

CPA Discussion Page

Open to All CPA Members—Send Your Contributions to Communist Political Association, 35 E. 12 St., N. Y. C.

Browder on Revisionism

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

In Comrade Browder's article in yesterday's Daily Worker, entitled *On the Question of Revisionism*, we have another restatement of his thesis that the "intelligent" and "progressive" big capitalists of the United States will lead our country and the world to a safe haven of peace, democracy and prosperity. Browder has learned nothing from the profound discussion that our Party has been carrying on for the past several weeks, except to hide his bourgeois reformist line under more skillful phrases. Thus, his article is replete with an extra dose of Browderite misrepresentations, misquotations, evasions and factional distortions.

Monopolies

On the question of our attitude toward the monopolies, Comrade Browder assails the National Committee's proposals to curb the monopolies as virtually a plan to establish socialism now in this country. He implies that the Party's immediate line is to "break" the power of monopoly capital, which he declares could only mean socialism. This, of course, is a direct misrepresentation of the Party's policy. Our National Committee has not made any such proposition, nor has any member of it. Browder's urgent solicitude for the monopolies is not due to any fear that we are all set to "break" their power, but because of his belief that they are progressive and must not be seriously interfered with. This is why he so vociferously denounced Henry Wallace's anti-monopoly speeches as crass leftism, and why he glanced disapprovingly down his nose at Roosevelt's election-time attacks upon the trusts. For, certainly, Browder did not base his disapproval of these liberals upon a belief that they were out to "break" the trusts and thereby to establish socialism. He just does not want the trusts attacked, for fear of offending big capital. Browder, on the question of curbing the monopolies, holds a position far to the right not only of William Green, but also of the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican parties. Indeed, not even the monopolists themselves have ever dared openly to ask for the free hand that Browder in his book on Teheran and in his policies willingly concedes them.

Comrade Browder pins his whole case about what he alleges to be our plan to "break the trusts" as a task of today upon an article of mine that appeared in the *New Masses* on Dec. 14, 1943. Purportedly directly quoting me, he says that I "insisted" that we base our 1944 election program upon "drastic curbs on monopoly capital, leading toward the breaking of its power."

This is a deliberate falsification of my position, as well as a misquotation from my article. Never did I propose any such formulation for our election program, much less "insist" upon it, as Comrade Browder knows quite well. Nor did I write it in my article and the words he ascribes to me are not to be found there. The article in question dealt with postwar perspectives in general, embracing many questions as well as the elections, such as organizing the unorganized, trade union unity, working class political organization, etc. It was in discussing, not an election program, but the long-run perspectives of the workers, that I wrote:

"Upon the war's end organized labor will also have to begin to pay real attention to correcting the fundamental evils that have produced these two great wars, plus the long economic crisis in one generation. Fascism must be defeated eco-

nomically and politically in this country, as well as militarily on the battlefields abroad. This means that the power of monopoly capital, the poison source of fascism all over the world, will have to be drastically curbed and eventually broken. To do this the nationalization of the banks and of such industries as the railroads, coal and steel is imperative. Nor can the danger of war, fascism and mass pauperization be finally liquidated in our country until the American people establish socialism."

This was an ultimate program, not an election platform, as Browder falsely asserts. As such, I stand upon it squarely. But, of course, there is much in this statement of an ultimate program that offends Comrade Browder, who has elected himself the champion to keep everybody, including Mr. Wallace and the late President Roosevelt, from curbing the trusts, or even speaking ill of them. With his visions of a capitalist utopia now in the making, he has a great distaste for any idea of breaking his "progressive" monopolies, however "eventual" the breaking may be. He has also discarded socialism completely, both for now and the future, and the thought that mass poverty can be finally curbed only by the introduction of socialism goes contrary to his whole thesis of an expanding, progressive capitalism.

But Browder does not attack my article as an ultimate program, which it is; he dishonestly twists it into an immediate election program and then, on the basis of this hocus pocus, he tries to make the Party membership believe that our Party now has as its immediate program the breaking of the power of finance capital: i.e., the establishment of Socialism. Such intellectual trash he hands us in the name of Marxism.

Not satisfied with this complete distortion of the Party's position, as well as my own, on monopolies, Comrade Browder, who was at great pains to establish his argument that the Party is fighting for Socialism as an immediate issue, suddenly turns a handspring and, because the Party correctly demands the enforcement of the anti-trust laws, says the opposite to his earlier argument, namely, that "all the furious outcry against the monopolies in the course of our current discussion comes to the climax of—a return to the Sherman anti-trust law!!!"

This is an insult to the Party's intelligence. Comrade Browder would have our Party ignore the elementary fact that its whole fight on every front is in some way or another centered against the monopolies and has the effect of curbing their power. This is true when we are struggling to defeat reactionaries in the elections, when we are working to strengthen the unions in the basic industries, when we are fighting against Jimcrowsism and anti-Semitism, when we are battling against profiteering and unjust tax laws, when we are fighting for the full production program, etc., etc. And, above all, is it true when we are fighting for a democratic outcome of this war and the realization of the Teheran objectives. Everywhere and always, the success of these struggles depends upon the clearness with which we see the real enemy we are fighting on the home front, reactionary monopoly capital. Browderism, seeking constantly to shield the monopolists from conscious attack, tends to compromise and weaken this whole struggle.

The U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

Comrade Browder, after "straightening us out" on the monopoly question, proceeds to "correct" the Party line also on the matter of

Anglo-Soviet relations. Here he presents us with a restatement of his shocking speech in the National Board on June 2, which opened the eyes of many members to the danger of his general political line. That is to say, once again he summons us to rely upon the big bourgeoisie to maintain good relations with the USSR.

But this time Comrade Browder is compelled to use a few new phrases. His old clichés about the "intelligence" and "progressivism" of the big capitalists being the decisive factors in determining their policy towards the USSR have been so completely discredited in the Party discussion that he does not venture to use them again. The same thing is true of his idealistic, non-Marxist nonsense about the "true class interests" of the big capitalists being the thing that will hold them to a line of friendly cooperation with the USSR. So he, therefore, has had to dig up a new and more plausible term. This time it is "the profit motive" of the big bourgeoisie that we must rely upon to guard and promote good American-Soviet relations.

But this "profit motive" is only Browder's former capitalist "intelligence," "progressivism" and "true class interests" dressed up in a new garb. Here again, we must say, "No, Comrade Browder, we cannot rely upon 'the profit motive' either, no more than we could upon the capitalists' 'intelligence,' 'progressivism,' and 'true class interests' to guarantee sound USA-USSR relations." It is, of course, very important in these relations that the capitalists want to trade with the USSR, and it is also important that the more farsighted among the capitalists realize the folly of a collision with the USSR. But these factors are not decisive, in the sense that they can be depended upon, as Browder says, to cement relations between the two great countries. They can readily be outweighed by other factors not immediately related to profits in trading with the USSR, such as the big bourgeoisie's dread of the spread of democracy throughout the world, their hatred of Socialism as typified by the USSR, their basic trend towards fascism, and their urge for imperialist expansion. Therefore, the only guarantee of continued and close collaboration between the USA and the USSR, which is the key to world peace and economic development, is that the democratic forces of the world, and particularly those in the United States, remain keenly on the alert to defeat the main enemies of such collaboration, namely, monopoly capital. This, Browder utterly fails to see. The more he writes about Soviet-American relations, the clearer he exposes the dangerous character of his revisionism.

Socialism

Comrade Browder, in his article, also speaks of Socialism. He argues to the effect that his position on this basic question has been justified because the Communist Parties of Europe, like our own, have not put Socialism upon the order of business as a question of immediate struggle after the war. But we did not need Browder to tell us that Socialism is not the issue at this time; we ourselves know that, and it was already a matter of public knowledge from the published programs of European underground movements.

What Browder is being criticized for regarding Socialism is not because he told us that Socialism is not an immediate issue, but because he abandoned the whole historical perspective of Socialism, even in the most remote sense. This, of course, the European Communist Parties emphatically did not do. Browder cast Socialism aside altogether, sub-

stituting for it a capitalist utopia. In his book *Teheran*, he developed a perspective of an expanding and developing capitalist system, which not only contradicted Lenin's theory of the decay of capitalism under imperialism, but also abolished the basic Marxist perspective of Socialism itself.

When Comrade Duclos said that "Earl Browder made himself the protagonist of a false concept of the ways of social evolution in general, and in the first place, the social evolution in the United States," he obviously had in mind the fact that Browder has abandoned the concept of a social evolution that culminates eventually in the establishment of Socialism, and instead, believes in a social development leading to a rejuvenated, progressive capitalism that liquidates the need and possibility of Socialism.

National Unity

In dealing with the question of national unity in the postwar period, Comrade Browder exposes again his revisionism. His theory is that monopoly capital, or the decisive sections of it, must be a part of the postwar national unity, and he pictures a situation practically devoid of struggle, and in which labor and capital will agree upon basic national policy. To get big capital into this national unity it must be appeased, according to Browder's harmony of interest of labor and capital ideas. Consequently, in the postwar period there must be no attempts to curb the trusts generally, there must be no "dictation" by the unions to the monopolists, there must be a labor's postwar no-strike pledge (see Browder's formulation of this in his article), there must be an incentive wage generally in the industries (Daily Worker, April 14, 1944), and (judging by the way leading comrades have advocated this idea throughout the Party unchecked by Browder) there must also be guaranteed profits for the employers.

Such a national unity in the postwar period, based on class peace with the monopolists, would be a first-class disaster to the workers and the people generally (as well as to our Party). It would paralyze the unions by robbing them of their strike weapon in the face of the employers' offensive; it would turn the unions, with their incentive wage plans, into speed-up instruments of the bosses; it would put the employers on "Easy Street" as regards profits; it would exempt the trusts from public criticism and give them a free hand to carry out their exploitation and reactionary politics. In short, it would be a nation under the complete domination of finance capital; that is, a paradise for the employers and a menace to the peace and prosperity of the world.

Obviously, therefore, Browder's conception of postwar national unity is absurd. The national unity of the postwar period must be made, not with the participation of the great finance capitalists, but with the truly democratic masses against these big capitalists. That a few big capitalists may go along with the national democratic coalition does not alter the rule. All the democratic forces of every class must join ranks against the common enemy of labor and the people, the trusts. Comrade Duclos gives a clear picture of the kind of national unity we must strive for when he says:

"We, too, in France, are resolute partisans of national unity, and we show that in our daily activity, but our anxiety for unity does not make us lose sight for a single moment of the necessity of arraying ourselves against the men of the trusts."

Duclos' proposition to organize national unity not with, but against,

"the men of the trusts" is doubly correct for the United States, where the big capitalists are the richest, most powerful, most reactionary, and most rabidly imperialist of any in all the United Nations.

Browder's oft-repeated argument, which he uses to buttress his false conception of national unity, namely, that it was finance capital that guaranteed the election of Roosevelt, is ridiculous. In reality, never did any President stand for re-election with so few big capitalists supporting him as Roosevelt had, which, of course, did not mean that the Roosevelt Administration was not a capitalist government. One of the most pronounced aspects of the campaign, indeed, was the intense effort made by the great bulk of the biggest capitalists in the country to defeat Roosevelt—a fact known to everybody, and which flatly contradicts Browder's theory that "the decisive sections of finance capital" were and are in the progressive camp. In his article, to justify his wrong notion of national unity, Browder repeats this absurd theory by stating: "It was that section of the big bourgeoisie represented by the *New York Times*, which swung over to Roosevelt in the final fortnight of the election campaign, together with the mass following which it commands, that furnished the narrow margin of victory." This is supremely absurd. It is quite certain that the deathbed switch of the *Times* in the last days of the campaign did not bring as many as 100,000 votes to Roosevelt. Indeed, the figure was probably very much less. The belated, wavering stand of the *Times* was completely indecisive in carrying New York State, much less the United States.

The Labor-Management Charter

Curiously, Comrade Browder complains of the slowness of the National Board, and particularly of myself, in rejecting the Labor-Management Charter. I say "curiously" because Browder himself accepted this charter entirely without criticism (Daily Worker, April 8, 1945), and he still does, his only complaint being that the notoriously reactionary National Association of Manufacturers was not a party to the charter.

Speaking for myself, I may say that when the report on this charter was first made in the National Board, three months ago, I replied to the report with such an emphatic set of warnings of the dangers involved in this form of class collaboration that Browder declared that I was rejecting the charter outright. I did not so reject it, however, believing for a while that it could be used as an instrument to advance the unity of labor and to help split the bourgeoisie. But I am now convinced that the charter cannot do these things. This conclusion is emphasized by the fact that both the AFL and the Chamber of Commerce are now sabotaging the charter. Organized labor cannot afford to feed itself with illusions, such as the charter and Browder cultivate, that it can harmonize its interests with big capital in an over-all postwar economic program. This is clear from the charter itself, which repudiates the intervention of the government in production, does not accept the new Economic Bill of Rights, and does not endorse the principle of full employment. In order to achieve the economic aims of labor and the people, the trade unions, together with the rest of the democratic forces of the nation, in the postwar period, will have to conduct a long and complicated economic and political struggle against the big capitalists. These aims cannot be achieved in advance by a harmoni-

(Continued on Page 2)

Isolation From Members Hurt Leadership

By AL LANNON

Maryland-Washington District.

As an alternate member of the National Committee of the CPA elected at its convention of June, 1944, and as president of the CPA of Maryland and the District of Columbia, I would like to register what I consider my responsibilities in connection with the opportunist and revisionist errors committed by our organization.

First as to my responsibilities as a member of the National Committee.

Here I assume my full share of the responsibility of that body for its wholehearted agreement with the opportunist and revisionist policies projected by Browder and for exerting my every effort to line up the entire Party membership behind these policies.

I not only agreed wholeheartedly with these policies but fought for them to the very best of my ability. What is more, I am one of those people who had a lot of difficulty in understanding and accepting the criticism directed at us by Duclos and for a time tried to rationalize our past mistakes and avoided meeting the issues squarely.

In addition to the exposure of my complete lack of Marxist understanding in this situation my reaction was very subjective, first of all and mainly, because of my unwillingness to "take it," and secondly I had developed a deep distrust of some people who in my opinion are more interested in "jumping on the band wagon" than in thinking things through to their bitter end.

I may be wrong, but the question that bothers me is what happened to these people between yesterday and today? Do they really think things through or do they just go along their sweet way from one "line" to another. I am not condemning a person for being more able than myself to more quickly see our mistakes and take steps to correct them. What does bother me is a certain glibness on the part of some of our National Board mem-

bers which makes me wonder whether we are going to get everything we want out of this discussion without intense personal evaluation of ourselves.

I've been criticized for my slowness in seeing the correctness of the Duclos criticism and the comrades who criticized me are undoubtedly correct. I believed in and worked for the wrong policies for a long period of time and I had to sweat, and sweat hard, to see that they were wrong because I wasn't "following the band" all this time.

There are some leading people who after the Duclos article began to strut around with the "I knew it all the time" attitude. This is a lot of unadulterated clap-trap because I remember these same people over a year ago advocating that we go even further and dissolve the Communist organization altogether and join the Democratic Party. These same people looked upon me with disdain when I raised the question from time to time that the key thing was to mobilize the workers around issues and I was practically accused of "underestimating the need for 'top deals.'" These people were the great Marxists who understood the line and I was just an ex-seaman who hadn't yet learned how to work.

Another point I would like to make in connection with my role as a National Committee member is that I honestly cannot convince myself that I have the same degree of national responsibility as the members of the National Board or even of those members of the National Committee who have been in active national leadership over a long period of time and who were close to the National Board in discussing and hammering out policy.

When I was elected an alternate member of the National Committee I was sure, and still am, that the projection of my name for the position was more in the sense of window dressing (seaman, worker, etc.) than an honest desire to bring me into active national leadership of the organization.

The only change that took place in my status as a result of my election was that I was able to attend a National Committee meeting one

year after the convention at which I was elected.

At this meeting I raised with a couple of Board Members that I would like to participate in the discussion but I did not know just how to do it and needed some help. The only answer I got was, "think the problems through and make your contribution."

What further confused me was the fact that almost everyone came to the meeting with a written speech which usually started out in this manner: "I agree wholeheartedly with Comrade Browder's brilliant report." These speeches were written before anybody even heard Browder's report. Before the discussions had hardly gotten underway, Comrade Trachtenberg would get up and announce that Browder's report was already printed and wanted to know how many copies we could take for distribution, and you always had to take twice as many as you originally asked for.

With the exception of the National Convention (where incidentally there "was not time" and I never got the opportunity to speak my only contact with the National Board was one of the check-up on assignments given my district "voluntarily.")

This contact was either in the form of mail or in the very brief "listening in" sessions where I was told what was expected of me on the various campaigns. Somehow there was never any time to really discuss problems many of which bothered me quite considerably.

The only exception to this was my talks with Comrade Hudson on various problems concerning the labor movement in my district. Comrade Hudson was the only National Board member who could, once in a while find the time to discuss problems without constantly and impatiently looking at his watch and reminding me that he was very busy and that I'd better get out.

Now as to my responsibilities as District President of the CPA of Maryland and D. C. Here I had to accept full responsibility for the ap-

plication of the opportunist and revisionist line of our national organization. I not only agreed with the policies but exerted all of my efforts to "whip" the District leadership and membership into line.

This was my approach throughout the whole period since that convention. I did not go to clubs to discuss with the comrades but rather to "tell them" and if questions of doubt were raised my approach was to "straighten them out."

What's even more serious is that because most of the District leadership was new my attitude tended to develop the same in the rest of the leadership and therefore their responsibility cannot be near as great as mine.

In my district I was the one who took the lead and carried through the dissolution of the industrial clubs. As I see it now this decision was part and parcel of a policy which denied the independent and leading role of the working class and placed reliance for leadership of the nation in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Here too the approach was not to consult and discuss with our industrial comrades. The fact that our industrial comrades did not attend their community club meetings, became dues problems, etc., concerned us not from the viewpoint of trying to figure out what was wrong with our policies. Things reached a point where a regular witch-hunt was directed against our best mass workers, our trade unionists, by the entire leadership, district, city and club. The result was a dispersal of our industrial forces which reflected itself adversely in the labor movement.

In the application of our policy of all-out uncritical support of the Roosevelt administration I also developed the attitude that, whenever Roosevelt appeased the reactionaries, there was nothing wrong with Roosevelt but rather the labor movement was to blame for not giving him enough support.

When trade union comrades raised questions about the anti-union attitudes of particular company bosses I told them that in

order to change this the boss had to be convinced of the good-will of the worker's side. This could only result in a policy of appeasing the company and hoping to change their "bad-will" into "good-will" rather than the organization of the workers for struggle.

When conditions became so unbearable in some industries that stoppages of work took place we condemned the workers as scabbing on the armed forces and demanded that our comrades do their utmost to get the workers back on the job.

Now, of course, the workers should not have struck and of course they had to be gotten back to work, not only in the supreme interest of winning the war, but also to prevent reaction from using such strikes to whip up anti-labor sentiment in the country as part of its drive to paralyze and destroy the labor movement. But if we had spent some time in ourselves learning and teaching the workers how to fight politically we would have been better able to guarantee maintenance of the no-strike pledge as a defensive weapon in the hands of the workers rather than as a club in the hands of reaction over the heads of the workers.

In conclusion one final point. I reacted quite subjectively when a comrade mentioned the fact that he thought the District leadership had lost contact with the membership. My first reaction was this was not true; didn't we meet with the clubs, wasn't I talking to members, many members every day? But on further thinking this question through I have come to the conclusion that the comrade was right.

Meeting and talking to the members, even if we meet with the entire membership every day does not necessarily mean that we have political contact with them.

Having live contact with the membership means not only meeting with them, but listening to them, discussing their experiences and learning from them. Contact with the membership is lost when we talk to them and work in such a way as to prevent freedom of expression and in this way demonstrate our egotistic unwillingness to learn from them.

Why Browder Got A Favorable Press

Dear Comrades:

I am grateful to Comrade Duclos for his brilliant Marxist analysis that exposed the revisionist tendencies which dominated our CPA. I am also grateful to him because his article was the instrument which helped, to a great degree, initiate our new anti-reformist policy. Yes, for this we can thank Comrade Duclos. But I am also cognizant of, and grateful for, the swift way our national leadership met the new situation and corrected itself and drafted, in the main, an excellent resolution with which I am in full agreement.

There is no doubt in my mind that this incorrect policy, if pursued much longer, would have resulted in havoc for our movement by liquidating the independent role of the Communist Party as the vanguard of the working class. Little wonder the capitalist press fairly leaped to embrace "Victory and After," which Comrade Browder wrote about a year and a half ago. It was evident to the bourgeoisie then that Browder was revising fundamental Marxist concepts of class relationship.

Enough has already been clearly stated by others in this discussion concerning Comrade Browder's revisionist tendencies and how they led to opportunism, with the full support of our national leadership—except Comrade Bill Foster. So that the outstanding question in our minds today is: How was it possible for leading Communists to

swallow Browder's deviation from Marxism-Leninism?

In arriving at a correct answer based on real self-criticism, we must inevitably touch on some aspects of misapplication of democracy in our organization, which even Comrade Williamson omits in his otherwise excellent report to the National Committee meeting on June 18-20 and published in *The Worker* of July 1.

Can we accept the explanation that, because Comrade Browder exerted tremendous influence and prestige, he, therefore, affected the whole approach to the question of real Marxist self-criticism? Full discussion is only possible when comrades, unhampered, feel free to discuss. From the national leadership down to club leaders we must begin immediately to make democracy a live thing—not just for meetings, but from minute to minute, hour to hour, and day to day.

Only in this way can we quickly rectify past errors and galvanize our members into action as outlined in the resolution.

In closing I must point out what Comrade Amter makes very clear—that the old course must be changed, not by a rank and file revolt, which is an expression of anarchism, but by refreshing leadership wherever needed and by constantly being on the alert to uproot bureaucracy and develop collective leadership. This is the life blood of all Communist movement.

M. B.

Victory Club, Philadelphia, Pa.

No Faith in Decaying Capitalism

At the beginning, let me say that the discussion on the political line of our CPA certainly has revealed one thing that I and some others have known for a long time. We have been suffering from a lack of proletarian democracy in our ranks. Not only do we see this in the suppression of Comrade Foster's position at the time of the dissolution of the Party but in many instances before. Coupled with this lack of democracy is a petty-bourgeois, mechanical, know-it-all, cock-sure approach to the problems of the workers. The citing of the story about Antocus of Greek Mythology by Joe Austin is a very fitting one to characterize the lack of democracy and contact with the masses in our highest ranks. I only cite this longstanding condition in our movement because I believe it has some bearing on the present mistakes and departure from the correct theory.

Before going into our mistakes and Browder's position let me say something about the nature of our discussion up to now. Some of our people seem to go to the extreme right all out defense of Comrade Browder. Most of them, however, take the extreme left position, that we have gained nothing in the past year and a half, or at least they feel now we must make a complete change in line and nullify the gains of this period. This position I consider to be very bad, and, if persisted in, will harm our movement and cause a loss of contact with the masses. Comrade Browder gave us a masterful analysis of the relation-

ship of class forces, laying before us the correct perspective in his book, *Teheran—America's Path in War and Peace*. Where he made the mistake and where he departed from Leninism was placing our faith in monopoly capitalism as a class, to play a major role in carrying the Teheran agreement and United Nations policy into life. The inherent laws of capitalist development and its many contradictions make it impossible to place our dependence in them as a class, despite the radical changes in relationship of class forces and a stronger Soviet Union. As capitalism decays, the capitalists become more disunited with the working class growing more united and stronger. If the capitalists were united in this country as a class on a progressive program, we would have a national unity approaching that of the Soviet Union, but we Marxists know there can be no comparison between the two in this respect. Any other errors of Comrade Browder, and there are many as quoted by Comrade Foster, I believe flow from this incorrect application of Leninism to the present period.

In my opinion our work in the future will be for the perspective of Teheran, win the war against Japan, friendship with the Soviet Union as the cornerstone of world peace, national unity, reciprocal trade with all nations and upholding the living standards of the workers at home, etc. This is much in line with our program in the past period, except we should now

perform our tasks better, with the correct theory to guide us. Now the next question is do we need a change in the structure of our organization to carry out these tasks. As I see it, this doesn't matter too much whether we are an Association or Party as far as our immediate tasks are concerned. We know that capitalism cannot solve all the problems of the workers forever. We know that to make the change to socialism the working class must have its own party. In view of these facts, possibly we should take a long range view and reorganize the Party now, although we all agree that the change to socialism cannot be made in the near future.

Now, one more point on the matter of Socialist education. Here in my opinion we have failed in our duty. It is one thing for the people generally to admire the Soviet Union for the job it has done in the war. It is another for this admiration to be coupled with a real understanding of why they were able to do it. In getting that understanding, they must learn just what the fundamental differences are between capitalism and socialism. If the reasons for the success of the Soviet Union were sufficiently popularized among the masses, that in itself would be a weapon to prevent the capitalist class from pursuing that disastrous alternative of antagonism to the Soviet Union and repudiation of Teheran. I believe the need for education on the Soviet Union and socialism should have been stressed in the National Board resolution.

LEWIS HURST, Texas.

Forceful Analysis Of Errors Urged

I am a faculty member of the Personnel Training Dept. of the N. Y. CPA who with but few unexpressed doubts accepted and taught the revisionist policy of our CPA. This acceptance was based primarily on the uncritical respect for the unanimous opinion of our National Board, especially for Comrade Browder as "one of the greatest living Marxists." It was buttressed by statements from our leadership to the effect that it was part of a world policy as it applied to the USA. Never did I believe that "it created difficulties for the European Parties" as Browder belatedly apprised us.

Once accepting the idea that an unprecedented situation had arisen, it was not difficult for me to "understand the unprecedented theories" that flowed therefrom.

The many questions about our theories, the anxiety expressed in my classes, I attributed to insufficient understanding of the present course of world events. It never entered my mind that we were basically wrong.

However, the increased manifestations of reaction at San Francisco and elsewhere set me to wondering about the validity of our policy. The explanation based on the death of FDR, coupled with the general heightening of reaction after V-E Day, just didn't jibe with our policy—"Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace." Yet I had no other answer.

Under these circumstances, Comrade Duclos' article struck me as hitting the nail square on its head. It was a shock and a relief. It provided a realistic answer. I am glad it was made available to us. We certainly needed it.

Likewise, I agree with the National Board resolution. However, I would like to see it strengthened in several respects.

How could our National Board discuss the present situation as scientific Marxists without recognizing first its past mistakes? Part I, which deals with the present situation and our program, instead, should deal with our revision of the Marxist-Leninist theory regarding the role of monopoly capital, why we made this mistake and how we can correct it, at the same time recognizing Comrade Duclos' leadership as well as Comrade Foster's in this connection.

While it is true that "in the struggle for the establishment of the anti-Hitler coalition . . . for national unity . . . etc., the Communists have been second to none," (N. B. Resolution, Section 5, paragraph 4), nevertheless we should not compare ourselves with other organizations. Rather we should evaluate the good work we did do in spite of an incorrect policy in the light of the much better work we could have done with a correct policy. It would have been an obvious tragedy indeed if the Communist vanguard had not compared favorably with other groups. We must realize the enormity of our error. We cannot afford to minimize it in the least.

There is lacking a clear explanation of how we revised the Marxist-Leninist theory of the role of monopoly capital. In criticizing Kautsky's definition of imperialism, Lenin stated, "The important fact is that Kautsky detaches the politics of imperialism from its economics, speaks of annexations as being a policy 'preferred' by finance capital and opposes to it another bourgeois policy which he alleges is possible on this very basis of finance capital. According to his argument monopolies in economics are compatible with non-monopolistic, non-violent, non-annexationist methods in politics. . . . The result is a slurring over and a blunting of the most profound contradictions of the latest stage of capitalism instead of an exposure of their depths. The result is bourgeois reformism in-

stead of Marxism." (Lenin—Selected Works, Vol. V, page 85).

This separation of the politics of monopoly from its economics was, in my opinion, our basic error. Probably it was the basis for accepting the diplomatic document of Teheran on its face value. We Communists who are opposed to be the vanguard of the working class were trying to show our class enemy how to overcome its inherent contradictions and how to gain longevity.

We used our past prestige as revolutionary fighters for the people, as well as the prestige of the CPs of Europe, to restrain the democratic, anti-fascist aspirations of the people. For example, the restrained struggle against Jim Crow in the armed forces; compare our struggle for the Scottsboro boys with the recent Mrs. Taylor case. Foster's contention that Browder rejected proposals that labor be given adequate representation in the Roosevelt Cabinet as well as representation at all international conferences held by the United Nations; the continuation of the no-strike pledge into the postwar era while carrying on a weak campaign against employer provocations and WLB weaknesses in settling workers' grievances. The completely apolitical manner in which we carried out the clothing campaigns for Europe's anti-fascists. What a job we could have done on this issue alone to raise the general political level and cement the ties between the peoples of the US and the USSR, as well as the liberated countries.

We quoted the History of the CPSU re being bold in discarding outmoded propositions of Marxism. Never once, however, did I hear or say that such bold replacement must be "in accordance with the substance of the theory" (History, CPSU, pg. 356). We "boldly" replaced the very substance of Lenin's theory of imperialism!

The Resolution would be stronger, too, if it specified the strata or types of capitalists which have regrouped themselves into the most reactionary camp. In the past period many of us were led to believe that Kaiser and duPont were equally representative of the biggest monopolists. We need a clearer picture of the breadth of national unity as well as its limits. Moreover, we need a more precise indication of the form of our struggle in the present period. For instance, our demand for 60,000,000 jobs remains as before. Exactly in what way will we fight for it? Can we expect to achieve it completely under capitalism?

Finally, I firmly believe that the name of our organization should be changed to Communist Party immediately. It would evidence a deeper appreciation of our past revisionist errors and help us to overcome them more quickly.

Even though the entire policy making body of our organization is responsible for our mistakes, I make a distinction between Browder and the rest of the National Board. He is the only member of the Board who continues to maintain his opportunist position.

Comrade Duclos' article has been in his possession since May 20, if not before. The National Board must have discussed it quite thoroughly so that Browder had further opportunity to think through Duclos' criticism. Yet he voted against the Resolution. A whole week later he submitted in writing (Worker, June 10, 1945) the same revisionist position.

In this letter his position is quite obvious. The over-emphasis on the electoral activity of the Communist Party—the statement that "even a wrong answer is better than none," are simply not Marxian. Even his discussion on Soviet-American collaboration is outside the frame of the general advance of the working-class movement.

First, he continues to accept the Teheran declaration as a political

Points to Many Errors in Work

When the CP was dissolved and the CPA formed, many "convincing" arguments were presented to prove the correctness of such a step. I believe that life has shown us to be inaccurate in our judgment; also, that a reorganization now of the CP would be adding one error on top of another.

If we had followed a sound policy during the past one and one-half years, namely, if we had correctly estimated the role of the working class and its natural allies in a period of war in which a natural foe also participated for the defeat of Germany, it would have made little or no difference whether we called ourselves CP or CPA. This understanding would have been reflected in the daily work of the CPA and the neighborhood clubs would have continued to function as the vanguard within the national unity.

The various attempts that were made from the top leadership down to retain the CPA organizationally on a Marxian base fell flat because the quality of our work was such that it did not demand of us a strict Communist form of organization. In fact, the CP dissolution was a very logical step. The formation of the CPA fairly well conformed to the general program that we voted for at the beginning of 1944. We were so thorough in our (incorrect) programmatic approach that we did not overlook the form of organization that would carry such a program into life.

From my own personal experience I would say that the CPA very closely resembled a social-democratic organization during these nightmarish months that we are now reviewing.

For many years I have been a Communist and have learned to

appreciate the fundamental teaching that the strength of our movement lies in our unity of purpose and unity of action. Very often this means that even though we are very small in numbers (in my particular union we constitute about 1 percent of the membership) by all of us Communists backing a certain given proposition we can muster support far beyond our own numerical strength. But this presupposes that the proposition we are fighting for is a correct one; that it answers the needs of at least the majority of the members of my union; that truth being on our side we will all argue from different viewpoints, we will bisect the problem under discussion from various angles and the group of Communists will succeed in persuading the others to our position. Because we, the Communists, will bring to the organizations of the people not only the experiences that we accumulate together with our co-workers in our daily life, but the additional experiences that we have gathered through the education from and contact with the Communist movement as a whole. Therein I see lies our strength.

But when we gave up some of the fundamental teachings that the world (and our own USA included) Communist movement had gathered, when we abandoned the very rich and precious wells of labor knowledge and experience—as we did when we closed our eyes to the fact that American imperialism was in the fight to defeat Germany as a dangerous rival and not because it was sincerely interested in wiping fascism off the earth—then on what base can we Communists act in union in a local which has to deal

with employers who are these very same American imperialists?

Can we persuade the workers that these very same imperialists are going to help us establish an economy of full production—60 million jobs—when their employers were willing to take German prisoners of war into their factories (under the excuse of shortage of labor) rather than pay decent wages? Can we persuade our workers that their employers who refused to recognize the union will help us in the fight for the Wagner-Murray-Dingel bill, or for a democratic Germany?

We Communists were off base in our evaluation of the monopoly capitalists' role in this war and, consequently, we were not very persuasive; and, consequently, we also found ourselves not so well united. In my local we found one Communist arguing against another Communist first on big things and then on trivial matters, so that now there is no semblance of unity among us in this local. We don't represent any more the strength that comes with unity of purpose and unity of action.

A correction of our general policies; the adoption of a program for the coming period that will accurately reflect the needs of the day, will make it possible for us to operate through the CPA. In the course of pursuing a correct program we will have to make organizational adjustments so that as Communists we will be equipped organizationally to act in a disciplined and unified fashion. But the mere changing of CPA into the CP will not give us that guarantee.

E. S.
Joe Hill Club,
Kings County, N. Y.

Browder Discarded Marxism

The appearance of the Duclos article and the Resolution of the National Committee opened the gates of the revolutionary movement once again to return to the basic laws of Marxism-Leninism; the roots of fascism are in monopoly capitalism and imperialism is moribund. The working class is the leader of the toiling masses in their struggle toward Socialism.

In giving "Marxian" lessons to the capitalists on how to run their decaying system after the defeat of Hitler, in accepting "free enterprise" as indispensable to the well-being of society, in creating illusions about everlasting prosperity, Browder and the National Committee have forgotten that the decaying capitalist system is shot with the bullet holes of two world wars; as "respectful Marxists" they taught the working masses to tail the "intelligent" capitalists. Boastfully revising Marxism-Leninism to comply with "American conditions," Browder became the exponent of Bukharin's "organized capitalism" and Kautsky's "ultra imperialism," and drifted the revolutionary movement back to Lovestone's "American exceptionalism." (This opportunism could be traced to before the "Teheran Period"). On this basis a party of organized, self-disciplined, self-critical vanguard became an

obstacle; hence the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States.

Browder discarded the basic Marxist-Leninist teachings that the war is the result of the general crisis of capitalism and that the defeat of fascism in the military field neither destroys fascism nor solves the crisis (although the crisis is hidden in the war economy) of capitalism; he forgot that the victory over fascism was possible only because of the existence of the USSR and the politically maturing working class in the capitalist countries, together with the functioning of Communist Parties the world over, and farther that the section of the bourgeoisie in the capitalist world which has united

with the masses for the destruction of fascism and which worked for the Yalta and Teheran agreements, did not fear Germany. But it is their recognition of the invincibility of the USSR and the growing strength of the working class which was and is the motivating force of the "intelligent" capitalists.

Likewise, Browder's fear of anarchy and chaos in the postwar period and Bob Minor's "theoretical" explanation of same is another pea in their revisionist pot. They have no confidence in the toiling masses, they are unable to grasp the historic role that the workers are destined to play to protect, defend, build, and mould modern civilization.

Upon the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States, the Communists postulated that the existence of a Communist Party constituted a threat in the struggle against reaction. It was hailed as a "master stroke" of Marxism. In my opinion, such capitulation to reaction has not stopped but helped the red-baiters, it has not armed the vanguard, but disarmed it. Marxist-Leninist firmness and tenacity of purpose were replaced by tailing of "practical every-day politicians."

While Comrade Browder must carry the greatest share of the responsibility for the revisionism, a National Board that can swallow opportunism hook, line and sinker for such a length of time, and can overnight turn in the other direction, needs to do some explaining. It would be good to hear from Comrade Bob Minor, who for two years has scolded everyone who disagreed with his "theoretical" nonsense. If the trade union work on the Pacific Coast reflects the situation on the national scene, then Comrade Foster and those who thought alike must share the responsibility for helping to foster opportunism with their silence. The draft resolution and the Duclos article shone out like a shining star on the American political scene. It is the greatest contribution to the American Communist movement since the "Open Letter."

Pre-Convention Discussion Ends

The pre-convention discussion is concluded with the opening of the National Convention. Therefore, this page in the Daily Worker ends with this issue of the paper.

Hundreds of letters are still on hand that were not printed. We want to assure all contributors to this page that all letters have been read carefully, all points noted, and will be included in the thinking and deliberations of the Convention. All recommendations and amendments to the resolution will be referred to the Resolutions Committee of the Convention, all proposals on organizational structure, methods of work and leadership will be referred to the various other committees. Thus the opinions of the members whose letters have not printed, due to the limitation of space, will become the property of the Convention.

Editorial Committee
Discussion Page
William Z. Foster
Eugene Dennis
Bob Thompson.
B. H., Unity Center Club, N. Y.