The The Evolution of Browderism

By Alexander Bittelman

The question is no longer, as some seem to think, whether Browder has re-entered politics but what kind of politics he is in. To which the answer is: capital-ist politics, bourgeois politics.

Certainly, the field of Soviet-American relations, which Browder makes his main business, is the central question of world relations. It is therefore, at least one of the general questions in the internal political struggles in the United States. To be engaged in this field of struggle is to be engaged in politics; and to do so the way Browder now does it, is to be engaged in politics of the bourgeois, not working-class character.

Not only is Browder's recent appeal made directly to the bourgeoisie, or certain sections of it, but the entire outlook of the appeal is based upon the concept of the bourgeoisie.

Browder's policies may be said to be of a bourgeois-liberal character. These are the kind of policies which political leadership of the independent and leading role of the working class in the struggle for peace and democracy and upholding the need of a Communist Party, let alone its van-guard role in the labor movement.

More broadly, Browder's policies could be contrasted with those of Roosevelt Democrats but with this significant difference. Certain ele- ments among Roosevelt Demo- crats are critical of the monopolies, and the policies of such Democrats reflect in varying forms the attitudes of such sections of the bourgeoisie which are in conflict with the big corpora- tions and policies. On the contrary, Browder's policies are not critical of the monopolies but in part acceptable for them. Fur- ther: Roosevelt Democrats are growing away from critical and re- sentful of Truman's abandonment of Roosevelt's progressive policies; whereas Browder's poli- cies are not only not critical of Truman's desertion from Roose- velt but even apologistic for it.

It might be said, therefore, that the abandonment of Roosevelt Demo- crats is the Right-Wing of the party, the wing that has definite affinities with sections of monop- olistic capital.

All of the foregoing is plainly demonstrated by Browder's activities in the New Republic, espe- cially the first part. In this connection the following points are of partic- ular significance:

1.—No exposure of and not even a reference to American imperial- ism and its drive for world dom- ination but a deliberate covering up of this major and most danger- ous factor in world affairs as well as a covering up of the war- hawking conspiracies of the most aggressive sections of the Ameri- can monopolies. And remember: there are among Roosevelt Demo- crats important elements that do criticize American imperialism.

2.—No exposure of the fact that it is the imperialist offensive of the Anglo-American blue, led by U. S. Imperialism, that is responsi- ble for the hostile policies of the two governments in the Soviet Union and the new democracies of Europe. Browder ignores alle- gator the fact that it is these policies that are responsible for the refusal of the Anglo-Ame- rican blue to deal with the Soviet Union on the basis of equality and which need to dissolve the Soviet Union from its positions of influence in world affairs.

3.—Admitting the existence of "powerful forces in the world which want an Anglo-American war against the Soviet Union and are working tirelessly to bring this to pass." Browder pretends not to notice the fact that the main driving forces behind this inter- national reaction is American im- perialism and the most reaction- ary and aggressive circles of fi- nance—monopoly—capital in the United States. He fails to expose the fact that these circles with their war-hawking conspiracies are betraying the interests of the American nation, the interests of the American people.

4.—Browder deliberately covers up the desertion of Truman from Roosevelt's progressive policies. He covers up, or tries to cover up, the fact that the Truman Adminis- tration is capitulating to the reactionary monopolies, and in doing so is abandoning Roosevelt's policies of friendship and col- laboration with the Soviet Union, other significant concessions fac- ing now the American people, namely, how to bring the course of the American government back to the Roosevelt policies of col- laboration with the Soviet Union for a world peace, as Browder's answer? Is it an an- swer that is to hold the most important, namely, that only the successful struggle of an anti-imperialist and anti-monop- olistic coalition of the American people, headed by labor, against the repressive and war-hawking offensive of the monopolies can and will compel a change in American policies, restoring the Roosevelt policy of friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union for a durable peace.

6.—Promoting against the im- pealarist reactionaries who are trying to justify their anti-Soviet offensive by raising the false issue that there can be no peace be- tween capitalist and socialist states, Browder, very character- istically, fails to note the fact that the monopolies raise this false issue to cover up their own imperialist offensive for world domination, an offensive to im- pose upon the rest of humanity Well Street's "shady" concept and practices of "democracy." In doing so, Browder himself cov- ers up the fact that it is this imperialist offensive which pre- vents the establishment of a dur- able peace. He covers up the fact that it is this offensive of Ameri- can imperialism, with the atom bomb diplomacy of threat and blackmail which, Browder, by the way, fails to mention altogether, that is now undermining the peace of the world.

A durable peace is not only the dreamiest of all peoples but it is also a realizable objective. A durable peace is possible because the peoples need peace and be- cause the democratic, anti-fascist and anti-imperialist forces of the world are strong enough, as a re- sult of the victory over the Axis, to gain such a peace. But this kind of peace will be won and maintained only in the struggle to break and defeat the imperial- ist offensive of the monopolies, a struggle of the coalition of the people, headed by labor.

This is the anti-imperialist and anti-war struggle which this edition of the KKK is on and win the major his- torical struggle in which it is for friendship and collaboration between these peoples and the people of the world. (Continued on page 4.)
This Dog Really Talks

AT LEAST, THAT’S WHAT ONE REPORTER TELLS US

By Robert Musel

United Press Staff Correspondent

ROYAL OAK, England, Aug. 13—The story of the talking dog has come true in this quaint village on the ancient Roman road to London. Ben the terrier has made the town here.

"Of course he talks," his owner, the vet, declared, "He’s a talking dog, a talking dog to all the villages round.

But they haven’t been excited about the country. The Government Home Office has issued Carr’s regulations for new and unusual breeds of dogs.

Reports by the vet, a retired postman, of the dog's ability to bark in response to commands, have been verified by other villagers, who have seen the dog bark in response to various commands.

The vet, who is also the dog's owner, said: "I cannot believe that a talking dog exists."

The vet added: "It is not a joke. I have seen the dog bark in response to commands."

The dog, who is called Ben, has been credited with being able to bark in response to commands such as "sit," "come," "go," and "stay."

In a letter to the English language newspaper, the vet said: "I cannot believe that a talking dog exists."

The vet added: "I have seen the dog bark in response to commands."