

The Proposed C. P. Changes

By Robert Minor

And now we come to some borrowed trouble. The next answers will be to seven questions asked by a severe critic who signs himself or herself "One Who Thought the Communists Marched Breast Forward."

I must admit that these seven questions were not sent to the Daily Worker by the questioner, but were given to me by a friend of mine to whom they were sent. He loaned them to me for answers on this page.

Why did I want them? I consider them highly valuable because it seems to me the questioner has put together—more successfully than I had dreamed possible—every error that could be imagined on the subject under discussion.

An apology is due to writers of other questions which have come in quantities so large that it is difficult for one man to read them all, or for any newspaper to answer more than a small fraction of them. Fine and intelligent questions, most of them are, and the several of us who have been reading them have profited by them and are grateful to their writers. But their very virtue of clear understanding makes it less necessary to answer them than some others. We will reply later to a few of them.

I am sure that everybody will agree, however, that the following seven questions literally scream for answers. I seize upon them as lovingly as Bluebeard seized upon his seven wives:

"Will you please answer the following questions that fly to mind in discussing Browder's new line.

"1. Isn't it highly important, as you have been ceaselessly preaching, to discuss winning the war at present, and not far-off post-war problems about national income and what certain groups of capitalists may or may not do? Aren't we letting the lose-the-war elements get out of their burrows and snipe at Moscow-Cairo-Tehran too fast and too far while we consider distant futures not yet even born?"

"2. It seemed to me that every great Marxist writer, from Marx to Palme Dutt, felt that the essence of capitalism was that capitalism cannot plan. Isn't Browder asking the nature of the beast to change when he assumes it can and will plan after this war?"

"3. What has happened, then, to the contradictions of capitalism? If suddenly the best monopoly capitalists (contradiction in terms) are going to work happily together? Are they? Does that mean we ACCEPT cartels?"

"4. My readings of economic interpretations of the last 19 years led me to the belief that monopoly capitalism brought in fascism, because it couldn't solve the crisis any other way. That fas-

clism was an attempt to keep monopoly capitalism in the saddle. Why then are we to lie down with it?"

"5. The Morgan interests still will fight trade unions, etc., or do you think they suddenly will give all that up? Have you read "Business as a System of Power" and "Bimeth" for indications of the nature of monopoly capitalism?"

"6. Does one become a renegade because one does not agree with the nature of Browder's economic analysis nor his figures? And because what he has done seems DESPERATELY dangerous?"

"7. How does Browder's class collaboration differ from Kautsky's which Lenin denounced so formidably?"

"Sincerely,

"One Who Thought Communists Marched Breast Forward."

Each of the seven questions will be answered fully, beginning Monday. But a preliminary comment now:

These seven questions are asked in a way to argue that Tehran may be accepted as an agreement for the period of military action, but that a durable collaboration between the Soviet Union and the United States and Great Britain is impossible or fantastic.

As Earl Browder said, the division falls between those who are for and those who are against Tehran—and this means all over the world, and throughout the lifetime of all men now living.

There are many people against Tehran. But to be against Tehran is such a monstrous thing that persons wishing to be considered decent citizens of a republic can hardly bring themselves to say they are against it. They wish to pass the Jordan, as the old Bible story has it, as men of Gilead. They try to say Shibboleth, as the password to cross the Jordan: but they fail to say it, for their lips "could not frame to pronounce it right" (Judges: 12:6). Not being able to say Shibboleth, they say Sibboleth: they say "it won't work."

Logically those who oppose the great coalition would begin by saying that Tehran would not work militarily. But the Red Army has already proven that anything that cooperates with it will work.

Not being able to say that Tehran won't work militarily, our

critics say Sibboleth—"We are for Tehran, and it will work militarily, but it will not work economically." They borrow a phrase heard at cocktail parties, from persons who claim to know someone who read in Marxist writings that: "Capitalism cannot plan," which is about as true as that storks bring babies. Those are the words they say, but what they see the words for is to prove that a coalition that includes a gigantic socialist state with a planned socialist economy, fang across the world from middle Europe to the land's end of eastern Asia, and along with it the gigantic capitalist economies of the United States and Great Britain and the vast peoples of China just coming into their own, and all the freshly-liberated countries of old Europe—cannot work.

Hitler has quit saying it can't work militarily, but now says it can't work economically and for a long time; and this is the only thesis he had left after his line broke at the Dnieper. It is the only thesis against Tehran. Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin (who, for our present critic, is the unmentioned Marxist) say that will work. Mr. "One-Who-Thought" says Sibboleth: it may work for a little while—for the military period. Mr. "One-Who" "defends" Tehran as a purely military agreement.

But the military alliance existed before Tehran.

Tehran is the concord through which to strengthen the military alliance by giving it its logical extension, on the sound theory of Old Clausewitz that peace is a continuation by peaceful means of the foreign policies followed in the course of war. Mr. or Miss "One-Who" rejects Tehran as a concord for "an enduring peace," to "banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations"—which he calls "distant futures not yet even born." But he believes he can stand as a man of Gilead by warning us of persons "sniping at Moscow-Cairo-Tehran too fast and too far."

I think there is a splendid opportunity, in answering Mr. "One-Who's" questions, to answer many other inadequacies of thinking and much "liberal Hearstism" on the subject of the greatest event of several centuries which enables all the honest world to readjust itself to a new kind of action; and we believe all of us can get some pleasure as well as profit out of it.

Answers to Questions



"A STAMP A DAY

FOR THE MAN

WHO IS AWAY"

