

Roosevelt's Role in History

By Jack Stachel

National Education Director, Communist Party

(Conclusion)

Marxists do not deny the role of the individual in history. We do not deny the role of "intelligence." But the role of the individual and the role of intelligence are exercised, determined and limited by a whole complex of material conditions.

"Intelligence" and the "individual" Hitler played a role—but they were not the decisive factor in bringing the German trusts to the conclusion that only through fascism and war could they further their interests under the conditions existing in Germany. This was determined by the internal strength and weakness of German imperialism and by its relation to world capitalism and to its competitors.

It was the internal contradictions, the strength of the Communist Party, the growing inability of German social democracy to fulfill its role as a pillar of German imperialism, the beginnings of united front actions by the Communists and rank and file socialists, that led the German trusts, by using their "intelligence," to the conclusion to establish fascism.

AMERICAN capitalism in 1932-1933 was confronted by many new problems, as a result of the crisis, the struggle of the masses, the workers, the veterans, the unemployed, etc., the growing lack of confidence among the masses in capitalism and in the old labor leaders. But capitalism in the U.S.A. was not yet faced with such problems as was German capitalism. It was the strongest capitalism, incomparably stronger than German capitalism, and still had tremendous reserves.

It was not yet faced with a working class strongly influenced by socialist ideas. It still had alternatives.

Some capitalists wanted to move in the direction of fascism. But it was not yet the only alternative to socialism. Furthermore, in its fight for the world market against its rivals on a world scale, the maintenance of bourgeois democracy would also be an asset. All this made it possible for a Roosevelt to emerge and come to the helm.

Here the role of the individual and intelligence was present, but that role was played within certain limits, was not the decisive factor, and was not independent of the material conditions and class relations that WERE the decisive factors.

AND HOW was all this determined? What happened here was nothing new or unprecedented. And it did not happen just by a conference and decision on the basis of superior "intelligence." The following from Lenin can well be brought to bear on this point:

"The bourgeoisie in all countries in practice inevitably elaborates two systems of governing, two methods of struggle for its interests and for the de-

sense of its domination, and these two methods now replace one another and now interlace in different combinations. These are the methods of violence, the method of refusing all concessions to the labor movement, the method of supporting all ancient and dying institutions, the method of uncompromising rejection of all reforms. . . . The second method is the method of "liberalism," of steps towards the development of political rights, of reforms, of concessions, etc.

"The bourgeoisie passes from one method to another, not through the malicious design of individuals and not by accident, but by the force of the basic contradictions of its own position." — Lenin: "Difference in the Labor Movement, pp. 32-3; Marx-Engels, Marxism.

The history of American capitalism confirms the truth of Lenin's conclusions no less than the history of world capitalism. and even under the presidency of Roosevelt there were evident at different times between 1933 and 1945 various combinations of the policy of reforms and the policy of refusing concessions. Browder adopts not only an idealistic interpretation of events, but also a petty-bourgeois idealization of Roosevelt.

NOT ONLY was Roosevelt brought to power by a complex of issues and struggles, but the reforms won by the workers were a result of their struggle. Roosevelt was devoted to and defended the interests of the capitalists, and this led him quite often to resist the just demands of the workers. At different times Roosevelt resisted the policies of the most reactionary and pro-fascist sections of the bourgeoisie, and yielded to the pressure of the

(Continued on Page 10)

5,000 Copies of For Albany Legis

More than 5,000 copies of a call to a Citizens Legislative Conference of the majority of the people of Albany, Jan. 10, were issued yesterday.

Signed by 23 political, labor, civic, religious, and fraternal group leaders, the call declares the conference was called to "help work out a program geared to the interests of the majority of the people of New York State, to bring this program to the attention of the Legislature, and to provide a basis for achieving its enactment into law."

Convening in the Ten Eyck Hotel at noon, the conference in simul-

Browder

(Continued from Page 5)

demands of the democratic forces of the nation.

We do not deny the existence of differences in the camp of the bourgeoisie. We do not deny that they sometimes become sharp and play a very important role. We certainly know that the workers' movement must utilize such differences in its own interests although we cannot rely upon them as a primary factor. And such differences can only be utilized if the working class and its party carry on an independent class policy, something Browder never understood. One must not confuse a temporary coincidence of interests for common interests and thus replace the class struggle by class collaboration.

Differences among the monopolists do not make imperialism progressive. There are more reactionary and less reactionary groupings, but all imperialism is reactionary. It is necessary always to examine concretely each situation and adopt corresponding tactics.

Roosevelt's foreign policy was resisted by some capitalist groups. But it was supported by others. Some of the capitalist groups who supported him during the war are today supporting the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan. In fact, some of these same forces who supported Roosevelt, like the Harrimans, are today making the policy which Truman executes. This is what is important today. Only by understanding this can the workers' movement adopt correct tactics.

IF WALLACE today champions the agreements reached by Roosevelt at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam and carries forward a program developed under Roosevelt's leadership, then he must fight not just a Truman who, according to Browder, lacks "intelligence"; he must also, and in the first place, carry on a struggle against the "intelligent" Harrimans, Lamonts and Johnstons who dictate the Truman-Marshall-Vandenberg bi-partisan foreign policy.

It is idle to speculate on what Roosevelt would have done today as an individual in the face of the changed situation and program of those circles of finance capital who formerly supported him. We honor Roosevelt for those things he fought for that were in the people's interests. We fight to carry out those of his policies and agreements that are in the people's interests. We look forward and not backwards. We deal with the realities of today. And in our new tasks we cherish and make use of the best traditions of Jefferson, Lincoln and Roosevelt, despite their limitations.

As we confront the practical politics of today and the necessity to build an anti-imperialist people's coalition against the reactionary monopolists, we realize that this coalition cannot be and will not be the same as that which loosely existed under Roosevelt. Today we face new tasks and different class alignments.

It is no accident that Browder remains silent on the 1948 elections. He has nothing to say about the American working class and its struggles. His whole appeal is to the "intelligence" of the capitalists and by inference that the people shall not by their demands enrage the more "intelligent" capitalists who might fly into the arms of the most reactionary spokesmen of big capital.

What then can Browder say on 1948? In his book early this year he called for the support of Truman and considered that a third party was wrong and impractical

and could only arise with a socialist program when socialism was on the order of the day. This day has not yet arrived. Browder chose to remain silent on supporting Truman. It would not sound so good to call Truman a "neo-Hitlerian" and then call for his support at the same moment. But this silence too speaks eloquently. We do not know how Browder will resolve this dilemma. But from his whole revisionist and anti-Party position we know what his role will be.

Meanwhile, we go forward.

DuBois

(Continued from Page 2)

tion to let them spend five times as much on whites as on Negroes. He wants an FEPC without teeth.

There is Dewey of New York, a complete opportunist politician, saying just as little as possible about anything that is of moment to the American people, so as to get into the Presidency without commitments and without revealing his lack of knowledge of the great questions fronting the country.

There is a small and voluble politician from Minnesota, Stassen, who is trying to capitalize upon the provincialism of the Middle West by every possible caper, and thus stem the world tide of Socialism which is overflowing the world and is a part of our own organization of industry.

ONE MAN, ONE WORLD

In this great crisis of the history of the world, there stands forth in America one man, and one man alone, who is worthy of leadership and of support and that is Henry Wallace. Suppose we admit without argument that the chances for Mr. Wallace to carry the country in the next election are about nil, and that, not because the country does not want him, but chiefly because of the "rotten burrough" system which we have in the South, by which the will of the people cannot be expressed in any national election; a situation in which this great country, as leader of democratic methods of government, cannot and will not govern itself in a democratic way.

Nevertheless, we can protest even if our protests put a reactionary Republican in the White House or a Southern-supported Democrat. At least we can let the country and the nations know that there are people in the United States who are not stupid, who are not to be bought with graft or fooled with lies. It would be infinitely better for us to throw our votes away upon a great man who stands for real democracy than to shame ourselves, our people, or our country by voting for the impossible group of candidates who are trying to jostle and yell themselves into the Presidency.

Science

(Continued from Page 9)

apes and only a third that of modern humans. American field workers excavated the remains of our earliest known human beings in Texepan, Mexico. Scientists estimate that these bones are between 10,000 to 15,000 years old.

American science in 1947 lost the political battle to the military. The scientists fought for, but lost the battle for the creation of a national science foundation—administered by civilians. However, the major accomplishments were made by researchers in non-military fields.

Says US Hoards Scrap Metals