

**THE
ROAD
AHEAD**

**TO VICTORY
AND
LASTING PEACE**

By

EARL BROWDER

President, Communist Political Association

10c

THE ROAD AHEAD

TO VICTORY AND LASTING PEACE

By Earl Browder

President, Communist Political Association

NEW YORK

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

This pamphlet contains the speeches of Earl Browder to the Constituent Convention of the Communist Political Association, held in New York City, May 20-22, 1944.

Published by WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC., P.O. Box 148, Sta. D,
(832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y. June, 1944

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

*Remarks introducing the motion to dissolve the
Communist Party*

ON JAN 11 the National Committee of the Communist Party in the interest of national unity and to enable the Communists to function most effectively in the changed political conditions and to make still greater contributions toward winning the war and securing a durable peace, recommended that the American Communists should renounce the aim of partisan advancement and the party form an organization. This proposal has been unanimously endorsed by all the State and District Conventions which elected delegates to this National Convention.

It therefore seems most fitting that this Convention shall immediately confirm the actions of the State and District Conventions by declaring the Communist Party dissolved, clearing the way for the delegates assembled here, if they so determine, to re-assemble in a new Constitutional Convention to found such a new non-party organization as they may find advisable.

With that purpose, I propose in the name of the National Committee and in consultation with the most important delegations in this Convention, the adoption of the following motion:

“I hereby move that the Communist Party of America be and hereby is dissolved and that a committee of three consisting of the Chairman, Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Party, be authorized to take all necessary steps to liquidate its affairs and that such committee be further authorized to dispose of all its property and to turn over any surplus that may remain to any organization or organizations that in their opinion are devoted to our country’s winning of the war in which it is presently engaged and in the achieving of a durable peace.”

I move the adoption of this motion.

The above motion and the following motion were unanimously carried by the Convention:

“That all former members of the dissolved Communist Party and any other persons who join the Association by July 4, shall be accepted without payment of initiation fee.

“That all members of the dissolved Communist Party now on leave in the armed forces, who join the Association upon their return, shall be accepted without payment of initiation fee.”

Report to the Constituent Convention, May 20, 1944.

FELLOW DELEGATES:

We are meeting in the hours of final preparation for the great last act of the war, the opening of the Western Front against Nazism, which in coordination with the Red Army in the East will put an end forever to Hitlerism and all its works.

We will not concern ourselves in discussion with military problems of this war. We have complete confidence in the ability and judgment of our military leadership and especially of its Commander-in-Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. (*Applause*). We know that American soldiers will carry through their tasks with honor to themselves and their country.

We will turn our minds at this Convention to the problems of consolidating the home front behind our soldiers in order that the whole power that we exercise will result in the completion of our military tasks. We will turn our attention to the further problems of a political character still remaining to be solved by our country and its allies before we can realize the perspective of an enduring peace.

The report that I have to present to you today will be brief. This is possible because the basic political line which I must put forward has already been debated and adopted in the State Conventions.

We will concentrate our attention upon those key points of the great discussion that has gone on for the past three months since our January National Committee meeting, taking that January meeting as the political foundation, and as we go along, deepen a point here and there. Fundamentally there is nothing new on the political line to say to this Convention and for further expansion of discussions of the central political problems, I will not utilize this report but will take advantage of the fact that my new book, titled *Teheran—Our Path in War and Peace*, will soon be off the press and we will present an advance copy of the book to each delegate to the Convention.

Teheran

Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, meeting in Teheran last December, shaped and confirmed the common policy of the great alliance leading the United Nations. This common policy is to work together in the war and in the peace that will follow; complete agreement on the scope and timing of military operations from east, west and south, to guarantee victory; to make a peace which will command good will from the overwhelming masses of the peoples, and banish the scourge of war for many generations; to establish a world family of democratic nations.

Hitler's New Year speech laid down the Axis antithesis to Teheran. No longer attempting to deny that the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance holds the power to destroy him and his works, Hitler told the world that the alliance cannot hold together; that his defeat will result in a social and economic catastrophe of unimaginable scope, followed by a new war either between Britain and America or between the two and the Soviet Union.

America and the world must choose between Teheran and Hitler. Only the firm, energetic, unhesitating unfoldment of the Teheran program in action by all parties to it can defeat and cancel the threats and perspectives of Hitler. Every one who casts doubt upon Teheran, or weakens its execution in any way, is working for Hitler, whether he knows it or not.

A Binding Common Interest

I have full confidence that the complete agreement of Teheran will be executed. It is obviously essential to the national interest of each of the contracting great powers. The key question of the opening of the Western Front can no longer be considered by anyone as a question of "helping the Soviet Union." Today it is clearly a supreme necessity to help ourselves.

It is an elementary fact of life that the character of the post-war world will be largely influenced by those who win the war on the battlefield. The question of full coalition warfare has become, for the Soviet Union, a question of shortening the war. For Britain and America it is still a question of winning the war. Therefore the Anglo-Saxon powers have reasons fully as urgent as those of the Soviet Union for pressing the Teheran program to complete and early fulfillment.

American Opponents of Teheran

The concord of Teheran does not automatically execute itself. It does not relieve us of our worries and tasks. On the contrary, it demands a maximum of national and individual effort, materially and intellectually, to realize it. Teheran has many enemies to overcome in America.

Teheran demands firm unity with our allies. Every one in America who holds some special idea and interest higher than the consideration of such unity is an enemy of Teheran.

Teheran requires the full unity of all democratic forces within each country. Everyone in America who wants to exclude one or another group or category from such national

unity, on any grounds not entirely based on the consideration of winning the war, is an enemy of Teheran.

For every American who places victory and a lasting peace as the highest and all-determining consideration, all his fellow Americans who agree on this are his friends, and his only enemies are those who, for whatever reason of prejudice, special interest, defeatism, or simple business-as-usual, allow other considerations to disturb national and international unity.

We must fight against and defeat all the enemies of Teheran; we must unite all who support Teheran by word and deed.

The Teheran Concord at Work in Europe

In the months since the Teheran meeting we have been witnessing the concord at work in Europe, dissolving one after another the knotty problems which had been threatening the solidity of the alliance. What more precise definition of the concord can we find, then, than that given by its practical results? We may summarize a few outstanding examples.

On Yugoslavia there was a sharp cleavage of policy within the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance up to Teheran. Britain and America were supporting King Peter's government-in-exile, which included as its Minister of War the figure of General Mikhailovich, who plays an ambiguous role within Yugoslavia itself heavily entangled in collaboration with the Nazis; the Soviet Union supported Marshal Tito and the Government of National Liberation that arose in battle against the Nazis on the soil of that country. Since Teheran this sharp cleavage has been softened and largely bridged, with the three great powers jointly giving military support to Marshal Tito, with a sharp warning having been given to the Mikhailovich forces to cut off their relations with the enemy, and heavy pressure being exerted on the government-in-exile to purge itself of dubious and treacherous elements as the price of any consideration in the post-war world. There is little doubt now that the government-in-exile must either drastically reconcile

itself to the new regime within Yugoslavia or soon pass from the stage of history.

In Italy under Anglo-American occupation, the sharp cleavage between the Badoglio-Savoy regime backed by Britain with the acquiescence of America, and the six-party democratic coalition in the National Liberation Committee which had the sympathy of the Soviet Union and most advanced democratic forces elsewhere, threatened to degenerate into a stubborn deadlock, and was poisoning the relations between the great powers themselves. But a bold initiative in the spirit of Teheran succeeded, in a few weeks time, in bringing into existence a government which is substantially one of the democratic coalition, while it preserves the formal claims of the "legitimacy" for post-war consideration by the Italian people themselves. The new situation thus created has obviously been pleasing to all concerned, except the trouble-makers who had speculated on creating a division among the great powers. It has strengthened the war, the Italian people, and the three-power alliance, in all respects.

Regarding Poland, center of stubborn controversies, the spirit of Teheran is also effectively at work. So much so that little of the old controversy remains to disturb the relations of the three great powers, but the remaining difficulties are chiefly those between the Big Three and the diehard reactionaries still holding on to control of the government-in-exile. There is a general belief that the recent visit to the Soviet Union of two prominent Polish Americans, Professor Oscar Lange and Father Orlemanski, signifies among other things the opening of a final opportunity for the government-in-exile to purge itself of its anti-Soviet personnel and policies, and merge into the new Polish government which will undoubtedly arise as Polish territory is liberated by the victorious advance of the Red Army.

Teheran removed the last obstacles that had delayed the formal signing of agreement between the Czechoslovak government-in-exile and the Soviet Union for the installation of civil government in that country in the wake of the advanc-

ing Red Army. The Czechoslovak government-in-exile had long been a pioneer of the Teheran spirit; it was the first to base itself upon the broadest democratic coalition extending from Catholics to Communists; it has long fully understood that its destiny was bound up with the closest friendship with the Soviet Union. Its agreement with the Soviet Union, now completed with the full approbation of London and Washington, is a model of what would be most desirable for all European countries in the coming liberation.

We must express our agreement with Lucien Midol, member of the French Assembly in Algiers recently in this country, that a definite agreement with the Committee headed by de Gaulle is in order on the part of Washington and London, on the model of the Czechoslovak-Soviet agreement. The consolidation of patriotic Frenchmen around the Committee, inside and outside of France, has progressed so far as definitely to require this step. Such recognition will further the unification and democratization of the Fighting French organization everywhere, and will greatly strengthen the Allied forces going into France.

The policy of Teheran, thus sharply defined in actual political events, may be generalized as a process of giving to Europe a unified Anglo-Soviet-American leadership to dissolve the old contradictory orientations toward one or the other of the three great powers. It is a policy of releasing the democratic peoples' revolution, the sweeping away of absolutism and feudal remnants, the mobilization of the united peoples' forces for their own liberation. It includes the postponement of final decisions on the economic and political system for each country until after liberation, when each will be free to determine its own destiny without any outside intervention whatever. It requires support to groupings and leaders within each country entirely upon the basis of their effective contribution to war against the common enemy, and not at all upon ideological considerations or any desire to pre-determine that country's post-war destiny.

For the full effectiveness of this policy within each country,

a broad coalition of all democratic forces is required, within which the recourse to armed struggle to settle disputes is abolished, and all relations are determined through free discussion, free political association, and universal suffrage. Such a democratic national coalition within each country must include all who will fight the Nazis and submit to a common discipline, under the general world leadership of the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance, without any discrimination on the basis of conflicting ideologies or past prejudices.

Such is the policy of Teheran, the only road to quick and complete victory and a lasting and prosperous peace.

The Cairo Conference and Teheran

The Cairo Conference of Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek set forth the minimum program of expulsion of Japan from all territories she has seized, return to China of those parts formerly hers, and independence for Korea:

“With these objects in view, the three Allies, in harmony with those of the United Nations at war with Japan, will continue to persevere in the serious and prolonged operations necessary to procure the unconditional surrender of Japan.”

Background to this agreement is the cancellation of the unequal treaties with China, with renunciation of all extra-territorial rights, and the U. S. policy of independence for the Philippine Islands.

Unanswered are the questions of the future status of India, Burma, Indonesia, the Malay States, and Indo-China, with populations well over five hundred million. Also unanswered is the problem of Chinese unity against the common enemy.

For the quickest and least costly victory over Japan, we need the extension of the principles of Teheran to the Pacific. There are two great obstacles to this aim, still to be overcome. First is the resistance in the Kuomintang regime to unity with the Chinese Communists; second is the continuing lack of agreement between Britain and the United States on long-

term policy toward problems of world trade, which is a difficulty that extends not only to Asia, but to Europe, Africa, Latin America, and the whole world.

The *New York Times* of May 14, editorially taking note of the new Japanese offensive under the title "China in Distress," after years of urging Chungking not to make any concessions to the Chinese Communists, at last recognizes that "the greatest aid which China can furnish to herself is to compose the differences between Chungking and the Communists." The *Times* sees finally the disaster threatening China and the United States because, in the area of the greatest Japanese threat, the Eighth Route Army and the ten divisions of Chungking's best troops "have been facing one another in an armed truce and have thus neutralized one another." The *Times* does not recognize its own errors in having, for years, thrown its influence against any settlement between Kuomintang and Communists in China, and even in the present desperate moment it carefully limits its suggestions for unity "until the war is over," when presumably it will again insist that the Chinese Communists must be exterminated. Thus does the fatal policy of "too little and too late" continue to express itself among some of the most influential circles in America and China.

In October, 1942, Mr. Sumner Welles, then Under Secretary of State, gave me a statement on American policy toward China, which urged that unity should be achieved by conciliation. Doubtless, as I then recognized, this was a correct statement of American desires. But now it must be said openly that very little indeed has been done by our country to secure the application of that policy. And if nothing is done about it, declarations of policy have very little effect upon the development of events. The *Times* editorials of 1941 and 1942 urging the suppression of the Communists had more influence in Chungking than did Mr. Welles' statement, which was suppressed by the Chungking censorship. Now, at the eleventh hour, with the Japanese advance seriously threatening Chungking itself, the time is more than ripe for the United States

to insist that the Chungking government shall put its house in order with a real, not a formal, unification of all Chinese fighting forces, and their fullest utilization against the common enemy. We must once and for all put an end to the playing with the "Red scare," which, in China as everywhere, works for the enemy and against the United Nations.

In the rest of Asia, outside China and the Philippines, we have done nothing to mobilize the hundreds of millions of the population to fight on our side. It is clearly in the interest of America that this be done, with an unequivocal promise to all the great Asiatic peoples of their independence as a result of victory over the Japanese. We cannot, however, secure British agreement to such a policy, unless their fears of American post-war trade competition can be allayed. The British-American trade rivalry is today the greatest obstacle to establishing the grand strategy for victory over Japan in the Pacific.

How Can We Dissolve the Anglo-American Antagonism?

The main reason why the British cling so stubbornly to their obsolete colonial system is not to be found in the supposed innate conservatism or incapacity for change in the British character. Rather it must be seen in the fact that the British can see available no other instrument to avoid being overwhelmed by the gigantic forces of American capitalism. In a world of free markets as between nations, and bereft of their colonial monopoly, British capitalists cannot envisage successful competition with their American rivals. This is an old fear of the British, but it has been multiplied a hundredfold by the spectacular expansion of the American productive plant during the war. Unless this well-founded fear of British capital can in some way be allayed there is not the slightest prospect to dissolve the Anglo-American rivalry that is impeding the war effort, that blocks a common strategy in Asia, that prevents the formulation of any concrete long-time policy common to both countries.

Mr. Eric Johnston, in his new book, *America Unlimited*, tells us of his recent "Mission to Britain." He says, "I am fully convinced that there are no insurmountable obstacles to British-American cooperation." Yet he himself put forth a policy to the British which, if it is followed by our country, does constitute such an insurmountable obstacle, even if Mr. Johnston is unconscious of that fact. He told the British that Americans were "not persuaded" by Churchill's refusal to "preside over the liquidation" of the Empire, that America is anti-imperialist. Then he told them that America is going out for markets, that they insist on "free competition," and will have no part of any system of division of markets by agreement; he insisted that the American "regards all powers, in government or in business, as subject to constant revision—by himself. . . . What this American is in America, he will also be in international affairs." In short, Mr. Johnston told the British that what share they would have in the world markets of the future would be what they could hold in unrestricted competition with America, or what they can maintain with their colonial monopoly.

With all due respect to Mr. Johnston's subjective good intentions, I maintain that this policy toward Britain is a disastrous one, which will continue to create enormous difficulties in the prosecution of the war, and which threatens to bring a great economic crisis upon the world after the war. It is short-sighted in respect to America's true national interests. It will prove impossible to maintain. Yet there can be no doubt that Mr. Johnston was accurately reflecting today's dominant opinion of ruling capitalist circles in this country.

I venture to suggest that Britain and America must arrive at an agreed economic policy for the joint development of the world markets on a huge scale, ten times the size of the pre-war markets, based upon the rehabilitation of devastated lands and the industrialization of the undeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, the Near East, Latin America, and Europe. Since this requires free and independent peoples everywhere, the colonial system must be dismantled as quickly as possible; but

as the colonial system is Britain's main reliance for a "place in the sun," Britain must receive compensation by being guaranteed a proportionate share in these markets, and the play of free competition must be limited by this agreement, which cannot be "subject to constant revision—by [the American] himself." Without such a guarantee Britain, as the economically weaker power, will under no circumstances surrender or relax her historical claims to colonial monopoly. And that would mean for America and for a large part of the world that the perspective for a vast increase of economic cooperation would vanish. Failure to arrive at some such agreement must eventually result in defeating the hopes of Teheran.

Post-War National Unity

The most disturbing influence against our national unity for victory in the war is the expectation that peace between nations will be the signal for the outbreak of great class struggles within the nation.

War needs, therefore, dictate that we shall already now begin to lay the foundations for post-war national unity, so that this disturbing influence may be checked and if possible eliminated.

Our post-war plan is directed to achieve national unity for the realization of the perspectives laid down at Teheran.

That means, first of all, that we must find a program that will unite the democratic, progressive majority of the American people, from all classes, and that we shall not permit that majority to be split up and thus give the opportunity for the anti-Teheran forces to rise to power.

Such a program for America cannot be a socialist program, because there does not exist now in our country an actual or potential majority support for such a program.

Adherents of socialism, therefore, in order to be effective workers for unity within the broad democratic majority, must make it clear that they do not raise the issue of socialism in a form and manner which can endanger or weaken the national

unity. They must subordinate their socialist convictions, on all practical issues, to the common program of the majority.

The United States is the only capitalist country in the world today in which the great majority rejects any proposal for fundamental changes in the existing economic and social system. It not only rejects socialism in any form, but it also sets itself against the trend toward state capitalism. Even the labor movement, C.I.O. as well as A. F. of L., adopts the defense of "free enterprise," and demands governmental intervention in economic life only to the degree that it is demonstratively required to make up for gaps left by the operation of private enterprise.

Eric Johnston has revealed in his recent book how he was astonished to find British capitalists indifferent to this American concept of "free enterprise," and how they even grew "angry" with some of his propagandizing efforts. He finds "the most formidable of the barriers" to cooperation between the two countries in "the difference in our respective approach to post-war economy—ours from free enterprise assumptions, theirs from either government participation or monopoly bases." He records Lloyd George's admission that his "great mistake" as Prime Minister was to try to go back to "free enterprise in England" after World War I. "The English people do not want it," said Lloyd George.

It would be well, therefore, for Americans to rid themselves of the notion that our country with its economic system is the model for all the world. All the world wants to copy our industrial technique, but no other country agrees to our economic system, not even England. On this question, America is much more isolated than is the Soviet Union. Our country stands literally alone on the question of "free enterprise."

As a matter of cold fact, however, as distinguished from ideology, "free enterprise" today is merely a synonym for capitalism *as it exists*; and the present stage of capitalist development is that of a high degree of trustification and monopoly, not only of the basic economy but even of the channels of retail distribution, far exceeding in its specific gravity in

the total national economy that of other countries with a higher degree of formal state capitalism. "Free enterprise" means in practice the freedom of capital to concentrate and centralize itself in ever larger units, with a minimum of public regulation and control; while in relation to the world market it signifies opposition to all measures taken by trade rivals to offset the competitive advantages of American mass production.

It must be clear, however, that while we cannot adopt the ideology of "free enterprise" into our method of thinking, neither can we put forth its repudiation as a program for the democratic progressive majority of the nation. It is an ideology that is shared by the progressives with the reactionaries. It must be accepted as one of the political facts of life that the program of the democratic progressive majority to which we adhere includes the defense of "free enterprise," and that we do not challenge this program.

We must, however, seek to bring the program of the democratic majority to face more squarely the practical problems that must be solved, and to deepen that program, in such a form and manner which will secure a maximum of agreement and a minimum of opposition from both capital and labor, from business circles and the working classes. That can best be accomplished by concentrating attention upon specific problems rather than general ones, upon the concrete rather than the abstract, upon action rather than philosophy. And, in the final analysis, national unity must be built on the foundation of an economic program which does not contradict the prevailing ideology, yet which is workable in the world of reality, and in which conflicting class and national interests can be reconciled.

An Economic Program for National Unity and International Collaboration

The starting point for an economic program that meets the requirements we have noted is to be found in the general agreement that American economy must operate at approxi-

mate full capacity in the post-war period, that approximate full employment of all workers must be maintained. To accomplish this aim, markets must be found for peacetime commodities equal to the war market for military goods, and the war market for consumption goods must also be replaced by a civilian peace market of equivalent volume. The total war market for which a substitute must be found is, if we take the figures of 1944 as our measure, around ninety billion dollars per annum.

It must be noted that under war conditions American economy has demonstrated such capacity for expansion that, despite all restrictions upon consumption (such as the almost complete cessation of production of consumers' durable goods), the civilian market is still about as large as any previous year of peace, if not larger. Since this is so clearly a response to war conditions, it seems to me that it is not sound to speculate that any considerable proportion of the replacement for the war market will occur spontaneously or automatically with the beginning of reconversion. The only sound course is to plan for new markets, which did not before exist, equal in volume to the war market which will come to an end.

Foreign markets demand first attention for many reasons. Politically they come first, as a necessary instrument of our foreign policy of reconciling conflicting interests and maintaining peace (although it must be noted that, improperly managed, our foreign trade may cause a severe intensification of these conflicts). Economically they take a primary place on account of foreign needs, since the rest of the world has been impoverished by the war that has enriched our country with a tremendously expanded economy; and because our own first need will be a market for machinery and other capital goods of which there already will exist a surplus here.

I have estimated that we require new foreign markets of about forty billions per annum, above what we would obtain in the course of business-as-usual, in order to guarantee with any seriousness the continued full operation of our economy. Orthodox economists have assured me that it is quite impos-

sible to realize foreign markets of such magnitude, but I am unable to accept their verdict, since I refuse to accept the perspective of mass unemployment and economic crisis in the post-war period. If such markets are necessary to keep our industries in operation, then it is nonsense to say they cannot be realized.

The champions of "free enterprise" in its extreme form, which denies any economic function to government, are put to the test on this question of foreign markets. They must find and organize such markets, in time to prevent a great post-war economic crisis. If they cannot do it by their methods, then they must agree to governmental intervention which obviously can do it. All that is required is the same determination with which we carry the war to victory.

America's extraordinary achievements in war production are universally cited by business circles as a triumph of "the American way of life," of the system of private initiative, of our traditional capitalism. Very well, the argument is granted. But these achievements were on the basis of a *governmentally organized market*, with the government itself as customer for most of the goods produced. Upon what grounds, then, can we say that the governmental organization of the necessary foreign market for the post-war period would not also be a triumph for "the American way of life," for the "free enterprise" system?

Our government can, in agreement with its great allies, and drawing into partnership the governments of each territory directly involved, set up a series of giant industrial development corporations, for the various devastated and undeveloped regions of the world, Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America. The long-term credits that will be required will be no burden on America, but on the contrary will be an economic relief to us, as one of our greatest needs is for profitable fields of investment to put our vast sums of idle money to work. Such projects, underwritten by governments, would be the most secure of investments; the genius of American industrial engineering could guarantee their technical success; they would

quickly start new streams of wealth flowing that would greatly exceed the original investments, which could be made self-liquidating within a generation if desired.

Only America has the potential ability to initiate and carry through such a program of international economic collaboration, which could furnish the medium of reconciliation of clashing special interests, of realizing the political program of Teheran for liberation of all peoples and a long-time peace. Only American initiative on such lines can realize the free collaboration of nations on the scale needed.

The necessary expansion of our domestic markets on an equal scale is more complicated and difficult. Yet it is equally necessary if we are to avoid a devastating economic crisis within a few years after the war ends.

There is never any lack of purchasing power in the country, as some persons mistakenly think, to provide a market for everything our economy can produce. What brings economic crises is not lack of purchasing power in general, but its lack at particular points where it could be effectively used. The problem is not one of creating purchasing power, but of mobilizing that which already exists.

In the final analysis the needed domestic market expansion can only be realized by increasing the consumption of the masses of the population, the great majority of whom are wage workers. That requires the raising of wage standards to the degree that we need a larger domestic market for maintaining full employment and production.

Higher wage standards, therefore, will be a national aim, a goal of public policy, and not merely a special interest of the labor union movement as heretofore. Labor unions, in forwarding their special aims, will be serving the whole society, and will command a broader cooperation of all classes than ever before. This cannot, however, be reached through the accumulated decisions of individual enterprises, but only through the simultaneous enforcement of such higher standards upon all individual enterprises; i.e., by stronger trade unions, by higher legal minimum wage levels, by guaranteed

annual wages, by applying the rule of equal wages to equal work, by increased earnings commensurate with increased production. Such problems must be removed from the field of separate individual decisions and be regulated as questions of public policy.

Let it be quite clear that such an expansion of the domestic market has in it nothing whatever of socialism. There is not the slightest suggestion of confiscation of wealth, nor even of the war-time proposals for a limitation upon private incomes of the wealthy classes. On the contrary, this policy is consistent with the fullest possible expansion of consumption by the wealthy, and the accumulation of their private incomes above their consumption level in whatever form they see fit—just so long as it is not accumulated in the form of unused commodities that would fill the warehouses and result in halting further production. The economic policy we are proposing has only one *must*, one categorical imperative in it: That is the unconditional demand that we must keep all workers employed and all industries producing at approximate capacity, which means that the goods produced must be consumed by someone to make way for the new production. Strictly speaking, this policy could even be operated through the systematic destruction of surplus goods, replacing war-time destruction with a peace-time equivalent, but that is a variant against which I would most strongly argue on political grounds.

The essential outline of the economic problem is this: That full American production will furnish a stream of commodities which, after satisfying the existing standard of living, selling as much abroad as possible, providing the wealthy classes with everything they can possibly consume, and making all practical new investments—will still provide a large and growing surplus which can only be disposed of by expanding the consumption (purchasing power) of the masses of the people who are mainly the working people who still have unsatisfied needs.

This expansion of the domestic market must become even greater when our huge exports to the foreign market begin,

with the expiration of the terms of credit, to be amortized, and with the flow back to America of earned profits on the investments. Eventually all our exports will flow back to America in augmented volume, in the form of a flood of goods which must also be consumed in one way or another.

Finally and over a period of years, therefore, the problem of replacing the war market is entirely one of expanding America's consumption until it is equivalent to our entire production.

America has such tremendous productive powers that we will surely choke to death with our surplus goods unless we learn how to consume them. The national gullet of consumption must be enlarged until it equals our scale of production. If we cannot learn how to do it under our existing system, then there will be no choice but to find another system that will balance the books.

We are proposing a policy which, if energetically carried out, will meet and solve all the most pressing problems of the immediate period, will give a basis for international peace and collaboration, will make possible an effective degree of unity within the nation with the expansion of well-being for all.

Democracy and National Unity

Many conflicting views and interests must learn how to come together on the basis of compromise in order to build and maintain national unity. But there is a line beyond which compromise is not permissible. We cannot compromise basic democratic principles without seriously damaging our national unity and helping Hitler.

The shameful spectacle of the U. S. Senate blocking the Marcantonio anti-poll tax bill from coming to a vote is a typical case in point. The unholy alliance of poll-tax Senators, Dewey Republicans, and log-rolling politics-as-usual Northern Democrats excused their crime under the plea that to abolish the poll-tax would harm national unity because it would anger the Southern Bourbons to the point where they would

refuse to support the war. Ten million white and Negro workers and farmers are to continue to be denied the ballot, because this little gang of political blackmailers threaten otherwise to sabotage the entire nation. Men who could not be elected otherwise are thus continued in office with power of veto against the overwhelming majority of the nation. Such compromise with democratic principles is the deadliest enemy of American national unity.

So also with the whole Jim Crow system, the systematic violation of the U. S. Constitution by denial of equal citizenship to Negro Americans, their segregation in the Army, in housing and public places; the denial of equal economic opportunity; their special exploitation and oppression. The Jim Crow system is the outgrowth of the ideology of "white supremacy" which is just as shameful and dangerous for America as Hitler's identical racialism proved to be for Germany and the world. *Jim Crow must go if America is to stand.*

A direct importation from Nazi Germany is the spreading poison of anti-Semitism in America. Everyone who spreads anti-Semitism is enlisted in Hitler's fifth column. Anti-Semitism is a crime that must be outlawed as a measure of American national security.

Anti-communism, the doctrine of Hitler's "Antikomintern" organization, is the most deadly of all Hitler's poisons because it has penetrated American society most deeply. We have the extraordinary spectacle of Americans who call themselves liberal, who would consider it outrageous to be called upon to be either Catholic or anti-Catholic, to be either Semitic or anti-Semitic, to be either Negro or anti-Negro, but who still consider it the most natural thing in the world that they and everyone else must be classified either as Communist or anti-Communist—and by anti-Communist understand the support of the public boycott of all even suspected of Communist opinions, their exclusion from public employment and even from private industry, the dealing with Communist opinions as a kind of crime.

The anti-Communist doctrine is justified by those who claim

to be liberals by analogy to the question of the Nazis. All decent persons must be anti-Nazi, and anyone who is not must be considered an enemy of mankind, to be exterminated or at least locked up indefinitely. That is why we are making war, to cleanse the earth of Nazis and all their friends. But it is very dangerous for anyone to extend this to justify being anti-Catholic, or anti-Semitic, or anti-Negro, or anti-Communist. For that would lead toward the conclusion that America must also exterminate the Catholics, the Jews, the colored races, and the Communists from the world. That is somewhat too big an order even for America!

Catholics are an important minority in America, and a majority in several countries we very much need as friends; the Jews have always made important contributions to human progress, and gave the western world its chief religion; the colored races happen to be a considerable majority of the human race, and the Communists just "happen" to be our most important allies in this war. Even considered from the most narrowly practical viewpoint, all these anti-ideologies, whether anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic, anti-colored races, or anti-Communist, are the most dangerous and stupid mistakes for Americans. And they violate our best American tradition and philosophy as well as our basic law; they violate Christian ethics, as well as all other ethical principles that recognize the brotherhood of man. They are immoral as well as unprofitable.

If America wants to play a leading role in the world, we must defeat all these anti-democratic doctrines and practices; and we must retire from public life, and especially from all dealings with our partners in the United Nations, all persons who are incurably afflicted with these divisive ideologies.

The 1944 Elections—For Unity or Disunity?

Our country is entering the crucial hours of the war, our soldiers entering decisive battles for the first time, with a national election on our hands.

We are the only great nation with such a rigid Constitution

that elections come at set intervals without regard to the actual problems with which the nation is confronted.

In this, as in so many other matters, we must take our world as we find it and do the best we can. Certainly we cannot take time out from the war to amend our Constitution, which would be more difficult than handling the election.

It is no use pretending, however, that the necessity to conduct elections this year is anything less than a dangerous strain on the national unity required for victory.

If the 1944 elections are carried through in the usual American spirit of recklessness, abandon and irresponsibility, as a wild scramble for power, then indeed the result may be fatal to our hopes for early victory and a lasting peace.

The spirit of partisanship is today a most costly luxury, which America cannot afford. Our problem is how to subdue and control the spirit of partisanship, how to conduct a national election in the spirit of national unity. It is not an easy task.

Our country faced a similar problem in 1864. Lincoln then decided, against his personal inclination and the demand of his enemies, to accept the Presidential nomination and to transform the electoral struggle from a source of disunity in the nation into a means for reuniting the nation. He rose above party lines without conceding an inch to his opponents in matters of principle. He braved the anger of his own partisan supporters, to substitute the Union coalition for the Republican ticket and took the Union Southerner, Johnson, as his running mate. He subordinated everything to national unity and the national interest.

Roosevelt today faces a situation extraordinarily similar to that which was faced by Lincoln eighty years ago.

Can Roosevelt help the nation to unity and victory by conceding the demand of Republicans and the disloyal Democrats that he announce his retirement?

A moment's thought reveals that such a step would be a disaster for our country. Our enemies in the war would be encouraged to new efforts, our allies in the war would have

deep misgivings, and our own country would be launched upon an uncharted sea of uncontrolled factionalism.

That is why the demand for Roosevelt to succeed himself has swept the Democratic Party so completely as to silence even most of the disloyal Democrats who have sabotaged the President's program. That is why the labor movement is almost unanimously demanding Roosevelt as candidate. That is why "Republicans for Roosevelt" clubs are springing up all over the country. That is why this convention will support Roosevelt.

This election must not be left in the hands of the old party machines of professional politicians. The extraordinary emergency in which our country finds itself calls for an extraordinary manner of handling the election, that it may be transformed from a threat against national unity into a means of uniting the nation on a higher level.

We must learn how to rise above and dissolve old divisions and prejudices, we must achieve fraternization with former enemies, we must cross the old party lines, we must subdue the class antagonisms, we must dissolve the ancient feud between New Dealers and Old Dealers, we must weld a deeper unity of patriotic Americans than has been seen for generations. We must demonstrate that it is unprofitable for any candidate to display extreme partisanship; we must slap down the loud-mouthed demagogue, expose the wily maneuverer, retire the old machine politicians to the background, and begin to bring forward a new type of people's leadership.

The people, and especially the largest part of the people, which is "labor," must build their own organizations for political action, beginning in the neighborhoods and wards, extending to districts, towns and cities, to the states and the nation as a whole. These organizations should be nonpartisan, taking their stand on issues and judging candidates on their merits without regard to party labels.

That is the road to victory in the war and a people's victory in the election. The program of Teheran, the prospects for victory and a lasting peace, are at stake. Never has there been

a greater challenge to the American people or a greater opportunity.

The Position of the Communists

This Convention of American Communists, in confirmation of the deep seriousness of our program and perspective for national unity, renounces all aims of partisan advancement. We have dissolved the Communist Party, and we are now forming a new non-party organization through which we expect to contribute to the common cause of the progressive majority of the American people. We will participate in political life as independents, through the established party organizations of our progressive associates, without committing ourselves to any party label. We will judge issues and men on their merits.

We remain an organization of Communists, of American men and women who hold that the principles of scientific socialism, of Marxism, have an indispensable contribution to make to our own nation. We will not permit, however, that any struggle over the question of socialism, for or against, shall be allowed to divide the progressive majority of the American people, who must be kept united on the road of democracy and progress at all costs.

We are not retreating, we are advancing. We are advancing with the great majority of humanity to the cleansing of Hitlerism and its allies from the face of the earth. We are advancing with the majority of Americans to a more democratic and progressive America. We are advancing closer to the majority of the American people by bringing them a new and better understanding of our role as a sector in their ranks. We are advancing a clearer understanding of what is socialism by the very act of removing the issue as the center of political struggles today. We are advancing in the strength of our own ranks, as witnessed by the successful recruiting of more than 22,000 new members in the very weeks of most intense political discussion leading to the historic decision to dissolve the Communist Party, and this present Convention to set up a

new organization that will grow much stronger in the time ahead. We stand firmly on the program of Teheran, which is America's program for war and peace.

Remarks presenting the Preamble to the proposed Constitution of the Communist Political Association

I WANT to present to you the draft of the Preamble to the Constitution which was recommended to the Convention by the National Committee. First I will read the preamble and then make some comments upon it. It reads as follows:

"The Communist Political Association is a non-party organization of Americans which, basing itself upon the working class, carries forward the traditions of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, under the changed conditions of modern industrial society.

"It seeks effective application of democratic principles to the solution of the problems of today, as an advanced sector of the democratic majority of the American people.

"It upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy, against all the enemies of popular liberties.

"It is shaped by the needs of the nation at war, being formed in the midst of the greatest struggle of all history; it recognizes that victory for the free peoples over fascism will open up new and more favorable conditions for progress; it looks to the family of free nations, led by the great coalition of democratic capitalist and socialist states, to inaugurate an era of world peace, expanding production and economic well-being, and the liberation and equality of all peoples regardless of race, creed or color.

"It adheres to the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism, the heritage of the best thought of humanity and of a

hundred years experience of the labor movement, principles which have proved to be indispensable to the national existence and independence of every nation; it looks forward to a future in which, by democratic choice of the American people, our own country will solve the problems arising out of the contradiction between the social character of production and its private ownership, incorporating the lessons of the most fruitful achievements of all mankind in a form and manner consistent with American tradition and character.

"For the advancement of these aims, the Communist Political Association establishes the basic laws of its organization in the following Constitution."

I will now make a few observations about this document.

First, by the adoption of this Preamble, we will definitely establish the name of our new organization, the Communist Political Association. There has been considerable discussion in the last three months as to whether the new organization should maintain the name Communist which indicates its character in terms of long range perspective and program, or whether some other name should be adopted which would place the emphasis upon the tasks of the next period in which we are engaged. The great preponderance of opinion has shown to be on the side of maintaining the name Communist in our organization. In this discussion it has been clearly established in the minds of all of us, I believe, that this is not a question of principle; it is a question of what is most conducive to the practical success of our work and it is in this sense that we, I believe, will register here that preponderance of opinion that flows out of the discussion to maintain the name Communist.

The second word in the proposed name, Political, was subjected to some criticism to the effect that any organization of Communists is necessarily political and therefore it is not necessary to put the word in the name. But as against that argument there was also the consideration that precisely at this moment when we are emphasizing the dissolution of the party form of our organization and the non-partisan character of our politics, we need to emphasize that non-partisan

does not mean for us non-political. And therefore, it is of considerable value to emphasize the political character of our organization by putting the word in the name.

The third term in the proposed name,—Association. There have been a number of proposals that have arisen in the discussion for some variation of that term. I will not review everything that came forward in the whole discussion because that will take too long, since we received in the National Office from the lower organizations of the party, proposals embodying more than 70 different names. The large majority of the proposals that came in included the term Association. Others used the term League and the final decision seemed to be between these two. In the discussions in our committee it seems that the final choice between Association and League turned not upon logic but upon atmosphere. Somebody disclaimed all logic in his approach but expressed the feeling that League carried the atmosphere of a narrow association where association carried the feeling of an atmosphere where we associate with everybody and this logic of feeling overcame the scientific argument that League was a word of one syllable and easy to pronounce and association is a word of five syllables and hard to pronounce. So we went against all logic and science and came with the proposal to adopt the five syllable word Association.

Now, as to the character of the Preamble itself. It requires little explanation, I think. We have tried to condense into 300 words the essential features of our whole immediate and ultimate program. As to whether we have succeeded in this or not, you must judge and pass upon. We have given in this preamble the firm basing of our movement upon the best traditions of America from the American Revolution on, and at the same time we have very carefully eliminated any suggestion that this means a tendency to try to return to the past; that, on the contrary, it is a complete facing of the future on the basis of the best achievements of the past. We have tried to give a clear and brief statement which identifies us as a particular minority sector of the American democracy and at

the same time, and in the same sentence, establishes a complete identification of our sector with the camp of democracy as a whole. We have included the specific support of the classical documents of American democracy and the struggle against all its enemies, the enemies of popular liberties. We have included the identification of the historical period in which we are making these changes, that is in the midst of war, and do not feel that this war is something outside of the course of history which will be forgotten, but is that factor which is laying the foundations for the whole future. And by the wording of this preamble which identifies the historical moment, we believe we are writing something permanent also and giving a complete characterization of the historical significance of this war and its character and the success for which we strive.

And finally, we give the statement of the principles of scientific socialism, including its essential programmatic character, in such a form as to completely adjust it to the tasks of today, to completely refute all the misrepresentations and slanders directed against scientific socialism, to place it in its character as an international movement, science being always and everywhere international in character. At the same time we place it very specifically for America as something which will and must be realized in characteristic American terms, in a form and manner consistent with American tradition and character and as something which arises in the practical order of the day, when it is practical to speak of the democratic choice of the American people deciding the transition to socialism in our country.

We believe that in this draft document we have given a satisfactory and adequate correlation of immediate tasks with the ultimate historical aims; we have given a correct statement of the relationships between the nation and the world family of nations; we have given a guide which can be taken not only for the immediate period of the war but for this whole immediate next period of the development of our country and the world in the stage of history arising out of

this war. This is not a temporary guide of the day; this is a document which will be valid for many years to come.

In this sense, we present this Preamble for adoption at this Convention as a guiding point from which we will hammer out the detailed provisions of our Constitution.

Speech greeting the fraternal delegates from Latin America

DISTINGUISHED Guests of Latin America, Neighbors, Fellow Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am very happy to respond to the important messages we have received tonight from our neighbors in the South. We note with great regret the absence of many of our friends from Latin America who would have liked to have been here, but who were prevented from arriving by the difficulties of war-time travel. I refer particularly to our old and beloved friends from Mexico and Cuba.

We know that in every Latin American country we have friends and co-workers. We also know that they are doing magnificent work in their own countries. We know that they are holding up their end in this war, something that many of us tend to forget because our eyes are largely fastened upon the great tasks on the battlefields in Europe. We do not always realize what a difficult part is being played in this war by the democratic forces in Latin America. Against greater difficulties than we can conceive of, and with only a little fraction of the resources which we have at our disposal, they have been holding that great territory against the assaults of fascism over a long period—and too much of that time with very little help from the United States.

We saw this dramatically expressed in the recent meeting of the International Labor Organization in Philadelphia. One would have expected that the labor representative of the

United States in that organization would have been in the forefront in protecting and advancing the policy of the United Nations and the policy of our own country in resisting the encroachments of the Axis in our hemisphere. But we saw that this task had to be taken up by the Latin American labor delegates, under the able and brilliant leadership of Vicente Lombardo Toledano. And we saw, to our great shame, that the Latin American delegates who were fighting for the interests of the policies of our country, the United States, had to overcome the resistance of the American labor delegate, Mr. Robert Watt.

So we know that our Latin American brothers and sisters are really carrying on the war and in many cases doing it with greater efficiency and greater honor than some of the representatives of our own country, and we thank our Latin American comrades for the services that they have rendered. (*Applause.*)

Not only in the war do we understand the great services that they have rendered to us. We know in the post-war world they are going to play a role of tremendous importance, and of tremendous importance to us in the United States. I want to say a few words about just one aspect of the post-war problem of Latin America in relation to the United States.

We need Latin America very much in the post-war world. We need Latin America especially because our whole system of civilization in this country, the whole continued operation of our economy on which we depend for our daily bread, depends upon finding other lands that will relieve us from the tremendous production of our factories that we don't know how to consume ourselves. And we are depending upon Latin America to help us out in this respect. "Please, Latin America, take a lot of our goods off our hands in the post-war world."

Some people think the Latin Americans need us. In a way, yes, they do. But they don't need us nearly as badly as we need them. Even if they don't get our goods after the war, they can at least continue along as they have for hundreds of years. But if they don't take our goods, we are going to have a

catastrophe in this country such as we won't know how to meet. We cannot continue without their countries as markets. So we turn to Latin America, as we are turning to Africa and to Asia. We say: "Please, you other countries in the world, we are producing machines; we are going to produce more and more of them after the war. When the war market is gone, we are not going to be able to use these machines ourselves. We must find customers. Please be our customers and help us keep our factories going."

We hope the Latin American countries will be gracious enough to listen to our request—"Please be our customers."

We are learning also that it is no good for us to have Latin America as customers in the same way as we had them in the past—that is, under the terms laid down by short-sighted and greedy monopolists, with the imperialist mentality, who went into Latin America as conquerors, using commodities in the place of the sword and bank credits in the place of guns. They went to enslave the Latin American economies and to subvert their democratic structures, and to distort their industrial development so as to transform those countries into appendages, colonial appendages of the North American metropolis.

That kind of market is no good to us any more because that kind of market is too limited. It simply will not solve our problems. The only kind of market in Latin America that really responds to our need is that provided by Latin American peoples who are modernizing their countries in every respect, industrializing them. And that means a different kind of customer from the old colonial customer. All the old colonial features of our economic relationship must be wiped out because otherwise the market is going to be too small.

We have to have a huge and growing market and the only nations that could give us a huge and growing market are nations which buy not only the chief consumption commodities but our most expensive machines. We want Latin America to take locomotives in large numbers, rails, heavy machinery. We want them to buy from us the

means of production so that they can go into business for themselves in a modern way.

So we want a new relationship with Latin America. We want strong Latin American democracies standing on their own feet, nobody able to give them any orders of any kind, because that is the only kind of customers that can buy the goods in the volume that we must sell and that is the only kind of customers that can pay. And eventually, of course, Latin America is going to pay us for everything we send them. And they are going to find it easy to pay because they will not pay by the intensified exploitation of their own people. They will be able to pay because their own people will be becoming more wealthy all the time, with rising living standards and rising demands. They will be able to pay because through an all round modern industrialization, they will be able to produce wealth as we produce it in the United States. We hope they will be able to produce it even more efficiently than we have done so far. (*Applause.*)

We have great hopes for the future relations between the United States and Latin America—and I must say that we are not expressing merely our own point of view on this. We have a growing degree of agreement with capitalists in the United States who are more and more awakening to the fact that the old type of colonial profits has no future for them, capitalists who are more and more prepared to do business with the Latin American peoples who are sensible to the need to organize themselves democratically with strong governments and to make plans for their own national industrial modernization and to do business much more reasonably than they ever did before. They are beginning to feel a growing strength in Latin America and they have respect for strength. So we have great hopes for the future of our continental relationships. Even though we have strong and stubborn reactionary and imperialist, blindly imperialist, forces in the United States, and though we warn our Latin American neighbors they must be aware of these forces and be prepared to defeat them when they come down to their countries—

nevertheless we must also say that the future does not belong to these blind and greedy and shortsighted imperialist forces in our country. Their day is finished although they will not depart from the historical scene until they are licked and removed. Their day is finished because they can no longer answer even the problems of the American capitalist class. With their methods they can't produce markets big enough for American industry, and therefore more enlightened men have to come into the direction of American capitalism. Such enlightened men are beginning to appear, and they are going to become strong because the forces of history are with them. They are the only men who know how and have sense enough to begin to cooperate with the labor movement, to find common policy with the labor movement of this country and of Latin America. They are the only ones who can sit down and talk with such men as Lombardo Toledano about the plans of Latin America. These are the kind of American capitalists to whom the future belongs in this country, because they are the only kind of men who can go out and get a market—who can get the only kind of market that is not going to choke us after the war because we don't find customers. The men who can find the market for America's surplus products in the post-war world, are the men who are going to shape our western hemisphere, if not a large part of the western world.

And in this question of finding the markets that they must have if our industries are to continue to operate—in this task we expect tremendous cooperation from our Latin American friends. We promise them our full collaboration in seeing that those relationships are placed on the basis of complete equality and common interest between the Latin American countries and our country. We promise them that we are going to be working here to remove the last traces of colonialism from the policy of the United States toward Latin America. And we want to see, and we expect to see, the good neighbor policy so deepened that it will find expression in the exchange of goods between this country and Latin America—an exchange which North American capital will find it profitable to finance

from this country for a whole period of years with long-term credits. We expect it to be an exchange in which Latin America will become rich enough to pay off all the bills in the course of industrialization, and to stand on a firm basis of equality with us. Together we will fight for that kind of extension of the Good Neighbor policy. Not only must it completely express itself in our economic relationships, but it must expand those economic relations tenfold in the next few years.

Closing Address to the Constituent Convention, May 22, 1944

FELLOW Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

We have had a fruitful Convention. We have met in one of the most critical moments in the history of our country and of the world. We have faced unprecedented problems. We have avoided every temptation to fall into the pattern of copying the answers from the past; we have worked out new policies to meet an entirely new and unprecedented moment in our history.

We have not, however, cut ourselves off from the past. It is only the work and the thinking of the past that have armed us with the sure knowledge of the direction in which we must march in the present and in the future. We are people who have the greatest appreciation of the enormous work that has been done for human progress by the generations that have preceded us. We know that we are able to march forward into the future only because we have been lifted on the shoulders of the millions of heroes of the past who gave deep meaning to the words liberty and progress. We know that we are able to think clearly about the problems of today only because we sat humbly at the feet of giant figures of the past and thankfully learned from them. And we know that if what we have in the world today is important for future generations, it is

only because from the great minds of the past we learned the continuity of the historical process. There may be setbacks, but there is progress. There is a continuous chain of cause and effect which can be studied scientifically. And the pure rays of the lamp of science can be thrown upon the present and the future.

We have learned how to be strong and bold as the spokesmen and fighters for this great current of human progress. It is a current that leads to an ever greater freedom, an ever greater mastery of nature, a greater mastery over the social problems of mankind. We have also learned the necessity to be modest in our personalities. This leads us to understand that no man or woman attains greatness in his own right. He gains it only to the degree that he can give service to this great historic movement of humanity and freedom.

We think—I believe all of us think—this Convention has given us a sure direction in the struggle. We can have confidence in this direction. We can be sure that the Convention has put solid ground under our feet as we go out to do battle against all of the enemies of human progress. We are sure that this Convention has laid the foundations for a much broader, deeper, closer, more confident collaboration, a more harmonious co-working between ourselves and our many allies in this country, who comprise the great majority of the American people. We can be sure that this Convention has armed us to be effective workers and fighters for closer consolidation of the great Anglo-Soviet-American alliance which leads the United Nations. The united leadership of this alliance gives the only hope that exists in the world for the crystallization of a real family of free, democratic nations everywhere on this earth.

It is true, we have not satisfied everyone. Many people will express dissatisfaction with our Convention. But I think it will be found that everyone who gives a negative verdict upon our Convention will either be thinking about it in a way entirely dissociated from our nation's task today—that is, he will be thinking in terms of his own special ideological pre-disposition, his prejudices or his special interests—or else he will be

tainted with a lack of enthusiasm for the completion of our nation's tasks in this war. That is so because no one who places the victory of our nation and its allies in this war as the first consideration can possibly have any other thought than that of accepting gladly the contributions that this Convention has made to our nation and to the Allied war effort.

Still, some people are dissatisfied, people who generally must be classed as patriotic and as wishing to win the war. We had, for example, this morning, in the eminent *New York Herald Tribune*, an editorial judgment upon our Convention of a very flatly negative character. The *Herald Tribune* seems to be overwhelmed by the fact that there are still Communists in America, and *organized* Communists, even after the Communist Party is dissolved. The *Herald Tribune* a year ago editorially demanded that the Communist Party should dissolve. At that time I addressed a letter to them publicly, which they printed, in which I challenged their conclusions but offered to debate the question with them. They refused to discuss the question. We proceeded to debate it on our own and we came to the conclusion that the *Herald Tribune* had been correct in recommending that the Communist Party be dissolved. And with different motives, and following a different line of reasoning, we came to the same conclusion today that they expressed a year ago.

Instead of being happy that they had converted us to their point of view, the *Herald Tribune* this morning expressed the greatest concern: some serious danger threatens our country; the Communists have taken an action which the *Herald Tribune* recommended one year ago!

We had the same experience in connection with some of the old leading figures of the New York State American Labor Party, now the leading figures of the new ambitious project called the Liberal Party. Two professors, in fact doctors of philosophy, and therefore men with a lifetime of training in the laws of logic and the rigors of the pure intellectual processes—Dr. Counts and Dr. Childs—wrote a whole book, and published it, to prove the Communist Party could

make only one contribution to America, and that is, to dissolve itself. And yet, when the Communist Party took the matter up in a practical fashion and proceeded to move in the direction of doing precisely what the two eminent doctors of philosophy had proved in a learned thesis, published in hard covers, was necessary, the two learned doctors of philosophy immediately forgot their book. They have not mentioned it in six months and I understand it has been withdrawn from sale. We have no public explanation as to why they changed their minds, but Dr. Counts and Dr. Childs, the eminent professors, now stand before the world as the great champions not only of the right of the Communists to have their own party, but they insist that the Communists must have their own party whether they want it or not.

Well, as I said, we cannot satisfy everybody, because the moment we try to satisfy some people and accept their proposals we find they change their minds. As a matter of fact, such people we never try to satisfy.

The only people we are really concerned with and profoundly anxious to satisfy, are those we want to convince that, though our ideas may differ somewhat from theirs, we have the same interests. They are the people we want to convince that they and we have to fight shoulder to shoulder together for these interests. We want to convince them that the very fact that we think a little bit differently from them may make our cooperation with them even more valuable than if we were simple yes-men cooperating. The people that we really want to convince—are the great mass of the American people, the alert and intelligent workers of America, the business and professional people who are honestly trying to think through the problems of today and who are earnestly attached to the welfare of their country as their first consideration. Yes, we want even to convince that large number and great body of professors and doctors of philosophy who are badly represented by Dr. Counts and Dr. Childs. We want to convince the capitalists of America that we are serious and earnest in our proposals for a national

unity broad enough to include capital and labor. We want to convince every honest man and woman who understands the great crisis through which our country and the world is now living, the greatest crisis of all history, that Americans must learn how to think together, how to act together and how to unite in a new way in order that this world crisis shall not represent a setback for our country and for human progress. We want to guarantee that this great ordeal of fire—these great sacrifices that our country must make together with the other peoples of the world to emerge from this crisis—will not be the inevitable forerunner of another world crisis. We want to make sure that the price we pay for the solution of this crisis shall bring us up onto a new field of human progress for our country and the world, and that as a result of victory in this war we shall have plowed up the seeds of future wars and humanity shall be organized for peace for generations to come. We want to guarantee that the achievement of well-being and democracy for all within our own country shall not proceed through crisis after crisis and struggle after struggle, but will be the product of intelligent collaboration of all intelligent men in America.

We think this is a realistic program. We are going to fight for it; we are going to welcome the collaboration of men and women from every circle and all stratum of the American population toward this end. We are going to guarantee that if this goal is not achieved, it shall be clear to the world where the responsibility lies—clear that it does not lie upon the Communists or upon those who sympathize or work with the Communists, but precisely upon those who have tried to make the word “Communist” synonymous with the enemies of America at the very moment in history when Communists throughout the rest of the world have proved the most reliable allies of America in the greatest crisis our country has ever gone through.

We are convinced that the forces of democracy and progress and intelligence in America are sufficiently strong to guarantee the ultimate triumph of the policy put forth by this Convention.

Just Published!

TEHERAN

OUR PATH IN WAR AND PEACE

By *EARL BROWDER*

Americans of all classes and political affiliations will find in Earl Browder's brilliantly illuminating book on the new problems, tasks and perspectives, confronting our nation and the world as a result of the historic Teheran Agreement, a penetrating guide to the future. As the newly-elected President of the Communist Political Association, he writes:

"The Teheran concord furnishes the platform upon which can and must be gathered all forward-looking men and women of all classes and political ideologies, subordinating all other considerations to the single purpose of welding a firm and effective majority of the people and directing the nation and the world along the Teheran path."

His new work is a continuation and companion-volume to *Victory—and After*. But while in his former book the author devoted only one short chapter to the problems "After" victory has been won, his latest book is practically entirely occupied with the vast, world-enveloping tasks of post-war reconstruction which press ever more urgently for attention, and which will be tremendously influenced by the outcome of the 1944 presidential elections.

Among the chapters is included Browder's searching evaluation of the problems of "The Guarantee of Teheran"; "Reconstruction of Europe"; "Characteristics of Capitalism"; "Elements of an Economic Program"; "The Changes in Communist Organization" and "What Marxism Contributed to America."

PRICE \$.35
CLOTH \$1.50

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.