

Browder's Propaganda for U. S. Imperialism

By MILTON HOWARD

A reading of Earl Browder's latest propaganda, his "Distributor's Guide," leaves no doubt that he has rapidly developed his anti-working class views into an open defense of American imperialist aggression.

Browder's fundamental thesis is that American imperialism is progressive, that its accumulation of capital, its very strength and power, compel it to act as a progressive force.

This is so, according to Browder, because Wall Street monopoly's hunt for markets (for goods and for capital investment) collides with the obsolete colonial system of the British Empire.

Here is how he puts it in his own words:

"What seems to be shaping up is a new pattern of imperialism on the part of America. . . . Anti-colonialism is a characteristic feature of America's new 'pattern of Empire.' . . ."

INDIA

As an example of America's progressive imperialist role in the world today, Browder cites India:

"United States policy toward India, and toward the colonies generally, is more and more definitely and energetically toward gaining for them the status of political independence—both as a means of removing British monopoly control without war, or at least with the Indians doing the necessary fighting, and further, as a means of expanding the Indian market potential."

Here then is the Browder view in all its nakedness.

The rivalry between Britain and the U. S. is painted as a rivalry not only between a weakened British and a strengthened American imperialism, but also as a rivalry between a reactionary and a progressive imperialism.

This is the special way that Browder is today serving the reactionary, aggressive aims of Wall Street monopoly.

His theory flouts Marxist-Leninist theory, and flies in the face of actual Wall Street practice.

U. S. AIMS REACTIONARY

It is very true that imperialist rivalries are sharp between British and American imperialism, that the latter seeks to penetrate

into the vast areas controlled by Britain.

But U. S. imperialism does not seek to change the social conditions in these colonial areas in any basic way whatsoever.

On the contrary, it seeks to penetrate the British Empire with a minimum of encouragement to the progressive forces, since these progressive, national forces must be anti-imperialist.

That the progressive national forces, whether they be in India or in Latin America, can and should take advantage of the Anglo-American rivalries is, of course, quite clear.

USING THE DIFFERENCES

But Browder urges the colonial peoples and the American working class to utilize the differences between Britain and the U. S. in a slavish way, by linking themselves submissively to the "better" imperialism, that is to say his own.

The Marxist-Leninist way of utilizing these imperialist differences is exactly the opposite. It is the way of combatting both the older, "obsolete" tyranny of the British and newer, more subtle,

financial penetration of the United States which in its social consequences is no less stifling than the older colonial system.

This is, in fact, just the way that the Communist movements in Latin America are combatting Wall Street's effort to jimmy into Britain's preserves with "anti-fascist" weapons.

American imperialism may here and there introduce some minor changes as incidental bait in its struggle, or may even grant some modern concessions to the colonial mass struggle. But it has no intentions of building up any new productive forces, facilities, etc., to rival its own.

UNITED AGAINST FREEDOM

All recent developments prove that American imperialism, despite its acute rivalries with Britain, and despite its desire to supplant British domination through financial control, still backs British imperialism on the question of suppressing national independence and colonial freedom.

This explains American imperialism's special form of support for Britain as against the Soviet

Union's charges at the recent London UNO meeting. It also explains why Secretary Byrnes met Vandenberg's criticism of "softness" toward the Soviet Union by himself developing Vandenberg's bullying policy toward the Soviet Union to a blunter stage.

If Browder pretends that his theory of a U. S. imperialism compelled to be progressive is merely a description of what is happening, then the events themselves refute him.

If he is trying, on the other hand, to "persuade" Wall Street that "it ought to be progressive" for "its own good" then he is selling reactionary, cynical nonsense intended only to perpetuate illusions within the American working class. Browder insists that the working class help Wall Street extend its financial power throughout the world on the ground that this is good for the world and for the working class in the United States. His insistence on a policy so poisonous to all working class ideas and interests is a measure of how he and his propaganda must be spurned and combatted.