

That 'Communist' Issue

by Robert Minor

WHEN President Roosevelt in his Boston speech proved the shallow falsity of the isolationist claim that Communism is an issue in this election, he could have gone even further than he did and still have remained well within the realities of present-day history. The enormous political and economic facts that support his assertions are far more important than his or any individual's unfavorable opinion of Communism.



A turn in history without precedent and on a scale in proportion to the greatest military defeat and destruction of feudal empires in both of the two centers of world population, in Europe and Asia, has brought the corresponding change in the relationships of the surviving states and in the conditions for the continuation of the prevailing world system of production.

The capitalist mode of production, more nearly deserving the title "free enterprise" than it has ever deserved it since the beginning of monopoly development, will survive.

Sectarian groups, rule-of-thumb dogmatists, will protest that the high development of modern means of production and exchange makes the world, from that purely economic point of view, ripe for Socialism. And some sensible people, uneducated in such questions, are deceived by this undoubtedly general fact. But it leaves out of account the biggest and most decisive of all concrete historical facts. There is no abstract truth; the truth is always concrete.

Capitalist economy of the United States is not in a state of decline. And as a result of the colossal events of the war, and of the extension of the alliance of the United States, Russia, Great Britain and China into the postwar peace, assuring a vast expansion of the world market and home market, there is no present prospect of a decline of capitalist economy. Quite the contrary is true, and this truth has consequences much greater than most people have been able to see through the maze of outright lying or mediocrity of the press.

No economic and social system

has ever fallen or will ever fall in a time when it is successfully functioning to develop the forces of production, to expand production and exchange, in the midst of a rising general standard of living of the masses. The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States, including almost the total of the working class, practically the entire labor movement, has in the past opposed socialist solutions; and this majority is not likely to change its mind in this respect during a period of enormously expanding economy and rising standards of life.

Consider the conditions and needs of immediate and gigantic reconstruction and ordering of world economy after the war. And cast aside the stupid anti-Marxist dogma that capitalism "cannot plan." Then you will see that as far as our country and many others are concerned, while such a situation prevails, capitalist production and exchange are more capable of meeting the needs of the masses than would be any effort at changing the system. Within these limits and under these conditions it can be said that for the present interest of the American people, labor included, not socialism, but capitalism is the best system of production.

Nor is this to the discredit of socialism; quite the opposite. This new vitality of the world economy that remains nine-tenths capitalist is made possible first through the triumphant strength of the Russian Communist state, military, economic and political, and secondly, through the newly manifest political vitality of advanced capitalist states, the United States and Great Britain, shown in superb military prowess and in the political capacity to join their strength with that of the new socialist state for the war and the peace. Enormous social advance is possible thereby, and for most of the world this advance will be made under the "free enterprise" system.

THERE is no Communist issue.

The issue is not the social-

ization of industry, but the vigorous and united effort of the nation to put through the adopted national policy that means breaking through the prewar limitations of our home and foreign markets. Twice before we have broken through the barriers that obstructed the development of our forces of production. The first was the colonial subjection of England, broken by the American Revolution. The second was the system of Negro slavery, broken in the 1860's. What we are breaking down now is the extremely severe restriction of the world and home markets that has for 50 years threatened to strangle our production and did so with most deadly effect in 1929.

The issue is not the socialization of industry but the foreign and domestic policies for the expansion of our economy in a world situation entirely without precedent, and opening up a future such as President Roosevelt was fully justified in sketching with the words:

"At the end of this war this country will have the greatest material power of any nation in the world.

"It will be a clean, shining America—richer than any other in skilled workers, engineers, farmers, business men, scientists.

"It will be an America in which there is a genuine partnership between the farmer and the worker and the business man—in which there are abundant jobs and an expanding economy of peace."

IT is for this, and not for Communism, that the majority of the American people, including those in the armed forces, would like to vote today.

It is against this, and not against Communism, that the Dewey campaign is directed—and it is this that will fall with a crash if the new "Ohio gang" succeeds today.

If the people vote, President Roosevelt will be elected.

If the people do not flood to the polls, the course of history will change, and there is no one in the world who is saying more ardently today than Adolf Hitler that "it is time for a change."

Worth Repeating

The TORONTO, CANADA, STAR, in its Nov. 1 issue: "Russia's position all along has been that a country which uses its neutrality in favor of the enemy cannot be dealt with as a friendly nation. . . . For all practical purposes, Spain is no less an enemy than if her armed troops were firing on ours. In this view Russia is being consistent."