

**The Liquidation of the Comintern**

**Browder Proclaims C. P. To Be Staunch Bulwark Of American Capitalism**

By Liston M. Oak

"The Communist Party is not subversive", Earl Browder informed a Massachusetts State legislative investigating committee on October 1, 1937. "Communists make the defense of our democratic institutions one of the cardinal tenets of our theory and practice.... The Communist Party does not conduct any teaching or activity which is subversive to American Government." And the secretary of the American section of the Communist Internation-

al, founded to overthrow all capitalist states and institutions by force, emphatically disavows the rumor spread by subversive fascists and Trotskyists that the Communist believe in the use of force and violence.

**Black's Defender**

In the same issue of the Daily Worker, "people's champion of liberty, progress, peace and prosperity," which comments editorially upon Browder's statement to Massachusetts investigating committee, also carries eight column headline in 72 point bold cap—"Black Upholds Religious and Racial Freedom in Radio Talk to Nation." No other newspaper in America has so vociferously defended the appointment of Hugh Black, late of the Ku Klux Klan, to the Supreme Court. The Daily Worker is far to the right of the Times, Herald-Tribune, Post, World-Telegram, etc. on this issue. It doesn't even scold Black for his failure to repudiate the Klan and all it stands for. On this as upon almost all other political issues, the C.P. position is identical with that of John L. Lewis and other labor bureaucrats, and with the New Deal Democrats committed to defense of the Roosevelt Administration whatever it may do.

In this same issue of the Daily Worker, of Oct. 2, there are two other editorials. One denounces the "meat trust" and the chain stores for the high cost of steak. Not one word about the curtailing of meat production by the government which led to the shortage giving the meat trust its pretext for a bit of additional profiteering. The other editorial calls for sanctions by the United States Government against Japan. This editorial quotes with disapproval an editorial in the Post declaring that the U. S. must either get out of the Far Eastern war and be strictly neutral, or impose sanctions against Japan and prepare for the inevitable consequences of such war-like measures—armed conflict in defense of the interests of American capitalists in China. The C.P. on the contrary says that collective sanctions is the only way to avert war! The Stalinists on this, the most important issue today, are to the right even of the liberals who recognize that sanctions mean war.

**Stalinists and War**

But the Stalinists in reality also know that sanctions mean war—the secret is that they want war. Considering war inevitable, the Stalinists seek desperately to gain military allies for the USSR against Japan, German and Italy. They call for measures in the name of collective security and peace knowing full well that these measures would precipitate war, but war on terms favorable to the Stalin Government; their fear is that Britain and France may

join the Four-Power Pact or make some other deal with the fascist nations, isolating the Soviet Union.

What further evidence is needed to prove the ideological liquidation of the Comintern, which presages its eventual organizational liquidation? If additional evidence is required it is available.

Lenin is dead. The Comintern which he founded is also a corpse; but it continues to use the name Lenin gave it. The C.I. has long ceased to be revolutionary, to seek the overthrow of capitalism—democratic and fascist. Marx is dead; but the Second International continues to use and to besmirch his name. Both Internationals died of the same dread disease—social-democratic opportunism, social patriotism, reformist illusions, bureaucratic degeneration. When a pseudo-Marxist or Leninist party cease to be revolutionary it gives up its only excuse for instance and is headed toward organizational liquidation, whether the process takes years or decades.

Nothing that has been said by Stalin, Pollit, Thorez or Diaz, so aptly illustrates the ideological bankruptcy of the C.I.T. as the oration delivered by Earl Browder on Sept. 9, 1937, in Boston, hailing the Constitution as an instrument of liberty and democracy and peace which belongs to the American people, not to the capitalistic class; and approving the speech delivered a few hours earlier by Roosevelt.

**Browder the Democrat**

"American democracy, as established by the Constitution... is in danger of being destroyed," proclaimed Browder, "but it is not threatened by the Communists, nor by any vague proletarian dictatorship... I have no hesitation in declaring for the C.P. that with the central thoughts and direction of President Roosevelt's speech, we are in practical agreement; and that, on such questions with which we disagree, these are not questions for immediate and practical solution."

The threat of proletarian revolution and dictatorship is vague indeed, so far as the Stalinists are concerned, not only in U. S. but everywhere. The capitalists need have no fear on this score. Browder's reassurance only echoes assurances given by Stalin repeatedly, and by his flunkies in Spain, in China, and wherever they seek collaboration with the "good" democratic capitalist rulers against the "bad" fascist capitalists, collective (military and economic) action of the "peaceful" powers upholding the status quo, against the warlike aggressive powers seeking re-division of the world. As Browder says, the differences between the Stalinists and their new allies, the "anti-fascist" section of the international capitalist class, are insignificant; "we are in practical agreement..."; "no immediate and practical solution is necessary for our slight differences of

opinion with you such theoretical reservations we may have (an embarrassing hold-over of our Marxist-Leninist tradition) need not prevent a united front on all practical questions such as war, the suppression of subversive elements such as the Trotskyist agents of fascism advocating violent overthrow of our sacred democratic institution. Thus spake Browder.

Roosevelt had promised the American workers a higher standard of living "if only government is intelligent and energetic in giving the right direction to economic life." Yes, echoes Browder, we Communists are with you in supporting a New Deal which will accomplish these purposes; and if the workers can get higher wages, shorter hours, social security, under capitalism, what need is there for the overthrow of capitalism? Obviously none.

Browder did not dare say that Marx and Lenin were mistaken in supposing that capitalism cannot give the masses these things; that wealth is concentrated into fewer and fewer hands; that inner contradictions incapable of peaceful solution bring inevitable crises, as imperialist conflicts bring inevitable war; that capitalism can afford the luxury of democratic forms only in the period of rise and relative growth; that democracy is a sham and a delusion and that the "immediate" aims of the communists (which they disdain to conceal) are the destruction of bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat."

**Marx Out-dated**

But of course the Stalinists consider Marx as outdated as the dodo; Lenin could not foresee the rise of fascism which invalidates everything he taught. The Communist Manifesto from which I quote seems to the "practical, realistic politicians" to be leftist, sectarian, outworn. "Twentieth Century Americanism" and People's Front Communism is revisionism which makes Bernstein a flaming revolutionist—a subversive extremist.

And so Browder declares "the heartiest agreement" with Roosevelt's "central thought", quoted above, promising a higher standard of living, etc. for American workers. "With every group or person which makes this thought the guide in formulating policy, we of the C.P. can find an ever-growing basis for common action," Browder declares, and asks "what prevents this policy from being expressed in government action?" He does not answer: capitalism. No, it is the reactionary section of the capitalist class fighting Roosevelt's New Deal which stands in the way of realizing this earthly capitalist paradise. "Roosevelt answers this question correctly," says the ex-bookkeeper of Kansas City.

The spectre of the "Communist Manifesto" haunts me; what was it that Marx and Engels said on this subject of capitalist reform? "There are certain bourgeois who

**Stalinist Hoodlum Beats Up Socialist at New York Election Campaign Meeting**

The International Stalinist terror begun in Russia against the Soviet masses, continued in Spain through the wanton assassination of Andres Nin and the murder of many Anarcho-Syndicalist workers; carried into Switzerland with the machine-gun murder of Ignace Reiss—is now being carried into the local election campaign where members of the Socialist Left are being unmercifully beaten and terrorized by hired squads of brass-knuckle gorillas sent out by the local G.P.U. of the Communist Party.

Monday evening October 18, the Chelsea and Village branches of our party were holding a campaign rally for our mayoralty candidate, James P. Cannon, on the corner of 14th Street and Seventh Avenue, when a gang of Stalinist hooligans, tired of whooping it up for LaGuardia under the ALP banner, descended on the platform of the Socialist Left in a body, began disrupting

the meeting and when told to keep quiet and go back to their own meeting which was at the diagonally opposite corner, hit out at the comrades selling literature. One of the literature agents, Morris Miller, was hit, evidently with brass knuckles and had to be given medical treatment at St. Vincent's Hospital. The other comrade injured, Ed. Findley, did not need hospital treatment but is nursing a swollen jaw.

The truly despicable character of these terrorists hiding under the "liberal" skirts of the ALP and LaGuardia is shown by the fact that they called a cop and pointed out our comrades to him. If it wasn't for the fact that Miller was bleeding profusely from the chin and that the officer himself doubted the stoolpigeon statement of the Stalinist our comrades would have been arrested—for beating themselves up!

want to redress social grievances—in order to safeguard bourgeois society." Did not Roosevelt repeatedly declare that the purpose of the New Deal was to safeguard capitalist society?

"Apostles of conservative or bourgeois socialism" were frequently denounced by Marx and Engels, later by Lenin and all the Bolsheviks. Bismarckian Socialism, the Gotha Program, German Social Democratic "government socialism," state ownership of public utilities, all reform programs, all working class collaboration with the liberal bourgeoisie in support of such programs, were denounced, ridiculed, and torn to theoretical shreds, by Marx and Lenin. Roosevelt reforms, like the People's Front programs in France and Spain, are the modern equivalent of programs which Marx and Lenin said the proletariat vanguard could not support without betraying the revolution, reforms pointing toward state capitalism.

**Browder Is Patient**

But Browder is wiser; he says: "And we have those who are in a hurry, who are impatient of the processes of constitutional democracies, who want utopia overnight and are not sure that some vague forms of proletarian dictatorship is not the quickest road to it. Both types are equally dangerous."

Kerensky has hailed similar utterances of Stalinists as final justification of his social democratic program; Lenin was such a Utopian, too much in a hurry; impatient of the process of constitutional democracy such as Kerensky established, and replaced it with a dictatorship (not vague); and from this, Kerensky has recently argued, came Stalinism and the defeat of the socialist revolution in Russia.

There will be no danger of revolution, continues Browder, unless progressives such as Roosevelt fail, "if those leaders should prove themselves incapable to produce a far higher standard of living. Only produce constantly that higher standard of living, even show only a consistent and effective fight for it, and all fear of the impatient masses can be laid aside as unreal." "The progressive program is not revolutionary nor communist.... It can all be achieved under capitalism—if the progressive rally to the people for a real battle to achieve it."

If, as Browder declares, a far higher standard of living for the masses can be achieved under capitalism, why is there any need for a revolutionary party? Only to insist that the battle for these

ends shall be "real", he answers, and to hold in check the "impatient" revolutionists—to serve the bourgeoisie as a more efficient police force against subversive elements who want to overthrow capitalism in the only way it can be overthrown.

**A Mercenary for Sale**

"The C.P. repudiates all theories and proposals looking toward a forcible imposition of socialism or any utopia upon the majority of the people... If there should arise in America anything similar to the situation in Spain, where the democratic republic, while repulsing the fascist invasion, was stabbed in the back by the 'uncontrollable extremists'—a minority of the anarchists and the Trotskyist POUM—then we, like our brothers of the Spanish C.P., would be in the forefront of the struggle to suppress such extremists, who are really agents of fascism, and render them harmless."

In plain words, Browder herewith serves notice upon the American capitalist class that the C.P. will gladly play the same role here as was played by Noske, Scheidemann and Ebert in German, by Chiang Kai-shek in China, by the Spanish G.P.U., and by the Russian G.P.U.—to slaughter revolutionists should the need arise. The C.P. has become the party of reaction, the executioner of revolutionary leaders. It pledges itself to be the watch-dog of capitalist democracy, of reformism within the structure of capitalist society.

Not one single word in Browder's speech about the class struggle, about the inevitability of poverty and war and exploitation under capitalism, nor the socialist solution as the only possible solution of the social problems which grow more pressing as capitalism declines. Not one word to show he remembers that in March, 1918, Lenin wrote: "The petty-bourgeois democrats prattle of a united democracy... of a single democratic front and similar nonsense.... Those who have not learned this much even... must be given up as hopeless."

We must give up the Stalin and Browders as hopeless—the C.I. cannot be reformed, "We communists quietly and calmly tell the President that he has nothing to fear from us," says Browder. What did Marx say? "Communists openly declare that their purpose can only be achieved by the forcible overthrow of the whole extant social order. Let the ruling class tremble at the prospect of a communist revolution."