

LFP/030p204/14

"BROWDERISM"

"BROWDERISM"

FOREWORD.

In this essay I have not dealt with the American Party System or Browder's mysterious conclusion that it necessitates the C.P. dropping the word "party" from its title. Nor do I understand why Communists must freely join the Republicans or Democrats not as parties but on "issues" merely, and so possibly cancel each other out. Unfortunately Browder offers us no analysis of the respective class-forces behind the Republicans and Democrats - which it is necessary to know, since real parties do not spring into existence without a basic interest as a cohesive force. He leaves the parties as unanalysed and permanent facts.

Ever since Roosevelt's new deal commenced I should have thought it clear that the Democrats predominantly represented Finance Capital, and the Republicans Industrial and Petty Capital; that Roosevelt's progressive features arose out of the antagonism to, and this desire to straight-jacket, Industrial Capital in order to render more secure its regular tribute to Finance and its dependence upon Wall-street.

That in this process, with its appearances of "socialism" Finance Capital can make a strong appeal to the workers has been painfully illustrated in Hitler's Germany. But Finance Capital is in this international conflict fighting upon the progressive side in Britain and America. It can, therefore, claim and must have the workers support. But this is a

support / ...

support directed to both the war and the peace that requires the maximum of vigilant alertness, the maximum of clarity. The Government requires "prodding" whether it is liked or not; and the workers require theory whether it immediately "catches on" or not.

To this end a theoretical examination of this Browder line is most important. It is necessary for all workers to see and support the war in its correlation to the class-struggle.

GEORGE FINDLAY.

APRIL, 1944.

D.C. 852 - 3/5/44.

B R O W D E R I S M.

A "Leader" becomes a "Sympathiser"

A treatment, a full analysis, of the subject of Browderism is long overdue.

At the Johannesburg Conference of the Communist Party in January 1944, Earl Browder's proposal to turn the Party from an organ of struggle into an association to disseminate political education had only just been reported in the capitalist press. The Conference, while satisfied that no such line was to be contemplated in South Africa, felt itself unable to consider the matter in the absence of more detailed and reliable information.

We now know that the December reports were fairly correct and we have the full text of Browder's New York speech in explanation of his line.

(10th. Jan. 1944) We also have quite a good deal of cautious and hesitant comment from British Communist leaders.

In the February "Labour Monthly" Palme Dutt appears to be in much the same position as we

were / ...

were at the Johannesburg Conference. He is emphatic that such a line is out of the question in Britain. But he tries to "understand" the American leader and tries to find reasons to declare that his line is a "ruthless drawing of the practical conclusions for the path of advance". Frank Pitcairn in the same journal goes further and welcomes the New York speech as a "breath of fresh air". In neither case is a real analysis of the Browder line attempted by these busy British Communists, engaged as they are in more momentous affairs, but the time is now past for any respectful salaams to the American leader.

In fact the tendency in Browder's line is nothing new. Even in his pre-war speeches there are little turns of phrase that indicate what is going on in his mind. But it is after his imprisonment that this attitude begins to take definite shape.

Some months after Pearl Harbour, on the 16th. May 1942, Browder was released from the penitentiary by Roosevelt "unconditionally" and, as he says, "in the interests of national unity".

On July 2nd. at Madison Square Garden, New York, he declared that the Party would "subordinate every issue to this one imperative necessity of National Unity under the Nation's Commander-in-Chief to win the war at the earliest possible moment." He explained that this included among other things, "our proposal for socialism in our country" which would not be brought forward in any way that could disrupt national unity for the war effort. We have still to learn that "our proposals

for / ...

for socialism", scientifically applied to historical and concrete developments are in any way directed at this juncture and in a progressive war to the undermining of National Unity.

Unscientific and misguided socialism might take that line, but Browder thinks the circumstances call for a promise - that we shall never undermine National Unity, even after the war. In fact we, petty individuals, must by promises and affirmations make the supreme sacrifice - We must call off the class-struggle.

It is many years since Browder last referred in Marxist terms to the Class Struggle, as a phenomenon of the Capitalist System. Instead he talks vaguely about "various groups" and sections of the population and he treats the War as an act of wickedness brought about causelessly by the gangsters of Europe.

There are however two ideas involved in the Madison Square declaration:-

(a) That it is unstrategic to talk about Class-Struggle at such a time when we are engaged in a progressive war which in any case is in the interests of the world working-class, and

(b) That the struggle itself can really and truly be called off for good and all, both now and after the war.

To the Marxist neither of these theses can stand examination. The Class-Struggle is not an

invented / ...

invented line of conduct but the result of the Class contradiction in the Capitalist system. We cannot surrender it - even if we are let out of prison unconditionally. Individually we can only promise not to lead and direct it, - if we are disposed to take that line. On the other hand if the workers are to support a progressive war what is more important than that they should understand how this international issue lines up with their own true class-interests ? They may act from Patriotic motives, but it is also profoundly important that they should see and feel that the interests of their class are being served in this war on the anti-fascist side, and that the war has become their war. They should realise that although our capitalists are conducting the war, capitalist leadership is not in it for purely capitalist motives but because these motives are involved in insoluble contradictions.

All this is sufficiently obvious, but to Browder talk about the class-struggle is not only "bad publicity"; the struggle itself is really something we should "give up". History, he says, is about to give birth, not to socialism, but to a third thing, an "intermediate form". He says: "The freedom-loving nations, whether capitalist like the U.S.A. or socialist like the Soviet Union, or some intermediate forms that may appear, are pledging themselves to peaceful co-existence and collaboration in the post-war world" (my emphasis). The only "intermediate form" that history has hitherto produced, or that it can produce, is Finance Capitalism with a facade of "Socialism", and that is what we call Fascism.

But this "intermediate form" haunts Browder's mind.

Four months after his release he published "Victory and After" (September 1942) in which he is anxious to stress that the class-struggle has nothing to do with the present war. And again the new compromise-system obtrudes itself: He says - (page 9)

"This war is not "for or against" communism. It is Hitler's propaganda purpose to raise this issue in order to create confusion among his enemies. But that which will be destroyed, if Hitler and his Axis win, is not communism but the right of all nations to determine their own destiny, including that of the United States - it will be all civilization that falls. When Hitler and his thugs are crushed, it will not be Communism that wins, but the right of every nation to determine for itself whether it shall be capitalist or communist or socialist or something else not yet labelled - it will be democracy that has won."

The notion that a state can vote itself "Communist" without an intervening Socialist phase is surprising enough to anyone who knows the difference between Socialism and Communism, but it is this new "unlabelled" kind of social system that interests one in the mouth of a Communist leader. Feudalism gave way to Capitalism not by reason of any democratic or even plutocratic process of selection. It came about because Capitalism was developed in the womb of Feudalism. So surely too Socialist forms develop and nothing else can be born from Capitalism. But Browder seems to resist this inevitable change. To preserve its own existence America must collaborate with Socialism in the post-war world. Their respective "ideological difficulties" he says "must be frankly faced to be overcome." No doubt both systems

after / ...

after the necessary "ideological" adaptation will turn into this new unlabelled something.

"Victory and After" admirably leads up to his December proposals to turn the Party into an organisation for propaganda merely and to the "reasoning", if we can call it that, of his New York speech of January 10th., 1944.

Here again the idea of a new and adapted form of Society puts out its head.

"While we cannot invent programmes, it is possible to begin to examine the approach to a common path of dealing with economic problems, on the basis of the unity of the different classes". Note his phraseology. He doesn't say "Class-collaboration is desirable and possible" but he says it is possible to begin to examine the approach to this unMarxist millenium. The programme of class-collaboration has been so frequently condemned in the Marxist classics that Browder feels the need to approach it with all this gingerly and cautious circumlocution.

Of course the first point about this programme of his is that it must be "good publicity", just as was the case with Hitler's National Socialism. This is how he proceeds:

"Such an economic programme must be designed to win the maximum of agreement, and to arouse the minimum of opposition, from at least the two most decisive groups: first, the business men, the industrial and financial capitalists and their managers, who have effective direction of the nation's economy; and second, the working-class, organised labour and farmers."

It / ...

It is a pity he has declined to "invent a programme," but if the basic interests of the two classes are in direct contradiction - as we remember from our reading of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin - then it would be interesting to see what the "maximum of agreement" will amount to as between a class that directs the nation's economy and a class that does not! Under such circumstances perhaps no greater inter-class unity can be achieved than is the case in Hitler's Germany. It is difficult to imagine that the American Secretary does not know all this.

Browder however discovers not an insoluble real conflict of interest but that there is a "common idea" shared by both classes. How strong "ideas" have become for this ex-Materialist! That common idea is to be the basis of our post-war class-collaboration. Again Browder's phraseology deserves examination:

"One common idea seems to have crystallised in both these two main groups and this is the impossibility that our nation be permitted, when the war ends, to plunge into a new economic crisis" (my emphasis).

The age-old notion that crisis is avoidable, and is either "permitted" or "not permitted" under capitalism is here slyly introduced as a truth the two classes have just stumbled upon - a new thought that they are beginning to "crystallise."

"Not even the most reactionary capitalist organisations" he says "are willing nowadays to subscribe to the dismal prediction of the

American/...

American Academy of Political and Social Science in its annals of March 1942 which described the post-war economic situation as it saw it then in these words: 'The national income will drop almost overnight to one-third, or one-half of its pre-war peak there will be corresponding unemployment any plan that fails to accept these facts is unrealistic and futile.'

What does Browder mean when he says "not even" the most reactionary capitalists believe in the return of crisis? Does he expect the reactionary capitalists to be the main upholders of the doctrine of ever deepening and, finally, permanent crisis? Surely these are the very people who always deny that doctrine, who try to argue crises away, who contend that they are accidental and can be avoided. They do this because they dare not think otherwise. For them to admit that doctrine would be to admit the basic rottenness of the capitalist system.

The people who make the "dismal prediction" are not and never were capitalists; they are Marxists. And they do not make their predictions as a matter of choice or propaganda but as scientific foreknowledge based on the law of motion of the Capitalist system. And even the American Academy, a body for statistical and not analytic observation, senses that they have got the correct line on the facts.

Browder here not only sweeps Marx, Lenin, Varga and all others that understand the nature of crisis into the wastepaper basket; he puts out the deliberately false suggestion that this is a doctrine of "reactionaries" in order to

intimidate / ...

intimidate his own Marxist following. "If you say that **sort of thing**" he impliedly threatens "you will be worse than even the most reactionary capitalists." By these dishonest means he prepares his audience to accept the thesis that crisis is avoidable, and that upon the authority of not only the advanced but even the most reactionary capitalists.

The modern technical development in productive processes has shown in America something of its tremendous power. It has been able to do so under Capitalism under the immense stimulus of a war-boom and on condition that the products must be immediately destroyed. Such a boom, such a heave in production, always persuades the bourgeoisie that crises are for ever past and done with. It is this war-boom in production that has hypnotised Browder and shaken his faith in Marxism - for it could only have been "faith", not knowledge, if it is so readily abandoned. This is how he continues:

"Now on the contrary on all sides there is general agreement that the marvellous expansion of American production to meet the war needs has proved beyond question that there is no valid reason why the same economy, including agriculture, should not produce for peace-time needs at approximately the same level, and that no plans worth considering can proceed from any other basis."

He then sets about a ludicrous and infantile description of the way in which the war-demand of 85,000 million dollars per annum must be maintained after the war.

One half of this amount must be a demand created "under our economic system" in "foreign markets". And of course America is to meet that demand. The export of capital upon this lavish scale would no doubt make Wall Street lick its chops. It would be as good as war everlasting. But to the Marxist this is Finance Capitalism in the Imperialist stage with a vengeance ! How disappointed, how outraged Browder would be if any part of the world declined the privilege of servitude to his growing imperialism ! But of course any resistance to this "benevolence" is precisely what we have to stop.

"The Teheran Conference for the first time gave a realistic perspective of the quick organization of such huge foreign markets"... a search of the Teheran announcement of course shows nothing of the sort, but Browder is quick to read an American imperialist solution into it..."Such huge foreign markets are unthinkable except under stable conditions free from international or civil wars of major proportions. Without such foreign markets there is no possibility of finding an economic foundation for National Unity within the United States."

Here we agree with Browder. Under the existing system there is indeed no possibility of "National Unity" without an immense and continued expansion of foreign markets. The American scramble for foreign markets would no doubt get along marvelously without any international opposition - and indeed that programme has a dreadful and realistic basis. But how does all this square with the Teheran declaration against Tyranny and Oppression ? Must we rewrite Lenin's Imperialism when America's "National Unity" is at stake ?

The other half of the war-demand must by some clever juggling be re-created in the home-market. Browder does not himself suggest how this is to be done. As a Marxist he knows it is impossible but his new-found friends are going to help him. For grabbing foreign markets "the government should go no further --- than the capitalists themselves demand in the interests of really getting orders and obtaining payment therefor". In the American homeland "some extraordinary means must be found to double the buying capacity of the domestic market" - what if this extraordinary thing happens to be the one possible solution, Socialism? - But Browder refuses to think along these lines.

"How that shall be done is not suggested at this time. We look forward to practical suggestions from the capitalists, who must find the solution in order to keep their plants operating" (my emphasis) Yet the capitalists are the very people who close the factories and turn the workers out when profits fail. They do not want merely "operating plants".

Browder has made himself clear. Both in foreign and domestic policy capital is to dictate in accordance with its needs. Our job is to see there are no "civil wars of major importance" that may hamper them. Browder refers many times with abhorrence to these "revolutionary upheavals" that must at all costs be avoided. The Teheran allies have agreed "to work together in the war and in the peace that will follow."

This brings us to the heart of Browder's position, for in his reasoning everything hinges today, not on the stage of development reached in the mode of production - of that he says not a word - but on the agreements of Teheran, Cairo and Moscow.

Before we deal with his main thesis, let us first be quite outspoken about this new class-compromise that he envisages. If it is now possible it must always have been a logical possibility. It must have been an inherent possibility in the system, - a capacity to develop by evolution and by persuasion into a mighty organisation of modern production. Under these circumstances there is of course no room for a revolutionary party. And that is what Browder now seems to think. But the position goes further than that. If he is right, then there was never the slightest justification for creating a Communist Party. Why should we ever have aimed at or countenanced revolution if the other thing is possible? For Browder, as for Lenin, it is monstrous that he ever was a communist on these hypotheses.

That Browder even speaks of this immediate but satisfactory solution of the social contradictions is astonishing. If he has read Marx's "Capital" then certainly he has not understood it. And all his previous references to Dialectical Materialism must have been so much parrot-like repetitions. On the other hand one wonders if he is bluffing. If so whom does he hope to deceive? For a Communist to mislead the working-class is inexcusable; that he should hope to mislead the ruling class is grimly improbable. He is indeed a simpleton if he thinks he can do that.

It is more likely that having no thorough grounding in Marxist economics - and there are many indications of this in his writings - he feels himself misled as to world-crises. Marxists have often been premature in assessing stages of development; and in particular in assessing the last world crisis as the final and concluding stage of capitalism, the

permanent / ...

"permanent crisis", they have not been altogether correct. The present war-boom has since still been possible.

Now Browder has in the past taken the phrases of the Marxist authorities very literally. He has not been very happy in applying them to concrete situations. Thus we may read with amazement his statement in the April 1934 Manifesto that: "In every material respect the United States is fully ripe for Socialism". (Communism in the United States p. 18) This was at a time when far from ceasing to govern, the government was beginning to take the situation in hand and the New Deal, which he then denounced but now praises, was beginning to operate. Obviously he was banking on the "permanent crisis", but the system survived it and recovered. To-day his faith is shaken, for he merely knew the outlines but had not the logic of the theory in his mind. So he regards it as proved that with a little frank conversation, with a little help from financiers and their managers, and a few international declarations we can get round the temporary vices of the system. We can solve crises and forget about the class-struggle.

We may return to his thesis on the crucial importance of Teheran. In opening his New York speech he says:

"Fellow Americans! Any realistic dealing with the national and world problems today must begin and end with an evaluation of the agreements of Teheran, Cairo and Moscow. The answer to all other questions will depend, in the final analysis, upon the judgment made at Teheran."

We/...

We may draw attention in passing to the way in which Browder nowadays puts national problems before world problems. It is not an accident of phrase for he constantly gives priority to the American national preservation. As Robert Minor stresses, Browder's "patriotism" is not to be questioned. (p. 23. "Victory and After.")

It is interesting however that he treats Teheran as such a turning point for the purposes of his argument. In "Victory and After" only a few months earlier he was hanging all the same arguments, all the same consequences, on the Atlantic Charter and the speeches of Wallace and Welles of the 8th. and 30th. May 1942 (See Chap. 1.) However now it is all Teheran and we must consider his main thesis in that setting. There is after all this difference in Teheran, that Stalin was party to it.

Before Teheran, he says, there were two questions: Was it possible for the Capitalist democracies and the Socialist state to bring their "full combined power to bear against the enemy, Nazi Germany, in full coalition warfare?" Or, would this coalition, before it completed its task, fly apart and "open a new period of revolutionary upheavals and international war?" Both these questions he says have now been adequately answered by Teheran.

Now Teheran is indeed a great diplomatic achievement of the Soviet Union, and so too is the enforced recognition by Churchill of Marshall Tito in the Balkans for that matter. We shall say no word to diminish the greatness of any such achievement. Let us remember Lenin's warning in 1917 when he said that International Capitalism, with all the might

of / ...

of its capital and its highly organised military technique, could "under no circumstances, under no possible conditions, live side by side with the Soviet Republic ... a conflict is inevitable". These words have been proved in history. They have been demonstrated by the appeased Germany in its attack on the Soviet Union. On the other hand they also serve as a warning for the future and as an indication of the greatness of the Teheran achievement from a diplomatic point of view. To every communist this agreement must be the subject of joy and mutual congratulation. It means that the capitalist democracies are in honour bound to admit the Soviet to the peace-tables and to the adjustment of every important international issue in the near future. On every occasion the voice of the world working-class will thus be heard in international Councils. It has also other political bearings of wide immediate importance. This is the typical achievement of a country under the leadership of a Marxist party which has not been disbanded - a Party which will approach its problems with practical realism and on the scientific principles of social development. That is the immense importance of Teheran.

We have however to examine the importance that Browder attaches to Teheran, as well as the inferences he draws from it.

As we have already indicated, he places great emphasis on the Teheran undertakings :

" to work together in the war and in the peace that will follow."

From this premise he moves to the conclusion

that /

that just as we must not "raise the issue of socialism" during the war, so also we must not raise it in the peace that is to follow. Therefore the Party must turn into a new kind of organisation.

The sequence of thought by which he passes from the Teheran sentence to this conclusion is hardly set out with Bolshevik clarity and he leaves much to guess work, but his argument appears to be this:

You cannot expect the capitalist democracies to put their back into the war if it is to be followed immediately by a lot of revolutionary upheavals directed against the capitalist regime. Therefore "both phases of the declaration must be taken with equal seriousness. We cannot accept one and reject the other." The prospect of revolution in other countries will threaten "international unity", that is, the collaboration of Britain, America and the Soviet; and the prospect of internal revolution in America will destroy "national unity" in that country, which is essential for winning the war. The winning of the war, our immediate or short term policy, is so terribly important, that as realists we must genuinely and truly renounce any long-term policy of socialism, for merely even to entertain that objective will be fatal. It will lead to international anarchy, to "chaos"; the war against Fascism will not be fully concluded when the participants will fall asunder and after revolution and civil wars pass into another World War. Teheran looks to something different. It seeks to achieve a peace of collaboration in

which /

which Socialism, represented strictly by the Soviet Union, is to collaborate with Capitalist Democracy, represented by our countries. We must therefore abandon hopes of Socialism after the war. It is imperative to find the way to the peaceful co-existence and collaboration of Capitalism and Socialism in the same world. In short we must make the continuance of Capitalism possible in the Capitalist democracies. We must modify the class struggle that impairs National Unity and we must change the nature of the Party that directs, or has hitherto sought to direct, that struggle.

This is what Palme Dutt refers to as a "ruthless drawing of the practical conclusions for the path of advance". In fact however it is just middle-headed idealism.

What is wrong with all this reasoning ?

First of all, will the Capitalist democracies fight if there is a smell of revolution in the air ? That is precisely what they will do and habitually do. The internal movement of the people is by time-honoured tactics thrown into an external achievement. The more we sign away our rights to the ruling class, the more legitimately will they disregard our demands both in the external and internal fields.

We must remember the actual power-position of the classes. In the international field the working class has no power of action whatsoever, save of course through the Soviet Union. Elsewhere its power of action is limited to the internal field, and it is exerciseable mostly in a negative sense alone. It cannot act, it can only refuse to act. All its propaganda, all its teaching and its effect to

gain / ...

gain wide support is but collateral to that real material but negative power. It is however that power and that power alone that elicits an appropriate response in the ruling class. By the power of the workers to deal with and oppose the ruling class internally, and by that power alone, can it compel Capitalism to progressive action in the international field.

Give them national unity, yes, but strictly only at the price of progressive international action; and you must retain the only power you have in order to exact that price. The power of action we refer to has its ramifications in all fields, - industrial, political, cultural and so forth. But in the last resort it expresses itself in revolution and that "chaos" of which Browder is so apprehensive.

It is not "unpatriotic" to say that if the government does not fight Fascism with all its might the people will not stand for it. It is not wrong to say that if the government after the war fails to co-operate for peace the people will not stand for it. Nor is it hampering to say that we shall do our best to see to it, that the people make this clear to the government now. On the contrary the serious conduct of this war against Fascism externally requires a strong, clear-headed, disciplined organisation that will lead the working-class to insist upon it; and in the aftermath peaceful collaboration with the Soviet Union as a matter of internal necessity depends upon the same thing. There can be no thought of weakening the Party, of ham-stringing it as a fighting organisation of class leadership. That line is precisely the wrong way to set about realising Teheran.

In a divided world with a Socialist and Capitalist sector the imperialist antagonisms have in the present struggle split up the capitalist sector. The Fascist or more advanced capitalism is being opposed by the democratic or less developed capitalism. With the Socialist sector involved in the world war it is a factor of immense importance that democratic capitalism has perforce been thrown on to the progressive side. It is all-important that the progressive side should win, that Fascism should be ended. We therefore stand four-square behind our capitalist governments. We welcome it when they are pinned to Teheran Conferences. We welcome the fact that the patriotic nationalism of the peoples on the progressive side happens to coincide with the progressive cause. But no amount of flag-wagging will make us put the position higher than that. No amount of undisputed "patriotism" will hypnotise us into imaginary and impossible class-collaboration.

In "Victory and After" Browder cites the speeches of Wallace and Welles extolling the Atlantic Charter and the fact that this is a "peoples war". It is or should be a Peoples War, a progressive war. Yet Browder says: "There are persons who, indulging in an easy and cheap cynicism, sneer at this deepgoing change in the nature of the dominant expressions of policy between 1941 and 1942." He says he believes all the more in their sincerity because the brutal necessities of national survival force them to do what they are doing. Since when, we may ask, has the Marxist knowledge of capitalist contradictions become easy and cheap cynicism? May we no longer see the dilemma, the insoluble contradiction of a decaying system, in which these administrative princes have to change the "dominant expressions" of their policy? Must we abandon this

"cynical" / ...

"cynical" Marxist insight and put our faith in them because of what they say? This is of course the Fuhrer-principle; it is idealism's preparation for the new "intermediate form" of society we know as Fascism.

The Marxist does not put his faith in leaders, not because he is a cheap cynic, but because he recognises in them the conflicting motivation of a class in self-contradiction. Nor does he abandon his theory, his means of foreknowledge, because Earl Browder advocates an allegiance based on faith in personal sincerities.

Browder however strikes not only at the ideological roots of Communism; he logically deals a blow also at its practical organisational form - the Party. When the New Deal started he thought America was all set for a Socialist revolution. Now, when the material contradictions are developing with catastrophic precision, he suddenly says:

"It is my considered judgment that the American people are so ill-prepared subjectively for any deepgoing change in the direction of Socialism that post-war plans with such an aim would not unite the nation."

The Communist long-term programme is not popular; it requires profound insight - but it is an essential guide to a short-term policy, and without it any short-term policy, however popular or unifying it may be, must take a queer course - in fact it can only take one course, back into the camp of reaction. And that is Browder's line.

This teaching academy of Browder's, this new organisation of Political Enlightenment, is going to teach - what ? Certainly not the class-struggle;

certainly / ...

certainly not the development of capitalist contradictions; certainly not the dictatorship of the proletariat. It must avoid an analysis of Imperialism; it must abandon dialectical materialism - indeed materialism of all sorts until the American people are "subjectively" conditioned for the intermediate form of society - and it must above all avoid any "cynical" Marxist insight that may shake our faith in leaders.

Browder may keep this organisation - if he does he is welcome to it. It will tell people to wait for the bright ideas that come from financiers and their clever managers. Communists will not be further interested in the corpse of a slaughtered organisation even if it is ceremoniously laid upon the Wall Street altar.

No: the Communists of America will either retain or they will re-create a fighting organisation that will propound, even with interim lapses of popularity, the truth of the class-struggle. And they will be politically correct. They will seek by active leadership of the masses to pin their capitalists to a progressive international course as long and as hard as they can. They will advocate national unity only so long as it serves the interest of the world working-class. They will promote the anti-fascist war by strengthening and not by castrating the Party, and if this causes national division they will recognise that they have become a living force and they will still further strengthen the Party. If they fail the struggle will have to go on even so, but if they follow Browder now they are abandoning struggle, they are renouncing success.

Meanwhile Browder's line that the war should be won is a correct one. He is

following / ...

following the Party line but for confused, non-Marxist reasons. His attitude has become that of a "sympathiser" - one who wants the right thing, Victory, but who does not understand why. It is tragic that he should have a say in the organisational form which should be adopted by those who do understand, but these things no doubt must happen when a leader turns into a sympathiser.
