

backed to the limit in the administration fight for the measure, and urged if necessary to issue an executive order under his war powers. For the consequences of losing FEPC to winning the war and effecting a proper reconversion would be very serious indeed.

Here and There

MEMO to the State Department: Four prominent Nazis on a *Spanish* ship en route to *Argentina* with

home-bound *Argentine* diplomats were apprehended during a stopover in Trinidad. How about some repercussions?

• The glitter has dimmed from Pastor Niemöller, another of the German denouncers of that ol' Bolshevik menace, whom the *New York Times* called a "shining star." He admitted to having volunteered for U-boat service under Hitler, to not believing in democracy for Germany and to having stood up against the Nazis not for their Naziness but only when they attacked his church.

• In opening the Tory election campaign Churchill added to the evidence he has already given of unfitness for postwar leadership by reverting to the Bolshevik-bogey demagoguery by which he helped to destroy the peace after the last World War. Churchill policy at work can be seen in Greece, where British bayonets keep a reactionary minority in power whose repressions and political murders have aroused even the fellow reactionary, General Plastiras, to protest.

THE CPA EVALUATES ITS COURSE

By THE EDITORS

THE discussion that will determine the future course of the Communist Political Association has opened with the publication in the June 4 issue of the *Daily Worker* of the resolution of the CPA National Board, followed by the publication in *The Worker* of June 10 of the first comments by individuals. Though this debate is being conducted within the Communist Political Association, the questions of policy involved concern the entire nation and the world. The editors of *NEW MASSES*, after considering the material that has already appeared, have arrived at conclusions concerning the major points at issue. However, we feel it desirable to postpone the formulation of those conclusions so that they can be amplified in the light of further discussion.

We especially would like to get the views of our readers. In the meantime we present the highlights of the two most important articles in the June 10 *Worker*, those of Earl Browder, CPA president, who cast the lone vote against the resolution of the National Board, and of William Z. Foster, CPA vice-president.

Browder's article, which is his speech at the June 2 meeting of the National Board, states he can "accept the resolution's program of action as a basis," but that he objects to other parts of it. He argues against the criticism made by Jacques Duclos, one of the principal leaders of the French Communist Party, of the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States. Browder declares that "the dissolution of the Party and the creation of the Communist Political Association in place of it helped to win the election" and was therefore justified since "America had become a decisive point in the world

struggle . . . decisive for the whole course of world development." In Browder's opinion, "if we had decided otherwise, Roosevelt would have lost," although he states this cannot be proved. "But it can be proved," he insists, "that our action strengthened the Roosevelt forces." He defends the dissolution on the further ground that "it gives us a more favorable approach to the general question of electoral struggles in the future."

BROWDER then discusses what he calls "the key question of the world—the relations between America and the Soviet Union," which in his opinion "is not adequately dealt with in the resolution." He states his "profound conviction that coincidence of interest between America and the Soviet Union . . . will override and overrule the surface conflict of ideology and etiquette. . . ." He analyzes the world relation of forces "which makes it to the class interest of the American bourgeoisie . . . to take the course of Teheran and Yalta." The changed relation of forces that in his opinion make an enduring peace possible short of socialism consists in: "the emergence of the Soviet Union in alliance with America and Britain as the victors in the greatest of all wars"; the fact that the USSR was the greatest contributor to victory; the enormous wartime expansion of American economy, doubling our productive forces and relegating Britain to a secondary position, with only America and the Soviet Union as "great powers in the fullest sense of the word"; "the wiping out of the main bases of reactionary, anti-democratic power in Europe and the consequent rise of broadly based democratic governments of the people"; the impetus given by the war to "the na-

tional liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies."

Decisive for a durable peace, Browder states, is the collaboration of the United States and the Soviet Union and he presents what he considers the evidence that such collaboration is possible. "Only if the bourgeoisie has a class interest which coincides to some degree with the national interest," he declares, can this collaboration be achieved without fundamentally changing the monopoly capitalist structure of America. He declares that just as the British and American bourgeoisie collaborated in the war only after "collapse and failure of every other alternative policy, so also may we expect that they will move along the postwar path indicated at Teheran and Yalta only to the degree that all other alternative proposals are found to be closed to them, impractical to them, impossible of working." He finds that the American bourgeoisie has only two other alternatives: immediate transition to "a new war against the Soviet Union," or "an armed peace within which the main policy would be diplomatic and economic war against the Soviet Union, with military hostilities postponed to some indefinite future time. . . ." He analyzes these two alternatives and concludes that both would be disastrous for the bourgeoisie. He then asks whether there is "any serious basis for conceiving that it is possible for the bourgeoisie, the American ruling class, to have within itself enough intelligence" to reject both these alternatives and to follow the path of Teheran and Yalta. He concludes that "this possibility is not excluded," that "the American bourgeoisie from its own class interests under this relation of forces may take this path."

Browder asks whether "we should

not make this possibility the basis of a serious effort to mobilize all the forces that can be mobilized to realize it, and form a bloc, an alliance, with that section of the bourgeoisie which sees its true class interests . . . throwing the power of the labor and democratic mass movement to bear upon the more backward and reluctant sections of the bourgeoisie, thereby reenforcing the convictions of the more farsighted leaders of the bourgeoisie." He adds that "It is, of course, understood that the decisive force for realizing a lasting peace is a powerful labor movement with a clear policy at the head of all the democratic masses."

FOSTER in his article charges that Browder's ideas represent opportunism and a revision of Marxism, and that this revisionism "has the same class roots and goes in the same general direction as the traditional revisionism of Social Democracy." Its essence, he states, "is the belief that capitalism is fundamentally progressive and that the big bourgeoisie may, therefore, be relied upon to lead the nation to peace and prosperity." This theory, Foster states, caused Browder "to develop in his book, *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace*, a capitalist utopia which far outdid anything produced anywhere by the Social Democratic revisionists. Typically, too, he developed theories about the 'progressivism' and 'intelligence' of finance capital. In consequence, the policies he formulated on the basis of these wrong conclusions tended to subordinate the workers to the influence of reactionary capitalists." He presents eleven illustrations of the practical effects of Browder's theories:

"While our general wartime policy

of supporting the Roosevelt administration was correct, we made the mistake, under Browder's influence, of failing to criticize many errors and shortcomings of the Roosevelt government"—one example being the Communist defense of the appointment of Stettinius as Secretary of State; the failure to demand that "organized labor be admitted into the Roosevelt government on a coalition basis," this reflecting "the revisionist feeling that all was safe under the leadership of the bourgeoisie and that labor should not disturb the 'harmonious' class relationships by making unpleasant demands for representation in top administration circles"; Browder's rejection of proposals that "labor should demand representation at all international conferences held by the United Nations," a demand "now being pushed by the new World Trade Union Federation"; Browder's "acceptance of the two-party system virtually in perpetuity," which, according to Foster, was a major factor in leading to the dissolution of the Communist Party.

Among the other illustrations Foster gives were "Browder's serious concern that our party should not attack the trusts as such" and his insistence that "the only regulations of monopoly practices that should take place . . . were those which the monopolists themselves should agree to"; his "incredible proposals that in the postwar period the capitalists would voluntarily double the wages of the workers"; his proposal that "in the vitally important matter of developing American foreign trade," the government shall go no further in regulation: "than the capitalists themselves demand"; his "easy acceptance of their [the big capitalists'] slogan of

'free enterprise' " which was "in reality a demand for a free hand, economically and politically, for the monopolists"; his "belief in a postwar class collaboration for many years with the big bourgeoisie . . . [which] flowed naturally from the revisionist ideas that he was developing"; his attempt to "exorcize imperialism out of existence" and especially his failure to see any "danger whatever from American imperialism," as a result of which he "underestimated the hostility in the ranks of finance capital in the United States and Great Britain towards the USSR"; his "curt dismissal of the whole question of socialism in our country, not only as an immediate political issue (in which he was correct), but also in the sense of mass education (in which he was wrong)."

Foster finds that "these are not isolated, unrelated errors; they constitute a whole system of revisionist thinking. They involve violations of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and must be eliminated from our party theory and practice." He declares that "the resolution of the National Board constitutes a fundamental correction in theory and practice of Comrade Browder's errors. It furnishes the basis of the widest unity of the people for the realization of the democratic goals of Teheran and Yalta; it provides practical policies to help build the great national democratic coalition which in the postwar period must be broad enough to include the workers, farmers, professionals, small businessmen, and also those groupings among the bourgeoisie who support Roosevelt's anti-Axis policies, and who understand that the alternative to Yalta would be economic chaos, a big growth of fascism and a new world war."



FRONT LINES

by **COLONEL T.**

TOKYO'S YEAR OF FIRE

THE B-29 Superfortress rounded out a year of operational activity in the Orient on the eve of the first anniversary of the landings in Normandy, *i.e.*, on June 5. An examination of this activity for the past year is of great interest because the data disclosed may give us an idea of the cost and duration of the war against Japan.

Last week I pointed out some of the factors which permit us to hope that the

effect of strategic bombing on Japan would be greater by far than the effect on Germany. (Incidentally, in connection with my article of last week I wish to draw the attention of the reader to a misprint: in writing about the condition of the I. G. Farben plant in Frankfort-on-the-Main I meant that the mammoth administration building, *not* the mammoth plant itself, had been found intact. There is no information

as yet as to what happened to the plant itself.)

Let us see how our main air instrument in the Pacific war, the B-29, has been operating during the past year. It has been disclosed (the main source of facts and figures is an article by Foster Hailey in the *New York Times*, June 10) that the first experimental models of the B-29 were ordered back in the Summer of 1940, before Pearl Harbor.