

Capitalism's Crisis—and Mr. Browder's

By Gilbert Green

AT THE OUTSET, this writer wishes to apologize to the readers of *Political Affairs* for the rather considerable delay in the completion of this series of articles begun in the October issue. We are certain, however, that the reader will readily understand that with the removal of physical constraints on our personal liberty and activity, and with our consequent immersion in the daily political struggle, it has been exceedingly difficult to find the time to complete this job.

* * *

In the second article of this series, which appeared in the November issue, we showed how false and mendacious is the claim of the apologist for American imperialism, Earl Browder, that only in the U.S.A. was there a break-up of the war-time national coalition, while elsewhere in the world these coalitions are still intact. We conclusively proved the very opposite—that when confronted with the chemical changes of an entirely new world situation, the various national coalitions dissolved, giving way to qualitatively

new coalitions at varied levels of development and stages of formation, depending on the concrete relationship of class forces in each country.

In this article we shall touch upon the following subjects: 1) Browder's position on whether a third world war can be prevented, and how; 2) Who is responsible for the disunity and internecine warfare in the labor movement? and 3) Why some of the Left-wing labor set-backs?

THE RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

In our previous articles we concentrated on the way in which Browder distorted the facts of history and grossly misrepresented the character of the Second World War in order to "prove" that our Party, by rejecting a policy of coalition with the "intelligent" sections of monopoly capital, is essentially predicating its policies on the "inevitability" of a third world war. Let us therefore give treatment to certain important phases of our Party's analysis of the relationship of forces in the struggle for peace.

Is there any truth in Browder's contention that the position of our Party is essentially based upon the inevitability of a third world war and the victory of domestic fascism? There is not an iota!

Our Party is firmly convinced that American imperialism can be stopped in its drive toward a new world war and fascism, but not by appeasing it, as Browder advocates, not by appealing to its "intelligence"; rather, by creating the kind of movement that can *compel* it to pause, take heed and stop its suicidal course. Anything less than this approach, any illusion about the "progressivism" of U.S. monopoly capital, any attempt at unity with it, can only lead to complete and utter betrayal and disaster—can only help grease the chute to a new world war and domestic fascism.

In answer to this Marxist position of our Party, the renegade Browder quotes Soviet Deputy Prime Minister V. M. Molotov to prove that the Soviet leaders place much stock in bourgeois "intelligence" and depend upon it as a major factor. In his booklet *World Communism and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Browder writes:

It was the Roosevelt type of bourgeois intelligence to which Stalin appealed in 1939 . . . and which Molotov had in mind when he said, on Nov. 6, 1947:

"A sober attitude to the matter shows simultaneously that in our time new imperialistic adventures constitute a dangerous game with the destinies of

capitalism.

"Certain Ministers and Senators may fail to understand that. But if the anti-imperialist and democratic camp consolidates its forces and utilizes its opportunities, it will force the imperialists to be wiser and to conduct themselves more calmly" (p. 37).

Only one who worships at the posterior of American imperialism can read into these remarks of Molotov, what Browder would have us read. What will make the imperialists wiser and calmer, Mr. Browder? Appeasing them? Cajoling them? Humoring them? Unity on the part of the working class with them? Appealing to their intelligence? No! The *only* thing that can accomplish this is the *strength* of the "anti-imperialist and democratic camp," which, if it "consolidates its forces" and "utilizes its opportunities," will be able to "*force* the imperialists to be wiser and to conduct themselves more calmly."

Yes, Mr. Browder, the word used was "force." Not necessarily the kind that Grant used against Lee, but force none the less—namely, the bringing to bear of a superior political strength sufficient to compel a certain course of action.

And it is entirely possible to achieve this in respect to U.S. imperialism, which finds itself in the quandary of both needing time and yet witnessing the sands of time run against it. *Its dilemma arises from the very fact that the world camp of*

peace and democracy is already stronger than the camp headed by U.S. imperialism and is bound to become still stronger.

U.S. capital needs time because, even though its military strength does now correspond to its economic development, as distinct from the situation a decade ago, this is insufficient to win a war against the Soviet Union and the world democratic camp. One reason for this is that U.S. imperialism cannot hope successfully to wage war upon the Soviet Union except through the territories of other European and Asiatic nations. For this it requires, not only willing imperialist allies and slobbering Social-Democratic lackeys, but these must be able to guarantee docile working classes. However, this is not so simple to bring about when the great bulk of the working class in such countries as France and Italy is united under Communist leadership. This is quite different from the situation that obtained in pre-Nazi Germany, where the working class was split and its main industrial section headed (be-headed) by Social-Democracy. And that is why the American bourgeoisie is paying such loving attention to the so-called European "third force"; for it realizes how important to it is the achievement of a split working class. Any attempt to impose fascism upon France and Italy, or to involve these countries in an anti-Soviet war,

could only mean civil war, and the ruling classes of these countries know it. That is one of the reasons why U.S. foreign policy depends so much upon a rebuilding of a reactionary Germany as a general counter-revolutionary and anti-Soviet economic, political and military base of operations in Europe. That is also why the traitor Tito plays so large a part in their plans, and why Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey are considered the Balkan military and political bridgeheads of U.S. imperialism.

The nature of the quandary facing U.S. imperialism can best be seen in respect to the two major *irrevocable* defeats suffered by it in the past year—China and the atom bomb. Both of these defeats make the imperialists more frantic, more rabid, more desperate, and yet at the same time narrow down their base of operations, lower their world prestige, weaken their military-strategic positions, and thereby also *force* some of them, at least, to "conduct themselves more calmly." Certainly in respect to China one can see both of these tendencies in operation at the same time—the panic, the desperation, the new H-Bomb diplomacy, and yet at the same time the growing note of realism which admits that the new people's China is here to stay "at least for the time being" and that the U.S. will have to follow the footsteps of British diplomacy and give it recognition.

No, the world situation does not favor U.S. imperialism, and, given a constant strengthening of the mass movement and struggle for peace, will less so tomorrow. For the world camp of peace and democracy will grow in strength and influence. Not only is the mighty Soviet Union reaching new heights of economic and cultural attainment, but the New Democracies of Eastern Europe are daily becoming economically and politically more consolidated and strengthened. Throughout the world the overwhelming majority of the people fear a new war and crave for peace. Even many of those in this country and elsewhere who have heretofore supported the bipartisan foreign policy are today giving it a second look; for they realize that with the atom-bomb monopoly gone (it always was only a figment of their imagination), so also is gone the illusion that American imperialism can bludgeon or intimidate the Soviet Union and the rest of the world into Truman's peace (!) objective of "unconditional surrender." Nor can this illusion be so easily resurrected by its being wedded to another—the promised H-bomb monopoly.

At the same time, U.S. capitalism is now entering a period of sharpened inner (class) and outer (world) contradictions. With the postwar "boom" over, we are beginning to witness a vast sharpening of all class antagonisms; for the monopolists are

striving to maintain both their exorbitant volume and rate of profit by seeking a rapid increase in super-profits from investments abroad, and by drastically increasing the rate of exploitation of the working class here at home, especially of the Negro people. This is *inevitably* leading to sharper class battles and to new attempts on the part of the monopolists to break the backbone of organized labor. The first attempts in this direction we are now witnessing in respect to the mine workers and the Left- and progressive-led unions.

Thus, while the economic crisis and the intensification of the class struggle will accelerate the danger of war and fascism as the "way out" for the bourgeoisie, these will, on the other hand, greatly diminish the prestige of American capitalism in the eyes of the masses, weaken the economic foundation for the postwar illusions about American "exceptionalism," draw vast new millions into the arena of militant class struggle, and thereby create also the conditions favorable for the defeat of the forces of war and fascism.

Furthermore, as the postwar economic crisis looms ever closer and in more menacing proportions, this leads to a sharpening of the inter-imperialist contradictions. It especially leads to an ever sharper intensification of the contradictions between the colonial peoples and imperialism.

The crisis of overproduction that

is developing throughout the capitalist world is inevitably leading to a sharpened imperialist struggle for world markets. At the same time, the growing economic problems faced by the American bourgeoisie, accentuated by the failure of the Marshall Plan, are leading it to exert a greater and greater pressure upon its imperialist satellites in Britain, France, Italy, etc., to "put their houses in order." By this is meant, the adoption of sterner measures against the working class and the living standards of the people in the "home" countries and especially in the colonies, and the reduction of their own share of the profit booty—guaranteeing the lion's portion for Wall Street. This can only lead to mounting friction within the imperialist camp and to a sharpening of the class contradictions in each capitalist country.

The growing economic difficulties will also tend to increase the differences within the ranks of the American bourgeoisie. Even in the ranks of big capital, differences over policies will assert themselves more frequently and with greater intensity, although these differences over policy will not be over the basic strategic objective of world domination, but only over the *best tactics* by which to achieve this. Thus, while the working class must make use of these differences, it must avoid reading into them the basis for an alliance.

How futile and false it is to read the possibility à la Browder for a class alliance with one or another section of monopoly capital, can best be seen in respect to that monopoly grouping which has opposed the Marshall Plan in the course of the recent past and which is even more strongly opposed to it today. If one were to follow the Browder line of reasoning, then this certainly must be the "intelligent" section of monopoly capital, for it has from the very outset prophesied the failure of the Marshall Plan. And yet, a closer glance indicates that the grouping of monopoly capital which occupies this position is rabidly anti-Soviet in its foreign policy, and violently anti-labor and pro-fascist in its domestic orientation—its ideological high priest being none other than Col. McCormick of the *Chicago Tribune*! Need anything more be said about the futility and criminality of seeking for an alliance with one or another section of finance capital?

FOR A BROAD ANTI-MONOPOLY, ANTI-WAR COALITION

From all of the above, it can be seen that American imperialism may be a mighty giant, but with feet of clay. This, however, does not mean that it can *automatically* be stopped from plunging the world into war and this country into fascism. Even though its dreams of complete world domination are like a madman's hal-

lucinations, its "intelligence" cannot be counted upon to keep it from attempting this insane venture. There is only one way that this can be done: the world peace camp must be powerful enough to *bridle* the warmakers and to *prevent* their breaking loose. Anything less than that will make a new war inevitable.

We do not underestimate the difficulties, but we do know that it is possible to weld together the kind of coalition which, together with the peace forces of the world, can prevent a third world war and domestic fascism. Such a coalition cannot of course spring forth ready-made like Minerva from the brow of Jupiter. It can arise only out of struggle, out of the *postwar* experiences of the masses of people and first of all the working class, and as a result of the patient, painstaking work of our Party among the people, guiding their struggles, helping them to draw the necessary lessons from *their own experiences*, and in every other way playing the role of a vanguard party.

When Browder accuses our Party of having no perspective short of Socialism and of believing that "there is no practical, effective obstacle to the march of American imperialism toward world conquest except the 'final conflict,' the proletarian socialist revolution in America" (*Where Do We Go From Here*, p. 11), he only means that he, Browder, has no perspective except that of holding on to the petticoat of American im-

perialism. For Browder it is either unity with monopoly capital, or the abyss.

On our part, we adopt the opposite point of view. We say that the reality of the postwar period is such that there can be no unity with monopoly capital, in fact, the unity which we strive to achieve is in the first place directed *against* monopoly capital. For the objective of the coalition must be to prevent a new war and fascism, and it is U.S. monopoly capital which stands as the deadly foe of this objective.

This does not mean that we are thinking of a narrow, restricted coalition. We are thinking in the first place, of course, of the united front of the working class, and of its alliance with its most important allies, the Negro people and the poor farmers. But we are also thinking of a much broader alliance inclusive of the middle farmers, the small businessmen and professional people, and *all* social strata, including non-monopoly capitalist elements, who have an interest in preserving peace, maintaining and extending democratic rights and raising living standards. This means that the broad coalition will undoubtedly include many forces that disagree with, and are even hostile to our Socialist objectives, that are strong believers in capitalism, but that are nonetheless ready to unite *with* the Communists in joint struggle to prevent war and fascism.

THE IMPERATIVE NEED FOR WORKING-CLASS UNITY

Point number one in the approach to our present-day coalition policies is the struggle for the unity of the working class. For without this it is impossible to create the broader coalition. This is so because the very anti-monopoly character of the coalition means that there is only one class, the working class, which—due to its role in production—can play a consistently progressive role and can become a magnet attracting the intermediary classes—those which vacillate between the two main classes of society. Without this decisive role played by the working class, the broader progressive coalition cannot be firmly welded together, and all attempts to do so will only prove abortive.

It is precisely the past inability of the American working class to take the bit in its own teeth, and to head in a direction independent of the bourgeoisie, that explains the petering out of the great popular anti-trust movements that developed in this country during the past half century. These in the main were petty-bourgeois radical movements; without the working class playing the role of catalytic agent, they were doomed to failure in their attempts either to change the character of, or to break up, the two-party system in this country (*i.e.*, monopoly capital's monopoly over politics).

Browder has written much of late about the importance of "labor unity." He has even become its "defender," accusing the Party of being responsible for the lack of labor unity. But the labor unity that Browder advocates is the same kind of "unity" that William Green, Philip Murray, or Harry Truman advocates. This is a "labor unity" based upon class-collaboration policies and leadership, which only means the "unity" of the lion and the lamb—the "unity" of abject surrender to the bourgeoisie. Likewise, when Browder speaks of the political role of the labor movement and its "political action," he also means no more nor less than what a Keenan of the A. F. of L., a Kroll of the C.I.O., or any bourgeois politician means—namely, class collaboration in the political field, as against the *independent* (of monopoly capital) political action of the working class. Thus, Browder is capable only of visualizing the working class as playing the role of the anvil, and never that of the hammer.

This point of view Browder has spelled out for us in a number of his writings of the recent past, especially his pamphlets *Where Do We Go From Here*, and *Labor and Socialism in America*. In these pamphlets he literally licks his chops in wishful anticipation of "the collapse of a great Left-wing labor movement" and heatedly denies that there is any objective cause for the sharpened struggle over policy in the labor movement.

For him, the recent postwar setbacks and difficulties in the labor movement stem, not from any change in objective conditions, but from a single subjective factor, the removal of one, Earl Browder, from the Communist ranks. Until that time (July 1945), everything, according to Browder, was just going along fine, the Communists "for a whole historical period . . . put their mark upon" the labor movement and "set the general tone, character and direction for the whole labor movement" (*Labor and Socialism in America*, p. 38). But then, all this was thrown to the winds. And why? It can all be summed up in the fact that the working class had removed its own "intelligent" ("creative Marxist") leader (Browder), after death had removed the bourgeoisie's intelligent leader (Roosevelt). Modest man!

Browder says that the Murray leadership in the C.I.O. bears no responsibility whatsoever for the Right-Left struggle and for the C.I.O. leadership's violent and rabid Red-baiting and anti-Sovietism. He insists, on the contrary, that "Murray resisted stubbornly all the pressure brought against him from clerical circles to break his cooperative relations with the Left wing. When that break came, it was not on the initiative of Murray, but of the Left wing" (!) (*ibid.*, p. 22).

In respect to the intensified drive of clerical Catholic reaction against the Communists, the Soviet Union

and the progressive movement generally, the cause here, too, lay not with the Vatican and the Roman Catholic reactionaries, according to Browder, but with the fact that "anti-Catholicism has again become established in the Left wing," "anti-Catholic slogans and clichés abound in Left-wing discussions, and this is literally driving hundreds of thousands of healthy Catholic workers . . . back into the arms of the reactionary clergy. A vicious circle of religious division within the trade unions has been initiated and the Left wing, instead of breaking this circle, is accelerating its development." And further, "The Left wing has lost much and gained nothing by abandoning the policy of the 'outstretched hand' to the Catholic workers, and its relapse into dogmatic and anti-catholic propaganda" (*ibid.*, p. 33).

All this is a baseless lie—completely fabricated! There is not a single document, speech, pamphlet, or article in Communist literature to warrant this slander. What we have given up is Browder's outstretched hand to the reactionary Catholic hierarchy; we have not given up the outstretched hand to the Catholic masses. How low has this man sunk to become both the apologist and ideologist for Philip Murray and Cardinal Spellman in their struggle against the Communist Party!

But if the warfare inside the C.I.O., and the recent split in its ranks, are all due to the fault of the Commu-

nists in the U.S., what explains the Social-Democratic "third force" split in the trade-union movement of France, and the similar split in Italy? What explains the split in the World Federation of Trade Unions? Are Foster and Dennis also responsible for what happened in the W.F.T.U. and in the French and Italian labor movements?

Furthermore, if the vicious anti-Communist and anti-progressive attacks of Roman Catholic reactionaries in this country are due to Communist "mistakes," how can the renegade Browder explain the Mindszenty case and the recent Vatican decree of excommunication? Are the Communists in Hungary, Poland, France and Italy responsible for this infamous decree?—or, is it rather not the product of the connivings of the Vatican reactionaries with the representatives of the U.S. State Department? Or, would Browder like to have us believe that it was his expulsion from the Communist ranks in the U.S. that also caused the Social-Democratic split in the W.F.T.U. and the wave of anti-Communist hysteria in the Vatican? Who said Browder had delusions of grandeur? He is the very acme of modesty!

Possibly there is another and more basic explanation for these developments than the "great man Browder" theory of history. Possibly the explanation is to be found in the changed world situation, and the new

aggressive role of U.S. capital. Maybe it was the ending of the war that brought about the change in relations within the labor movement, as a reflection of changed class alignments, and not the fact that Browder was given a boot in his political pants. And no matter how this may hurt the vanity of Browder, it is the only real explanation.

Browder calls upon the past to bear evidence to the possibility of harmonious working relations with Philip Murray. We know about this as well as Mr. Browder. But we also know that even in the years of greatest working together, in the years when Communists gave unstintingly of their resources, manpower, mass contacts and organizing skill—without which the workers in the great mass-production industries could not have been organized—men such as Murray never changed their basic class-collaboration views. Nor can we forget that even at the moments of closest cooperation neither Murray nor Lewis, nor Hillman ever permitted Communists or Left-wing workers to enjoy positions of prestige or influence in their own particular unions; in fact, they maintained a strict look-out to behead any Left-progressive that developed an independent position of influence among the workers. And all too frequently, the Communists kept their eyes glued only on that which they held in common with the Murrays (first, organizing the unorganized,

and later, winning the war), while overlooking completely the basically different class outlook, expressed in class-collaboration versus class-struggle policies.

Thus, it can be said that although the reformists, even in their united front with the Communists, always had their guard up, the Communists had it down, forgot their fundamentals, themselves succumbed to class-collaboration practices and thus weakened their own potential strength in the ranks of the workers.

Once the war was over, once the threat from Nazi imperialism had disappeared, so also disappeared the anti-fascist music. Now, Wall Street insisted that the Socialist Soviet Union was the new "foe" and anti-Communism the new tune. And it must be said that the trained labor Fidos danced to it with alacrity. As James Carey blusteringly put it: "In the last war we joined with the Communists to fight the Fascists; in another war we will join the Fascists to fight the Communists." How revealing!

Thus it became impossible to maintain even a modicum of unity with those who were carrying out the war-mongering orders of Wall Street and the State Department within the labor movement. Try as the Communists did to prevent a split in labor's ranks both here and abroad, the Fidos heeded, not the voice of the workers, but that of their imperialist masters.

Hence, there can be no labor unity without a struggle against Social-Democratic, class-collaborationist ideology and leadership. Only to the extent that the rank and file of organized labor are won away from these influences and join hands in united struggle, especially for peace, can labor unity be established, whether or not the Murrays, Careys, Reuthers or Greens desire it. And the very frenzy of the assault of the employers, the government and the Right-wing leadership against the Left-progressive forces, is an indication of two things: (1) the intensity of the war drive; and (2) the lack of confidence these gentlemen have in their own preachments about "continued prosperity," expressed in an animal-like fear at the potential might of the American working class (of whom some fourteen million are now organized) once it sheds its illusions.

These are the real reasons for the attempt to isolate and destroy the Left in the labor movement. The aim is, first of all, to try to "coordinate" the labor movement, to bring it in line for Wall Street's war drive, to smash all militant resistance and make the labor movement subservient to the monopolies. Further, the American bourgeoisie well knows that in the course of the growing and sharpening class struggles, the American working class can take a new leap forward in political consciousness and class unity. This is what it

fears and is intent on preventing. And despite the momentary split in the labor movement, this must be and is our fighting perspective.

In pointing to the similarity of developments (the splits) in France and Italy to those in the United States, there is of course one very great difference. In those other countries there were no expulsions, only splinter departures. That is, the main body of organized labor remained united under Communist and Left leadership. The splits that occurred were of small minorities led by the Social-Democratic "third force," leaving the main body of the organized working class.

In the United States, unfortunately, the situation is quite different. Here the main force of the organized labor movement is still under reformist leadership and influence, and the split took the form of outright expulsions. The question naturally arises: What explains the difference between the ability of the Communists of France and Italy to emerge from the war with the vast majority of the working class under their leadership, and the much lesser influence and strength of our own party in the ranks of the working class?

The answer to this question must of course include a number of vastly important differences in the objective situation. The relative strength of the bourgeoisie; its continued ability to bribe sections of the workers;

its prestige and influence as a consequence of its war role; the particular historic development of the country and its working class; the level of class consciousness, etc., etc., all play their part.

But if we cannot answer the above question without carefully and concretely weighing all these objective factors, we can, however, answer the question as to why the Communists in this country did not emerge from the war considerably stronger in mass influence and organized strength than they did, especially in the working class and among the Negro people. The *main* reason for this is that our Party left its Marxist rails in matters of policy and liquidated itself as a Communist Party. It became just another anti-fascist organization, extolling the virtues of American "democratic" capitalism, singing paeans of praise to Roosevelt, as if his program was ours, and in every other way trying to blunt the sharp wariness of the masses, who on many questions instinctively adopted a correct, class position.

Thus, as was pointed out in our first article, our Party failed to leave a "class imprint" on the anti-fascist struggle, thereby permitting the bourgeoisie to appear as the unchallenged leader of this struggle in the eyes of the masses. And the logical consequence of this position was expressed in the liquidation of our Party as an independent political party of the working class.

We completely forgot the teachings of Lenin that the bourgeoisie, owing to its class position, is "incapable of undertaking a decisive struggle for democracy," and that if the proletariat is not strong enough to put its "class imprint" on the democratic struggle, the bourgeoisie "will impart to it the character of inconsistency and selfishness," because the "bourgeoisie looks behind, is afraid of democratic progress which threatens to strengthen the proletariat" (*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, pp. 44 and 49).

For this great error, which found its culmination in Browder-revisionism, we are still paying and shall continue to pay. Certainly, had we taken advantage of the favorable conditions of the war to *force* through certain *basic* reforms in behalf of the Negro people, instead of being satisfied with temporary half-measures, we would have greatly enhanced the prestige of our Party and the working class in the eyes of millions of the Negro people and could have made gains in the struggle for Negro rights that could have greatly strengthened the whole camp of democracy in the country.

But we are paying also in that large masses to whom we helped sell the erroneous ideas of class collaboration, of accepting the two-party system, of accepting the Murrys in the labor movement as true progres-

sive labor leaders, must now be unsold on these propositions.

Thus, the root cause for some of the recent setbacks suffered by the Left-progressive forces is to be found, not alone in the united assault of the government, the employers and the labor reformists, nor a number of sectarian tactical errors, but in the opportunism of the Browder period and the carry-over of remnants of this thinking into the present. The advice given by Browder during the war, that a good trade-union leader should resemble a Philadelphia lawyer more than a people's tribune, certainly created a corroding atmosphere; it flung the doors wide open to a class-collaboration outlook and type of leadership. How difficult it has been to overcome the remnants of Browderism can be seen in the present-day, continuing struggle to teach Communist and Left trade-union leaders that their job is not to "service" the workers but to lead them; that their task is not bureaucratically to substitute for the workers, but to draw them most fully into *every* struggle—from the handling of the simplest grievance in the department, to the winning of a contract, from the struggle for Negro rights and for peace, to the struggle for independent working-class political action and Socialist consciousness.

Nor have we, even today, despite the great headway made in this respect in the past few years, complete-

ly eradicated the false notion that trade-union consciousness and class (Socialist) consciousness are identical or that the former *spontaneously* generates the latter. It is this concept, whether in conscious or unconscious form, that still lingers on and that *in practice* tends to negate the leading, vanguard role of our Party among the workers and leads to the glorification of spontaneity and narrow trade-unionism.

During the formative years of the great industrial unions, we tended to lose sight of the fact that trade-union consciousness, even when expressed in the most militant struggles (and the American working class is "no slouch" when it comes to militancy in economic, trade-union battles)—is still only a form of bourgeois ideology, and becomes class consciousness only when the workers recognize, not alone the existence of an economic conflict with their employers, but its *irreconcilability*, its logical extension to the political field and to the revolutionary transformation of society. Had this been borne in mind, we would have consciously fought against the ideology of class collaboration and also fought to infuse the struggle with a growing class consciousness, remembering that to fail to do so, and to fail to build our Party in the ranks of the workers, was only to encourage the spontaneous generation of bourgeois ideology within the working class.

ADDENDUM

Since the above article was written, this writer has had the occasion to read the most recent and most scurrilous product of Browder's pen. In it he once again proposes a "third force" for America. He accuses this writer of denying that there can be anything in between those who believe in Socialism, on the one hand, and those who believe in monopoly reaction, on the other. This, of course, is nothing but sheer Browder distortion. It is quite clear that the overwhelming majority of those who must make up the progressive camp in the United States are not supporters of Socialism. But that does not make them a "third force" any more than it puts them into a third camp. Anyone, whether he be for or against Socialism, who is ready to unite with the Communists in the fight against Wall Street's war program, is part of a *single common front*—the front of peace and democracy. Conversely, anyone, even though he may profess in words to stand for Socialism, as does a Browder or a Tito, but who does all in his power to aid American imperialism, to split the unity of the working class and the peace forces, to attack the Soviet Union or the Communist movement, is also part of a *single common front*—the front of imperialist reaction!

The only thing "new" in this new pamphlet is that Browder is forced

to remove still another portion of his hypocritical mask. The readers of *Political Affairs* will recall how Browder tried to pass himself off as a great "defender" of world Communist strategy and tactics as against those pursued in this country. Well, that's ended. Now Browder sees a "crisis," not only in the American Communist movement, but on a world scale. In fact, he says that "the crisis in the American Party had been only a by-product, an indirect and distorted expression of a much more profound crisis in certain parts of the international Communist movement" (*Modern Resurrections and Miracles*, p. 49), and that the American "crisis" could not be solved "except as a part of the solution of the whole international crisis which continues" (p. 50).

Where is this "international crisis" which "continues"? It doesn't take much to figure that one out. After all, has not Browder been exposed and expelled from the Communist ranks? And is this not sufficient—according to Browder—to cause a "whole international crisis" in and

by itself? Alas, the Tito fifth column was also cleansed from the Communist world movement; and is this not another symptom of this "crisis"?

What difference does it make if the Chinese people have won their great world-shaking victory? What difference does it make if one-third of world mankind are now part of the Socialist world and no longer a part of the imperialist one? What difference does it make if a great world camp for peace has now been established directed against Wall Street aggression; or that the working classes of France and Italy are under Communist leadership; or, that the colonial peoples are "storming the heavens" in a great anti-imperialist upsurge?

Are not all these symptoms of "crisis"?—in the eyes of Browder. Yes, indeed, Mr. Browder, they are symptoms of real crisis—but not of the world Communist movement, only of the world capitalist system. And this very real crisis creates a crisis also for the Browders and for all other imperialist lackeys and traitors to the working class!