

The Proposed C. P. Changes

By Robert Minor

"I. Isn't it highly important, as you have been ceaselessly preaching, to discuss winning the war at present, and not far-off post-war problems about national income and what certain groups of capitalists may or may not do? Aren't we letting the low-the-war elements get out of their burrows and snipe at Moscow-Cairo-Tehran too fast and too far while we consider distant futures not yet even born?—(This is the first of seven questions asked by "One Who Thought Communists Marched Breast Forward.")"

The subject that Mr. "One-Who-Thought - Communists - Marched - Breast - Forward" is scolding us for discussing, is the Tehran Agreement. The Tehran Agreement is not a "far-off post-war problem."

Answers to Questions

There is not the slightest doubt that the Tehran Agreement looks further into the future, and plans the future more boldly and drastically than has ever been done before. But it is nevertheless not a "post-war" matter at all—in the sense of skipping over the war into imaginary solutions based upon thinking up what would be the nicest kind of a world, or country, "if." Even in opening up a perspective far into the future "for many generations," the Tehran Agreement does not become a "post-war" matter in the sense of diverting attention and action from the war to some preoccupation separable from the prosecution of the war.

Why did we stubbornly reject all preoccupations with "post-war problems"? Because they were departures into unreality—they were a desertion of the reality of military struggle and of the reality of the consequences of military struggle.

Looking ahead, in itself, is not the same thing as playing with unrealities while, in the real world, we are destroyed. Looking ahead is the first mark of understanding of reality. But if one looks ahead, one must look at what is becoming real. And one must stand upon present reality to do that.

Nor is it a question of whether it is a long or a short-time perspective. Browder spoke sharply about Yugoslavia two years in advance of the present situation, and his public actions in regard to Yugoslavia can be seen to have had a powerful effect on the present-day situation, and will have further effects also in respect to Italy and Greece. And nine years ago, at the time of Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia, we, the Communists, worked for a coalition of the United States, Great Britain, the French Republic and the Soviet Union to form an iron ring around the aggressors to prevent war or to defeat the fascists in war if it came to war.

That might well be called anticipating events. But it was based

upon a sound knowledge of an existing reality and of forces of further development of history. It was not what we called a "blueprint of the future."

It seems that some of our blueprint specialists now want to tear up the Tehran agreement as a blueprint.

We are asked not to discuss "what certain groups of capitalists will or will not do." Will do about what? Of course, what they will do about the agreement the President of the greatest of capitalist nations made to "work together [with the other two of the most powerful states in the world] in war and in the peace to follow."

But "what certain groups of capitalists will do" about Tehran, and what all groups of capitalists, and what all groups of all classes will do about Tehran—is the question of whether Tehran will be supported by the national unity of this country.

Mr. "One-Who" is evidently sniping at Tehran "from a burrow."

About national income. The other day we said storks don't bring babies. Now we say the same thing in another form: That responsible men do not make agreements between nations that disregard the economic foundations of society. The commonest falling of minds influenced by political quackery is that of separating politics from economics. The thoughtless assumption is that when nations pledge themselves to "work together . . . in the peace that will follow" the war, to "make it an enduring peace," and to "banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations"—there is not necessarily any question of economies involved. And if we are induced to omit economic "working together" in "the peace that will follow," and to forget the necessity of enduring economic relations in the "enduring peace"—on the

ground that we can do nothing about economics—what would this mean? It would be to surrender to the only other thesis, which is Hitler's. Hitler's claim that the coalition of capitalist states with the socialist state can do nothing about economics, and therefore that an unprecedented "social collapse" will follow the victory of the Allied coalition.

Communists do not operate with politics of peace and war from which economics have been subtracted. We know that politics is "concentrated economics."

Mr. "One-Who" lives in such an unreal world that he fails to notice that the production figures given by Browder are taken from no field of imagination, but from the statistics of production already achieved, the sum of \$85,000,000,000 being nothing else than the level of war production, and the \$135,000,000,000 to \$150,000,000,000 a cold estimate made by a large capitalist institution, based upon statistics of the rise in the productivity of our industrial plant by the men who run those plants. Where is the fantasy? Utopian nonsense is expressed by those who play with notions that the capitalist class and capitalist states will do nothing to avoid a collapsed world market and 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 unemployed.

The hard-headed reality was expressed when the leader of American Marxism said "there was operative in Tehran a motive for agreement for the post war period equally as forceful as the motive for agreement on the joint war."

In tomorrow's DAILY WORKER we will answer the second of the seven questions propounded by Mr. "One-Who-Thought - Communists - Marched - Breast-Forward." It is: Whether capitalism can plan, and whether we can "assure it can and will plan after this war."

Letters From Our Readers

On the Soldier Vote

Crawford, Nebr.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have written to Senator Butler of Nebraska as follows:

Dear Mr. Butler:

It is my studied opinion that the Nation stands united for the Lucas-Green federal ballot bill.

If the men and women who are in the armed forces and auxiliaries are not granted this vital and democratic right now, for their use in the coming elections, the sinister elements of national disunity will have won the day. Such an outcome would be a dastardly stab in the back to the very men and women who are giving their all that this country shall remain free.

Millions of our people are closely watching just exactly what the congress will do in granting or withholding this democratic right. Speaking frankly, political suicide will be

the eventual destination of those who, by their actions in the Congress, refuse to grant it.

H. E. KEAS

A Plea for a Needed Agency

Brooklyn, N. Y.

Editor, Daily Worker:

I have just been told that the "Army Emergency Relief Headquarters" is to be closed.

I can't tell you what a tragedy that would be. There is really no other organization which has done so much for the families of our soldiers in the armed forces. They have extended temporary financial aid to needy families while waiting for their government allotment. They have given prenatal care and a start in life to new born infants. And many more services.

To stop such an organization in its splendid work would mean untold suffering to countless needy people.

A CITIZEN.