communists were the only people in France that voted against the Munich betrayal. . . .

Finally, let me make it clear that if the Communist Party comes under the terms of this bill it is not because the Communist Party in any way is under foreign control. . . . I can remark in passing that in my opinion it is clearly unconstitutional, and I would expect that four or five years of its enforcement would finally bring a Supreme Court decision that it was unconstitu-

tional and illegal; but that would not be of very much help for the immediate situation before the country. . . .

One last word. I do not think that the argument that I have presented is an argument directed towards protecting the Communist Party against attacks which it would experience under such a law as this, except in the most incidental way. I direct all of my arguments primarily to the preservation of the political life of our country. The harm that would be done to the Communist Party would be purely incidental but the harm that would be done to the whole political life of America by such measures as this would not be remediable under the present world situation for a very long time. It would distort the whole political development of our country in facing the world crisis. It would stultify the thinking of our country. It would place under the ban of illegality some of the most important issues and programs which America must debate in the coming period and in advance of such debates try to determine its outcome by prejudging it, placing certain views under the ban.

We have confidence in American democracy that it can consider all of these issues and arrive at a correct decision. We do not think that you have to control the thinking processes of the American people in order to guarantee the outcome.

Senator Miller: . . . Now, going back to the faith in American democracy, can we as an American democracy afford to let an international political organization with un-American ideals and un-American living conditions—can we afford to let any such political organization infiltrate its doctrines here among our people? . . .

Mr. Browder: I would say that we cannot afford in America to exclude the lessons of international experience, we cannot afford to exclude the considerations of common interests of the main mass of the people of all countries. . . . Now, if these things are realities, and if it is true that, as Lincoln expressed it, the

strongest bond outside of the family relationship should be that which unites the toiling people, the workers of all countries, races and nationalities—if so, those things have to find organizational expression; and if they find organizational expression they come in conflict with your draft law here.

Senator Miller: Now, is the Communist Party a member of an international political organization?

Mr. Browder: It is affiliated with the Communist International.

Senator Miller: That is, of Russia?

Mr. Browder: No, that is, of the world. . . .

Senator Miller: . . . Now, are the policies of the Communist Party determined by or at the suggestion of or in collaboration with any existing government in the world?

Mr. Browder: No, not of any government, but collaboration with an international political organization of political parties in other countries by all means. Just to give you the latest and most concrete example of the life of our Party, we had discussions recently between the leaders of our Party and the leaders of the Communist Party of Cuba, discussing the common interests of the two Parties and of the people of the two countries toward certain current issues of the world. The results of those discussions influenced the attitude of the Communist Party of the United States in discussion with Cuban Communists. Our decisions were influenced unquestionably. You cannot have a discussion, except a purely barren one, that does not influence decisions.

Senator Miller: Is the policy of the Communist Party in the United States determined in collaboration with the Communist Party in Russia, we will say?

Mr. Browder: No. The determination of the policies of the

Communist Party in the United States rests completely and entirely with the National Convention of our Party within the United States, and the leadership elected by that National Convention.

Senator Connally: But that policy is determined after a consultation with leaders of the Party in other nations of the world?

Mr. Browder: To the extent that it is practically possible. These possibilities of course are constantly narrowing. Our practical contacts internationally are only with our immediate neighbors at the present time.

Senator Miller: That is on account of the European situation?

Mr. Browder: But in principle we would always have as broad a consultation as we could, before we would decide an important question.

Senator Miller: That is all.

Senator Connally: Mr. Browder, let me ask you a question or two. Now, has your organization, since you have been in connection with it, received any financial contributions from Moscow?

Mr. Browder: It has not. . . .

Senator Connally: Where do you get your funds? . . .

Mr. Browder: In the United States, from the American workers, primarily.

Senator Connally: How do you get them? By dues?

Mr. Browder: By dues, assessments, and donations. . . .

Senator Connally: You speak a good deal about "democratic processes" and "American democracy," and all that sort of thing, and Constitutional rights. Those rights that you are talking about

and invoking are guaranteed and protected by the Constitution of the United States, and yet your organization is advocating and believes in the changing of that system and its overthrow, does it not? . . .

Mr. Browder: No.

Senator Connally: Does not the Communist Party believe in overthrowing the Government of the United States? . . .

Mr. Browder: It does not believe in overthrowing the Government of the United States.

Senator Connally: By peaceable means, or by advocacy of change in the Government of the United States? Do you not advocate that?

Mr. Browder: Not by any means.

Senator Connally: Do you not mean to establish the communist system in the United States?

Mr. Browder: Oh, yes. . . .

Senator Connally: Then you believe in changing the Government of the United States from its constitutional democratic system into a communist state, do you not?

Mr. Browder: You are identifying the present economic system of the United States with the American democracy, which I cannot accept. . . . If you will allow me to illustrate my point, I would point out to you the message to Congress by Abraham Lincoln. . . . That was in December, 1861.

Senator Connally: Let us get down a little closer to the Communist Party. There wasn't any Communist Party, was there, in the days of Lincoln?

Mr. Browder: Oh, yes, there was a Communist Party, then,

and the Communists had commissions in the Union Army under Lincoln.

Senator Connally: Well, if Lincoln had found it out, he would probably have put most of them in jail, I think.

Mr. Browder: Lincoln carried on correspondence with the Communist Party. That is a matter of historical record.

Senator Connally: . . . If you attain your objective of establishing a communist state, you would have to change the Constitution of the United States, would you not? . . .

Mr. Browder: I would not exclude the possibility of the changing of the Constitution, but I say this is not the essence of the question, and this is a purely incidental question of a technical juridical nature. . . .

Senator Connally: Let us go back to the democratic processes. One of the things about democracy is to bring things out in the open and discuss them and let everybody know about them.

Mr. Browder: That is it.

Senator Connally: And all that this bill does is to require the filing by certain organizations that come within its terms of information about themselves. . . .

Mr. Browder: Besides the objections I have already stated, I would add that we would have the same objection to making matters of public record the names of our members, which is also required here. . . . We would have the same objection to that as Republicans in Texas who would absolutely object to making a matter of public record everybody who has relations with the Republican Party in Texas.

Senator Connally: All right.

Mr. Browder: Because it would mean economic boycott and harm to them. . . .

Senator Connally: . . . The political ideal of your organization is Russia, is it not? They are set up over there. That is a communist setup, is it not?

Mr. Browder: Well, I would not state it in that way, of course.

Senator Connally: State it in your own way.

Mr. Browder: I would say that in the Soviet Union we have the first concrete example of the working out of the principles of socialism or communism.

Senator Connally: Communism?

Mr. Browder: Of which socialism is the first stage; that, therefore, from that country you have the first chance to learn concretely in life the problems involved in the change-over for all countries. That is, there is a certain universal validity in this experience which, however, has to be taken in connection with the concrete historical differences in all countries. That is, while in essence the problems involved are the same, the historical form in which they will be developed will be different for each country, in the same way in which republicanism and democracy developed in different forms in each country.

Senator Connally: Yes. You would like to see the Russian system instituted in the United States, would you not?

Mr. Browder: No, no. I want to see the American system instituted in the United States.

Senator Connally: . . . You want to see an American system on the Russian pattern, do you not?

Mr. Browder: No, I do not take Russia as a pattern. . . . I could accept your formula only if it is clearly understood that it is the same way in which the establishment of the American Republic became a model for the republican movement in all countries of the world. In that sense, I could accept your point of view.

Senator Connally: You think the Russian idea is all right, but it ought to be refined a little and sort of brought up to the American standard, is that it?

Mr. Browder: I object to calling it a "Russian idea." . . . If you are going to identify it with the national origin, you would find it difficult, because the first great theoretician of the movement was a German.

Senator Connally: Mr. Marx?

Mr. Browder: But he formulated his theory primarily in England, on the basis of British experience. . . . And the first large-scale application of these theories came in Russia. . . .

So you have at least a triple national origin, if you trace it to the main contributing sources; but if you go a little farther from the geographic, you will find that from the stream of the philosophical development of the human race, the sources which were drawn upon were world-wide and went back into the very roots of history.

Senator Connally: . . . Do you admire the constitutional system of Russia, in which they take them out and try them after supper, then shoot them before daylight?

Mr. Browder: Well, of course, you will pardon me if I cannot accept your description of the constitutional system of Russia.

Senator Connally: . . . Did not Stalin purge a great many generals and army officers and others, here, a year or two ago, on the principle of trying them today and shooting them tomorrow? . . .

Mr. Browder: I would suggest that on this subject you would consult with the French people and ask them if they do not think they should have followed the example of the Soviet Union

a few years ago. . . . The political question that you raise as to whether traitors in high office should be detected in time and taken out and disposed of in some way or other, I will answer that in the affirmative.

Senator Connally: Without trial?

Mr. Browder: No, no. . . . I believe in giving them legal process.

Senator Connally: Well, everybody believes in that, here in this country.

Mr. Browder: I hope so, but sometimes I doubt it.

Senator Connally: Of course, if there is a traitor over here, we try him according to law. We do not take him out and Ku-Klux him.

Mr. Browder: Well, it has been known to happen in the United States. . . .

You have very inaccurately and distortedly represented the position of the Soviet Union. . . .

Senator Connally: . . . You say you cannot accept my ideas about the constitutional guarantees in Russia. What are the great outstanding guarantees of the Russian Constitution?

Mr. Browder: Well, the guarantee of a job, the guarantee that the rights of free speech and free assembly will not remain empty for the masses of the people, by placing at their disposal the auditoriums, the radio and the press of the country. . . .

Senator Miller: Going back to the theory of the Communist Party in Russia, where they believe in work for everybody, education, and making a reality of freedom of speech. Now, as a matter of fact, their theory has not worked out over there, has it, Mr. Browder?

Mr. Browder: I think it has worked out very well.

Senator Miller: Isn't it an actual fact in Russia, or do you know, from experience, that under the Communist regime in Russia the peasant class may have obtained security but have utterly lost all freedom of action and thought and motives, the control of their individual lives? Isn't that the actual fact about how it has worked out over there?

Mr. Browder: No, I would challenge such a statement. . . . In answering that, I would direct myself first of all to the apparent contradiction that you place between security and freedom. . . . I do not think there is any such contradiction inherent in the natural situation of the world. That is, it is not a natural law. Of course, there is a contradiction between the ideal of security and the ideal of freedom under our present regime. That is not only true of security and freedom; the whole nature of our present system of society places all the great ideals in contradiction with one another. . . . I would refer again to a point which I started to develop under a previous question, and which was unwelcome at that moment. I would call your attention to a very important section of the message to Congress, delivered by Abraham Lincoln in December, 1861—

Senator Miller: Yes, I am familiar with that.

Mr. Browder: —In the first year of the Civil War. In that Lincoln developed what became his famous elaboration of the questions of labor and capital, and if you will recall that famous document of Lincoln's, it certainly represents one of the basic stages of the development of Americanism. He very specifically places his whole conception of Americanism in opposition to the idea that Americanism and liberty and security were to be achieved on the basis of stabilizing relations between capital, owning the economy of the country, and wage labor. He was able to do that at that time very convincingly, because a vast

majority of the people of the country at that time were neither capitalists nor wage laborers, and as against the capitalists and the wage laborers, he placed the center of the democracy of our country then upon the majority who were neither, but he pointed out the great danger that the growing dominance of this relationship between capitalist and laborer in the country threatened to destroy American democracy.

Senator Miller: Yes, and I quite agree with him—the great majority of the people, the backbone of this country; and if our country's ills are to be solved, they are to be solved by that great majority, which is not the so-called capitalists, nor is it so-called "organized labor," either. . . .

Mr. Browder: Of course, on a question of fact, I have to take issue with you there, when you say that the great majority of Americans are still excluded from the two categories of capital and labor.

Senator Miller: I believe they are. Where I come from, there are "the great open spaces."

Mr. Browder: Statistics I think will not bear you out, for the great majority of the American people are wage workers.

Senator Miller: That would depend entirely upon the definition of a wage worker.

Mr. Browder: I might well take the definition that Lincoln used in the development of that message to Congress. . . . You see the point which Lincoln developed in that famous message was precisely this, that the relations of employer and employee constituted the great danger to American democracy, and that those who do not enter into the influences of those relationships were at that time the foundation of American democracy. That foundation is gone, my dear sir, today, so far as the majority of the country is concerned.

Senator Miller: I do not agree with you on that. Whenever we lose that sustaining force in this country, we are in a bad shape.

Mr. Browder: We have lost it, my friend, for the whole period of the twentieth century, and we are losing it more every day. . . . However much we may bemoan the fact, it is a fact, and it is within the framework of that fact that we have to work out the problems of democracy today. This is the point which all of the ideologists of the day refuse to recognize, but precisely this is the point upon which their plans are all going to come to wreck.

Senator Miller: There is the fundamental difference between my political philosophy and your political philosophy.

Mr. Browder: That is true. Mine is a growing one, and yours is one that is going out. . . .

Senator Connally: Mr. Browder, let me ask you one other question. . . . Life means a desire to lead one's own life, to indulge in one's own contacts, social, cultural, and educational, and for a man to think what he pleases, and to speak what he thinks.

Mr. Browder: That is right.

Senator Connally: Those are the characteristics of the American system as we have known it, are they not?

Mr. Browder: Those are some of the characteristics.

Senator Connally: Well, let us say that those are our ideals, whether we attain them or not. . . . You are living here under the protection of the American Government. You were born here, I suppose?

Mr. Browder: Oh, yes. My ancestors settled in Virginia in 1680.

Senator Connally: That goes back to the foundation. Now, under that system America has become what it is?

Mr. Browder: That is right.

Senator Connally: And yet you want to change that whole system, do you not?

Mr. Browder: No, not the whole system, no. . . . Those splendid ideals that you have just been talking about I would not want to change at all. I would only like to realize them better.

Senator Connally: Do you not think we had better devote ourselves to working out our own institutions and our own traditions and our own Constitution in the attainment of those ideals, rather than to go over and import a lot of foreign "isms" and false doctrines from Russia?

Mr. Browder: Well, if there are false doctrines being imported of course we will find it out, and we will reject them.

Senator Connally: Well, we are trying to find them out, now, and you will not let us find them out. You will not file the information about your doctrines.

Mr. Browder: Oh, yes. As far as these "isms" that you are talking about are concerned, the great complaint against the Communists is not that we hide them but that we spread them too far. . . . In the last nine months I have spread my fundamental views on the present world situation and the present issues in our country in some three and one half million pamphlets, not trying to hide them at all. On the contrary, the one object that I and my Party have is to get these views placed for careful and serious consideration before the public.

Senator Connally: How much did it cost to print and distribute those three and one half million pamphlets?

Mr. Browder: I do not know. Most of these pamphlets sell for as low as 1c and 2c, and more than pay for their cost of production. We do not distribute literature free, you know.

Senator Connally: You do not?

Mr. Browder: Except leaflets. We sell all of our literature. . . . Could I say just in conclusion, if there are no more questions—

Senator Connally: Anything you want to say. Go ahead.

Mr. Browder: I would like to say in regard to certain questions that have been raised here, which I did not take up in the first place, with regard to the Soviet Union, and as to relations of the United States, and what attitude we should take towards it, I should like to say that in my opinion, quite apart from any questions of attitude toward the doctrines of socialism or communism, but approaching it from the broadest standpoint of Americans interested in their own country, in a very dangerous world—whatever we may think about the economic system, it is my firm conviction that the future of our country, whatever its economic system, requires the constant development of closer relations with the people of the Soviet Union and their government. I think the protection of America under any system in the world today requires rapprochement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Senator Connally: Well, Germany believes in that too? She is cultivating Russia, is she not?

Mr. Browder: German influence is directed, like British influence today, towards trying to break up these relations and to make them more difficult.

Senator Connally: Let me ask you one more question. Your organization of course does not believe in war under any circumstances, does it?

Mr. Browder: No, we are not pacifists in principle.

Senator Connally: You are not?

Mr. Browder: We conceive that there have been and probably may be again such things as just wars which have to be supported.

Senator Connally: If the United States were invaded, would you call our defense a just war?

Mr. Browder: Oh, yes.

Senator Connally: Would you be willing to fight?

Mr. Browder: I certainly would.

Senator Connally: You would not ask any questions? You would be ready to fight for the Government?

Mr. Browder: Whatever the regime, I would be opposed to invasion and would support its resistance. . . .

Precisely on the question of war and peace, the whole policy of a party is tested as to whether it is correct or not. The rise and fall of parties in American history has always been connected with questions of war and peace. These are not questions on which parties cancel their differences. On the contrary, these are questions on which parties decide who is right and who is wrong in a large political sense.

Senator Connally: Is there anything in your constitution on the subject of your beliefs as to the rights of the Government to fight—war, peace, and so on? . . .

Mr. Browder: In the constitution of our Party, we support the Constitution of the United States against all of those who in any way would attack it, from within or without, to take away from the American people any of their achievements that are registered in that document. . . .

Senator Connally: I am amazed that you want to hide and keep secret the "great fundamentals," as you call them, of your Party.

Mr. Browder: Nothing to hide, Senator, except we do not want to help the enemies of our Party to create blacklists of our members; and there is a movement in this country, a very un-American movement, to try to deny the right of livelihood to people because they believe that our Government could be served better under a socialist system than under capitalism. . . .

Senator Connally: There is no identity between socialism as such and communism?

Mr. Browder: Of course. Of course there is. . . . Socialism is merely the first stage of communism.

Senator Connally: What is the last stage?

Mr. Browder: The last stage is the complete achievement of these measures of the common ownership of the economy, and the development to the point where it is no longer even necessary to have any kind of discrimination in distribution. . . .

Thank you, Senator, for your courtesy.

Senator Connally: Thank you, Mr. Browder; very glad to have had you here.

In a Popular Abridged Edition!

THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

BY EARL BROWDER

128 Pages. Price 25 cents

This new volume constitutes a political handbook on the forces, at home and abroad, which have unleashed the Second World War. It reflects the development of the basic policies of the Communist Party in relation to the unfolding of events on the international arena during the last year, events which have made the struggle for peace the central issue in the 1940 elections.

"... Browder produced this book during the course of hard and tireless work as leader of the Communist Party," wrote Clarence Hathaway, in a recent review. "It came out of the crucible of the Party's vanguard role in the struggle of the people's forces to prevent this war, to stop its spread, to bring it to an early end, to prevent the United States from being drawn into it. It is the work of a Marxist-Leninist political leader who understands well how to make great contributions to the theoretical growth of the working class movement while giving it direct every-day leadership in its struggle for its class aims."

In addition to the most basic articles and speeches of the original edition of "The Second Imperialist War," published at \$2.00, the Popular Abridged Edition contains Earl Browder's speech accepting the Communist Party's nomination as candidate for President of the United States.

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

Best Seller the 1940 Election Campaign!

The People's Road	Earl Browder . . .	\$.05
Campaign Book	ons, 194015
What's What About	William Z. Foster	.05
Farmers and the War,	per Haaland03
Intellectuals and the War,	by V. J. Jerome10
Why the Negro People Should Vote Communist for Equal Rights, Peace and Democracy, by Theo- dore Bassett02
Women, Vote for Life, by Meridel LeSueur and Ann Rivington02
Italian-Americans and the War, by Peter V. Cacchione		.01
Browder and Ford for Peace, Jobs, Socialism, by Ruth McKenney02
Earl Browder Talks to the Senators05

●
Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.