

The Proposed C. P. Changes

By Robert Minor

The questions we answer today are the last of those asked by "One-Who-Thought-That-Communists-March-Breast-Forward":

"The Morgan interests still will fight trade unions, etc., or do you think they suddenly will give all that up?"

No, they won't "give all that up." The trade unions must be stronger than ever.

Capital will continue bargaining in the market over the price of labor power; this is the very essence of capitalism. The contradictions of interest on a thousand points between labor and capital continue.

Answers to Questions

This remains an inescapable ground of struggle even when the powerful trade union movement, by its very strength is able deliberately to keep this struggle within certain limits, by agreement with capital and the Government as a matter of policy in support of the war. Capitalists have not ceased to be antagonists of the labor movement. Not all of them are even without the deadly illusion that a modern society can exist without trade unions, or without the great mass unions. But there is a policy adopted by both labor and capital of national unity in support of the war, eliminating all interruptions of production; accepting, as a matter of national unity and of government policy, the unconditional and full right of trade union organization.

Thus the trade union movement operates on a policy of fighting definitely for the war. Does the questioner mean that he opposes this policy of the trade unions?

Another from the same questioner:

"Have you read 'Business as a System of Power' and 'Behemoth' for indications of the nature of monopoly capitalism?"

We do read these books, yes—because it is necessary to be informed of what is being published on these subjects, and because useful material is to be found in the works you mention—but we do not depend upon that kind of books "for indications of the nature of monopoly capitalism." For so fundamental a purpose it is necessary to go to scientific sources. In our opinion it is logical that we find the adequate scientific work in this field produced by those who have done the most monumental work in handling such problems in real life. The best of these scientific sources are in our opinion the works of Lenin and Stalin. Have you read Lenin's "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism"? (Collected Works, Vol. XIX, International Publishers, New York.)

We earnestly recommend to anyone who seriously wishes to understand the conditions of present-day

struggles, the works of the foremost American Marxist, Earl Browder. We suggest especially his book *Victory—and After*, of 256 pages, (and his latest very brilliant report to the National Committee of the Communist Party, published in a pamphlet called *Tehran and America*, of 48 pages.)

Wouldn't it be better to read these Marxist works rather than to attempt to "defend Marxism" from the Marxists on the authority of non-Marxist writers?

Another:

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

No, one does not become a renegade because of disagreeing with the views of the Communists, or because he thinks our frequent adjustments of policy to new situations are "desperately dangerous." Persons as yet unclarified about the reasons for a very basic change of policy at a time of a great turning point in history are necessarily startled, and some are frightened, by the bigness of the change. But that only means that they need orientation, not that they are renegades.

No. Most of the 130,000,000 people of the United States at present disagree with the Communists' views in regard to Socialism, and certainly these millions of Americans are not "renegades" by any stretch of the imagination.

Only persons, who desert the labor movement are counted as renegades. We have no reason to think that the questioner in this case has ever had any connection with Marxism or the labor movement.

However, if one has in mind, not the specific views of Communists, in respect to the historic necessity and desirability of the introduction of socialist society, but the all-important question of today—the question of this war—then of course the Communists' principles in respect to supporting our country are not the principles of a minority among the 130,000,000 population of our country. In this decisive matter the Communists and all other patriots are inseparable and together constitute a majority—almost the total number of the adults and adolescents of our population.

This is a different matter.

If the questioner took a position of disagreement with us in the matter of fighting and winning this war and crushing ruthlessly anything and everything that opposes the necessary means of winning the war—then we would count such a person a renegade.

We do not think that the questioner is a renegade.

But it might be well to change his reading matter.

The last of these questions:

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

The policy which Lenin and all other Marxists have always denounced as "class collaboration" is a policy of sacrifice of the interests of the labor movement, of the workers and of all progressive mankind. It is a policy carried out by weak and corrupt leaders of the labor movement in exchange for special immediate advantages to their personal careers or to a small, relatively privileged "aristocracy of labor."

Karl Kautsky, the theoretical leader of the Second International of Socialists, became a symbol of desertion of Marxism and of labor's cause during the first World War. Of Kautsky's particular theories we will deal later under another heading, but here we are dealing only with the fact that he deserted the cause of the workers of Germany and the cause of internationalism and Marxism, taking a position which, with certain equivocations, was in substance a support of the German Kaiser's government in the war of 1914-18. Kautsky thereby became the chief theoretical apologist for the policy historically known as "class collaboration," a policy of renouncing the role of labor and the initiative of the labor movement in the political life of a country and of the world.

The policy of Browder and the Communist Party is quite definitely the opposite of Kautskism.

Browder and the Communist Party, and the labor movement, and the nation as a whole, and internationally the freedom-loving people of the world, are supporting a people's war. This is in the interest of the workers and the labor movement, as it is in the interest of all progressive mankind.

The questioner made it appear so simple as this: That Kautsky favored collaboration of the working class and the capitalist class, that this is "class-collaboration," and that therefore, there is no difference between "Browder and Kautsky."

You see that the questioner is making a play on words with the expression "class collaboration." He is reducing a serious matter of principle to the level of a pun.

To answer this confusion nothing is needed but to restore the concrete reality—difference between the present war of all progressive mankind against the axis, and the entirely different war of 1914-18.

You can easily dismantle almost any such word-booby-trap by looking at it in a concrete way.

The next question, to be answered in Saturday's Daily Worker, will be:

"How about the two-party system? Isn't it a rotten fake all the way through?"