

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

Communist Party Dishonesty Exposed

By ARNOLD PETERSEN



**Published Online by
Socialist Labor Party of America**

www.slp.org

March 2007

Communist Jesuitism
Communist Party Dishonesty Exposed

By Arnold Petersen

PUBLISHING HISTORY

FIRST PRINTED EDITION December 1938

SECOND PRINTED EDITION ... April 1939

ONLINE EDITION March 2007

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS
P.O. BOX 218
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94042-0218

<http://www.slp.org/nyln.htm>

INTRODUCTION.

Addressing the eighteenth congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union, D.Z. Manuilsky, secretary of the Third International, delivered himself of the following amazing report on the “progress” of the burlesque bolsheviki, *genus Americanus*:

“Considerable progress has been made by the Communist party of the United States of America. *By doing everything possible to assist in shaping the class movement of the proletariat and in its breaking away from the bourgeois parties*, its membership has grown from 20,000 to 90,000.” (Italics mine.)

Aside from the fact that his “crowing is in inverse ratio to the size of the eggs he lays” Manuilsky lies! He lies deliberately and in the most sordid manner, for the manifest purpose of deceiving the Soviet workers. His falsification is all the more contemptible because, as an official of the Third International, he has helped to shape the policy which is diametrically opposed to the one he so brazenly declares is responsible for the growth of the C.P.U.S.A. It is the policy of ingratiation with the bourgeoisie, known as the Trojan horse.

Theoretically the Communists are still devoted to “revolution,” or at least to what they, in their anarchic infantilism, conceive to be “revolution.” Actually, to make themselves acceptable to the liberal bourgeois taste, they have abandoned themselves to an uninhibited orgy of opportunism. Indeed, no

INTRODUCTION

mandate ever issued by the Kremlin was ever received with such giddy approval as the one instructing the American Communist party to “go the whole hog” in playing undisguised capitalist politics.

That they have “gone the whole hog” is ably and conclusively proved by Comrade Arnold Petersen in the essays which follow. The array of evidence is vigorously presented and incontrovertible, yet we make bold to present a few additional facts which further deflate the heroic figure of the Trojan horse—and prove it to be a cur’s tail which, in its stupendous egotism, believes itself capable of wagging the dog!

How the Communist party helps the proletariat in “breaking away from the bourgeois parties” is illustrated in the Chicago primary campaign of 1939.

In a social system, wherein political corruption is the rule, the municipal administration of Chicago has achieved the distinction of being one of the most polluted and venal in the nation. As it surpasses nearly all other municipal governments in its degree of corruption, so it excels them in the degree of brutality it metes out to workers who fail to conform to its rules of conduct.

The steel workers of South Chicago know. They will never forget the stupefying horror of those fateful five minutes, nor the field strewn with the bleeding bodies of their dying comrades. Mayor Edward F. Kelly said it was a victory for law and order. Later, when the La Follette committee heard the testimony establishing the guilt of the murder-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

ous police officials and their underlings, Mayor Kelly said nothing.

Kelly entered the primaries of 1939 with the auspicious backing of Colonel Robert R. McCormick's *Tribune* (known far and wide as a paper capable of out-Hearsting the unspeakable Hearst), the New Deal (which is counting on the votes of Kelly delegates at the 1940 Democratic convention), the department stores, utilities, reactionary trade unions and the Communist party! *The Communists said Mayor Kelly wasn't in town during the Memorial Day massacre!*

The *Daily Record*, a sort of Chicago edition of the *Daily Worker*, and very, very "progressive," printed two special editions of 150,000 copies each "to defeat" Colonel Knox's candidate, Courtney, which were purchased by the Kelly-Nash machine and distributed free. The daily *Freiheit*, official Communist publication, also went to bat for Kelly, receiving slightly more than the proverbial thirty pieces of silver as its reward. The "machine" bought a special edition of several thousand copies. The day after Kelly won the Democratic nomination (tantamount to election in Chicago), the *Daily Worker* jubilantly hailed the "people's" victory!

This unvarnished political racketeering and shameless traffic with corrupt and malignant capitalist politicians, the Russian Manuilsky impudently describes as "doing everything to assist the proletariat in its breaking away from the bourgeois parties."!!

The "considerable progress" of the Communist party consists in this: It has succeeded in debauch-

INTRODUCTION

ing thousands of our fellow workers who, had they been more fortunate, might have taken up the falchion of uncompromising revolutionary Socialism.

Socialism does not look upon the proletariat as pawns to be maneuvered in accordance with the devious course of Soviet foreign policy, but as a class which must *consciously* strike off the chains of wage slavery. It, therefore, guards against aught that will confuse the workers, insisting instead that the issue be made clear and plain. Jesuitism beclouds the issue and, because of the lack of class-consciousness among the workers, seems to enjoy a momentary triumph. The triumph is illusory. 'Twould be imbecile folly to believe that Jesuitic policies which bewilder the workers deceive their exploiters. Far from being deceived, the ruling class makes the fullest use of its Communist errand boys, as the notorious Kelly-Nash machine did in Chicago and as the petty capitalist elements did in Spain.

And in Spain we may read the fate of the Communist tail that would wag the capitalist dog! But, above all, there we may read the fate of a despoiled, defrauded and outraged working class that follows the will-o'-the-wisp of the corrupt and unprincipled Jesuitism of the Communist party politicians.

ERIC HASS.

New York, N.Y., March 24, 1939.

The Mendacious and Fraudulent Anarcho-Communists.

“By the term ‘abolition’ of capitalism we mean its overthrow in open struggle by the toiling mass, led by the proletariat. . . . As Lenin has stated . . . ‘there is no complete absence of a way out’ for the bourgeoisie until it faces the revolutionary proletariat in arms. . . . The working class cannot itself come into power without civil war. . . . The Program of the Communist International thus puts the matter: ‘The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peacefully “capturing” the ready made state machinery by means of a parliamentary majority. . . . The Socialist Fascists [Morris Hillquit and Norman Thomas, et al.] make a great parade of their theory of the “gradual” evolution of capitalism into Socialism through a process of peaceful parliamentarism.’”

—W.Z. Foster, in *Toward Soviet America*, 1932.

“The toilers want peace. They want to accomplish the inevitable transition from capitalism to Socialism through the orderly processes of democracy.”

—W.Z. Foster, approvingly, in *From Bryan to Stalin*, 1937.

“I have no teachings or principles.”—W.Z. Foster, testifying under oath before United States Senate Committee, 1919.

I.

Since the Seventh “World Congress” of the Communist International in 1935 repudiated one of the most important fundamentals in Marxism, viz., the

class struggle, the feeble-minded Anarcho-Communists of the United States (and elsewhere, for that matter) have been laboring under a terrific strain. Not that the class struggle meant anything to these simpletons before, but the phrases and slogans, and to some extent the tactics, suddenly had to be changed, under pain of repudiation by, and expulsion from, the Communist International. True enough, the Communist International did not, in so many words in formal resolutions, repudiate the class struggle. But it did what was more eloquent: It changed from a hitherto uncompromising foe of bourgeois democracy to its most ardent, professed defender. And the "tactic" adopted—the new "line" constituted a stronger and more emphatic repudiation than could have been expressed in a mere formal resolution. "The People's Front" is an unreserved surrender to capitalism, and a direct betrayal of the Marxist doctrine of the class struggle—a marching into the camp of world capitalism under the banner of the "democracy" of wage slavery.

The Communist party of America has always constituted the slum-proletarianism of the country, partly because of its program and "principles," and partly because of the personnel of its leadership, so-called. Most of these "leaders" were recruited from the corrupt bourgeois Socialist party, some from the Anarcho-Syndicalist "I.W.W.," and a goodly number from the bankrupt, petty bourgeois intellectuals who found themselves adrift on the stormy social sea. The Communist party leadership is well typified in the repulsive W.Z. Foster, whose zig-zag

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

career and chameleon-like changes fully illustrate the fraudulent and slum character of this so-called party of American communism. Being at best a caricature of the Russian Communist party, it was perhaps inevitable that the Communist party of America should become the fraud and burlesque that we now know it to be. For, whereas the Communist party of Russia has practised lying, deceit and double-dealing in a good cause (at least in its earlier period), the American Communist party has practised lying, deceit and double-dealing in a rotten, infamous cause—the cause of making America safe for capitalism, as far as it lay in their puny powers to make it so.

This was clear to the Marxist from the very outset, though not to many people who had come to a realization that capitalism had to be destroyed if civilization were to be preserved, and human and social progress advanced. But since 1935 the out-and-out capitalist character of the mountebanks and impostors calling themselves Communists has been fully demonstrated, particularly so during the last year or so. For even during the 1936 campaign their support of capitalist politicians was indirect, though none the less real and effective, while since then they have gone over to the Roosevelt camp, bag and baggage—so much so, in fact, that in a magazine “debate” between an avowed bourgeois historian and the Kansas grocery clerk, Earl Browder, the latter upheld Roosevelt’s imperialist army and navy program against the criticism of the honest bourgeois writer! Having discarded all pretenses of being Marxists, the Communist party

politicians naturally find it somewhat inconvenient to have their past pretenses contrasted with their present claims. Two of the most uncomfortable “ghosts” are the one-time “tactic” of forcible, violent overthrow of capitalism, and the obvious and well known fact of their being mere puppets of the Moscow Executive Committee of the Communist International. The most brazen denials are entered when unpleasant reminders of these facts are made, and most brazen and unscrupulous are the denials made by the erstwhile Kansas snake-oil vendor, “Oily” Browder. In a letter addressed to a Communist “revival meeting” at Madison Square Garden (reproduced in the *Daily Worker* of February 22), he says:

“They say that the Communists are conspiring to overthrow American democratic institutions by force and violence. That is a lie, without a shadow of proof to back it up. *It is not true, never has been, and never will be.*” (Emphasis ours.)

II.

One might answer this brazen statement with a paraphrase of Shakespeare: “The faker doth protest too much, methinks!” But there is proof even more relevant than that. For one thing, prior to August, 1935, one could not read a book, or an article, by any prominent Communist on the subject of the “revolutionary approach,” without encountering one or more sneers at the “peaceful” and legal “social patriots,” accompanied with bold and brave protestations concerning the inevitability of violence, and

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

of the insurrectionary overthrow of capitalist institutions. During the years the Marxian Socialist Labor Party was particularly reviled and sneered at because of its insistence that it was *at least* theoretically possible to effect the change from capitalism to Socialism peacefully, and that every effort in that direction should be made. As late as 1933 an editorial writer in the *Daily Worker* wrote a series of articles, attacking the S.L.P. for urging (among other things) a civilized and peaceful settlement of the social question. One of the chapter heads in this series read: "S.L.P. Believes in Ballot as the Road to Revolution." The slummist scribe then went on to ridicule the S.L.P. for so "believing," thereby obviously proclaiming that the Communist party did *not* believe in the ballot "as the road to revolution." For the alternative to the ballot, in the revolutionary crisis, necessarily is force and violence—there is no third alternative. And this in the official organ of the Communist party!

However, there is even more direct evidence that the Communist party officially has advocated physical force and violent overthrow of capitalist institutions, than the incident just cited. The *Communist* is the official organ of the Communist party of the United States of America for the discussion and consideration of "the theory and practise of Marxism-Leninism." (Lately Stalinism has been added to complete the trinity, but why poor Engels should be neglected is not clear. A revision is suggested so that the creed of the Communist party be henceforth designated "Marxism-Engelsism-Leninism-Stalinism"—to which eventu-

ally should be added Browderism, when he receives his apotheosis as the American deity of “Communism”!) Accordingly, any article appearing in the *Communist* comes as the official expression of the Communist party. In the April, 1934, issue, there is an article written by one W. Burke, entitled “De Leonism in the Light of Marxism-Leninism.” This particular clown attempts to refute De Leon, with special reference to De Leon’s insistence on the possibility of a “peaceful solution of the social question,” and in attempted refutation of De Leon, he says, with the air of full authority:

“The history of all revolutions, and particularly of the proletarian revolutions, has taught us that the proletariat can win power only by FORCIBLY overthrowing the bourgeoisie and that this proletarian power can only be maintained by crushing the resistance of, and disarming the bourgeoisie, ARMING THE PROLETARIAT, and thus establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (Emphasis ours.)

Contrast this with Browder’s lying statement quoted above that the Communists do not advocate the forcible overthrow of capitalist institutions.

In support of his statement just quoted, Burke submits the following quotation from Lenin:

“The necessity of systematically fostering among the masses this and just this point of view about [inevitable] violent revolution lies at the root of the whole of Marx’ and Engels’ teachings.”¹

¹ See Appendix I, p. 103.

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

And again, a little further in the same article, Burke says:

“Let us for the time being travel further with De Leon into his utopian realm of a ‘peaceful solution of the social question.’”

That which Mr. Browder now insists is the policy of the Communist party, his fellow traveller in Anarcho-Communism four years ago designated travelling into a “utopian realm.” To emphasize the swindler character of the Anarcho-Communists, the following is cited from Foster’s book, *From Bryan to Stalin*, published in 1937 (that is, following the receipt of orders from Moscow to change the “tactic” with regard to democracy, namely, to adopt the “tactic” of defending the “remnants of bourgeois democracy”):

“The toilers want peace. They want to accomplish the inevitable transition from capitalism to Socialism through the orderly processes of democracy.” [!]

That which Burke in 1934 ridiculed as utopian and anti-Marxian, Foster and Browder in 1937 and 1938 hail as the absolutely correct method of solving the social question!

III.

Among the most loud-mouthed spokesmen of the Communist party is one Israel Amter who has held more jobs within the party than any other Anarcho-Communist. Some of his friends affectionately call him “Dizzy Izzy.” Possessing that kind of a mental-

ity, “Dizzy” has survived every change in “lines” within the Communist party without serious shock to his nervous system—for the same reason, no doubt, that the lower order of animals survive mutilation which in the higher animal would prove fatal. About ten years ago “Dizzy” took part in a debate in Youngstown, Ohio, he representing the then “Workers (Communist) party,” his opponent being a representative of the S.L.P. The debate was stenographically reported, and it is our pleasure to put the right honorable Israel Amter on the witness stand to testify on the subject of advocacy of force and violence by the Communist party. As a build-up for his main thesis, Mr. Amter explained to his audience what he understood by “democracy in general” and the “proletarian dictatorship.” We are not at all interested in the “morals” of these questions, nor in the correctness nor incorrectness of “Dizzy’s” premises, but simply in *noting* his premises, and where they led him, and to contrast his conclusions and contentions with Mr. Browder’s, and the Communist party’s lying statements that they have never urged the overthrow of “democratic institutions” by force and violence.

“Democracy,” said Mr. Amter, “is the mask of the capitalist dictatorship.” And so “democracy” (bourgeois democracy, or the “remnants” thereof!) must now be saved so that the capitalist class may continue to mask its “dictatorship”! Next, Amter tackles “proletarian dictatorship.” Following him in that subject makes one almost as dizzy as he is himself. “Proletarian dictatorship,” according to “Dizzy,” is a wondrous thing. He says: “What is the

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

Proletarian Dictatorship?”, and he answers, “*I agree it would be very delightful if we could attain a workers’ state in a peaceful way, it would be very delightful, but, comrades, we are living within society.*” [!!] As a definition, this leaves something to be wished for, but at least we learn that the Amter definition of “proletarian dictatorship” definitely precludes effecting the change from capitalism to Socialism “in a peaceful way.” However, “Dizzy” tries again: “What does the Proletarian Dictatorship mean? It is a sign, a symbol, an insignia of power of the workers, that the workers have established their power, that they have a Proletarian Dictatorship instead of being a class without power, that everything will be done for the benefit of the oppressed class.” Let us see where that got us: The “proletarian dictatorship” is a sign (in the sky?), a symbol—in short, “proletarian dictatorship” means that the workers have a “proletarian dictatorship.” [!] That still does not help us much. Yet, from hints thrown out by “Dizzy” throughout his discourse we finally have it definitely that his “proletarian dictatorship” *is* the armed force of the workers, directed at a forcible overthrow of capitalist institutions. For instance, he says: “How will we face these things [i.e., “the legislative, executive, judicial . . . the military”] and destroy them? Ballots? Masses of workers—*unarmed* workers? . . . I say the only way we can meet the force of the capitalist is to organize the workers for the Proletarian Dictatorship.”

Now we are getting somewhere! To drive his point home, Amter asks: “Is it going to be different in the U.S.?” The answer, of course, is in the nega-

tive. And again he asks: "I ask the question, how are we going to face the guns of the enemy? By ballots? By persuasion? By debates?" And he answers: "The working class must organize to do as the workers of Russia did, *to meet force with force*. . . ." (Emphasis ours.) And disputing Marx (who, poor fellow, did not have the benefit derived from listening to the profound utterances of Stalin and Browder!)—disputing Marx as to the possibility of a peaceful solution in England and America, "Dizzy" says: "We see that, even though Karl Marx said that in America and Great Britain the workers might get control by peaceful means." And yet, the "reformed," the "revised" Communist party of Browder and Foster now says that the transition from capitalism to Socialism may be accomplished "through the orderly processes of democracy." Humbugs, swindlers and charlatans all!

IV.

No amount of Jesuitic casuistry can, accordingly, explain away the fact that the Communist party and its spokesmen, on innumerable occasions in the past, in print and by word of mouth, have insisted that only through force and violence will it be possible to overthrow capitalism. For while casuistry might get to work on Lenin's utterances by arguing that these were made years ago, and for Russia only, the fact remains, as we have seen, that the utterances quoted above are of comparatively recent date, and with application fully intended to the United States of America and its "democratic institutions."

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

Patently, then, “Oily” Browder brazenly and criminally lies when he asserts that the Communist party never advocated the overthrow of capitalist “‘democratic’ institutions by force and violence.”

And in this advocacy of violence and force, the Communist party of America, including Browder, simply followed the declarations of the Communist International, including the famous “21 points” and Lenin’s teachings. It is hardly necessary to give additional citations, yet here are a few more. As a condition for membership in the Communist International, Communist parties *everywhere* are “obligated to unmask not only open social patriotism [a la Browder!], but also the dishonesty and hypocrisy of social pacifism, *and systematically bring to the attention of the workers the fact that, without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism . . . no kind of an international court of arbitration . . . will be able to prevent fresh imperialistic wars.*” (Emphasis ours.) (Point 6.) The phrase “revolutionary overthrow” here obviously means forcible, and violent, overthrow, for that is what these gentlemen understand by “revolutionary,” the S.L.P. being, in fact, the only party which insists that revolution does *not* necessarily imply violence and bloodshed.

Point 1 makes acceptance of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” mandatory, and the “dictatorship of the proletariat,” as interpreted and applied by the Communist International, and its American branch, means the *forcible* overthrow of capitalist institutions, and *forcible* suppression of the capitalist class. We are not here concerned about the proper application of the phrase “dictatorship of the

proletariat,” nor with the correctness or incorrectness of the implied means or methods. We simply note the *fact*, and contrast it with the dishonest, hypocritical protests of Browder & Co.

Point 4 imposes on “Oily” Browder and his pals the duty of carrying on “a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the army.” And to emphasize the point, this is added: “*Renunciation of such activities would be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the Third International.*” (Emphasis ours.)

Whom is Browder double-crossing: His big army and navy pal Roosevelt, or his Communist International masters?

Again Browder says:

“The Communist Party supports American democratic institutions against all their enemies. . . . It is the Communists who defend democracy most consistently and stubbornly.”

We have already seen how devoutly Browder & Co. believe in, and “stubbornly defend,” the “American democratic institutions.” However, among the “enemies” of “American democratic institutions” and “democracy” in general was one Lenin, who all-embracingly stated that “the imperialist war, 1914–1918, has ONCE FOR ALL shown the least progressive workers the true character of the capitalist democracy EVEN IN THE FREEST REPUBLIC [our emphasis], which is nothing less than bourgeois dictatorship.” (Clause 10 in Lenin’s thesis on “Bourgeois Democracy and Proletarian Dic-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

tatorship.”) Thus Mr. Browder, with beautiful logic, finds himself arrayed against Lenin on a matter of fundamental importance, while Lenin, according to the Browder contention, finds himself bracketed with the “one-hundred-percent-patriots,” to use his own phrase.

Lenin said further on this head:

“Therefore the present defense of ‘bourgeois democracy’ in speeches on ‘democracy in general’ . . . is a direct betrayal of Socialism and definite going over to the camp of the bourgeoisie. It is a denial of the rights of the proletariat to a proletarian revolution; a defense of middle class snobs’ reformism just at the very historical moment when such reformism has gone bankrupt throughout the whole world—and the war [read “wars and breakdown of international capitalism”] has created a revolutionary situation.” (Emphasis ours.)

And finally this:

“All middle class republics in our times . . . still maintain this bourgeois state apparatus, which continually demonstrates more clearly and plainly than ever *that the outcry in defense of ‘democracy in general’ is nothing else but a defense of capitalism and the privileges of profiteers.*” (Emphasis ours.)

This, Messrs. Browder & Co., was Lenin speaking, not the S.L.P., even though it is exactly what the S.L.P. has been saying right along, and for saying which you have reviled us and lied about us!

In a resolution adopted by the Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow, March 2–6, 1919, we find the following:

ARNOLD PETERSEN

“So called ‘democracy,’ that is, middle class democracy, is nothing else but the hidden dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The so much talked about ‘will of the people’ no more exists *than does the oneness of a people. In reality classes exist, whose opposite interests cannot unite.* But the bourgeoisie is only a small minority, and so it makes use of this fiction, this muddle of a national ‘people’s will,’ *so that under these good jingling words the mastery over the working class may be maintained, and the enforcing of their own class will.*” (Emphasis ours.)

In these declarations by their acclaimed master, Lenin, the anarcho-bourgeois Communist Browder and his associates and allies are definitely exposed as aiding the capitalist class to maintain mastery over the working class, precisely as the S.L.P. has insisted right along!

The other “ghost” that rises to plague the Kansas master mind is the subserviency to Moscow. The Ozarks statesman denies vehemently that such subserviency exists. “That [“taking orders from Moscow”] is another barefaced lie. We receive no orders from Moscow, and if anyone in Moscow were crazy enough [!] to send us orders they would have not the slightest effect upon American policies.” [!!] Of course, Mr. Browder means this in a very definite Pickwickian sense! He has just returned from Europe, and undoubtedly he received permission to say this, with the knowledge of “Moscow” that he would be having his tongue in his cheek when he said it. “Oily” Browder is as amusing as he is brazenly impudent. In the first place, the very first of the “21 points” provides that “the entire propaganda and agitation” of a Communist party MUST

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

“agree with the program and the DECISIONS of the Third International.” You are “crazy” if you read anything mandatory into that! As the present writer has pointed out again and again, whenever disagreements arose among factions in the “American” party (as in the Foster-Ruthenberg feud in 1924–1925), or when a new “line” was to be adopted, *orders*, definite orders, were sent from Moscow, and, if not obeyed, the “rebels” were transformed into Lovestoneites, Trotskyites, or what have you.² The facts in this connection are too well known to require further proof. Nor, once again, are we here concerned about the morals of the situation, but simply in certifying to the fact, and in exposing the lying and hypocritical contentions of the Kansas grocery clerk and his associates.

V.

That “Oily” Browder is a mere stuffed dummy—an ignorant, almost illiterate upstart—is revealed through every word he utters. And when he utters a lot of words, and puts them between covers, this fact becomes painfully emphasized. Recently a “new” book by him has been published by the “literature bureau” of the Communist party, at the head of which is the former S.P. reformer, Alexander Trachtenberg. It turns out that the “new” book is merely a collection of the dull and tedious “theses,” etc., delivered from time to time by the Kansas statesman. Apparently, the only new thing

² See article in WEEKLY PEOPLE of January 1, 1938, entitled “The Trotsky ‘Trial’ and Soviet Russia.”

about the book is the introduction specially written for it by this little sawdust Lenin, and it is in this introduction alone that we are now interested, as it appeared in reprint in a recent issue of the Anarcho-Communist family journal, the *Daily Worker*. It seems that when Browder's previous "book"—a similar collection of theses, etc.—was published, it was reviewed in one of the organs of the "left wing intelligentsia," the *New Republic*, by none other than our charlatan friend, Harold J. Laski, who, to quote Mr. Browder, "gave it the most intelligent treatment of all non-Communist reviewers." The Communist Landon goes on to say: "Now Mr. Laski is a critic not to be lightly dismissed." So! So! And who may Mr. Laski be that he rates so high with Mr. Browder? Mr. Laski, an English professor, is the lad who wrote an appraisal of Marx which Norman Thomas enthusiastically hailed as a "scientific, not theological" approach to Marx. And Mr. Thomas thought so much of Mr. Laski's "appraisal" that he included it in a Karl Marx fiftieth death anniversary issue of the *Communist Manifesto*, which he (Thomas) edited. As thoroughly demonstrated, with documentary evidence, in the Socialist Labor Party pamphlet, *Karl Marx and Marxism*, Mr. Laski, either because of gross ignorance, or with "malice aforethought," falsified and misrepresented Marx's writings and scientific theories and conclusions. Among other things, Mr. Laski said: "Upon Marx's theory of value it is not necessary to spend much time. It has not stood the test of criticism; it is out of harmony with facts, and it is far from self-consistent." And the professorial charla-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

tan brazenly charged that Marx failed to mention “that in addition to labor, all commodities to have value must have this at least in common, that they satisfy some need.” And pompously, and with continued mendacious impudence, Mr. Laski adds in the same connection: “Utility, in other words, is a necessary factor in value [!]; it would be an impossibility to produce aeroplanes except upon the assumption that some people wanted to fly in them.” [!] Paraphrasing Mr. Laski, one might say that it would be impossible, for capitalist institutions, to produce bourgeois professors except upon the assumption that they {are} wanted to lie about Marxism! However, there were many more falsifications, all of them brazen, where they were not unmistakably the result of pure stupidity.

Now, then, Mr. Laski being this sort of person, and Mr. Browder being the dull and ignorant nitwit that he is, it is wholly understandable why he should say: “Now Mr. Laski is a critic not to be lightly dismissed.” [!] *Après vous, Aphonse!* You scratch my back, and I’ll tickle you in the ribs!

Mr. Browder, with the air of a profound thinker, and the oil of smugness and self-satisfaction oozing out of him, says:

“Curiously enough, the only reviews predominantly favorable were those of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, and of *The American Political Science Review*.”

Why “curiously enough”? What more natural than for bourgeois publications, specializing in

bourgeois political economy, etc., to hail with pleasure the product of a fellow-laborer (Mr. Browder) in the vineyard of bourgeois “political science”? Anybody who has ever wasted the time to read the Kansas master-mind’s petty bourgeois drivel would be surprised if it did not receive a favorable reception in capitalist circles of political “learning.”

The Communist “fuehrer” made a gracious concession when he said that “We Communists of America were not fully conscious of the possibilities and necessity for the anti-fascist People’s Front [prior to the 1935 Moscow Congress] even though we were struggling in that direction.”! If the Kansas grocery clerk had simply said: “We Communists of America were not fully conscious,” and stopped there, he would, in the language of the street, have “said a mouthful”! However, he is laboring with the theme of the “People’s Front,” the anti-Marxian contraption for defending “general democracy,” to use Lenin’s phrase, in order, to quote Lenin, to betray Socialism and to deny “the rights of the proletariat to a proletarian revolution.” And knowing that a complete *volte face* was effected by the Anarcho-Communists in 1935, he craftily admits that of contradictions in the utterances of the oracle of the Ozarks “the critic will find a rich crop. . . .” And because at one time the Anarcho-Communists profess adherence to Marxian principles, and later deliberately repudiate these and adopt petty bourgeois principles and tactics denounced in the severest terms by Marx, Engels and even Lenin—therefore, according to this intellectually dishonest mountebank, this is “to grasp the fundamentals of dialecti-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

cal materialism”!! Well, by that yardstick every crooked politician, every corrupt capitalist propagandist, every capitalist lickspittle and sycophant, every villainous labor faker and betrayer of labor, is a competent practitioner of “dialectical materialism”! But, possibly, the Kansas boy wonder confuses dialects with dialectics!

Having now laid the foundation for his little thesis on the “justification” for changing principles, we now arrive at the point where little Jack Horner Browder pulls out the plum. This is the *piece de resistance*:

“In the United States the single political phenomenon in which no essential change can be seen is the old but little known Socialist Labor Party (not to be confused with either the Socialist Party or Labor Party) which carries on the pure tradition of Daniel De Leon without so much as the change of a comma. But the ‘purity’ and ‘consistency’ of the Socialist Labor Party have gained for it only the position of a sort of museum-piece and the role of a horrible example.”

Though otherwise intended (decidedly otherwise!), we accept this as the unwilling tribute rendered Marxian science, truth and decency, by Machiavellian dishonesty and political scoundrelism. There are occasionally a few “Nice Nellies” in our midst who object to the strong, though otherwise correct and wholly deserved, designations which we bestow upon our crooked and unscrupulous enemies. Here and now we plead for a fresh supply of descriptive phrases in order properly to label the infamy intended, and implied, in the above “wrin-

kle of a sneer” in which the Communist clown attempts to hide his rage!

Detailed comments on this literary gem are obviously superfluous. Certainly, a dissertation on steadfast adherence to principle would be utterly wasted on those to whom principles mean nothing and who, in fact, make a proud boast of repudiating one “principle” today, and adopting a diametrically opposed “principle” tomorrow. In the classic phrase of Wm. Zig-Zag Foster: “I am one who was raised in the slums. . . . I have no teachings or principles.” And Mr. Browder boasts of his many years’ close friendship and association with the unspeakable Foster, and even if we did not already know it, we could safely assume from that association and friendship that he, too, boasts of having neither “teachings” nor “principles.” Principles are inconvenient things, a downright nuisance, to fakers, adventurers and political swindlers. Let those fool De Leonites cling to principles, and see where that gets them! As Lowell’s Mr. Bigelow said:

“Ez to my princerples, I glory
In hevin nothin’ o’ the sort. . . .
I *don’t* believe in princerples,
But, oh, I *du* in interest”!

Mr. Browder and his allies *do* believe in interest. Well, we shall give it to them, compounded again and again. For the villainies they have perpetrated against the working class, and in the name of the working class, they shall pay dearly, and with high interest added. You may fool your contemporaries,

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

and even your immediate posterity, but you cannot, and do not, fool history. Its judgment is as harsh as it is unrelenting, and on the historical judgment day accounts are squared. Let the Kansas faker and political swindler, and his capitalist allies, remember that. Meanwhile, the Socialist Labor Party cleaves to *principle*, knowing full well that it is the *shortest* road to success. As Tom Paine long ago said:

“When a man in a long cause attempts to steer his course by anything else than some polar truth or principle, he is sure to be lost. It is beyond his capacity to keep all the parts of an argument together, and make them unite in one issue, by any other means than having this guide always in view. Neither memory nor invention will supply the want of it. The former fails him, and the latter betrays him.”

The “inventions” of the enemies of the S.L.P., of the revolutionary proletariat, will surely betray them in the end. And we of the revolutionary working class, we “harsh,” “unrelenting” and “unchanging” Marxists have terrible memories!

(*Weekly People*, March 12, 1938)

The Communist Swindlers.

“It was without a compeer among swindles, it was perfect, it was rounded, symmetrical, complete, colossal.

—*Mark Twain.*

I.

In his story of Lysander, the Spartan general, Plutarch observes: “Lysander . . . seemed cunning and subtle, managing most things in war by deceit, extolling what was just when it was profitable, and when it was not, using that which was convenient, instead of that which was good; and not judging truth to be in nature better than falsehood. . . . [And answering his critics, Lysander said]: ‘Where the lion’s skin will not reach, you must patch it out with the fox’s.’”

From which one gathers that if Lysander were with us today, and by chance had become an American Anarcho-Communist, his Communist party *alias* would be either Wm. Zig-Zag Foster, or “Oily” (Brooklynese for Earlie) Browder. For if Plutarch’s description fitted one faker better than Foster it would be Mr. Browder, general secretary of the Communist party of America. Between these two political swindlers the choice would be difficult if one were to pick the bigger or the worse. Yet, the two together are thoroughly representative of the gross humbug and vulgar fraud known as the Communist party of America.

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

Of the two, Oily Browder, the Kansas bookkeeper and spiritual kindred of Alf. ("Mossback") Landon, his fellow Kansan, has been particularly in the public eye in recent years—that is, specifically since Wm. Zig-Zag Foster was rendered *hors de combat* in 1932 (when he was the Communist party candidate for President) by the publication of the S.L.P. pamphlet, *Wm. Z. Foster—Renegade or Spy?* As one listens to the dull, monotonous voice of the Kansas oracle; as one reads the endless drivel that comes from his pen; as one observes the physiognomy of the posturing, strutting mountebank (now pictured as the sleek, smiling, baby-petting politician, now as the scowling "Fuehrer," as in *Time* of May 30, where he tries so hard to look like Stalin, but achieves instead an amazing resemblance to that other posturing lowbrow, Adolf Hitler)—as one listens to and studies this mountebank, one perceives clearly the large patch of fox-skin pieced to the borrowed lion-skin in which he performs his act.

A swindle, to be successful, must not be too palpably fraudulent in appearance. The swindler must not too openly presume on the ignorance and gullibility of his contemporaries, nor too frankly acknowledge his contempt for his victims. For if there is one thing that is almost as certain as death and taxes, it is that sooner or later the swindler is bound to be found out. And the louder the acclaim by the unthinking crowd, the brighter the sun of momentary success, the surer the reckoning, and the swifter the inevitable retirement of the swindler, and the ensuing silence and darkness.

It is, of course, no accident that Browder and his party have been so widely publicized. When a new movie star is discovered, the first important thing to be done is the “build-up.” When the ruling class picks a plebs leader, the “build-up” of the faker is the important thing. He has to be “sold,” and the more threatening the workers become in their discontent, the quicker the “build-up” process must get on the way. John L. Lewis, pal of Morgan’s man, Myron C. Taylor, is an example; Earl Browder is another. The plutocracy realized that the revolutionary classconsciousness, latent in the working class, had begun to stir, threatening to lead the workers out of the reform camp and into the camp of revolution. And the plebs leader, or fake revolutionist, was the answer—the plebs leader who pretends to oppose the social system of the plutocrats, and who seemingly speaks the language of the revolution, but in reality is doing his best to patch up and preserve that system, and whose real language is that of reform, compromise and class collaboration. He who does these things is plutocracy’s man—and it does not matter whether he does them consciously because he is the out-and-out hired man of the plutocracy, or because he is an illiterate nitwit and mountebank who mistakes his petty bourgeois philosophy for Marxism, or his Landonistic “wit” for the profundity of Marxian science.

II.

A favorite theme in world literature is that of an ignorant and stupid person being picked from the dunghill or the gutter by some lordly person who

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

wants to have fun with him, or who wants to demonstrate upper-class claims to natural superiority, and natural inferiority on the part of those of the “lower orders”—usually peasants. Among others, Cervantes employed the theme in *Don Quixote*, the peasant Sancho Panza being made the “governor” of “an island”; Shakespeare uses it in the prologue to *The Taming of the Shrew* and Ludwig Holberg in *Jeppe on the Hill*. The victim for the moment raised to high estate, the lordly pranksters bow and scrape before the lout, until the latter actually believes he is what his masters say he is, and it is not until the peasant takes himself so seriously as to threaten the bodily welfare of the nobleman and his servants that he is again deposited on the dunghill, left to wonder if it was merely a dream!

The publicity given him, the featuring of “Oily” Browder as a “statesman,” as a man of great importance, has gone to the poor fellow’s head to such an extent as to suggest powerfully the peasant who went to sleep on the dunghill, and woke up in the baron’s bed! And so we find him talking the language of the master class, only more so! He struts and strikes poses, discourses “learnedly” on every issue in terms of, capitalist ideology, and as if he really knows what it is all about. And the “slogans,” and the newest party “line” being bourgeois democracy, he becomes a greater patriot than Washington, a more thoroughgoing Jeffersonian than Jefferson, and a nobler Emancipator than Lincoln—aye, even a more genuine New Dealer than Franklin D. Roosevelt himself, whom he flatters in many other ways besides imitating him! And with

it all he engages in an act of belly-crawling before the “public opinion” manufactured by the plutocracy, and before everything and everybody that he formerly had seemingly contended against and vilified, including petty exploiters, labor fakers a la Lewis, bourgeois governments, and even Roman Catholicism!

Having for the nonce consigned all the “Leninist” slogans to limbo, and replaced them with “Jeffersonian” ditto, it is obviously incumbent upon the clown (and his party, of course) to prove the genuineness of his democratic faith. The “dictatorship of the proletariat” is forgotten. “Toward Soviet America” is heard no more. Instead, the welkin rings with protestations of love and devotion for democracy—specifically the American “institutions,” the Constitution, the Supreme Court (at least the “minority”), ex-K.K.K. Black becoming a hero, the “self-determination of the Black Belt” notwithstanding, and *peace* and the *peaceful solution* of the social problem being now the very core of his creed!

Not so long ago, Mr. Browder’s colleague, Simon Gerson, was put on the stand, ostensibly in connection with alleged forgery of the record in a court case in which he was involved. The blatant Senator McNaboe (defender of the erstwhile hero of millions, but now forgotten James J. Walker) interrogated him, and, in reply to some of the questions put to him, Mr. Gerson, echoing his “leader,” “Fuehrer” Browder, certified to his belief in American democracy, patriotism, etc., etc., to wit, as follows:

To a question by Senator McNaboe—“Do you believe in the overthrow of the American govern-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

ment?”, Mr. Gerson, reputed Communist and capitalist jobholder, answered: “No.” Taunted by the Senator for his “deviation,” he insisted: “It is all how you look at it.” Indeed, Mr. Gerson, it’s “all how you look at it”—and looking at it through a fat job given you by a capitalist politician for services rendered him during his campaign for election, the American government “looks” pretty good, eh?

Asked again by McNaboe if he would defend the principles and doctrines of this form of government—the government we know in the United States—Note: “*the principles and doctrines,*” not the temporary form or expression—Mr. Gerson enthusiastically replied: “*I would bend every effort to maintain this form of government.*” And the newspaper which reports this supplies as heading to its report: “Gerson tells belief in Marx and Lenin.”!! Again Mr. Gerson, echoing Foster, the war bond salesman, and Browder, the Kansas patriot, said: “Communism does not advocate the overthrow of government by force.”! And this in face of the tons of literature published by the Communist party stressing the necessity of violence and force in the overthrow of capitalist government!

III.

Obviously, Mr. Gerson was “on the spot,” as any dishonest person must be who believes one thing (as far as he has any principles at all) and must pretend belief in the direct opposite. And so, when he was asked whether he believed in the “plan” outlined by Browder and others for the forcible seizure of banks, warehouses, etc., Gerson replied, lamely,

“Yes, I believe in them.” And when McNaboe (whose mind, understanding and temperament are practically identical to the Anarcho-Communists) insisted—“Isn’t that the ultimate objective?”, Gerson dodged and answered: “Socialism is the ultimate objective of the Communist party, *but there is no definite plan.*”! “No definite plan”! The Communist party had printed reams upon reams of theses and resolutions and blueprints, outlining in detail how to overthrow, by violence and force, the capitalist system! Tons of books have been published by the Communist party, telling the neophyte how to “bore” within every institution, even within revolutionary organizations! Foster, Browder, “Dizzy” Amter and the rest of the Anarcho-Communist “professors” have written “text-books” galore (notably Foster’s *Toward Soviet America*, in 1932), “planning” every step toward the “revolution” and “Soviet power” in America—“but there is no definite plan”! And, finally, Mr. Gerson denied that the Russian Soviet government is a dictatorship, though he and his brother swindlers have insisted over and over that it is *the* “proletarian dictatorship.” Mr. Gerson might justly have argued that it was a dictatorship quite dissimilar to the Hitler and Mussolini gangster dictatorships—but, no, in the words of Mr. Gerson, the “notion” that there is any kind of dictatorship in Russia is “a current misunderstanding.” The “cute” Mr. Gerson! And to cap the climax, after cravenly renouncing the Soviet dictatorship, he hails as his heroes Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Lincoln—all of whom (except possibly Paine, who is a recent Communist patron

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

saint) the Anarcho-Communists heretofore have denounced as bourgeois oppressors of the masses! Chief among the vilifiers of American revolutionary heroes stands Robert Minor whose slanders of Lincoln, etc, the present writer exposed in an article entitled, "The Minoristic Conception of History," published in the WEEKLY PEOPLE of February 27, 1926.

As a sample of the then prevailing attitude of Communists toward Lincoln and the Revolutionary Fathers generally, the following is quoted from that article:

"Here are a few grotesque observations which at least serve to identify Mr. Minor as a full-fledged burlesque comedian, and a worthy member of his burlesque party:

"Lincoln cleverly managed the question of the relief of Fort Sumter in such a way that the South became the aggressor and thereby Lincoln's task of getting the wavering elements of the North to support him was lightened.'

"What a pity Mr. Minor wasn't born early enough to have assisted Mr. Gordon Bennett of the *Herald* in his anti-Lincoln campaign! For I doubt that even Bennett attributed so much ability and craftiness to Lincoln as to enable him to 'manage the question of relief of Fort Sumter' in such a Machiavellian manner."

And this (Minor pandering to Harlem and the "Black Belt"):

"But Lincoln also understood, from his own [capitalist] class viewpoint, and did not consent to recruit Negro soldiers until much later and then only to a severely re-

stricted degree.”

Finally this:

“Mr. Minor poses the question: ‘What does Abraham Lincoln mean to the working class?’ And we get this gem:

“‘This matter must not be confused, as so many flabby ‘socialists’ attempt to confuse it, by quoting certain passages of speeches which throw a little sop in a crafty way to working class psychology.’”

According to the “Minoristic Conception of History,” Browder and Co. (including Minor) are at the moment engaged in “throwing sops”—large sops!—“in a crafty way to working class [read: *capitalist class*] psychology”!

But before dropping the clowning Mr. Gerson, let us note the estimate placed upon him by one of his own pals, the strongly Jew-conscious Michael Gold of the *Daily Worker* and *New Masses*. (We say “Jew-conscious” because Mr. Gold forever dwells upon the accidental fact that he is a Jew. Quite recently he wrote a letter to a capitalist editor, addressing him as a Jew, saying, “And now, as a fellow-Jew, I want to ask you. . . .”!) Well, Mr. Gold rates his fellow-member Gerson as follows: “By golly, I am willing to go out on a limb and predict that as a result of all his handsome photos in the press, Si [Gerson] is going to receive a Hollywood offer. . . .” Not unlikely at all! If you fail as a clown in the burlesque bolshevik circus, there is always Hollywood!

But let us leave “Si” Gerson who, besides his

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

character as entertainer a la Hollywood, after all is merely an unimportant “stooge” of the Foster-Browder team, and who simply serves as a horrible example of the mental corruption produced, and petty cupidity aroused, by that infamous machine for lying about Marxism, i.e., the Communist party of America.

IV.

Let us now proceed to the latest, and most nauseating, belly-crawling performance staged by the Anarcho-Communist crooked politicians.

As is now generally known, in the summer of 1935, when Moscow decided that its foreign policy required alliances with the so-called democratic powers, word was sent to all sections of the “Communist International” to change the line. With the world in revolutionary upheaval, at the very time of the impending collapse of world capitalism—at a time, in short, when the circumstances called for the organizing, on Marxian lines, of the world proletariat for the final overthrow of capitalism, “Moscow” and the Anarcho-Communist fakers throughout the world, but particularly in America, decided that the time had come for all good Communists to come to the aid of the party of capitalism—in other words, to “save the remnants of bourgeois democracy,” as the slogan of the hour had it. The Socialist Labor Party expressed doubt at the time as to the ability of the Fosters, Browders, “Dizzy” Amters, etc., to spout “Jeffersonian” doctrines. Our doubts have been shamed. For, as already pointed out, Mr. Browder particularly has risen nobly to the occa-

sion. Indeed, not only has he acclaimed “Jeffersonian principles” in the abstract, but, as pointed out in the WEEKLY PEOPLE of March 12, 1938, he has recommended as a wise “democratic” governmental foreign policy in 1938 the foreign policy of Thomas Jefferson in 1793!!

Since 1935, accordingly, the Anarcho-Communist politicians have progressed by leaps and bounds as capitalist democratic constitutionalists. Now, no one would quarrel with anyone for changing his mind, provided it is prompted by a sincere conviction that the position formerly held was wrong, and had been proved so. But when a “convert” to “democratic” and “peaceful” procedure is known to be an unscrupulous liar and unprincipled charlatan (a la Foster); when Machiavellian precepts constitute his guide of action and when, moreover, he pretends always to have held to the nice “democratic” and “peace-loving” viewpoints, whereas facts overwhelmingly prove the very opposite, there is thereby laid on the Marxian chronicler of events and movements the solemn duty of unmasking the swindlers, and exposing their nefarious schemes and the plausible reasons for offering them. In the WEEKLY PEOPLE of March 12, 1938, the present writer quoted Mr. Browder as saying in the *Daily Worker* of February 22, 1938:

“They say that the Communists are conspiring to overthrow American democratic institutions by force and violence. That is a lie, without a shadow of proof to back it up. *It is not true, never has been, and never will be.*” (Emphasis ours.)

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

The WEEKLY PEOPLE article then, among numerous other citations, quoted Wm. Zig-Zag Foster as saying in his 1932 "Campaign Book," entitled *Toward Soviet America*:

"By the term 'abolition' of capitalism we mean its overthrow in open struggle by the toiling masses, led by the proletariat. . . . As Lenin has stated . . . 'there is no complete absence of a way out' for the bourgeoisie until it faces the revolutionary proletariat in arms. . . . The working class cannot itself come into power without civil war. . . . The Program of the Communist International thus puts the matter: 'The conquest of power by the proletariat does not mean peacefully "capturing" the ready made state machinery by means of a parliamentary majority. . . . The Socialist Fascists [Morris Hillquit and Norman Thomas, et al.] make a great parade of their theory of the "gradual" evolution of capitalism into Socialism through a process of peaceful parliamentarism.'"

(The latest brazen denial that the Anarcho-Communists ever advocated violence, etc., is found in a recent column conducted in the *Daily Worker* by Michael Gold who impudently asserts: "No, Communists do not advocate violence. *They have never advocated it.*" In view of the record and indisputable facts, there is but one answer to such an assertion: "Liar." Incidentally, it was the same Michael Gold who, in approved fascist fashion, in 1935 said: "A leader . . . must be free of such confusion. Our lives are in his hand—we follow him where he points out the road, and we have a right to demand perfect clarity and science of him." This is the "Fuehrer" psychology with a vengeance, and is heartily approved by the Hitlers and Mussolinis as

the proper attitude of the “multitude” toward “the brains.”)

It was further shown, by documentary evidence which the swindlers did not and *would* not dare to attempt to refute, that the very heart and core of the Communist creed constitute persistent belief in the inevitability and necessity of violent overthrow of capitalism and its institutions in order to achieve Socialism. But though these brazen politicians knew that they were convicted and exposed as unprincipled liars and swindlers, they continued as if nothing had happened—following the method of the other political swindlers of the masses, the Hitlers, Hagues and Mussolinis, who are acclaimed by hundreds of thousands, and who point to that acclaim as proof of their being right, even as the Browders point to the alleged support of hundreds of thousands as proof of being “right”!

V.

This brazen and corrupt parading as advocates of “democracy” and “peaceful procedure,” etc., reached its climax at the recent state and national conventions of the Anarcho-Communists. For weeks prior to these events, the Browders and Fosters, and all the little Stalins and Stalinettes, had rent the air with their protestations of democracy and their insistence on being goody-goody little brothers to Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal pals. Magazine articles related in detail their passionate belief in “Americanism” of every sort—that is, every kind being acceptable so long as it suited the present fraudulent purpose. Indeed, having corruptly professed adher-

ence to the major “democratic” precepts, why be a stickler when only minor ones are involved? If Roosevelt wants a wages and hours bill, though it be the essence of reaction, and a denial of everything Marx ever taught, why, the wages and hours bill we’ll support! Does he want a “reorganization” bill? We are for it, too. And, speaking of the reorganization bill, we have in the attitude of the Communists toward this bill one of the simplest, and yet most conclusive, proofs of the corrupt character of the swindlers. In the *Daily Worker* of March 30, 1938, an editorial bemoaned the defeat of the President’s measure. Referring to the “reactionary propaganda against a progressive measure,” the *Daily Worker* editorial said: “All the machinery of faked telegrams, all the pressure of editorial ballyhoo, all the roaring brigade of Hired Columnists did their stuff to kill *this democratic and socially vital measure.*” Less than two weeks later, in the *Daily Worker* of April 11, a front-page editorial proclaims that “The reactionary artillery which brought down the Reorganization Bill, a *mild, routine reform measure*, is now being aimed at the real target—the Wages and Hours Bill. . . .” On March 30 the reorganization bill was a “*socially vital measure.*” On April 11 it had been reduced to “a mild, routine reform measure”! Only corrupt and unprincipled Anarcho-Communist “reasoning” and “tactics” could make a thing its direct opposite practically overnight! This by no means solitary example of such swindling furnishes a key to the understanding and proper evaluation of the whole philosophy, aim, tactics and “educational” processes of the Communist party.

And the adherents, the “following,” to whom is fed such corruption, who are trained in such tactics, are expected to effect the social revolution! As certain as the dawn will follow night, the unthinking and ignorant followers of such leaders and tactics, the product of such “education,” will serve as the yelling and cheering storm troopers of tomorrow’s fascism, if not headed off by sound, scientific Marxism, and decent and honest principles and reasoning.

But let us stick to “Oily” Browder as the typical representative of the Anarcho-Communist swindlers, and let us review briefly his impudent posturing and lying protestations. In an interview published in the *New York Post*, of May 7, Browder says:

“The Communist Party opposes with all its power and will help *to crush* by democratic means any clique, group, faction, circle or party—from within or without—which acts to undermine, overthrow or subvert *any democratic institution of the American people.*”!! (Italics ours.)

In the same interview we are regaled with this startling, profound thought:

“Our policy would be different if a majority were ready to install Socialism. We would then go forward to urge the establishment of Socialism.”

In short, when the “people” do not want Socialism, we don’t want it either! But when the people *do* want Socialism, when they are *ready* for it, why, “we” will give it to them! Just like that! It simpli-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

fies everything so nicely by doing away with the necessity for Socialist propaganda and education. For, say the Communist party clowns in effect, when the “people” are *not* ready for Socialism, then we teach them capitalist principles, just as we are doing at the moment—teach them faith in capitalist economics (“the workers pay the taxes,” etc.); we teach them that “the petty bourgeois and land owning farmer are allies of the workers”; that “the workers’ political interests are promoted by forming political alliances with their class enemies under the anti-class-struggle label of a ‘People’s Front’”; that “the Morgan- and U.S. Steel-blessed C.I.O. represents the workers’ interests, and that the unscrupulous plebs leader, the plutocracy-aping Lewis is a real leader of labor,” etc., etc., etc. In fine, when the people are *not* ready we train them to endure capitalism, and help to de-brain them so that they may become contented industrial serfs under industrial feudalism. But when they *are* ready [don’t ask us *how* they will ever get ready with such education and training!], well, when they are ready, *we* are ready—simple, ain’t it, no? But, continue in effect the jesters of the plutocracy, don’t forget *we* are your leaders, even if we do consistently trail behind you, and even though we do trample under our feet every proletarian principle, every Marxian scientific truth to which we have always so nobly and vociferously paid lip-service!!

“Oily” Browder, solemn ass that he is, probably did not realize how very asinine his observation was!

His interrogator asks:

ARNOLD PETERSEN

“Q. Your capitalist critics accuse you of mental double bookkeeping in preaching democracy.

“A. (Comrade Browder looks up searchingly. Is it because he was a bookkeeper by trade for eighteen years?) Yes, they say that we don’t believe in democracy, that we just pretend. But no political party can grow if it takes a hypocritical position. The reason the old parties are losing their following is precisely because of hypocrisy and double bookkeeping. The Communist Party couldn’t possibly operate on such a basis. If we want to prepare our members to overthrow democracy, we couldn’t do it by preaching democracy. (New York *Post*, May 7, 1938.)

Mr. Pecksniff could not have done better in the way of sanctimonious hypocrisy! (Mr. Pecksniff, as Dickens explains, “was a moral man . . . his very throat was moral.” He was “fuller of virtuous precepts than a copy book”!)

VI.

Throughout his arguments along the “new line,” Mr. Browder steals from S.L.P. literature whatever he needs in order to support his new “belief” in “democracy,” etc. He does so repeatedly, though not consistently, the while reviling the S.L.P. in approved fashion. The following seems lifted out of the WEEKLY PEOPLE, or from one of De Leon’s pamphlets, with hardly a change of a word:

“We are definitely opposed to force or violence. We point to the historical fact that violence in a period of change is always caused by a reactionary minority resisting outcarrying {carrying out?} of the majority’s will.”

In an article in *Time* of May 30, a great deal of

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

space is devoted by this plutocratic organ to boost Browder, Foster and the Communist party in general. It does so, however, with poorly suppressed amusement at the capers cut by the Communist mountebanks. Rather neatly, *Time* observes:

“In recent Communist thought Lincoln, Jefferson, and Tom Paine have assumed a stature comparable to that of Joseph Stalin and Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. However much this may surprise the bourgeoisie, Communists planned it that way. This week they also planned their convention and its publicized dramatics to impress upon all U.S. minds a man, a policy, a party, a program. . . . Once they denounced the N.R.A. as fascism. Today they damn all who damn Franklin Roosevelt. Most important, they have swerved from a concept of immediate world revolution to one of evolution toward revolution. Now that U.S. Communists want to unite with all progressive forces against domestic and world reaction, Mr. Browder must convince his fellow Americans: (1) that the Party is not to be shunned merely because it was of one mind yesterday, is of another today, surely will be of still another tomorrow; (2) that of whatever mind it may be, it will not necessarily be of Moscow’s mind.”

Well, if it will not “be of Moscow’s mind,” it will be because by that time Soviet Russia has definitely repudiated the American anarcho-bourgeois swindle and swindlers, or because “Moscow” itself will have become reconstituted on a sound Marxian international basis !

Time does its bit in fostering the Foster myth. Considerable space is devoted to the life and activities of this arch-faker but no mention whatever is made of his Anarcho-Syndicalist beginnings, or his war-bond selling, patriotic interlude. Foster is even

made one of the “Debs Socialists” who in 1919 allegedly had joined forces with “Big Bill” Haywood to form “the ‘Communist’ Parties”! This is history with a vengeance, but very pleasant history, not likely to be repudiated by the zig-zagging Mr. Foster, who at that time was trying to impress on the United States Senate Committee that he had renounced all “revolutionary” doctrines as things of evil, or youthful errors, and who had convinced Sammy Gompers that he was a sturdy patriot and an ardent craft unionist right after Sammy’s old faker heart!

With tiresome repetitiousness, “Oily” Browder repeats his servile faith in “democracy,” in “peace,” in the gradual instalment of Socialism, etc. In the *Daily Worker* of April 30, he reassures the petty bourgeoisie that they have nothing to fear from Communism (nor have the plutocrats, for that matter!), saying:

“I think that any program of socialization must begin with the monopolized sections of our economy. Socialization will probably, as a practical issue, be decided upon by our people, *step by step*, according as non-socialized industries close down and are unable to operate under capitalism.”

This completes the circle for Mr. Browder! He started as a Hillquit social reformer, as a “step by step Socialist,” and he is now right back to Hillquit’s “step by step expropriation” of the capitalist! Mr. Hillquit has reaped his vengeance! Pity that he is not here to enjoy it, and to admire the ridiculous posturing of those whom he trained and

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

taught so well, and who abused him for saying what they are now themselves proclaiming!

Your solemn ass never shines to better advantage than when he dishes out tautologies. Says “Oily” Browder:

“All monopoly is the creation of the particular social and economic system which gave it birth.” (*Daily Worker*, April 30.) In other words: “The particular social and economic system gave birth to the monopoly which was born of the particular social and economic system”! And such imbecility is exhibited as profound thinking and as the oracular utterance of a “statesman”!

In another passage, Browder reveals the cloven hoof of the common garden variety of Anarchist. Anarchists notoriously do not believe in government. Mr. Browder says:

“Government is a necessity of social organization in any society *which is divided into antagonistic classes*. It is generally recognized as desirable only because of the inability of a divided society to operate without instruments of coercion.” (Italics ours.)

And so, according to Anarchist Browder, in a highly organized system of production, requiring the utmost coordination and cooperation, there will be no government—that is, no central directing agency! Once more, the Anarchist and bourgeois reformer are shown to be the obverse and reverse of the same capitalist medal!

Repeating the oft-told hoax that “Socialism . . . is merely the first phase of Communism,” Browder continues:

“The difference between the Socialist Party and my [Communist] Party, is that our Socialist Party friends neither know what is Socialism nor how to get it, and therefore they flounder around in a confusion that helps reaction against the workers; while the Communists not only know what is Socialism, but how to get it, how to fight for it in such a way as not to separate us from the non-socialist masses of the people, but to unite us with the majority who want now, under capitalism, to win a better life, to win jobs, security, democracy and peace.”

We certainly agree as to the gentleman’s characterization of the “Socialist party,” but the characterization fits the anarcho-bourgeois Communist party a thousand times better! For never in its wildest and gayest reform heyday did the S.P. dare to parade its reformism, its social-patriotism, its belly-crawling before plutocracy and Ultramontanism, as the Communist party does today! But it is indeed interesting to learn from the cajoling “Oily” Browder that *now*, “UNDER CAPITALISM,” it is possible “to win a better life, to win jobs, security, democracy, and peace”! If these things are attainable *under capitalism*, what, then, is wrong with capitalism? “Oily” Browder, and his gang of plutocratic servitors, are advancing the strongest argument conceivable as to why the workers should support Roosevelt, Morgan, Rockefeller, William Green and John Lewis in saving and preserving capitalism! It is impossible to conceive of a more persuasive plea for the maintenance of capitalism, or a stronger argument against Marxian Socialism and the establishment of the Workers’ Industrial Republic, than this amazing appeal made in the

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

name of "Socialism," by this would-be working class spokesman! Every S.L.P. militant should "paste in his hat" that statement by this "true son of Kansas," as he was designated in a recent *Daily Worker* editorial!

VII.

The tenth national convention of the Communist party constituted a mere gathering of thoughtless or brainless—certainly ignorant—ballyhooers, assembled simply to ratify the "new" line laid down in accordance with instructions from Moscow, and polished up by Browder, Foster & Co. Every speech, every resolution, every cheer, was a mere repetition or slight variation of the same dull theme belabored for months past: "Save the United States Constitution"; "Defend American Democracy"; "Hail Washington, Paine, Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln" (each of whom would have kicked the Browders all around the political arena); "Long live Roosevelt's New Deal"; and "Long live 'Collective Security,' the Catholic front, the outstretched hand," etc., etc. One could write a book exposing the crookedness, the trickery, the transparent insincerity and hypocrisy of these cheap vulgar politicians and plutocratic mountebanks. But interminable as is the disgusting performance of these, the most unprincipled, the most unscrupulous enemies of the Marxian Socialist movement in America, this exposure of them, long as it is, may *not* become interminable. Yet there are many more valuable lessons to be drawn from the clowning and posturing of the reactionary anarcho-bourgeois Communist party of

America. One stands out above all others. It is that you cannot fool history, nor indefinitely hoodwink the revolutionary class. And we may add that you cannot fool the usurping, the ruling, class either. As De Leon expressed it:

“He [Franz von Sickingen] failed. He had a purpose firm, but the rock on which he suffered shipwreck was to fail to make his purpose known. Impossible as it was to conceal his purpose from the detection of the keen instinct of the usurpatory elements to whom his success meant destruction, nothing was easier than its concealment from the masses, to whom his success meant salvation. Assailed by the former, who penetrated his designs, and left in the lurch by the latter, to whom his designs remained a secret, Sickingen went down . . . —in such days as these no tactical maxim of conduct has the value of that which this tragedy of Lassalle’s preaches, whose observance it enjoins, and whose neglect it superbly warns against [that is] . . . —not merely to have a purpose firm, but also to dare to *make it known*.”—(Introduction by De Leon to *Franz von Sickingen*, by Lassalle.)

Again and again the Communist swindlers have boasted of their “phenomenal” growth. They claim a membership of 75,000, of whom 10,000 are admitted to be not in good standing. Of the 65,000 claimed to be in good standing, probably 50,000 have been “roped in” during the past year, and will probably drop out during the next year or two, leaving perhaps 15,000 more or less permanent scatter-brained, hallelujah-shouting Anarcho-Communists in the whole country. And by the law of capitalist political retrogression, these, or most of them, will

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

probably constitute the future shock troops of the fascist movement, if or when it arises in this country. But even accepting the figure of 75,000 as *bona fide*, what is this compared to the numerical strength of the Socialist party in its day of glory? Around 1910 or 1912 the S.P. officially claimed a membership of 125,000, and invariably a membership of 150,000 was claimed by the S.P. spellbinders. Considering the fact that the Communist party politicians receive a pound of publicity and boosting by the capitalist press, radio, etc., for every ounce then given the Socialist party; considering the fact that the Browders and Fosters are out-Hillquiting the Hillquits, and out-Bergering the Bergers manifold—considering all this, then, even by their own “Billy Sunday” methods and standards, 75,000 members represent a dismal failure, and reveal the witless, strutting Browder, and the crafty, unprincipled Foster and associates as mere pikers! And yet, William Z. (“no principles”) Foster, with a poker face, stood up and warned his sawdust-hitting, bedlamistic “followers” not “to get dizzy with success”!! In any case, it is rather a strain on one’s imagination to attempt to visualize the “Dizzy” Amters, and the rest of the howling mob that gathered at Madison Square Garden and in other halls—to imagine them dizzier than they already are!

It is a simple, logical proposition that the more you ape others, the more like these you become. Both the so-called Socialist party and the Communist party started as bourgeois, or anarcho-bourgeois outfits, though they affected the manner

and speech of working class parties. Eventually, the manner and speech in both instances yielded to the manner and speech of the out-and-out capitalist reformer and politician. This was bound to happen. Even in their conduct, their behavior at conventions, the Communist party politicians are indistinguishable from the old established capitalist parties. The *New York Times* (which is no more fooled by the Communist antics than are the other agencies and instruments of capitalist interests) observed:

“Aided by all the convention panoply of the older political parties—a brass band, delegation banners, a uniformed chorus of 500 girls—the 1,500 delegates and convention visitors whooped it up in approved Democratic-Republican fashion. . . .”

(They have even annexed good, old Walt Whitman of whom one of the infantile Communists said in the *Daily Worker* of May 31 that after reading one of Walt Whitman’s poems “you begin to have a fuller sense of what Marx in his political economy [!] called ‘social production.’” And, believe it or not, they have set to “music” Lincoln’s famous declaration on the right of revolutionary overthrow of the government—and this in the same breath of saying that they do *not* want to overthrow the government!!)

*

The impending social revolution is the greatest task ever undertaken by man. It cannot be ballyhooed into effect. Society cannot be revolutionized behind its back. The road of the proletarian revolu-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

tion must be that of the broad sunlit avenues laid out and paved by the founders of the Socialist movement, and it must be guided by the principles laid down by Marx and De Leon. There are no short-cuts, no back-alley approaches to the Socialist Republic of Labor. Attempt to fool the master class, attempt to seduce the workers, and you write your own doom, and perchance that of the Proletarian Revolution. There is but one *goal*, and one *method*. The Working Class Republic based on integrated industries—the Industrial Union Government; and open and above-board, frankly revolutionary political and economic unions of the workers. Eschewing humbuggery, skulduggery, ballyhooing and thought- and sense-destroying tactics—exposing politicians and labor fakers of whatever stripe and label, the Socialist Labor Party repeats:

Workers of all lands, unite! Unite to end the madhouse of degenerate capitalism! Unite to sweep the fair earth clean of the ruling class scum which now hinders progress and which is turning the world into a charnel house! Unite to frustrate the efforts of the reformers to swindle us of our birth-right, to lead us into the camp of the reaction! Unite to eradicate poverty, social diseases, ignorance and superstition! Unite to establish the Commonwealth of Emancipated Labor, on a basis of peace and abundance! Unite by organizing in Socialist Industrial Unions, the *only* hope of civilization! Unite to insure speedy victory—for speed *is* essential lest the forces of gangsterism and slavery triumph in the large industrial countries! Unite, unite, or defeat is certain! But, united, our cause,

ARNOLD PETERSEN

the cause of the working class, the cause of civilization and humanity, can know no defeat!

(Weekly People, June 11, 1938.)

Stooges of Capitalism.

Fecundus est error. (Error breeds errors in prolific abundance.) Erasmus.

I.

To continue to expose the bourgeois swindles committed by the Social Democratic and Communist politicians may seem like piling Ossa on Pelion, if old Homer will forgive our using his immortal words in connection with a subject so sordid as these petty, swindling reformers. But sordid as is the subject, thankless as may seem the task, and wearisome as may be the repetitiousness in the record, it is a duty that may not be shirked by the serious-minded Marxist. And in all the world there is none to do this office but the S.L.P., for the rest either lack the will, or the understanding, or both, to do it. And so, once again we turn the searchlight of Marxian science on the fakers and misleaders masquerading as “Socialists” and “Communists”—these utterly unscrupulous and unprincipled individuals who, despite their lip-service to Marxism (and a poor lip-service at that!), preach and practise principles and policies denounced again and again by Marx and Engels in such biting scorn, and with such contempt, that their continued taking in vain the names of the great founders of scientific Socialism would seem impossible. Yet these swindlers succeed, temporarily at least, in hoodwinking considerable numbers, and they do so for the same

reason, and in the identical manner, that the out-and-out capitalist apologists and sycophants succeed in hoodwinking still larger numbers, keeping *these* in the bonds of ancient errors—or, rather, keeping them to the precepts of an age in which they constituted truths—yet truths no more. For relentless time has placed its stamp of worn-out creeds on these, and established new truths. The ancient creeds can no more serve the needs of our age than the garments of infancy can serve grown man. As Huxley so well put it: “It is the customary fate of new truths to begin as heresies and to end as superstitions.” This is certainly so in class-rule societies where the truths of the age are being used, deliberately or otherwise, for exclusive ends—that is, in the service of a rising ruling class, even as those same truths, turned superstitions, are subsequently used by the same, but now declining, ruling class in order to prolong its rule beyond its usefulness in the scheme of social evolution.

II.

If it is pernicious of a dying ruling class to employ worn-out truths—political and economic—in order to prolong its misrule, what shall we say, then, of those who pretend to oppose that ruling class, and who yet employ the identical errors and falsehoods on the fraudulent pretext that thus they are gaining the support of the exploited class through whose continued ignorance the ruling class alone survives—who do so, moreover, in the name of a science (Marxism) which long ago exposed and condemned these ruling class frauds and trickery?

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

The latest instance of such swindling, of such ruling class propaganda by would-be working class saviors in the service of capitalism, and capitalist principles, is presented to us through the *Daily Worker* of July 6, 1938. Here the “true Son of Kansas” (the *Daily Worker’s* own designation of the clownish Earl Browder) is quoted and cited as an ardent defender of Roosevelt’s “New Deal”—that is, as an ardent defender of the system which maintains the useful workers in a state of slavery, and which subjects the working class to a process of ruthless exploitation. Here is this would-be working class emancipator pleading for measures, and for the preservation of the social regime, which bind the workers in wretched slavery, and which at every turn balk the slave’s efforts to achieve freedom! Mr. Browder is certainly no Jefferson or Lincoln, nor yet a Garrison or Wendell Phillips (pardon the association, even in denial!), though he would fain have his dupes believe him so. But if for a fleeting moment we pause to consider the claims of the swindler, let us try to visualize the logic of the attempted parallel: Can we imagine a Thomas Jefferson, penning the immortal Declaration of Independence, inserting a plea to King George III that, pending success of the revolution against him, he extend relief to the oppressed American colonists? Can we imagine a Garrison, thundering against slavery, pleading with the slave-owners to ease the bonds of slavery to the end of making slavery a thing to be endured? Can we imagine a Wendell Phillips, shooting his winged arrows of truth, facts and logic at chattel slavery, invoking the reasoning,

the philosophy, the *economics* of slavery, in behalf of the cause of the Abolitionists? Can we imagine a Lincoln, warring against Jefferson Davis's slavocracy, pleading with that same Jefferson Davis in terms of the economic and political interests of the South? As ridiculous, as insane, as are these suppositions, equally ridiculous and insane—no, unscrupulously villainous and treacherous!—would be, and are, the pleas and arguments of those who claim to oppose wage slavery, and who yet employ (allegedly in behalf of, but obviously *against*, the workers) every falsehood, every sophistry, every poisoned weapon from the arsenal of capitalism, which are regularly used by the out-and-out supporters of capitalism to make still more secure their misrule, their continued robbery of the working class!

III.

This self-styled Fuehrer of the masses (by a process of logical transposition and translation, this phrase becomes colloquially “Leader of them asses!”) is by the *Daily Worker* reported to have delivered a Fourth of July oration in Pennsylvania which, if the hectic language of the *Daily Worker* reporter is an indication, must have been equal to the best produced in the past by flag-waving, red, white and blue Tammany Hall spell-binders. “Amid scenes of ear-splitting enthusiasm, which caused waves of echoes to roll back from the hills surrounding the site of his Independence Day address,” we are told, Earl Browder urged the need to protect against “the economic royalists” “the princi-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

ples fought for by Jefferson,” while at the same time he used “razor edged sarcasm” against those who “would destroy every single measure of the New Deal”! There is no account of baby-kissing, but Browder is there with his smile (a la Roosevelt), and even sartorial details are not overlooked by the enterprising *Daily Worker* reporter, who joyously writes about “the sight of Browder, in an *immaculate* white linen suit, *smiling* and waving to the audience. . . .” What a splendiferous sight *that* must have been—the dear, kind, sweetly smiling Fuehrer, dressed in *immaculate* white (symbol of angelic purity!), receiving the homage of his people, and acknowledging (in the words of the *Daily Worker* reporter) “their great love for the foremost exponent of the democratic front in this country. . . .”! Did the mountainside crack—or was it a Fourth of July cannon cracker that exploded? Did the earth quake—or what is that yawning chasm yonder?—No, brother, it was

“ . . . the Porter’s shoulder-knot a creaking!”

It was Lenin sending forth an expletive against bourgeois swindlers! It was Marx turning in his grave at this thing done in his name! It was Engels and the rest of the departed great, moaning and groaning at the foul deeds committed under cover of *their* scientifically *immaculate* garments!

IV.

The Anarcho-Communist mountebank finally delivered himself of this magnificent peroration:

“When the Catholic hierarchy, in its red-baiting hysteria attacks me, Earl Browder, Secretary of the Communist Party, do they mean me? When the Catholic reactionary priests attack the Communists do they mean the Communist Party, which, with its 75,000 members, is, after all, a small party in America? When the reactionary Catholic hierarchy attacks the appeal and the struggle of the Communist Party to unite the people for higher wages, for unemployment insurance, for old-age pensions, for a democratic front against reaction and fascism, do they really have in mind just the slogans and the efforts of the Communist Party?

“No. They don’t mean Earl Browder. They mean President Roosevelt. They don’t mean the Communists. They mean the great majority of the American people. They don’t mean just our slogans. They mean the entire New Deal program, the end of a wages and hours law, the end of unemployment insurance, the end of old-age pensions, the end of every measure that is in the interests of the people, Catholic as well as Protestant, Jew as well as Gentile, Negro as well as white.”

So now we have it! Browder is simply the stooge for Roosevelt, the self-styled stooge, mind you! Roosevelt is the real “people’s hero,” the real devil in the plutocratic bible! All that goes to make up old-fashioned, traditional capitalism, becomes, in Browder’s tear-dimmed vision, the beatitudes of these latter-day faithful believers—of the “people”—the new beatitudes in a modern sermon on the mount, the sermon to be delivered in Pennsylvania to his people! Nothing is too good for my people, says Fuehrer Browder, and so I give you capitalism—capitalist precepts, capitalist slavery, capitalist hell and damnation! Yes, he offers the work-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

ers capitalism, about which Marx said that it enters the world “dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt”!

Browder continues his eulogy of his hero, Franklin Delano Roosevelt (who, incidentally, seldom misses an opportunity to give his stooge a swift kick in his immaculate white pants!), saying that (to quote the *Daily Worker*) “we know that when Wall Street hates anyone as it does President Roosevelt, then that man is not our enemy.” This conception of personages and events is known as—very well, then, it *should* be known as the Immaterialistic Conception of History! For isn’t it utterly immaterial to the working class whether Wall Street hates or loves a capitalist savior or reformer? If we are to judge our friends by the mere fact that a section of the exploiting class takes a dislike to one of the disgruntled members of that class, then, indeed, we have definitely arrived in the never-never land of pollyannaism! By that token Woodrow Wilson towers high, for did he not threaten to hang as high as Haman any Wall Street marauder who attempted to upset the Wall Street poker game! And still higher as a “friend” of the oppressed would tower the first Roosevelt, Teddy of the spiked police club, who in 1916 was vilified by Wall Street and by the organs of Wall Street (particularly the black reactionary *New York Sun*) for waging war against the standpat G.O.P., and its plutocratic masters. Teddy Roosevelt, *fifth cousin* of Franklin D. Roosevelt, launched the “Progressive party” which was at least *second cousin* to the avowedly capitalist New Deal! Browder, and his fellow-swindlers and their

dupes, have indeed been taken into camp—assuming for the moment that they have not been in that camp all the time—of the enemy of the working class!

He continues:

“We Communists, then, have given *wholesale* support to New Deal measures . . . Roosevelt is no Communist. [Hear, hear!] He is not even [!] a Socialist. ALL THE POLICIES HE PROPOSES FIT IN WITH THE EXISTING CAPITALIST SYSTEM.” (Emphases ours.)

(It is good to have that acknowledgment on record—though a year from now the swindler will probably unblushingly deny he ever said it.) Finally he tells his “people” that—

“The policy of the New Deal is merely an effort to apply Jeffersonian principles to our economic system.”

The current slogan of the Communist swindlers is that “Communism is Twentieth Century Jeffersonism, or Americanism,” or words to the same effect. The inescapable inference, then, is that “Communism,” i.e., Browderism, is New Dealism, or attempted capitalist rejuvenation, since both simply mean, according to Browder, the up-to-date application of the “Jeffersonian principles”! It now only remains for Browder to show why the workers should support his shabby imitation of the New Deal, when Roosevelt gives them the real thing!

V.

“Browderism” is, of course, no new phenomenon

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

in the history of the labor movement, nor in the history of the world, for that matter. It is as ancient as the Gracchi of decaying Rome, and finds its counterpart in the temporizing, compromising, time-serving, self-seeking plebs leaders in every social crisis. In modern American history "Browderism" made its appearance in the 1890's, in the persons of the late Morris Hillquit and Victor Berger, and in the person of the still surviving Abe Cahan of the Jewish *Daily Forward*, the Yiddish model for the *Daily Worker*. Abe Cahan started out as an avowed Socialist, but private interest (including the Egyptian flesh-pots of capitalism) quickly caused his skin-deep "Socialism" to vanish. The story of Abe Cahan is a story yet to be told, and well worth telling, but right now it is "another story." However, the other day, Cahan celebrated his 78th birthday, and once more became the subject of admiration on the part of his co-laborers in the capitalist journalistic vineyard. Cahan, by now a respectable bourgeois apologist, and, like Browder, an ardent New Dealer, used the occasion for the purpose of boosting his New Deal master, Mr. Roosevelt. The New York *World-Telegram* special feature writer (saying that "Mr. Cahan's devotion to President Roosevelt has not changed") quotes Cahan as follows:

"He [Roosevelt] means a lot to people of my type [!]. . . . For the first time we have a President who is not a politician. Even Lincoln . . . went only so far, within the limits of politics, to put across his ideas! Roosevelt has courage to disregard politics for his ideals."

ARNOLD PETERSEN

And this about a President who ranks as the shrewdest politician of his time, who himself glories in being considered the smartest of them all! This encomium bestowed upon this shrewd capitalist politician by Abe Cahan, the great “Soshulist,” is not merely the babbling of a senile old fool—it is expression given to the very essence of plebsism, of “Browderism,” “Hillquitism,” “Communism”—in short, petty bourgeois reformism, dedicated to the restoration, and preservation, in perpetuity, of capitalist exploitation, of wage slavery; dedicated to the frustration of working class emancipation, to the destruction of every hope and effort directed at introducing a higher social system, a nobler and infinitely richer civilization!

It is WAR—war to the finish against these stooges of capitalism. It is the war of Marxism, of De Leonism, against corrupt and corrupting reformism, against labor fakerism, against plebsism in whatever guise, under whatever name it may appear. And the finish will be, *not* the triumph of decadent capitalism, but the glorious triumph of Proletarian Freedom, under the aegis of the Industrial Republic of liberated and emancipated Labor!

Speed the day, hasten the hour!

(*Weekly People*, July 16, 1938.)

Communist Jesuitism.

“How absolute the knave is! We must speak
by the card, or equivocation will undo us.”

—*Shakespeare.*

“Which I wish to remark,
And my language is plain,
That for ways that are dark
And for tricks that are vain,
The Communistic clown is peculiar
Which the same I would rise to explain.”

—*With a nod to Bret Harte.*

I.

There is pleasure, and real satisfaction, in crossing intellectual swords with an honest opponent. The pleasure and satisfaction are not merely caused by the moral principle involved, important as that is. They are caused, above all, by reason of the fact that, however much one may disagree with a person, if he is honest one knows exactly where he stands, and one follows him to the end of his logic. And error, be it remembered, has its logic as well as truth. With an honest opponent the issue is fairly and squarely joined, premises are not suddenly abandoned, nor trickily substituted for others suggested by the shifting winds of current politics or by expediency. And the honest opponent does not resort to that abomination, surreptitious injection of premises in the argument. Hence, one respects such an opponent, even though one detests his principles and social philosophy.

But it is quite otherwise with the dishonest opponent, especially if that dishonest opponent is the tricky politician, the swindling charlatan, the corrupt scribbler, the venal plebs leader, in short, the double-dealing “Communist” humbug. *He* will affirm one thing today, and unblushingly deny it tomorrow, only to reaffirm it the day after. He will vilify you today for subscribing to a certain civilized principle, and tomorrow he will himself avow that principle, and in the manner of one who has always held to it, while he will vilify you for exposing his crookedness, whereupon he will drop the principle as quickly as he picked it up, and call the process “empiricism”! He will be unblushingly—not the “accidental” or offguard lie prompted by some trivial human weakness; not the “poetical license lie” which is

“merely corroborative detail,
intended to give artistic
verisimilitude to a bald and
unconvincing narrative”—

but the deliberate, corrupt falsification of facts. With him the lie has been raised to the dignity of a cardinal principle—in fact, he *lies* as a matter of principle, the only “principle” he clings to! As an unwilling tribute to truth and decency, however, he attempts to clothe his lies in the garments of ideology. Thus he designates his lack of principles, his day-to-day shiftiness, “dialectical realism,” which, incidentally, makes every Tammany Hall ward-heeler an outstanding “dialectician”! He will inno-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

cently recite: “Times change, and we must change with them,” and on that principle he will vilify a Jefferson, a Lincoln, today, and hail them as heroes tomorrow! He will quote (misquote rather) Marx today on the (alleged) inevitableness of violence and physical force, and slander those who expose his falsification of Marx, and tomorrow he will “prove” that Marx never advocated physical force and violence. He will now acclaim Thomas Paine, though rejecting one of the essentials of Paine’s creed, the clinging to principles. He has never understood (or if he did, he rejected it) this magnificent declaration of Tom Paine:

“When a man in a long cause attempts to steer his course by anything else than some polar truth or principle, he is sure to be lost. It is beyond the compass of his capacity to keep all the parts of an argument together and make them unite in one issue, by any other means than having this guide always in view. Neither *memory* nor *invention* will supply the want of it. The former fails him, AND THE LATTER BETRAYS HIM.”

And since mention was made of Jefferson (now acclaimed by the anarcho-bourgeois Communists), let us note one utterance of this great American which the lying and unprincipled swindlers are not likely to quote—though, on second thought, why should they be squeamish in this instance?—and which properly illustrates the fakers who now with their filthy paws besmirch the name of Jefferson:

“There is no vice so mean, so pitiful, so contemptible [as lying, said Jefferson]; and he who permits himself to tell a lie once, finds it much easier to do it a second and

third time, till at length it becomes habitual.”

One almost fancies that Thomas Jefferson had been studying the careers and utterances of those princes among prevaricators, Messrs. W.Z. (“Zig-Zag”) Foster and Earl (“Oil”) Browder!

With opponents such as these it is no pleasure to debate, nor does it give one any satisfaction to score points against them other than that derived from unmasking impostors who, whether they intend to do so or not, whether they are paid for doing so or not, are assisting the plutocratic-Ultramontane reaction in rendering the American working class the helpless victim of their schemes and designs. And unmasked these swindlers shall be, even though the Socialist Labor Party alone remains to perform the disagreeable and, at least momentarily, thankless task.

II.

Some time ago the WEEKLY PEOPLE briefly recorded the examination (by that spawn of Tammany Hall, Senator McNaboe) of the polynomial “Si” Gerson, *alias* Gilson, *alias* what-have-you. Recently the redoubtable Senator summoned before him “Si’s” beloved fuehrer, Kansas’s pride and “true son,” Earl Browder. Neither the Senator nor the strutting little fuehrer is very clever; neither is distinguished for learning or understanding. Both appear to have been cut from the same intellectual cloth. Thus, one might have looked for a “draw” in the verbal pugilistic exhibition which they staged. But despite McNaboe’s obvious deficiencies, despite

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

his ludicrous posturing as a protector of “Americanism,” it must be recorded that he won the battle on points! In any case, the Marxist has cause to be thankful that “Oily” Browder was once again placed in the pillory as a charlatan, as an outstanding capitalist stooge.

With that compound of childish naiveté and peasant cunning for which the petty bourgeois “Communists” are noted, they included in the preamble to their recently adopted constitution the names of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson and Lincoln, but omitted (among others) that of George Washington. McNaboe is puzzled—he asks Browder: “Did you leave out Washington by mistake?” Oh dear, no! said the true son of Kansas, we did that purposely. And the reason? Well, you see, “Washington did not contribute greatly to the democratic philosophy.” Alas! by failing to score sufficiently in “democratic philosophy” Washington did not make the Communist grade.

“But yet the pity of it,
Iago! O Iago, the
pity of it, Iago!”

And yet, was it not the learned Robert Minor who (while vilifying Lincoln) said that “nevertheless he [Washington] was a good revolutionist in his way and caught some of the spirit of his time”? Indeed it was, and Mr. Minor was then the editor of the *Daily Worker*. Something should be done about Mr. Minor’s *major* deviation!

Well, with that important point settled, the two

gladiators went into a clinch. There was plenty of hitting below the belt, and more than one foul blow was exchanged, but it was all good, clean fun, in the best traditions of Tammany Hall and Anarcho-Communism. Space permits our touching merely a few of the highlights, and that's a pity. But the WEEKLY PEOPLE is a serious journal, and not a comic sheet, nor a sporting paper.

III.

Mr. McNaboe wanted to know about Browder's stand on war and related matters, and Browder, according to the *Daily Worker* of July 1, "denied an old Trotskyist charge that William Z. Foster sold Liberty Bonds during the war. . . ." A "Trotskyist charge"? Oh, yes, of course, everything that rises to plague the Communist swindlers today is a "Trotskyist charge." We should like to enter into the spirit of the playful Mr. Browder, but our duty compels us to brand the "Trotskyist charge" alibi as a deliberate lie. For it was Wm. Zig-Zag Foster himself who proudly boasted that he had purchased and *sold* war bonds. Before the Senatorial Committee at Washington in 1919, Foster testified under oath that he supported the war, saying: "My attitude toward the war was that it must be won at all costs." He was asked whether he bought war bonds, and replied, "I bought my share, what I figured I was able to afford, and in our union we did our best to help make the loans a success." Pressed as to details, he testified further:

"Well, I think I [Foster] bought either \$450 or \$800 worth of bonds during the war." And—"We

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

[Foster, et al.], carried on a regular campaign in our organization in the stockyards.”

Who is the liar now?

On the question of his attitude toward war, the slithery Browder was possibly more revealing as a traitor to the working class than in respect to anything else he has said or done in the past, which has earned for him the contempt now bestowed upon him. In his replies to the questions put to him by McNaboe, his infamy was brought out in bold relief. Though he shifted and dodged, evaded and equivocated, McNaboe finally nailed him down as a super-patriot as ardent as any employed by Hearst or the Du Pont interests. Under the questioning of McNaboe, he declared that he would fight for capitalist United States against Socialist Russia, if need be. He declared he would sell Liberty bonds in order to support such a war against Soviet Russia. It is doubtful that any man, supposedly dedicated to a certain cause, has ever stooped to a lower level, and in more revolting fashion, in betraying that cause, than did Browder before the McNaboe committee. The following is quoted from Browder's testimony as published in the *New York Times* and the *Daily Worker* (the direct quotation from the *New York Times* of July 1):

“If there came a war between the United States and Russia, would you bear arms?” Senator McNaboe asked.

“I refuse to admit the possibility of such a war,’ Mr. Browder replied. But the Senator pressed him, and he finally said he ‘would fight for the United States.’ He said also he would sell Liberty bonds—‘a thing I wouldn't have done in the last imperialistic war.’”

This is a masterpiece in treachery and double-dealing, and all-around intellectual dishonesty. Let us examine this precious bit of testimony:

1. He does not admit, he claims, the possibility of war between the United States and Russia, despite the fact that the United States is the outstanding nation of capitalist economic imperialism, and Russia avowedly dedicated to the destruction of the social and economic system of the United States, the two being, in fact, absolutely incompatible in the long run; assuming, of course, that Soviet Russia is all that she is credited with being. Other things being equal, war between Russia and the United States is eventually as inevitable as war between Japan and Russia is eventually inevitable, all other things being equal.

2. Granted, then, the possibility of war between Russia and the United States, Mr. Browder then places himself on record that in such a war he will fight for capitalist plutocratic United States against Socialist Soviet Russia. Make a careful record of this. It will prove useful later in checking up on, and exposing, the Communist swindlers and traitors to the working class.

3. In saying that he would "fight for the United States" against Soviet Russia in case of war, Mr. Browder unmistakably showed the yellow streak. He was caught in a cleft stick—the cleft stick into which he had maneuvered himself as a result of his double-dealing and dishonest protestations as to acceptance of American bourgeois democracy. And it will not be the last time he will get himself caught in such cleft sticks. The logic of his tight-

rope dancing will land him in many more before he and his party are placed in the limbo of forgotten things.

4. He says he would sell Liberty bonds if war broke out, but that he wouldn't have done it in the last war. The last war was an "imperialistic war," by his own admission. A war against Soviet Russia would certainly be even more imperialistic. Where is the logic in refusing to sell Liberty bonds in the last imperialist war, and yet enthusiastically pledging his service in this respect in the war against the country—Russia—he now acclaims? Peanut politicians should not try to play the game of "statesmen," or international politics!

It is significant to note that while the *Daily Worker* reports his pledge to sell Liberty bonds "tomorrow if war broke out," the lying sheet suppressed entirely his testimony that he would fight for the United States in case of war with Russia. What a spectacle this man presents—as revealing as it is loathsome! And what will "Moscow" now do with this faded carbon copy of Russia's Stalin—this noble fuehrer who is so eager to fight for United States capitalism, even to the point of fighting against Soviet Russia? Our guess is that Stalin will wink an eye and say, "Good work! Charming fellow, that Browder. One of the finest products turned out by our Machiavellian school of statesmanship—that school whose curriculum includes a course in 'strategy and adroitness, illegal proceedings, reticence and subterfuge,' as Lenin taught us! Our motto is, like that of the Jesuits: 'The end justifies the means.' Browder, through his recent

dodging, reticence, subterfuges, double-dealing and premeditated prevarications, has lived up to the noble traditions of our neo-Jesuitism! As a Communist Loyola, we hail him.”

Something of the sort is undoubtedly what the “great Leninist strategists,” in and out of Russia, are saying about Browder’s craven, poltroonish, tricky and double-dealing tactics. And for cultivating this and similar Jesuitical microbes to infest the proletarian movement, the leaders in Soviet Russia will some day pay dearly.

IV.

In order to support the fiction that the Communist party of America is independent of Moscow, the recent convention decided to strike out the reference to its being a section of the Communist International, substituting “affiliated with” the Communist International. McNaboe wanted to know why the hocus-pocus. Insisting that “no change had taken place,” Browder attempted to give a rational explanation for discovering, *after twenty years*, that “affiliated with” was a better American term than “section of.” He was most unsuccessful in his attempt, achieving instead the not difficult task of proving himself a ludicrous clown. The fact is that Point 2 of the “21 points,” which “affiliated” sections must unconditionally accept, specifically says: “Every organization that wishes to *affiliate* with the Communist. International . . .”, etc. And alternately, in the same “21 points,” the phrases, “belong to the Communist International” and “belonging to the Communist International,”

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

are used, thereby establishing (what none but swindlers or ignoramuses would deny) that the Communist parties in the various countries are integral parts, or “sections” of the Communist International. In a prepared statement, Mr. Browder, denying that the Communist party received “orders from Moscow,” lyingly said, “There is no truth in any of these charges,” adding:

“The Communist party makes its own decisions, it has never received orders from Moscow or anywhere else, and if it did receive any such orders IT WOULD THROW THEM IN THE WASTEBASKET.”³

What a great, big hero is this little man, with the Hitler lock of hair drooping coyly on his low brow, directly above—well, almost so—his Hitler toothbrush mustache! Can we not all visualize the scene?—A knock on the door. A courier from Moscow—we shall call him Michael Strogoff—enters. Clicking his heels, giving the salute, and the password (which is: “There is none greater than Stalin, and Browder is his little pup . . .”—Uh, that is, “puppet!”), he hands the 13 Street fuehrer a despatch, saying: “An order from Stalin—long live Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalinism!” Browder opens the despatch and says: “Tell Stalin to go to hell—We take no orders from him.” “But,” objects Michael Strogoff, the intrepid courier, “an order is an order. Have you forgotten the very first of the 21 points to which the Communist party of America subscribes, and which it has unqualifiedly accepted, and which

³ See Appendix II, p. 104.

reads: "The entire propaganda and agitation *must* bear a genuinely Communistic character and *agree with the program and the decisions of the Third (Communist) International.*" Have you forgotten that, Tovarich?" Looking at Michael Strogoff severely, and waving a little American flag, the Fuehrer of Union Square answers sententiously: "I have learned nothing and forgotten nothing." And tuning up his sleazy voice, he adds bravely: "I say to hell with Stalin, and into the wastebasket with his orders."

Saying which, the little man rises to his full Bonapartist height, adjusts the Hitler-Napoleonic forelock, walks slowly across the room, and deposits—no, *throws* Stalin's orders in the wastebasket, mumbling rapidly: "Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, Lincoln, Democratic Front, hocus-pocus, abracadabra," and orders Michael executed for attempting to undermine an American institution, the American institution being, of course, the coily oily Browder!

Funny? Well, not half so funny as the denials and heroics of the strutting little mountebank who seems oblivious to the fact that he is the laughing-stock of America—at least, that part of America which (outside his de-brained "followers") pays attention to him at all, and which at the same time possesses sufficient discernment to detect a political swindler and a liar without submitting him to the test of the lie detector!

V.

The cynic insists that people generally love to be humbugged, and that they love the humbug and

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

swindler. There is some truth in this, but it is a partial truth. The fact is that the *mass* as such does not reason, it *feels*. It does not respond primarily to reason, but to emotions. Individuals in a mob will do things which they would never do as separate, reasoning individuals. That fact, of course, explains the horror of lynchings; it explains the savagery and fury of armies in action; it explains the pathetic sight of millions of religious devotees cringing and crawling before individuals who, as often as not, are unprincipled scoundrels; it explains the million-throated “Vivas” and “Heils” given to such vulgar upstarts and palpable frauds as Mussolini and Hitler; and it explains also the anomaly of large numbers of otherwise reasoning and thinking beings falling under the spell of so obviously ignorant and almost illiterate “leaders” as the Browders.

To a thinking, critical-minded person, the Communist “fuehrer,” testifying before the McNaboe committee, presented himself as an essentially ignorant vulgar yokel, whose main reliance is that low cunning usually associated with the peasant. Again and again he would answer questions with tricky evasions, or with the sort of “cleverness” exemplified in the grave-digger clown in *Hamlet*. Hamlet asks the clown: “What man dost thou dig it for,” to which the answer is given, “For no man, sir.” Hamlet insists: “What woman, then?” and is told: “For none, neither.” At last he asks: “Who is to be buried in it?” And finally receives satisfaction: “One that *was* a woman, sir; but, rest her soul, she’s dead.” It was precisely this sort of equivoca-

tion and dodging which the Communist “artful dodger” employed whenever cornered, or whenever the clownish mood got entirely out of control. McNaboe wanted to know if there was any “difference between theory and practice,” to which Browder replied, “Oh, yes!” McNaboe then quoted from Lenin: “With out revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice,” whereupon Browder, according to the *Daily Worker*, “snapped back”: “True, you can’t have the chicken without the egg.” That, of course, was no answer, or rather, it was a perfectly imbecile or crooked answer, unless the Communist statesman was prepared to argue further that the egg represented theory and the chicken practice! The answer obviously should have been that if the theory is sound, practice must conform to it, exactly as the finished building must conform to the blueprint. There was a reason for Browder’s crooked answer, for he knew what everyone knows, that the “theory” proclaimed by the Anarcho-Communists is the direct opposite of their “practice.” What Lenin meant, what every Marxist understands, was that revolutionary theory cannot in logic be translated into petty bourgeois practice, such as is being done by the Communist bourgeois reformers in America today. If you sketch a plan for an ocean liner intended for peaceful purposes, and you then proceed to build a battleship, you have a case where there is a real difference between theory and practice! If you formulate a theoretical program for the destruction of capitalism and the organizing of the workers *as a class* to effect this destruction, and to establish Socialism, and then pro-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

ceed to support measures that tend to support and prolong the existence of capitalism; and if you further proceed to organize the workers, not on a *class* basis, but, with other elements, on a “people’s” basis, i.e., on the basis of the alleged identity of interests between bourgeois groups and the working class, you have a clear case of an irreconcilable difference between theory and practice! Browder’s answer to McNaboe represents the Jesuitical casuist’s conception of “theory and practice.” It is a conception which sums up the entire philosophy of the Communist “statesmen” and which now, and increasingly so to the end, spells alliance with the forces of reaction, and the blackest, most contemptible treason to the working class.

VI.

Confronted with his own earlier statements concerning the inevitability of force and violence in achieving power, Browder (being questioned by McNaboe) commenced an egg-dance which might qualify him as an expert in the noble art of doing the “big apple,” but which hardly qualifies him as an exponent of truth and honesty, let alone Marxian principles, concerning which he knows nothing. The question posed heretofore in this connection was not what a *majority*, once in power, would do to maintain order. The question has been: Is force, violence, forcible seizure of government, necessary in such countries as the United States, in order that the Socialist revolution may be achieved? The Communists have ever answered the question with an emphatic “yes,” and, incidentally, ridiculed the

Socialist Labor Party for insisting that a peaceful *approach* to, a peaceful solution of, the social question is possible. Observe now the sleight-of-hand performance, the trick of the prestidigitator, the sharp card practice of the Communist faker: Confronted with these questions, and having to reconcile his past declarations with his present “peaceful” advocacy pretenses, Browder nimbly juggles premises, substitutes or injects surreptitiously different premises, and, of course, lands on his head! Evading the original premise (of violence as a means to conquer power), he tells his inquisitors that what was really meant was that when the Communist party secures power (presumably, or by the surreptitiously injected premise, *by legal and peaceful means*), there would be a small group of capitalists who would have to be forcibly suppressed! This is the way he puts it:

“When the majority wants Socialism, for instance, it must foresee the forcible resistance of the minority which profits by the old system.”

Let us examine this a little closer: Browder’s major premise is that a majority *wants*, i.e., is ready for, Socialism. His minor premise is that Socialism may be achieved through peaceful, “democratic” means, viz., the ballot. Now, then, if the majority is ready for Socialism, surely they will then vote it into effect. And if Socialism, according to Browder’s premise, has been achieved by peaceful means, the question then is to *hold* power against a minority which (illogically) he assumes has sufficient power

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

of resistance left to menace the vast majority. The question was not, as Browder trickily injects into the argument, whether the majority should *foresee* this supposed *forcible resistance* of a defeated minority, which Browder elsewhere identifies as the handful of “economic royalists,” or the “sixty families.” The question was whether force and violence are necessary *before* that minority is defeated!

If we now reread Browder’s answer, its fraudulent character unmistakably stands out. For sheer crookedness, for audacious swindling, for unadulterated faking and unmitigated effrontery, this answer of the bourgeois Communist charlatan takes the prize! Had anyone but a McNaboe been in charge of the examination, the Communist juggler would never have been able to make such an argument unchallenged! (Incidentally, the *Daily Worker* report on this question is cut and altered to present a false picture to the readers of the sheet. This is how the anarcho-bourgeois paper puts it:

“Questioned again on *revolution* the Communist leader retorted quickly:

“That thought [what thought?!] is not an original Communist thought [!]. It goes back to the Declaration of Independence.” !!

McNaboe did *not* ask Browder about *revolution* as such, as the *Daily Worker* falsely reported. The senator quoted the following to Browder “from the program of the Communist International”:

“The conquest of power does not mean peacefully ‘cap-

turing' the ready made bourgeois state machinery by means of a parliamentary majority,"

and added: "That is plain language"; to which Browder replied, not *quickly*, but hesitatingly, foolishly, and obviously highly embarrassed:

"It is plain and introduces nothing new in American political life [!!!]. *It goes back to the Declaration of Independence.*"!!

(One may well believe the *Times* reporter when he said that whenever McNaboe cornered the Communist "fuehrer" the latter's face "assumed a seraphic expression and his voice grew velvety."!!)

A member of the McNaboe committee (the *Times* says it was McNaboe, the *Daily Worker* says it was Assemblyman Holly) wanted to know whether Mr. Browder knew of any American political party that advocated "the capture of political machinery other than by peaceful means." (*Times* version; the Communist sheet reporting the question, "if any political party now existing ever advocated 'capturing power by force'")—to which the "learned" Jeffersonian Communist, according to the *Daily Worker*, gave this "brilliant" reply:

"Yes, the Republican Party in 1860, in prosecuting the Civil War for recapturing state machinery from the southern states."!

This reply is as dishonest as it is perfectly idiotic. The question was ADVOCACY of force to CAPTURE power, not the exercise of force to prosecute

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

a war, or to recapture “state machinery,” nor yet to enforce the decree of the majority expressed at the ballot box! Moreover, Browder distorts history and misstates facts when he says (or implies) that the Republican party advocated force in 1860. The Republican party platform of 1860 distinctly stated that its cause (the preservation of the Union and resisting the encroachment of the slave power) “more than ever before, demands its *peaceful* and *constitutional* triumph.” The violence, the *force*, was *advocated*, and *practised*, by the slavocracy long before the Civil War broke out, as every school boy knows. The *force* exercised subsequently by the Lincoln Administration was the answer of duly constituted government to the refusal of the minority to accept the decision of the majority at the ballot box. It was the legitimate application of constitutional governmental power to crush what Marx designated the “pro-slavery rebellion.” Browder proved himself an ignorant, vulgar historian, even as he had already demonstrated his dishonesty in falsifying facts, and denying or juggling his own premises.

VII.

At one point Browder squealed when confronted with quotations from his own earlier book. He whimpered protestingly that McNaboe should not make a “bouquet” of these quotations, in his supposed desire to secure “an accurate picture of the program of the Communist party.” The record, and particularly the written record, is an uncomfortable thing for every faker and swindler trying to impose

upon his contemporaries. When finally he could no longer evade the issue, he confessed abjectly: "Everything I have written I would not repeat today!" McNaboe shot back: "So you've changed?" to which Browder helplessly replied: "I would say a change has taken place in the world." How true, and how profound! A change has, indeed, taken place in the world. *We are nearer the revolutionary crisis than ever before.* And, therefore, according to Browder, the time has come to save capitalism and abandon all pretense of wanting to establish Socialism! What vulgar politicianism, what abject surrender, what stupid opportunism, what moral and intellectual bankruptcy!

That the Communist party has definitely abandoned its pretense of fighting for Socialism, Browder demonstrated beyond any question. In denying that the Communist party advocates force and violence, he said that victory would come "when the opposition becomes so weak as to do away with the necessity for any kind of action"! (And this is called Leninism!!) And he added that the United States will "be one of the last to adopt communism," which we would amend by saying that the workers of the United States will *never* accept "communism," if by "communism" we are to understand the "quack medicine" peddled in this country under the designation "communism"! But what he really meant was there would be no working class revolution in this country for a long time to come—he expected it might happen, he said, in the "far, far distant future." Here he is on the solid ground of pro-capitalist propaganda, for there is scarcely a pluto-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

crat or capitalist apologist who will not agree that Socialism is “a beautiful dream,” but that its realization will not take place until “the far, far distant future.”

Browder’s final abandonment of Socialism, and hence of working class emancipation, to “a far, far distant future,” brings to mind an editorial written by De Leon in (or about) 1912.⁴ The occasion was a statement made by the then S.P. candidate for governor in New York State, Charles Edward Russell, who (with Spargo, Ghent, Max Eastman and many others) subsequently joined the Wilson brigade dedicated to making the world safe for (bourgeois) democracy, even as Browder has joined the Roosevelt brigade for the same purpose. Russell had made some sneering references to those who insisted that revolution, and not reform, was the concern of the Socialist movement, saying, in effect, that Socialism was a beautiful dream which might be realized a million years from now on, and consequently “something now” was the business of “Socialism” (Russell’s S.P. “Socialism”). De Leon, exposing the bourgeois premises and conclusions of the S.P. gubernatorial candidate, Russell, pointed out that if Socialism was something “far, far into the distant future” (to quote Browder’s phrase), then it was no practical concern of anyone with common sense. If Socialism, said De Leon, is not realizable in our times, then those who are at all social-minded should drop the pretense of fighting for Socialism, bend every effort to obtain measures

⁴ [“Well for Russell, *Daily People*, September 19, 1912.]

of relief for the workers, and otherwise aid in making capitalism workable, and capable of being endured by the working class and the population in general. Of course, De Leon demolished the false premises and shallow reasoning of Russell, showing that capitalism had reached its logical termination, historically and economically, and that its continuance would inevitably spell increased misery for the workers and increased social and cultural decay and stagnation generally, with Socialism as the logical, and *timely* successor to capitalism. If, added De Leon, Socialism cannot be realized in a million years (or in the “far, far distant future”), then only fools would waste time working for it now!

Obviously, then, Mr. Browder, on the basis of his statement, must agree, as he undoubtedly *does* agree, that capitalism is at present the best of all possible systems and that it must and can be preserved, that it must and can be made to work, at whatever cost! The would-be “proletarian emancipator” stands unmasked, accordingly, as the defender and would-be preserver of the capitalist robber system! The would-be battering ram, supposedly assailing the capitalist robberburg, has become part of the protective walls and ramparts of that capitalist robberburg! Lo! the Communist party—bulwark of the rotten-ripe, all but collapsed capitalist system!

VIII.

In other respects, Browder exhibited himself as a shifting target, as a zig-zagging, dodging rabbit, in his testimony before the McNaboe committee.

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

McNaboe wanted to know whether it was a fact “that the Communists in America acknowledge the Soviet Union as the fatherland.” An honest answer to that would have been an unqualified and emphatic YES, but no such answer, in unqualified and emphatic terms, could be expected from the dodging Communist “fuehrer.” Instead, he said warily (according to the *Times* report—the *Daily Worker* suppressed this testimony entirely):

“That is a popular phrase used to describe the place where Socialism in the interest of workers is being first realized.”

But McNaboe pressed the point: “They [the Communists] look to the Soviet Union as the moving spirit in their hearts, don’t they?” To which Browder, cornered like a rat, finally answered: “Yes,” adding (after a pause, according to the *Times*)—

“NEXT TO THEIR OWN COUNTRY.”

Well, that’s that! We now have it on record, through the little strutting Stalin of America, Mr. Earl Browder, that the members of the Communist party look primarily to the United States, and the United States statesmen, for inspiration and guidance in their political struggle! If for just a moment we assume that Browder did not lie when he said that, this statement means that “Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin” have been ditched, and that when he told McNaboe subsequently that “Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin” were “the *greatest* teachers in the

world,” he was just spoofing!

At another point, “America’s No. 1 Democrat” (as Browder was called, according to the *Daily Worker*, at a meeting he addressed in Newark the same day!) castigated the American press, and certain capitalists, for not appreciating Roosevelt and the good work he is doing in saving capitalism. Said Browder:

“They are very short-sighted capitalists who do not understand that he [Roosevelt] is the greatest protector of capitalism.”

Lo! again—Earl (“Oily”) Browder: the defender and “protector” of capitalism’s greatest protector! The self-constituted bulwark of the bulwark of the capitalist system!

*

Apropos of Browder’s rabbit-like zig-zagging, of his artful dodging, a brief note may be made here of his recent debate with one Frederick J. Libby, who describes himself as “a Quaker and a pacifist.” Mr. Libby succeeded in “spearing” the slippery Browder once or twice, but as an honest Quaker, Mr. Libby was in the main no match for the unscrupulous and unprincipled Jesuitical Communist. Browder argued that the United States should join other “democratic governments” in opposing the fascist governments, or, as Browder himself put it: “My task tonight is to sustain the position that the United States . . . should take part in concerted international action to restrain the fascist war-making governments.” At one point Browder said:

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

“We declare that if . . . war should in fact occur between Japan and the United States, then we would consider that the interest of world progress . . . demand the defeat of Japan’s militarist government in such a war, and we would make that defeat a major guiding consideration of our [America’s] **WHOLE POLICY UNDER PRESENT** world relationships.”

Later Mr. Libby, quoting the capitalized part of the above statement, said:

“If this means anything—and I feel sure it must—does it not mean that you [Browder] favor preparing for the defeat of Japan now with a super-super-navy and super-super-battleships?”

Here again an honest and unequivocal answer would have been an emphatic YES, but again Browder dodged and crawled, refusing to accept the inescapable logic of his imperialistic and super-patriotic position.⁵ He had clearly stated that in case of war with Japan a crushing defeat of “Japan’s militarist government” would constitute a MAJOR guiding consideration of “our” **WHOLE** policy under **PRESENT** world relationships. Do not the *present* world relationships include determination of armed forces, and specifically of “super-super-battleships”? Does not Browder know that one of the most burning questions in that “world relationship” has been whether or not 45,000 ton battleships should be built? What does Browder think such monster warships are built for? Does he

⁵ See Appendix III, 105.

want to prosecute his war with Japan with the most superior means of warfare, or does he want to prosecute such a war “with elderstalk squirts charged with rose-water,” to use Lincoln’s phrase?

His answer constitutes a choice example of evasion and abandonment of premises. Whereas, as we have seen, he definitely assumed, as his premise, war with Japan, he now lyingly said that he merely *indicated* that Mr. Libby’s policy “might get us into war with Japan after all, in case my policy is defeated.” (Get that—“my policy”!—the “policy” of the posturing mountebank!) And he goes on to add that he feels “confident” that Mr. Libby’s policy “will be abandoned by America” and “that therefore there is little likelihood of a war between Japan and the United States.” This is the supreme impudence of the street gamin, the “frechheit” of the loutish and vulgar slummist! Mr. Libby’s “policy” (with the rightness or wrongness of which we are not here concerned) is that under no circumstances should the United States engage in a foreign war—or as he put it: “We advocate peace at any price from other people’s wars.” That policy, says the impudent Browder, would inevitably lead to war, whereas his policy of “collective security”—i.e., joining with the imperialist nations, Great Britain and France, “against the warmakers of the world,” would keep the United States out of war! Granted that Mr. Libby’s position is utopian, that fact does not make Browder’s less imperialistic, nor more honest and logical.

In the course of his debate, Browder expressed resentment at the ridiculing “of moral standards

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

between nations as guiding principles,” claiming that Marx and Lenin looked with reverence upon such alleged “moral standards” between capitalist nations! (Fancy Marx seriously brooding over such philistine notions as “morality” between the predatory capitalist nations, and their swindling politicians!!) Unfortunately for him and his swindling game, Browder quoted from the Inaugural Address to the First International written by Marx in 1864, and emphasized particularly the following phrase—

“to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations.”

About three weeks later Browder, with the enthusiasm of one who has made a grand discovery, repeated the lines just quoted in his report to the 10th convention of the Communist party, referring to them as “the immortal words of Karl Marx.” By so doing Browder not merely exhibits himself once more as a political swindler, but also as being more idiotic than anyone taking the public platform has a right to be! Did Marx write the “immortal” words? Yes—and no. They were not in the original draft prepared by Marx, as he explained in a letter written to Engels in 1864. Previously, during the absence of Marx, a declaration of principles had been adopted by a sub-committee appointed by the General Committee of the “International.” “I saw,” said Marx, “that it was impossible to make anything of the stuff.” And so, on a certain pretext, Marx re-

wrote the “declaration,” but was bound to include “sentiments” which had previously been voted for. Under this restriction, as said, certain philistine phrases had to be included in the address which he had prepared, at the risk of having the original “appallingly wordy, badly written and utterly undigested preamble” adopted as the official declaration of the International. In his letter written to Engels in 1864, Marx explained: “My proposals were all accepted by the sub-committee. *Only I was obliged to insert two phrases about ‘duty’ and ‘right’ into the preamble of the statutes, ditto ‘truth, morality and justice,’ but these are placed in such a way THAT THEY CAN DO NO HARM.*”!

He was “OBLIGED” to insert these meaningless phrases, said Marx! But, really, he assures the no doubt sorrowing Engels, “THEY CAN DO NO HARM.” And these empty phrases, these pious bourgeois sentiments, placed there against the personal feelings and wishes of Marx, become “immortal words of Marx,” to the Communist simpleton, and the “guiding principle” to the Communist party with relation to their 1938 “foreign policy,” or the “collective security” line!!

What was that tremor? Did Marx again turn in his grave? No, this time it was Marx, Engels and Lenin shaking with Homeric laughter in their respective tombs!⁶

IX.

That Browder expressed the Communist party

⁶ See Appendix IV, p. 106.

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

attitude, that he meant to convey that the Communist party has dedicated itself to the restoration of capitalism, is made very clear through recent *Daily Worker* editorials and other Communist party utterances. Notable among these is the *Daily Worker* editorial of July 8, entitled, "The Fight for Recovery Is On!" It begins:

"One word is in the mind of America. That short and simple word is—recovery. How can we get it in the shortest possible time?"

The matter could not be put in a more perfect capitalist fashion by the Chamber of Commerce, the *Wall Street Journal*, the Liberty League, the Union League, by a Ford or a Girdler, or by any other organ and representative of plutocratic capitalism! And the *Daily Worker* is as sure that capitalism can be restored, that recovery is possible, as are the out-and-out spokesmen of capitalism. Incredible as it may sound, fantastic as some of the naive Communist party sympathizers may consider it, the *Daily Worker* goes on to emphasize its faith in capitalist principles, its faith in the restorative powers of capitalism, its confidence in the possibility of rejuvenating capitalism, and its unshaken belief that for a long, long time—"far, far into the distant future"—capitalism will be able to function and furnish "the people" the opportunity "now, under capitalism [to quote Browder] to win a better life, to win jobs, security, democracy and peace." The *Daily Worker* certifies to its faith in capitalism and its restorative powers, and in capitalist princi-

ples, as follows:

“Recovery can be achieved. RECOVERY IS A PRACTICABLE PROPOSITION. BUT IT MUST BE FOUGHT FOR. AND IT CAN BE WON.” (Capitals in the original.)

And how can it be won? Why, say these latter-day saviors of capitalism, by, among other things, breaking the “big business” stranglehold on “the independent merchant and small business man INDEPENDENT BUSINESS MUST BE PROVIDED WITH LOANS TO STIMULATE THE MOVEMENT OF GOODS.”!⁷ (Capitals ours.) And the “Democratic front,” with “labor” as “dynamo,” is the defense of capitalism against the forces that threaten to destroy it (including, then, Marxism!), and around whose banner will rally *“the farmers, middle-classes, progressives and new dealers for jobs, security, democracy and peace.”* (Italicized part in capitals in original.)

There we have it—brazen, idiotic, reactionary—an unblushing plea for restoration or maintenance of capitalist exploitation, and, by inescapable implication, a violent assault on Marx and Marxism!

In his report to the 10th convention of the Communist party, Browder, in discussing the value of slogans, and, of course, particularly Communist party slogans,⁸ emphasizes the particular value and alleged soundness of the following:

⁷ See Appendix V, p. 107.

⁸ See Appendix VI, p. 109.

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

“Guarantee to the farmers possession of their land and prices corresponding to cost of production.”

This false and utterly reactionary slogan is entirely in line with that other proposal, viz., “Independent business must be provided with loans. . . .” Let us pause for a moment to see what Engels said about such swindles. In an article written in 1894, entitled “The Peasant Question in France and Germany,” he said:

“It is not to our interest to win the peasant [small propertied farmer] today or tomorrow in order that if we are not able to keep our promise he should fall away from us again tomorrow or the next day. . . . Neither now nor at any future time can we promise the small peasants that individual property and individual working will be preserved in face of the supremacy of capitalist production.”

No, Marx and Engels could not be parties to such a swindle, nor can the Socialist Labor Party, nor any other true, self-respecting Marxian working class organization! But the Communist party swindlers, being anti-Marxist to the core, can “guarantee to the farmers possession of their land . . . ,” and offer loans to “independent” exploiters of labor in order that they may continue indefinitely their petty, labor-skinning game, and with the blessing of the bourgeois Communist party!

X.

Marx spent a lifetime in a study and analysis of capitalist economic laws and tendencies, and in the

formulation of a program that would prepare the workers for the moment which inevitably must arrive when capitalism would collapse as a result of the working out of these economic laws and tendencies. A *whole* life of profound thinking, and noble endeavor, sacrificing self and family in order to finish his work. The Communist party, otherwise hailing Marx, in a few lines in effect says that Marx was crazy, that he wasted his time, that capitalism can be saved! Marx, in the famous passage often quoted, says:

“Hand in hand with this centralization, or this expropriation of many capitalists by few, develop, on an ever expanding scale, the cooperative form of the labor-process, the conscious technical application of science, the methodical cultivation of the soil, the transformation of the instruments of labor into instruments of labor only usable in common, the economizing of all means of production by their use as the means of production of combined, socialized labor, the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world-market, and with this, the international character of the capitalist regime. Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, *and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself*. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under, it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

sounds. The expropriators are expropriated.”

In short, Marx said: “The knell of capitalist private property sounds.”

The Communist party swindlers say, in effect: “Long life to capitalist private property!”

Marx said: “The capitalist integument is burst asunder.”

The Communist party says (in effect): “The capitalist integument must be, will be, healed.”

Marx said: “The [capitalist] expropriators are expropriated.”

The Communist party says in effect: “The capitalist system of expropriation must be preserved, and the petty expropriators, the petty exploiters of labor, must be saved!”

Marx said (in effect): “The small units of capital are inevitably absorbed into larger units until the monopoly stage is reached.”

The Communist party says in effect: “We must counteract the natural effects of the operation of the law of value, and save the small business men by giving them loans, etc., in order to protect them against monopoly capital, and in order to save capitalism from the inescapable doom scientifically forecast by Marx!”

And so forth. Marx proves that capitalism, once having reached the point where it can no longer function, *must be destroyed* to the end that the producers (the workers) may produce “in cooperation and [have] possession in common of land and of the means of production.” He says that recovery of capitalism is impossible—that it cannot be effected,

and should not be tried. The Communist party charlatans say that *“recovery is a practicable proposition.”*

The Socialist Labor Party has, from the very beginning, contended that the Communist party is a petty bourgeois reform outfit, whose endeavors, as far as they were effective, have strengthened the reaction, and momentarily aided in saving capitalism from its otherwise inevitable doom. The Communist party has now proved the contention of the S.L.P. to the hilt. The Communist swindle is exposed, the Communist swindlers stand unmasked for all time—unmasked as the conscious agents of capitalism, and as the train-bearers of the saviors of capitalism. Committed to capitalist recovery, committed to Roosevelt’s program (socially and economically reactionary), they take their place with other capitalist apologists and reformers as the deadly enemies of working class emancipation.

As if to emphasize the ultra-reactionary character of the Communist party, Mr. Browder, before the McNaboe committee, entered a vigorous defense of that sinister organization, the American Legion, the storm troopers of tomorrow’s fascism, the prætorian guard of today’s plutocracy. Making the usual exception respecting the “leaders,” Browder, in rebuking Prof. Gellerman for his indictment of the American Legion, said enthusiastically:

“The national policies of the Legion have been consistently democratic and liberal. . . . *We agree with the preservation of the United States Government as the Legion does.* . . . [“Hey, police,” yells Browder, “lock up

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

those Marxian S.L.P. disturbers of the capitalist peace—those ‘reds’ who would overthrow our dear United States government!”] As a matter of fact, *I think the Communist party is the only one which does not have a major difference with the Legion.* It was the only party that supported the Legion in its demand for the bonus.”

As defenders of capitalist reaction in general, what more natural than that the Communist party should defend the prætorian guard of capitalism and capitalist interests, the reactionary American Legion, which, collectively and otherwise, has seldom missed an opportunity to support the reaction, both as regards strikes, etc., as well as with respect to violating civil liberties, etc.!?

The Communist party’s belly-crawling before the Ultramontane machine is in keeping with its role of defender of all that is reactionary, including capitalism itself. Again pretending to distinguish between the “leaders” and “followers” in an organization, the Communist party politicians have coyly extended to the Ultramontane machine the “brotherly outstretched hand.” And, although the top-Ultramontane politicians treat their overtures with understandable contempt, they have, in part at least, secured recognition for their disgusting truckling to Ultramontanism, for one of the organs of the Ultramontane machine, the *New World*, bestows well deserved praise on the *Midwest Daily Recorder*, which is the daily Communist sheet published in Chicago. As quoted in the *Daily Worker* of July 9, the Catholic paper says of the Communist Midwestern sheet:

“And far from attacking the Catholic Church, it has been noted that when it [the Communist daily] has occasion to speak of that *institution, it has nothing but praise for the constructive work done* and is respectful throughout.”

Jesuitism and bourgeois communism—Siamese twins of the reaction!

Having swallowed capitalism, hide and hair, having hailed the American Legion and the Ultramontane church, and salaamed and belly-crawled before everything else of a capitalist reactionary character, what else is there for this despicable group of “Communists” to do? Only one thing: Fold up and die. And we shall do our share to speed the end.

XI.

Fakes sometimes die hard. In the blazing furnace of social revolution, however, they cannot long survive. The contradictions in which the Communist party is enmeshed will soon strangle it, even as its predecessor, the capitalist “Socialist party,” went the way of all flesh and for similar reasons! Having abandoned even the pretense of revolutionary opposition to capitalism, the petty bourgeois Communists can be of use only to capitalism as stooges and decoy ducks for plutocratic interests. A few years ago they still insisted that the fight was between Socialism and capitalism. They ridiculed those erring brethren who insisted that fascism was the real menace, not capitalism. In a pamphlet written by one of the wheel-horses of the Communist party,

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

one Alex Bittelman, there is a passage which now reads somewhat like an S.L.P. indictment of the present-day bourgeois Communist swindlers. Says Bittelman:

“Had Mr. X. included [in his readings] the theses of the Communist International *or the writings of Joseph Stalin* . . . he would have found *that Communism traces no opposition in principle between bourgeois democracy and fascism*. [This was written in 1934! Compare with Browder’s endless dull theses on the “fundamental error” in not distinguishing between bourgeois democracy and fascism, the latter of which, says Browder, must be fought, in order to save the former! Continues Mr. Bittelman:] . . . that fascism is nothing but the fascization of bourgeois democracy.”!!

“This fetishism of democracy,” concludes Bittelman, “. . . leads . . . to collaboration with the bourgeoisie in the very preparation of fascist rule. [How very true—and precisely what the S.L.P. is telling the Communist swindlers today!] *Fascism* [continues Bittelman] *does not come about because of the defeat of bourgeois democracy; it comes about because bourgeois democracy has not been defeated by the only force that can defeat it, the proletariat.*”

Again, how very true. One wonders what tune Mr. Bittelman sings today. Undoubtedly he is very busy refuting those who believed him and echoed him in 1934. If not, he had better look to his safety. “The line, straight or crooked, but *the line*,” is the motto!

The struggle today, as it has been for many years, is between capitalism and Socialism, what-

ARNOLD PETERSEN

ever the would-be Communist saviors of capitalism may say. The issue is clean-cut, and it is the duty of the Marxist to keep it so. Not reforms and palliatives, not preservation of capitalism, but revolutionary Industrial Union organization of the working class is the requirement of the moment. Not alliances with capitalist reformers on fake premises; not truckling to Ultramontane and American Legion reactionaries, nor the throwing of life-lines to “small business men,” or capitalist farmers, but the unceasing class struggle waged to the end of terminating the class struggle as soon as may be.

The capitalist integuments are bursting asunder. Let no one, parading as a champion of labor, ease the strain on the integuments to save them! Down with capitalism, and capitalist reformers, including the Jesuitical defenders of capitalism, whatever their name and whatever their claim!

All power to the Socialist Industrial Union!

The Socialist Labor Party points the way!

(*Weekly People*, July 30, August 6–13, 1938.)

APPENDIX I.

(Refer to page 12)

That Lenin misrepresented Marx and Engels when he insisted that physical force and violent overthrow of capitalism necessarily lie “at the root” of their teachings is easily subject to proof. For in 1872 Marx clearly and definitely said: “The worker must one day capture political power in order to found the new organization of labor. He must reverse the old policy, which the old institutions maintain, if he will not, like the Christians of old who despised and neglected such things, renounce the things of this world. But we do not assert that the way to reach this goal is the same everywhere. We know that the institutions, the manners and the customs of the various countries must be considered, and we do not deny that there are countries like England and America, and, if I understood your arrangements better, I might even add Holland, where the worker may attain his object by peaceful means. But not in all countries is this the case.” As for Engels, quoting Marx approvingly in his preface to the first English translation of *Capital*, he said: “Surely, at such a moment, the voice ought to be heard of a man [Karl Marx] whose whole theory is the result of a life-long study of the economic history and condition of England, and whom that study led to the conclusion that, at least in Europe, England [and, by parity of reasoning, the United States] is the only country where the

inevitable social revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means.”

APPENDIX II.

(Refer to page 75)

Once more let it be recorded that at a time when a majority decision in the Communist party threatened to lead the Communist party away from the Communist International “line,” the Communist International (“Moscow”) reversed the decision of the American membership. This was in the summer of 1925. After a long struggle between the Ruthenberg and Foster factions, the Communist International finally recognized Ruthenberg, representing the minority, as following “the line,” saying in a cable containing definite instructions: “It has finally become clear that the Ruthenberg group is *more loyal to decisions of the Communist International and stands closer to its views.*” The Communist International—“MOSCOW”—then issued definite instructions—deciding definitely, regardless of the wishes of the membership of the Communist party of America, who should be in charge of this or that post *in this country*, so that although Ruthenberg represented the minority, he was, by *order of* “Moscow,” retained as the National Secretary of the American party. As a result of the decisions made in *Moscow*, the minority faction actually became the majority. The *American* party proposed—“*Moscow*” disposed! Nor is this, of course, the only instance. As a matter of fact, the Commu-

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

nist party of America was recognized by “Moscow,” and admitted to the Communist International, on the sole condition that it unreservedly accept the 21 points, which, among other things, provide that the Communist party of America *must* “agree with the program and *decisions* of the Communist (Third) International.” We are not concerned here with the wisdom or “morals” of this arrangement. It is solely a question of facts. By the record, then, Browder & Co. once more stand exposed as deliberate and unscrupulous distorters of the truth.

APPENDIX III.

(Refer to page 89)

When Kautsky argued in the manner of Browder on the question of “Socialists” supporting the imperialist world war, Lenin scathingly observed:

“ . . . Kautsky, when approving the deception practised on the people, is approving the part played by the petty bourgeois in helping capitalism to trick the workers and to harness them to the chariot of the Imperialists. Kautsky is advocating a characteristically bourgeois and Philistine-like policy, imagining (and trying to instil into the minds of the masses the absurd idea) that a watchword [“slogan”] can alter the real position of affairs. . . . What is necessary is to test their sincerity, to compare their deeds with their words, to discard the idealistic charlatan phrases, and to seek for the *class actuality*. AN IMPERIALIST WAR DOES NOT CEASE TO BE IMPERIALIST THROUGH THE MERE FACT THAT CHARLATANS OR PHRASE-MONGERS OR PHILISTINES PUT FORWARD AND PROCLAIM

WATCHWORDS. It ceases to be such only when the [capitalist] class which carries on the Imperialist war . . . IS OVERTHROWN AND IS REPLACED AT THE HELM BY THE REALLY REVOLUTIONARY CLASS, THE PROLETARIAT. THERE IS NO OTHER WAY OF GETTING OUT OF AN IMPERIALIST WAR, OR OF THE NECESSARILY FOLLOWING IMPERIALIST PREDATORY PEACE.”

“De te fabula narratur . . . !” Change the name, and the story applies to the American petty bourgeois Communists under the leadership of Messrs. Browder & Co.!

APPENDIX IV.

(Refer to page 92)

If Browder had been familiar with the literature published by Russian Soviet writers, he would have known that they had long ago appraised Marx’s “immortal words” of “justice, morality,” etc. In his, on the whole excellent, work, *The First International*, G.M. Stekloff (a Russian Bolshevik historian) comments on the insertion of these “pious phrases,” or “idealist chimeras,” as follows:

“With regard to the Mazzini touch [!] about ‘the simple laws of morals and justice,’ *which is quite foreign to Marx’s style and general outlook* . . . with regard to the introduction of these phrases about ‘truth,’ ‘justice and morality,’ and (later) about ‘duty’ and ‘rights’ into the preamble, Marx ironically assures Engels that, in this context, they could do no possible harm. . . . In the same letter he goes on to say: ‘It was very difficult to manage

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

things in such a way that our view could secure expression in a form acceptable to the Labour movement in its present mood. A few weeks hence these British Labour leaders will be hob-nobbing with Bright and Cobden at meetings to demand an extension of the franchise. It will take time before the reawakened movement will allow us to speak with the old boldness. Our motto must be for the present *fortiter in re suaviter in modo* [strenuously in deed, but gently in manner].’—James Guillaume (*L’Internationale*, Vol. I, p. 14, Note 2) tells us that it is a tradition that Marx scoffed at ‘morality’ and ‘justice’ as ‘idealist chimeras,’ but that the phrase in the Preamble about ‘truth, justice and morality’ was written by Marx. The implication is that the tradition was wrong! Had Guillaume read Marx’s letter to Engels, he would have understood Marx’s attitude better. Guillaume’s own phraseology is unintentionally unjust. What Marx scoffs at, as every reader of his private correspondence knows, is not truth, justice, etc., in themselves, **BUT THE USE OF THESE HIGH-SOUNDING ABSTRACTIONS TO HIDE THE REALITIES OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE.**” (Our caps.)

Thus far Stekloff. By this token we can add here, then, that Browder, in using these “high-sounding abstractions,” is attempting “to hide the realities of the class struggle.” And that is precisely what he and his impudent and idiotic associates are doing, nationally and internationally!—A.P.

APPENDIX V.

(Refer to page 94)

Similar proposals were made in Engels’s time by German bourgeois reformers, and scathingly did

Marx's *alter ego* expose the anti-proletarian character of such proposals, and denounce them as "bourgeois utopias." With specific reference to extending loans (credits), Engels said: "But for the bourgeois and in particular for the petty bourgeois, credit is an important matter and it would therefore be a very fine thing for the petty bourgeois, if credit could be obtained at any time. . . . All these things which are held up to us here as highly important questions for the working class are in reality of essential interest only to the bourgeoisie, and in particular to the petty bourgeoisie, and, despite Browder [pardon, Engels said, of course, Proudhon!] WE ASSERT THAT THE WORKING CLASS IS NOT CALLED UPON TO LOOK AFTER THE INTERESTS OF THESE CLASSES"! When the S.L.P. answers the C.P. and S.P. reformers in this manner, we are told that we "come forward merely with dead and abstract formulas" when "faced with real practical conditions," which is precisely what the petty bourgeois opponent of Engels told him after he had been routed by Engels! To which Engels replied, as the S.L.P. today replies to the petty bourgeois Communists: "The first step in coming close to the definite and concrete conditions of society is surely that one should learn what they are, that one should examine them according to their existing economic interrelations . . . practical Socialism consists rather in a correct knowledge of the capitalist mode of production from all its various sides. A WORKING CLASS WHICH IS SECURE IN THIS KNOWLEDGE WILL NEVER BE IN DOUBT IN ANY GIVEN CASE AGAINST WHICH

COMMUNIST JESUITISM

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS, AND IN WHAT MANNER, ITS MAIN ATTACKS SHOULD BE DIRECTED.”

And apropos of Browder’s “small business man,” the following from Lenin’s pen in reply to Kautsky is illuminating: “Up till now all Marxists thought—and proved it by thousands of facts—that the small masters were most unscrupulous exploiters of hired labor. . . .”! But, then, Lenin forgot that the world, had changed since the days of Engels, and Engels forgot that the world had changed since Marx, even as the S.L.P. forgets that the world has changed—since 1935, when Moscow changed everything!!

APPENDIX VI.

(Refer to page 94)

In his report to the 10th convention of the C.P., Browder writes an “essay” on slogans in which he says:

“Slogans which express in a popular but concrete form the essence of a political program *are the very life blood of a democratic mass movement.*”

The very life blood, no less! Yet Lenin ridiculed Kautsky savagely for imagining that a slogan “can alter the real position of affairs.” As we see, Browder goes Kautsky one better! Considering the names Lenin called Kautsky for his apostasy, one wonders what “name calling” Lenin would indulge

in if he were here now to review the asininites of the Browders!!

He boasts of seventeen slogans in their resolutions which "will probably have to work for some time yet, before they are superseded."!! One wonders what caused that classic slogan WORK OR WAGES to be superseded! Perhaps the C.P. panhandlers discovered (with the advent of the W.P.A., etc.) that here a way had been found for getting wages without work, thus rendering the slogan superfluous! For certainly, as an alternative to wages, they would never accept work, despite their "life blood" of a slogan! It has been said of slogans that they are substitutes for thinking. That is essentially true. It is also true that they are the bait with which are caught the unthinking masses and which, no more than the bait to the hooked fish, can serve as food for the hungry, and still less as means to attain freedom. In their emphasis on the value of slogans, the Communists prove their kinship to the fascists who likewise despise thinking, and who appeal to the feelings of the mass, rather than to the reason of the workers. As that reactionary spawn of the British nobility, the "black-shirt" fascist Oswald Mosley (ex-Social Democrat, feted by the S.P. when a few years ago he visited America), said: "I have had enough of the people who think. I am going out to get people who feel." And "slogans" get "people who feel" but do not think!

—A.P.