

# CPA Discussion Page

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

## Differences With Browder Fundamental

Comrade Browder's discussion on the Resolution does not deal with the practical application of his approach. The Conclusions are not as outspoken as in his previous writings on Teheran.

As a result there is a widespread idea, that the differences between Browder and the Resolutions are not basic and fundamental. Some comrades say (expressed at my club meeting and other club meetings) that Browder is for the Resolution, but wants its strengthened in the form of recognition that there are differences within the capitalist class. Other comrades claim that Browder doesn't want us to go to "extremes."

Browder's discussion stems from the premise that a durable peace depends upon the support of the dominant sections of the imperialist bourgeoisie, in full recognition on their part that it represents their true class interests. He develops a "theoretical foundation" for estimating that there is a "possibility" for such support. He urges upon us, therefore, as a course of action, an orientation designed to realize that "possibility," to win their support.

What is wrong with this seemingly "logical" exposition by Browder? The premise is wrong! The realization of a durable peace is not dependent upon winning the support of the dominant elements of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The imperialist bourgeoisie as a class, has reactionary aims. This reaction is not a temporary policy of imperialism but is the basic characteristic of imperialism—the monopoly stage of capitalism, as explained in Lenin's "Imperialism." The economic foundations of imperialism, existing independent of the will of individuals, constitute the basic propelling forces moving the bourgeoisie as a class in a reactionary direction. The fact that the imperialist bourgeoisie in the U. S. fought Hitler (German Imperialism) is not a contradiction of Lenin's analysis of Imperialism. Confronted with the real danger of armed might of German imperialism, it fought desperately to save its life. Its motives were quite different than the motive of the people and this reflected itself in a wavering and inconsistent support of the war. To defeat their German rival they were compelled to acquiesce in many progressive measures adopted during the war.

The imperialist bourgeoisie, (its dominant elements) are not, and cannot be expected to be and will not be the conscious allies of the labor and democratic movement for the realization of a durable peace. This is not to say that individuals like Krug, Nelson, Kaiser cannot be accepted within the camp of democratic unity. Here too, however, we should not be shocked by inconsistency and wavering during critical periods. Neither is this to say that "the more backward and reluctant sections of the bourgeoisie" (Stettinius, Harriman, Grew) are to be lumped in the same category with the Hoovers, Vandenberg and Luces. It is sufficient to note that they are moving in Hoover's direction, that the inevitable tendency of their position is to continue moving in that direction. They will vacillate in their position and will be blocked only by the superior forces of the people.

If that is the case, how can the Resolution speak of the possibility of durable peace?

The strengthening of the forces of world democracy and the weakening of the forces of fascism, make it possible. The great, demonstrated strength of the Soviet Union makes it possible. The new type of Democratic governments in Europe makes it possible. The defeat of Hitlerism makes it possible.

The defeat of Japanese imperialism will further enhance our possibilities for a durable peace. The formation of the World Trade Union Congress makes it possible. The lessons and experience of the people throughout the world makes it possible. And above all it will be possible if we realize that the danger of war and fascism stems from powerful trusts in the United States as elsewhere and therefore it will be necessary to achieve the broadest unity of the democratic forces in our country to curb, limit, block, prevent the American capitalist drive to war.

The economic laws of capitalism remain, imperialist contradictions continue, the law of uneven development of capitalism remains, the striving for colonies and markets remains, the economic contradictions and factors making for war have not been removed. However, the capitalists do not have the same freedom of motion to resolve their contradictions in the same traditional manner, at the expense of the people, because of the new and changed relation of world forces. But as long as capitalism exists, the drive and tendency toward war continues.

The differences then which exist, between Browder and the Resolution, in estimating the direction of movement of the bourgeoisie are not mere hairsplitting differences.

Based upon the estimate of the imperialist bourgeoisie, and the direction of its movement, our approach must be to subdue, to weaken, to block, to prevent (through a democratic unity of the labor movements, its democratic allies and the far-sighted sections of the bourgeoisie) the execution of the reactionary aims of the imperialist bourgeoisie. No fear of antagonizing. No appeasement. No underestimation of its strength, nor fright and paralysis at its powers. No illusory expectation of voluntary consistent progressive action by the big capitalists. A clear realization that Hoover imperialism is the main enemy. An equally clear understanding that Stettinius and other elements are moving in that direction, will waver back and forth. Constant vigilance. Constant struggle. No tendency to be lulled into immobilization because of the thought that reactionary measures by big capitalists are only a temporary phenomena. A fight to realize a durable peace despite the consistent opposition of the Hoover imperialists and the vacillations and inconsistencies of the big capitalists moving in the direction of Hoover.

The approach to an eventual ally must be different from the approach to a foe, whom you're intent upon defeating. In the first instance you try to convince, through logic, concession, mutual understanding, collaboration and tempering of criticism with soft words. In the other instance you do not try to convince, you marshal superior force. Browder's course analyzes reactionary occurrences as something temporary, "A surface conflict of ideology and etiquette." Criticism of necessity is less sharp. Mobilization is less firm; if we believe as Browder does, that "The menace of a postwar world of chaos and disorder, which will be the consequence of disunity will quickly reveal itself as a danger that rivals Hitlerism and will force the rewelding of the coalition." Browder is so enmeshed in the "logic" of his position, that he actually believes that the menace of chaos will lead to unity!

PHILIP SCHATZ.

## Must Strive for Higher Type of National Unity

Perhaps the most pungent criticism of the incorrectness of our line for the past period comes from Earl Browder himself. On page 31, of his "Teheran," he states: "If Teheran was nothing but the scene of some sharp horse-trading in world politics, then this whole book is worth exactly nothing or less—except as an argument that the Teheran we are describing must still occur if America and the world are to escape tragedy beyond anything yet witnessed. For my part, I take the Declaration of Teheran at its face value."

I think that all of us, in the light of events, have seen that we cannot accept Teheran "at face value." Even Browder's recent writings admit that probably Churchill was forced into signing at Teheran. If we conclude that the Prime Minister had a tongue-in-cheek at Teheran, then Browder's own words conclude that a policy based on "face value" is erroneous.

Why was such an incorrect policy so widely accepted? I believe the basic reason lay in wishful thinking. Many members, especially among the middle class groups, jumped with joy at the thought of a peaceful trend toward socialism. Many had read of death, torture, and destruction—and unconsciously quite a few more swayed into believing a policy of peaceful collaboration would work. It is more pleasant to think of peace and prosperity, not struggle.

What were the more surface tendencies that caused us to formulate wrong basic theories? All of us feel a sense of guilt in having failed to evaluate present-day realities. Perhaps the following will summarize reasons for our mistaken approach:

1. The slogans and the practical program of action in the last period seemed to work. Although based on an un-Marxian illusion of capitalist progressiveness, our program met most of the needs of the time. Let us cite support of the no-strike pledge, price control, full production, etc.

2. We, supposedly an intelligent group, fell prey to the propaganda and gestures of patriotism of some reactionary circles, just as we accepted Churchill's words "at face value." We became overly enthusiastic about certain incidents—such as political speeches and praise of the Red Army—and magnified these incidents into long-term trends.

3. Conditions had shifted so rapidly from the dark days of Munich that we were "dizzy with success."

Great capitalist powers were fighting on the side of the USSR. Food and war implements were sent to Russia. The second front was opened.

Earl Browder was freed in the interests of "national unity" by FDR.

Jim Crow was beginning to crumble.

Unions were not smashed as in the last war. Living standards rose. Red-baiting became less popular in many locals.

All of us had on rose-colored glasses."

Well, now the honeymoon is over. Our line must be based now more than ever, upon the militancy and unity of the working class. We can see the mirage for what it is, a beautiful illusion of the "dominant" section of American capitalism marching on a long trek toward a progressive world. Our hands-off policy toward monopolies and capitalist abuses must be checked.

Of course, some people are frightened. They think that now we shall go on a rampage against capitalism. I urge them to read the National Board statement. We shall work for the defeat of Japan. Certainly we must strive for a higher type of national unity, led by the forces of labor in alliance with all other groups genuinely democratic, in order to wipe out American fascist tendencies. The split among the bourgeoisie must be maintained in order to isolate embittered reaction. Teheran and Yalta can be used in this fight; they furnish us with ammunition. However, we must use this ammunition wisely without complacency and illusions. I, for one, have faith in the courage and integrity of our CPA leadership.

T. J. Trenton, N. J.

## Browder Sought Postwar Unity Against Facism

When the recent change in name of our party was proposed and a program for national unity was outlined I was at first shocked by what seemed like a class collaboration program. I gave the program of our party more thought than I had given at any other time since my initial joining of the CP more than 12 years before. After very careful study I not only accepted Comrade Browder's analysis but I became enthusiastic over it. I recognized that with Comrade Browder's leadership we had been growing less and less sectarian in our dress, in our speech, in the form of our organization and now finally we had reached maturity in our economic and political actions.

Thanks to Comrade Browder we had been becoming more and more important in the life of our country, exercising enough influence among the people to determine many elections of city, state and national officials as well as the passage of many important acts of legislation needed for the welfare of the people. We had by no means given up our Marxist-Leninist thinking, but we were actually putting it into practice, scientifically taking all factors into consideration in determining our program and tactics.

Since the Daily Worker has been my favorite newspaper for many years I have not missed a single line of the present discussion. I have spent many hours in studying all of these articles and in thought on the present world situation as well as the situation on our U.S. home front. I have carefully reexamined my own enthusiastic acceptance of Comrade Browder's program to see whether I had become opportunistic and un-Marxist. I don't believe I have. I have come to the conclusion that Comrade Duclos and the members of the National Board underestimate the maturity of the membership of the CPA. We had changed to a less sectarian form of organization, and to different tactics of struggle, but in constituting ourselves into the CPA we never changed the character of our organization.

In reading Comrade Duclos' article I was impressed by the fact that Comrade Duclos failed to dis-

cuss the most important reasoning which led to the dissolution of the Communist Party. That was Comrade Browder's correct analysis that when the war with Germany was won the fascists in the U. S. would fight all the harder to create fascism here. Recognizing the numerical weakness of the CP Browder proposed that we take whatever steps were necessary to defeat this fascism. If at this time we should emphasize the independent role of the CP and stress the fact that the fight against fascism is essentially a class struggle in which the masses are fighting the big trusts and monopolies we might unfortunately be so far ahead of the people that we would actually be leading only ourselves — into sectarianism. Unfortunately the great majority of Americans are far from ready to accept a goal of socialism and they could easily be led to fascist actions to suppress a "Red" menace.

Fascism in the U. S. is the greatest danger for our own country as well as for the world and it is the duty of our party to prevent such a disaster. Even though our brother parties may not now understand our present methods of work they will measure their final judgement of us by our effectiveness in destroying the fascists of the U. S. We must not allow the present misunderstanding to drive us into methods of work which will isolate us and actually weaken our struggle against fascism.

From Comrade Foster's article it is clear that we have missed many opportunities for strengthening the independent role of the working class without isolating ourselves from the anti-fascist masses. These opportunist mistakes should be corrected, but the fundamental correctness of Comrade Browder's program for directing all our efforts and tactics to prevent fascism in the U. S. should be recognized. The

### Announcement

William Z. Foster's letter of Jan. 20, 1944 will be printed in full in the July issue of Political Affairs with an accompanying foreword explaining why the letter was not previously released to the membership.

impression is given in Comrades Duclos' and Foster's articles that Browder misled workers into expecting full social and economic security without struggle.

From my own experience and contact with other members of the CP as well as discussions with non-members we had no such illusions as to the magnanimity of the capitalist class, nor did we think Comrade Browder was trying to give that impression. We understood that we had to mobilize as many people as possible to bring pressure to bear continually on local, state and national officials to get proper economic and political actions. We were simply using less sectarian methods for struggle, but we recognized that so long as capitalists and fascists remained we would have to organize the people to struggle every step of the way toward a world free from wars and economic and social insecurities.

I believe that the resolution of the National Board should recognize the general correctness of the leadership of Browder even though in isolated instances opportunist mistakes have been made. I believe that because Comrade Browder's program is now under attack, he is afraid that we may return to sectarian methods of struggle which will only lead to fascism. He has therefore been over-emphasizing the need for unity and creating the wrong impression as to his general belief in the need for working class unity in the struggle for socialism.

I should like Browder to continue his excellent leadership and to give his attention now to the correct methods of struggle at this time by which we may defeat the arrogant fascists of this country. The resolution of the National Board has not departed in any way from the program of Comrade Browder, but it is an excellent statement of that program for its present application. I believe though that the resolution of the National Board should include a rejection of the unjust accusation that Browder has been guilty of a departure from Marxism-Leninism or that he had outlined an opportunist program.

With best wishes for a strong, united Communist organization,  
ROSE KLEIN, Brooklyn.