

## CPA Discussion Page

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

Sees Main Roots  
In Class Interests

By HARRY RAYMOND

The main line of the policies advanced by Comrade Earl Browder in January, 1944, and later adopted by the majority of the national committee of our Communist organization and approved after insufficient discussion by the majority of the membership, was correctly castigated by Comrade Jacques Duclos as "a notorious revision of Marxism." Concisely accurate in all of its points, the Duclos criticism was necessarily a minimum statement of the case. The serious, negative consequences of the opportunist course taken by our organization are now more fully revealed, emphasized and clarified by

1. Recent anti-democratic developments in connection with Anglo-American intervention in affairs of the people of Italy, Greece, Belgium and Yugoslavia. Comrade Browder weakened our struggle against these developments through his proposal that the U. S. and British governments should in agreement "create a series of giant economic associations for development of backward regions and war-devastated regions of Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America."

Here, seeking solution of Anglo-American imperialist antagonisms, Browder revised Marxist-Leninist evaluation of imperialism. Because destruction of Nazi-German imperialism was in the interest of British and American monopoly capitalism as well as the people of the Soviet Socialist State and the working class movement of the entire world, he drew the incorrect conclusion that the basic nature of imperialism had changed. This temporary alliance against the Nazi evil, necessary and effective as it was, was no evidence that monopoly capitalism had suddenly become progressive. It gave no reason for suggesting, and worse, urging that monopoly capitalism take leadership in development of war-torn and so-called backward areas.

Past history and present-day events show such intervention means ultimate economic and political control of these areas by the reactionary Anglo-American monopolies. Instead of urging this type of development we should be fighting it. We should look into the reasons why recent economic and political intervention of Britain and America in the above-mentioned areas has seriously stalled rather than advanced economic reconstruction. It has created a situation which no labor organization, and especially no Communist, can tolerate.

2. Discussion of the Duclos article in the branches. This has already brought out that while we correctly acted for the broadest unity in the war against Hitler fascism and Japanese imperialism, rallying the labor movement for uninterrupted production and supporting President Roosevelt for reelection, we lost ground by failing at the same time to arouse effective mass protests against dangerous waverings and actual capitulation to fascism on the part of sections of the Roosevelt administration.

This discussion brought out that on advice of CPA leadership, Communists in unions incorrectly opposed constructive criticism of Roosevelt's appointment of Stettinius, a reactionary, as Secretary of State, because, it was said, joining with other progressives in such criticism would tend to disunite the anti-fascist forces; that for this same reason, while fighting racial discrimination vigorously on many fronts, we nevertheless did not throw full weight into the struggle against Jim Crow in the armed forces.

The very fact that comrades got

up in branch meetings and rejected Comrade Duclos' criticism on the grounds he was "looking through French windows," was a Frenchman and therefore knew nothing about problems of Marxists in America—these startling remarks are tragic evidence that in wrongly emphasizing the strong "progressive" role of American capitalism our leadership failed to imbue in our membership—especially the new members—the understanding of the international character of Marxism.

Add to this Comrade William Z. Foster's penetrating Marxist examination of the opportunist deviations and their consequences and we find ourselves well on the way to full evaluation of the deviations. I do not think that even today all members of our organization fully realize the great debt we owe Comrade Foster.

The resolution of the national board, with which I agree in the main, is a basic step toward overcoming past errors. While the programmatic section is excellent, the latter part of the document does not sufficiently deepen the criticism of the deviations. I shall offer proposals for amendment through other organization channels.

Finally, I want to point to parts of Comrade Browder's speech rejecting the national board resolution as revealing some roots of his revisionism. He characterizes as "military and political insanity" actions of a section of the bourgeoisie to drum up war against the Soviet Union. He adds: "The bulk of the American bourgeoisie, unless suddenly goes as insane as Hitler or suddenly for some reason abandoned its intelligence, will reject this path."

I do not think that war between the U. S. and USSR is inevitable. Forces can and must be mobilized to avoid such a catastrophe. But there is danger of such a war being drummed up by sections of our ruling class, not for psychopathological reasons—although this does play a role—but for historic political-economic reasons. Here, Comrade Browder discards Marxist-Leninist evaluation of class contradictions and class interest and searches for answers to the anti-Soviet campaign in the field of psychology.

Comrade Browder's estimation of the reason for this campaign parallels very closely estimations of class conflicts made by revisionists of the past, about whom Lenin said: "Now they explain that it is all because wicked persons 'incite' class against class, and now they console themselves that the workers' party is a 'peaceful party of reform.'" (Differences in the European Labor Movement—Lenin). Our struggle against anti-Soviet incitation would be on sounder ground if we sought the main roots of it in the realm of political and economic class interest rather than in the realm of psychology. It was more than insanity that set Hitler on the war path.

I think it is our first task now to rally behind the main line of the national board's resolution, to strengthen the resolution, to boldly and honestly examine all our errors, to reeducate our ranks along true Marxist lines and to take all proper organizational steps to assure the existence and growth of a strong united Marxist organization in our country.

## Must Make Needed Change at Necessary Time

Norfolk, Va., May 29, 1945.

Comrade Browder:

I have just finished reading the article by Comrade Duclos of France, and your foreword to it in the Worker of May 24, 1945.

It seems to me that it is a question of basic agreement by both yourself and Duclos. I remember very clearly, your article following the Teheran meeting, and participated in discussion with club membership new and old at Pittsburgh, Pa., and in all the meetings, at which the changing the name and the party representation, was a point under discussion, not one person failed to agree with you. In fact it was common to hear praise of your ability to grasp correct theory at such short notice.

I think the results of the elections will show you as being correct, and that is something completely foreign to the comrade in France; that by your foresight and snap

judgment following Teheran, you organized many middle strata people in Roosevelt's corner by proposing an unselfish approach to help save democracy with a closely united allied bloc made of British, the USSR and the USA.

Further proof of your correctness, in my opinion, is the fact that you were ahead of the Dewey clique on the red-baiting issue. It is true that such tactics were effective among too many rank and file employees, but a majority of the big business representatives were not fooled by Dewey's Hitler tactics. Thus by the strategy foreseen and recommended by you may have been the straw that broke the back of the American fascist at the time. It is now well known that many of the capitalists backed Roosevelt on the basis of your slogan, to organize for a full production program around our present system of free enterprise. Now that Roosevelt has been re-

moved by death, and the apparent swing back to the right by the American and British delegations at San Francisco, coupled with the seating of Argentina and the rejecting of democratic Poland and the fumbling and coddling of captured fascist prisoners of war, all means that things may be reshaping in such a fashion that Duclos is correct minus a few earlier ifs and buts.

I am sure Comrade Duclos can appreciate that the schedule and time table was preserved for the United Nations arrival in Berlin only because Dewey's or Hoover's policies were defeated. He is justified, however, in calling our attention to the fact that a recheck of the international question is now in order. The most value to be derived from Marxism, in my opinion, is to be able to meet the necessary issues with the necessary changes at the necessary time.

EDDIE GOFORTH, Virginia.

## Wants Clearer Resolution on Peace and Jobs

Editor:

The arguments for and against the draft resolution of the National Committee as presented by Foster and Browder seem to indicate irreconcilable differences in approach to the present situation and the course of action that is to be followed in the immediate future. Yet the resolution itself, which represents, or seems to represent, a triumph of Foster's point of view, contains within it many specific carry-overs of the policy laid down in January, 1944, and, furthermore, has statements which in themselves seem at variance with Foster's stated position. I refer to the statement on the destruction of fascism and the building of a durable peace and the one calling for full postwar employment.

Unless a large portion of the Browder statement is accepted as the true analysis of the present alignment for forces, I cannot see how these two goals can be achieved within the framework of capitalism—and it is within that framework that the resolution sets forth its specific aims. What alternative is there to Browder's statement on the guarantee of peace in a capitalist world? If there is one, the resolution should be specific in pointing it out. And as to the question of full employment, how, except by allowing for an expansion of capitalism can we hope to utilize fully the plant facilities created during

the war? If there is an answer to this different from Browder's, it, too, should be carefully and clearly explained in the resolution.

Aside from these two points, I should like to protest belatedly against the fact that until very recently the membership of the Association had no inkling of the very serious differences among the leadership of the Association. I can understand how necessary it is for the

Association to present a face of unanimity to the world, but I think that even that might have been sacrificed temporarily so that the membership might have discussed these differences thoroughly. Not to have given them that opportunity is an indication of the lack of faith in the political development and intelligence in the membership on the part of the leaders of the Association.

R. R., New York.

## Says Duclos Not Acquainted With U. S.

Dear Editor and Friends of the CPA:

In all the remarks of Jacques Duclos there is not a single objection mentioned to our activity as a healthy functioning Communist organization. And this is most important after all. What we did and are doing is sound Marxist Leninism in every way. The rest is mere speeches, attempts at speculative discussions, decisions of a temporary character that have often occurred during the history of our Party as well as that of the French, English, Russian, etc.

Browder and Foster were and remain great leaders of the American working class. They are hard at work looking for the extension and propagation of Communist thought in the United States. In this work much must be attempted which has been done already considering our small and imperfect beginnings. Jacques Duclos is not fully ac-

quainted with what we have to contend with in the U. S.

The super-capitalistic system of our country is a hard nut to crack but cracked it will be.

JOSEPHSON.

## Duclos 'Hits the Spot'

Editorial, Daily Worker:

I was very glad to read the Duclos article in today's Daily. It just hit the spot.

If our leaders did not retire to Ivory Towers, and kept the ears to the ground they would be more able to know how a lot of us felt about certain changes.

Lenin, one of the greatest leaders of man in history, was a very busy man, but he always had time to come to meetings and come early so as to devote some time to informal talks with workers, he lived among them and was one of them.

I hope Duclos will be a bit of an eye opener and we will go on in building a bigger and better CP.

EVA LAWRENCE.

## Would Judge Ruling Class by Deeds, Not Words

Editors:

June 11, 1945

We needed very badly the healthy criticism of Comrade Duclos. Somehow the Communists were losing their punch and the present reality negated the lyric and beautiful expectations from the "progressive capitalists." But to start from the beginning, my criticism is not for having changed the CP to CPA, if, as Comrade Browder asserts, it helped better to win the election of Roosevelt. As the National Board indicated, our primary task is to educate the American people and stimulate organization of the workers and all progressive forces, to find the most suitable organization in order to contact them better is, therefore, practical and correct.

The whole mistake, it seems to me, was to swallow, hook and sinker all the magnificent promises of the representative of monopoly capital and plan our whole strategy on that basis. Comrade Browder doesn't seem to conceive the American ruling class as stupid enough "to avoid the dangerous course of the armed peace, preparations for future anti-Soviet war," etc. This forgets three realities: the historic lessons that all entrenched systems and regimes fell due to their in-

transigence and stupidity; that the capitalists, as Marx pointed out, always were dumb and stubborn enough "to dig their own graves"; that the every day situation contradicts the rosy expectations of Teheran. . . . Starobin pointed out that to be anti-Hitler does not mean necessarily to be anti-fascist.

We confused the temporary character of the unity between all of Hitler's enemies—a unity very much to be desired—and the continuity of the same sort of unity, without modifications, in the present conditions of attack against all progressive movements by the former allies. Comrade Duclos won't forget so easily about those days of the "Front Populaire" and the shameful course of those that pretended to stand for social legislation, democracy and labor, but who remained tied to the interests of the rotten French bourgeoisie and betrayed their commitments. . . . Or the Chinese Communist Party, that after trying to forgive the persecutions and massacres against their comrades, going even to the extent of saving the life of that butcher Chiang Kai-shek, had thousands slaughtered in the Shanghai area by its so-called

"allies" . . . But that might be ancient history. What about Greece, Trieste, Poland, Argentina, etc., to say nothing of India with all its misery and its jailed leaders, the Dominican Republic with the most shameful and bloodiest regime in America, the crime of Puerto Rico and so on?

Yes, we should be ready to cooperate with those wiser representatives of the capitalists—even if we had to appeal to a powerful microscope to trace them—but it is about time that we started calling a spade a spade.

Frankly, I won't blame Comrade Browder so harshly for his readiness to extend the cooperation of the CPA to all persons that so hypocritically manifested themselves in favor of Teheran. It seemed that 99.44 percent of us agreed more or less, at that time, with his prognosis. But this is the point right now: our former "allies" are breaking their pledges and their deeds are a striking mockery of the Teheran Pact. Let us make up and start exposing to the whole working class of America how the former enemies of Hitler are starting to show their fascist fangs.

M. CALLEJO, N. Y.