

The Proposed C. P. Changes

By Robert Minor

"Was President Roosevelt's Message to Congress an application of Tehran to the United States?"

No. The interests of the United States are not cut to the measure of the Tehran agreement. The Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, the Hearst press, the New

Answers to Questions

Leader, the Jewish Daily Forward, Norman Thomas' Call, and the newspapers of Germany constantly imply that

there is some kind of international bed of Procrustes on to which the nations are laid out to have themselves cut down to some other measure than their own greatest national interest—a sort of "Stalin" bed.

If anyone thinks I am splitting hairs about this, I refer them to the fact that the fascist lame-duck Senator Bob Reynolds and the magazine, the American Mercury, have only this week made this the subject of their "Goebbels" outburst. They present Tehran exactly as a forcing of a "Russian" policy upon America, an application of Tehran arbitrarily to America, and scoffingly say "there is no excuse for . . . presenting Moscow and Tehran as great and noble achievements in this respect."

The Tehran agreement exists and could have been arrived at only because it is an expression of, and meets the most urgent life-and-death national needs of, our country, the United States.

The fact that it equally conforms to the national interests of our allies in the coalition was necessary before there could be any agreement. This is no more than the fact that the national interests of each of these great signatory powers coincides with the national interests of the others in the field of the

greatest importance to all. This is Hitler's and the Mikado's misfortune.

Therefore President Roosevelt's message to Congress was not an "application of Tehran to the United States," but a business-like announcement to Congress that it has become possible to achieve a great victory for the national interest of the United States by the formation of an alliance through which our country and its allies assure themselves of a military victory in the most dangerous war that has ever been fought, and of an emergence from this greatest crisis not in a state of economic ruin, but with adequate means for a new and long period of full economic activity and international trade for the benefit of all participating nations.

Not the nations are being made to conform to Tehran, but Tehran is made to conform to the needs of the nations. We might quote from the New Testament, the Book of St. Mark:

"The Sabbath is made for men, and not men for the Sabbath."

And if I may be forgiven for that, I will add what seems to me a tremendously important message that I received in the late Summer of 1941 from the General Secretary and foremost leader of the Communist Party, Earl Browder, then a prisoner in a penitentiary at Atlanta:

"We can never propose to a nation any policy that is not in accord with the national interest of the nation."

In 1935, if the democratic collective-peace movement in the United States, Great Britain and France had been stronger, an alliance of these countries together with the Soviet Union, capable of reaching results comparable to the present Tehran situation, could have been realized. The enormous potency of the reactionary propaganda and agitation which dominated the

journalism of Europe and America for these ten years upon the one theme of the "weakness of the Soviet Union" was effective. The power of the Munich orientation, which finally had its seemingly decisive triumph in the selling out of Czechoslovakia in 1939, penetrated into official channels all over the world, in all nations of the world. It was based upon the fable to the effect that any arrangement for collective peace with the Soviet Union would be without advantage to the democratic capitalist countries. Its success made certain the conquest of Europe by Hitler, the plunging of the world into war and the loss of millions of lives.

The great alliance that can preserve world peace for a long period became possible only after what history will call the "Lindbergh lie" was destroyed. The lie was destroyed in the great military actions of the Red Army in defending Moscow and Leningrad, and then in the world-shaking victory at Stalingrad. All of this sacrifice had to go into the making of the possibility of a coalition of the great capitalist democracies with the socialist democracy.

That it was always to the national interest of the United States, Great Britain and France to make such an alliance is now written on the gravestones of thousands of young men.

But the Hitlerites are lying to us desperately, hoping we will believe that Tehran is something to which we have to sacrifice our national interest.

Let's not let them make us think in their terms.

The next questions, to be answered in tomorrow's Daily Worker, will be:

"How can the labor movement function if not as class against class?"

"Does the line of the Party signify giving up the class struggle?"