



N.S. KHRUSHCHOV

**IMPERIALISM — ENEMY
OF THE PEOPLE,
ENEMY OF PEACE**

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

IMPERIALISM—
ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE,
ENEMY OF PEACE

Selected passages
1956-63

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
MOSCOW 1963

Н. С. ХРУЩЕВ
ИМПЕРИАЛИЗМ — ВРАГ НАРОДОВ,
ВРАГ МИРА

(Из выступлений 1956—1963 гг.)

На английском языке

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

In response to numerous requests from abroad, the Foreign Languages Publishing House is issuing this collection, **Imperialism—Enemy of the People, Enemy of Peace**. It includes selected passages from Khrushchov published in the Soviet press between 1956 and 1963. At the same time we are putting out four more collections—selected passages on a number of other important issues of the day—**Socialism and Communism; The Revolutionary Working-Class and Communist Movement; The National Liberation Movement; and To Avert War, Our Prime Task**.

The reader will find in this collection a profound Marxist-Leninist appreciation of the processes now at work in the imperialist states, exposure of the mythical "freedom" of which capitalist propaganda boasts, and of the plans to stop and turn back mankind's progress hatched by the monopolists, especially in the United States.

The material in this book vividly illustrates the nature of imperialism, its striving to push the world to the brink of thermonuclear war. This reckless policy is most persistently applied by the monopoly bourgeoisie of the U.S.A., which is the main stronghold of international reaction and aspires to the role of world policeman. This collection shows that, although the nature of imperialism remains unchanged, its potentialities have been seriously curtailed since there are now forces capable of bridling imperialism, of thwarting any attempt by it to drag the world into a catastrophe of war. The might of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, of all peace-loving forces is a reliable barrier in the way of any reckless action on the part of imperialism.

CONTENTS

I. SHARPENING OF THE CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALISM	7
Growing Instability of the Economy. Further Decay of Capitalism	7
A New Stage in Development of the General Crisis of Capitalism	11
Acute All-Round Weakening of Capitalism	14
II. IMPERIALIST "DEMOCRACY"	19
Poverty and Unemployment—the Fate of Millions in the Citadel of Imperialism	19
Bourgeois Democracy—a Means of Deceiving the People	24
Falseness of "People's Capitalism"	25
Social Inequality. Fanning National Enmity	27
U.S. Government—Committee of Agents for the Monopolies	28
The Bourgeoisie Is Panicking, Curtailment of Bourgeois-Demo- cratic Liberties	33
III. IMPERIALISM IS A THREAT TO PEACE	37
Striving of U.S.A. for World Domination—the Main Cause of International Tension	37
Imperialism Creates a Breeding Ground for War Danger	39
Monopolists Make a Fortune Out of the Arms Race	45
The Price Paid by Peoples for War and Its Preparation	47
Imperialism Needs the Cold War Policy for Reinforcing the Dictatorship of Monopoly Capital	50
Fear of a Slackening in International Tension	51
Armed Force—a "Moral Principle" of American Imperialism	53
U.S. Imperialism—International Policeman	59
IV. IMPERIALIST INTEGRATION—THREAT TO THE PEOPLES	69
V. THE STAND OF THE C.P.S.U.: CONSISTENT BATTLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND ITS WAR VENTURES	77
Expose the Bellicose Designs of the Imperialists, Tear the Mask from Those Who Whitewash the Policy of the Imperialist States	77

Harbour No Illusions About Imperialism	79
Subversive Actions, Provocations Against Socialist Countries— Official U.S. Policy	80
Settling the German Question Is the Way to Consolidate Peace in Europe	82
U.S. Aggression Against People's China. An Attack on the Chinese People's Republic Is an Attack on the Soviet Union	88
Cuba Is Not Defenceless in Face of American Aggression . . .	93
Against the Crimes of Colonialism	97
The Colonialists Have Not Abandoned Their Arms. Colonialism Is Harboring the Danger of War	100
The U.S.S.R. Is on Guard over the Independence of Young Sovereign States	111
Imperialism Is Dangerous, but Can Be Thwarted. The Might of the U.S.S.R. and All Peace-Loving Forces Is a Reliable Bar- rier in the Way of the Aggressors	115
Imperialism Is in No State to Stop Mankind's Progress . . .	125

I. SHARPENING OF THE CONTRADICTIONS OF CAPITALISM

GROWING INSTABILITY OF THE ECONOMY. FURTHER DECAY OF CAPITALISM

In the hundred odd years since the publication of the *Communist Manifesto* tremendous changes have occurred in the world in the fields of science and technology and in the development of society. The world is far different today from what it was in Marx's time. A new social system, socialism, has emerged and is progressing well, and the bottom has been knocked out of the world colonial system. Capitalism, too, which entered the imperialist stage of development at the turn of the twentieth century, has undergone certain changes. However, the substance of capitalism as a society based on the exploitation of man by man remains unchanged, just as it was in Marx's time, and the intrinsic contradictions of capitalism have become still more acute.

The opponents of Marxism are trying to prove that capitalism has changed into something halfway between capitalism and socialism. They go to the length of substituting expressions like "welfare state", "people's capitalism", "economic humanism", etc., for the very word "capitalism". The big changes taking place currently in science and technology are presented by these opponents of Marxism as the beginning of a new epoch of prospering capitalism. But this playing about with pretty words cannot repudiate the obvious facts: scientific and technical progress does not, and cannot, alter the substance of capitalism as a social formation. Scientific and technical development has not

eliminated antagonistic classes and class contradictions in capitalist society. For all that the worker has substituted an excavator for a spade, he suffers brutal capitalist exploitation. This exploitation is absolutely inescapable under capitalism. Such is the law of the capitalist social system.

(Replies to Questions Put by Prof. Hans Thiring, Austria. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 2, pp. 395-96.)

In the years that have elapsed there has been further aggravation of contradictions both within the capitalist countries and between them, colonial empires have been disintegrating and the struggle of the working class and the national liberation movement of the peoples have assumed huge proportions.

The general trend—the further decay of capitalism—has continued to operate inexorably. Although there has been some growth in production, the economy of the capitalist countries has become still more unstable and reminds one of a man sick with fever, so often do its short-lived recoveries give way to depressions and crises. The U.S.A., the chief capitalist country, has experienced two critical recessions in five years, and there have been four such recessions in the post-war period as a whole. The crisis of 1957-58 involved countries whose share in capitalist industrial output amounts to almost two-thirds of the whole. With the incomes of the monopolies increasing to a fabulous degree, real wages of the working people have gone up very slightly and far more slowly than the productivity of labour. The social gains achieved by the working class in the past are gradually being reduced to nought. In general, the condition of the working people, especially in the underdeveloped countries, is growing worse.

During the past five or six years mankind has made great progress in science and technology, particularly in the fields of atomic energy, electronics, jet propulsion and rocketry. As Lenin pointed out, however, the evils of capitalist pro-

duction hamper the rational use of those achievements. As far back as 1913 he wrote: "On all sides, at every step, one comes across problems which man is quite capable of solving *immediately*, but capitalism is in the way. It has amassed enormous wealth—and has made men the *slaves* of this wealth. It has solved the most complicated technical problems—and has blocked the application of technical improvements because of the poverty and ignorance of millions of the population, because of the stupid avarice of a handful of millionaires.

"Civilisation, freedom and wealth under capitalism call to mind the rich glutton who is rotting alive but will not let that which is young live on." How apt those words of Lenin's sound today!

The application of new scientific and technical achievements, far from eliminating the insuperable contradictions of capitalism, only serves to aggravate them. Capitalist automation has only just begun, but millions of workers have already been thrown out of production. The imperialists hoped to find a way out of these difficulties by militarising the economy, but their hopes did not materialise.

Militarisation, of course, has brought prosperity to the branches of industry producing weapons. In five years direct war expenditure alone in the U.S.A. exceeded \$220,000 million; all the NATO countries together have spent over \$500,000 million on the arms race during the past ten years. Militarisation, however, gave rise to new disproportions, had a serious effect on other branches of the economy and deprived more millions of working people of their employment. During the past five years the number of totally unemployed in the U.S.A. has rarely been less than three million. In Italy, Japan and a number of other countries, mass unemployment has acquired a permanent character. The greater the amount of money spent on war production, the more unstable becomes capitalist economy and the more acute its contradictions. A glaring contradiction in present-day capitalism is the increasing employment of human

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 388-89.

labour for the production of means of destruction. A social system that creates such contradictions is discrediting and outliving itself.

No wonder the American millionaire Harriman proposed abolishing the word "capitalism". "Plagiarising from Khrushchov," he said, "we should 'bury' the word 'capitalism'." He had to admit that "people outside America think of the word 'capitalism'" as a synonym "for imperialism, for exploitation of the poor by the rich, for colonialism. It is a dishonoured word, and one that breeds terror". Indeed, there is no getting away from the truth! Not even the most thorough cleansing could remove the blood and filth from that sullied word. There is an apt proverb which says, "You can't wash a black sheep white". We can only welcome the efforts of Mr. Harriman who has taken up the spade to dig a grave for the word "capitalism". But the peoples of the capitalist countries will draw a more correct conclusion and will bury not the word "capitalism", but the capitalist system with all its evils, a system that is rotten through and through.

In recent years there have been some significant changes in the alignment of forces in the capitalist world.

First, the United States of America has lost its absolute supremacy in world capitalist production and commerce. Its share in capitalist world industrial output dropped from 56.6 per cent in 1948 to 47 per cent in 1960, its exports from 23.4 per cent to 18.1 per cent and its gold reserves from 74.5 per cent to 43.9 per cent. The result is that the United States today occupies approximately the same position among the capitalist countries as it did before the Second World War.

Secondly, there has been a noticeable weakening of the position of Britain and France; these states, like Belgium and Holland, are losing their colonies for ever. They have been unable to recover their pre-war position in world industry.

Thirdly, the vanquished countries, especially West Germany and Japan, have made a big leap forward. The share in capitalist world industrial output of West Germany, Japan and Italy combined is now about 17 per cent, that is,

greater than it was in 1937, on the eve of the Second World War.

West Germany has drawn level with Britain in industrial output, and as far as exports are concerned takes second place after the U.S.A. In post-war years U.S. monopolies have invested huge sums of money in the economy of West Germany and Japan. For a number of years these two countries were actually relieved of the burden of their own war expenditure because the U.S.A. provided them with armaments at the expense of the American taxpayers. West Germany and Japan have made huge investments in the key branches of the economy to renew their constant capital and reorganise production on modern lines. As a result they are already serious rivals to Britain, France and even the United States in the world market.

The contradictions that existed between the imperialist powers before the war have reappeared and new ones have emerged. The struggle between British and West German imperialism for supremacy in Western Europe is growing fiercer. French imperialism, in its struggle against British imperialism, is seeking support in yesterday's enemy, the West German monopolies. But this unnatural alliance, like a marriage of convenience, is more and more frequently operating against France herself. There are profound contradictions dividing the U.S.A. and Britain and other imperialist states. They are manifested in NATO and other aggressive blocs.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 24-28.)

A NEW STAGE IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

It is quite obvious that the rise of the world socialist system, the rapid process of the disintegration of the colonial system and the unprecedented upsurge of the struggle of the working class for its vital rights and interests are under-

mining the foundations of capitalism and intensifying its general crisis. Capitalism has suffered irretrievable losses from these blows. This applies equally to the capitalist system as a whole and to its main power—the United States.

The strongest capitalist country has been affected by the general crisis to the greatest degree. It is the United States that has been hit by economic upheavals more frequently than other countries in the post-war years. Since the war it has already experienced three slumps—in 1948-49, 1953-54 and, especially, in 1957-58.

U.S. industrial production last year (1960—*Ed.*), according to the American press, rose by only 2 per cent, and for 1961 U.S. economists forecast not a rise, but a drop of about 3.7 per cent, and perhaps more. Soviet production in 1960 rose roughly by 10 per cent.

U.S. monopoly capital is showing an inability to utilise available productive forces. The richest country of the capitalist world is the country with the greatest chronic unemployment. Obviously minimised official U.S. figures show that the number of wholly unemployed in the United States rose from 2,600,000 in 1956 to 3,800,000 in 1959, and exceeded 4,000,000 towards the close of 1960. In addition there are millions of semi-unemployed in the United States.

Under-capacity operation of industry is continually spreading in the U.S.A. In 1959, the U.S. steel industry operated 37 per cent under capacity, although steel output rose somewhat after a steep decline in the crisis year of 1958. By the end of 1960 the U.S. steel industry used less than half of its capacity. Despite the big increase in military appropriations, the rate of growth of production has slowed down there in the post-war years, barely exceeding the growth of population. Between 1956 and 1959, U.S. industrial production per head of population remained at the same level.

Although the United States is still the main economic, financial and military force of contemporary imperialism, its weight in the economy and politics of the capitalist world is declining. The share of the United States in the industrial output of the capitalist countries dropped from 54 per cent in 1950 to 47.48 per cent in 1959. In 1950 the United States accounted for 57.4 per cent of all the steel produced in the

capitalist countries; in 1959 this percentage dropped to 40.4. The share of the United States in the total export of the capitalist countries shrank from 30 odd per cent in 1946 to 21 per cent in 1953, and to 17.4 per cent in 1959. Nevertheless, the U.S. monopolists were, and still are, the chief usurers and exploiters of peoples.

There is every reason for drawing the conclusion that both economically and in the sphere of international affairs the principal capitalist power has entered the twilight phase, a phase of growing difficulties and crises.

As for the economy of the other capitalist countries, it, too, is characterised by increasing instability.

At present the capitalist world is not split into two imperialist camps as it was prior to the two world wars. But it is far from united, and is rent by bitter internal conflicts. Even behind the so-called "Atlantic solidarity" there is the unprepossessing picture of internal strife and conflict, and increasing resistance to United States leadership and *diktat*. The revival of German militarism and revanchism in the heart of Europe is restoring the complex entanglement of Anglo-German, Franco-German and other imperialist contradictions. One has only to compare the present state of capitalism with what it was after the end of the Second World War to see clearly that its general crisis has become much deeper.

Having made a profound analysis of the international situation as a whole, the Meeting* reached a conclusion of great theoretical and political significance, namely, that **"a new stage has begun in the development of the general crisis of capitalism"**. The feature of this stage is that it originated not in connection with a world war, but in an environment of competition and struggle between the two systems, the increasing change in the balance of forces in favour of socialism, and the intense aggravation of all the contradictions of imperialism, an environment where the successful struggle of the peace forces for the practice and consolidation of peaceful coexistence has prevented the

* Reference is made to the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties in November 1960.—Ed.

imperialists from wrecking world peace by their aggressive actions, an environment of rising struggle by the masses for democracy, national liberation and socialism. All this speaks of the further development and deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. Results of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties, January 6, 1961. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 22-24.)

ACUTE ALL-ROUND WEAKENING OF CAPITALISM

The socialist and national liberation revolutions, the growth of the world socialist system and the disintegration of the colonial system—those are decisive factors deepening the general crisis of capitalism, which has in recent years entered a new, third stage. But they are not the only factors adding to the crisis of capitalism. The crisis of world capitalism is a far-flung and all-embracing process involving all aspects of life in bourgeois society—the economy, domestic and foreign policy, and the ideological superstructure.

To begin with, it should be noted that the **economic instability of capitalism has increased steeply and the uneven development of some countries in relation to others has become far more marked.** The rates of the economic development of the capitalist system are dropping, and in some countries are barely ahead of the growth of population. Economic crises are becoming more frequent, especially in the United States. War production has become a permanent element of the economy. Militarism has swelled to enormous proportions. Fifteen to twenty per cent of the national income is spent on armaments. A substantial portion of the manpower is not being used to produce material values. The chronic underloading of the production apparatus is all the time increasing in scale. During crises underloading of productive capacities in some industries amounts to as much as 50 per cent. In many countries mass unemploy-

ment, to say nothing of agrarian over-population, has assumed the proportions of a real national calamity. According to official statistics 8-10 million out of 85 million industrial workers in the developed capitalist countries of North America and Western Europe, and in Japan and Australia are fully unemployed. This means that on the average one person in every nine is unemployed.

The political instability of world capitalism has increased, especially as a result of mounting class antagonisms. This is indicated convincingly by the deepening of the contradictions between the handful of monopolists and all the other sections of the people, and by the vast scale of the working-class struggle, the mounting struggle of the peasants, and the mass actions of the working people in defence of democracy, against fascism and the despotic militarist regimes. It is also strikingly illustrated by the ever-growing role and influence of the Communist Parties.

The structure of imperialism is afflicted from top to bottom by an acute and deep-going crisis. This does not mean, of course, that imperialism is in a state of complete stagnation, that its productive forces are bogged down. A more rapid growth of capitalist economy may be observed at different periods in different capitalist countries under the influence of incidental factors. But on the whole, capitalist relations of production are increasingly inhibiting the development of modern productive forces. In our time it is the rates of growth of production in the socialist countries that constitute the criterion of their development. In the past decade the average annual rate of growth of the capitalist economy did not, on the whole, exceed 5 per cent, while it was nearly 14 per cent in the socialist world.

Imperialist ideologists and politicians are vainly trying to prove that capitalism still commands great possibilities and "reserves" of development. The Right-wing socialists and other defenders of imperialism capitalise on the new phenomena in capitalist economy to infer that capitalism is changing its nature and, of all things, evolutionising towards socialism. All that is nonsense, of course. In effect, these new phenomena could not do more to confirm Lenin's analysis of imperialism. They show that there is no such

thing as "transformation" of capitalism, and that the process of its growing enfeeblement, sharpening of contradictions, increasing decay and parasitism is well under way.

What, in substance, are the apologists of imperialism pinning their hopes on? Above all on state-monopoly capitalism. But, as we know, state-monopoly capitalism has been operative for quite some time. And what do the facts show? They reaffirm that state-monopoly capitalism by no means signifies the emergence of a new stage of capitalist development distinct from imperialism, that it does not signify the development of the bourgeois state into a mediator, a supra-class force safeguarding private and public interests and the interests of both labour and capital, to an equal degree. State-monopoly capitalism constitutes a fusion of the strength of the monopolies and that of the state into a single mechanism subordinating all aspects of the nation's life to the interests of the financial oligarchy. The monopolies remain the basis of the economy, and not just within the framework of individual countries, but also on the scale of the capitalist world as a whole. Suffice it to say that nearly one-third of world capitalist production is concentrated in the hands of only 200 major monopolies. Like giant octopuses, they have fastened their tentacles upon entire countries and continents, sucking the lifeblood out of the peoples.

True, the transition to state monopolies and increasing intervention by the state in the process of capitalist reproduction make it possible to exercise a certain influence on the development of the productive forces and facilitate a mobilisation of resources in the interests of the financial oligarchy. The state's intervention in economic relations in the interests of the monopolies has had a certain effect, inducing some growth of production and renewal of basic capital in the post-war period. Conscious of the far-reaching social consequences likely to follow economic crises of the scale of 1929-33, the monopoly bourgeoisie is trying to soften by methods of state control the destructive impact of the economic upheavals inherent in capitalism. However, state-monopoly capitalism does not cancel—nor can it cancel—the objective economic laws of capitalism, eliminate spon-

taneity and anarchy of production, economic crises and the other evils of the capitalist system.

In the U.S.A. state-monopoly capitalism is highly developed. But what good has it done the country? It is in the United States that underloading of plants is most acute. At a time when vast multitudes starve in the capitalist world, U.S. monopolists hand out premiums for curtailments of sown areas and reductions in the output of agricultural produce. In place of the vaunted "full employment", the U.S.A. has a permanent army of many millions of fully and partially unemployed.

It follows that the hopes pinned on state-monopoly capitalism as a means of salvaging imperialism are essentially groundless.

American imperialism aspires to the role of citadel and saviour of world capitalism. The United States is, undeniably, the richest and mightiest power of the capitalist world. But it is becoming more and more the epicentre of capitalism's economic difficulties. Furthermore, the fact should also be noted that for all of the last decade the share of the U.S.A. in world capitalist production and commerce has been dropping steadily. American capitalism has passed its prime, and is declining.

There is yet another reason why the designs of the United States to "integrate" the whole capitalist world under its aegis proved futile. It is the ineradicable economic strife between the imperialist states. The international state-monopoly organisations springing up under the guise of integration of the capitalist countries, of alleviating the problem of markets, are in effect new forms of redividing the world capitalist market and are becoming sources of acute strain and conflict. Objectively, there are two trends that operate and intertwine in the imperialist camp. One is the trend towards joining all its forces against socialism, and the other towards an aggravation of the contradictions between the imperialist powers, and also between the imperialist powers and the other countries of the capitalist world. The United States has not succeeded, and will not succeed, in overcoming the latter trend. The American financial oligarchy does not have the strength or the means to implement its

claims to the role of saviour of capitalism, to say nothing of its claims to world domination.

Comrades, the more acutely the exploiting essence of capitalism, its anti-popular ideology and moral degradation come to the fore, the more stridently the advocates of the bourgeoisie try to extol capitalism. But what has capitalism given mankind? It warps the achievements of man's creative genius and turns them against him. It has turned the release of atomic energy into a menace to mankind. Capitalism turns every new technological advance against man. The wealth of a few countries is maintained by the poverty of the peoples of many other countries. Even the pure light of science, as Marx put it, is unable to shine under capitalism but on the dark background of ignorance.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. **The Road to Communism**, Moscow, pp. 182-86.)

II. IMPERIALIST "DEMOCRACY"

POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT—THE FATE OF MILLIONS IN THE CITADEL OF IMPERIALISM

The defenders of capitalism like to picture the United States as a country of prosperous enterprise, as a model of bourgeois freedom, of bourgeois democracy. One could cite many facts and figures showing what this "model" democracy is really like. I shall not quote such facts and figures, because they are generally known. Allow me to refer only to some statements from a recent speech by an American trade union leader, George Meany.

An emergency conference, called by the trade unions to consider the economic situation in the United States, opened on March 11 (1958—*Ed.*). It was convened with the object of drafting proposals to be submitted to the U.S. Administration and Congress which would make it possible to restore the full volume of production and the economic development of the United States. In his speech at the conference George Meany, President of the American Federation of Labour-Congress of Industrial Organisations, dwelt on the question of unemployment, which has now spread to all the main U.S. industries. According to the figures cited by George Meany, there are now in the United States 5,250,000 totally unemployed and over three million partially unemployed. During last month alone the number of unemployed in the United States increased by 750,000.

George Meany painted an unattractive picture of the present economic situation in the United States. He said:

"More than 25 per cent of our production capacities are idle. In some industries—for example, steel—production ca-

capacities are utilised only 50 per cent. . . . Freight shipments are 25 per cent below last year. Exports have dropped by 25 per cent compared with March 1957.

"Here are the latest extremely important statistics: In February 170,000 workers exhausted their unemployment compensation," Meany pointed out. "Just think what this means. Every week during February more than 40,000 workers exhausted all the unemployment compensation to which they were entitled. By the middle of February, 7.5 per cent of all those with a right to receive unemployment compensation were getting it."

In his speech George Meany also gave other highly characteristic data about the burdens the working people of the United States are forced to bear.

"Do you know," he said, "that according to the last survey, in December 1956 13 million families were living in houses not conforming to the accepted standards. Thirteen million families! And the census showed that these figures had remained practically unchanged since 1950.

"We are short of many thousands of classrooms," Meany said. "Many children of our trade union members today study in buildings which are not much better than mere chicken coops, in old, neglected buildings with a big fire risk . . . and then people wonder why we do not have enough scientists, engineers and technicians to equal the Soviet Union.

"We must get America back to work. . . ." George Meany exclaims. "This is the only possible answer to the economic crisis that is confronting our country today."

Those are some of the facts given by an American trade union leader.

A small handful of millionaires and billionaires are making fabulous profits out of the sufferings and privations of the people, while the millions of the working masses are compelled for months and years to look in vain for jobs and do not possess the means to feed their children and their aged fathers and mothers. At the same time the American Government is spending thousands of millions of dollars on building military bases.

The arms drive is profitable for the monopolists. They do not worry about the urgent needs of the people. Such is the nature, such is the essence of capitalism. Enrichment, aggrandisement, maximum profits—that is what the rulers of the capitalist countries strive for. Such is the motive force of capitalist society. That is what capitalist prosperity looks like in practice! That is what capitalist freedom means!

We, of course, do not rejoice over the fact that unemployment, a real scourge for the working people, is growing in the United States. The older generation in our country remember how, before the revolution, many hundreds of thousands of working-class families suffered hunger and poverty owing to unemployment. Unemployment is an inevitable concomitant of capitalism the ulcers of which were profoundly revealed by Marx and Lenin. They showed the working class and all the working people the road to liberation from the fetters of capitalism, the road for gaining power, the road to socialism.

And if one is to consider which world—the socialist or the capitalist—has a real right to call itself free, then there can be no two opinions on this matter—only socialism brings mankind real, and not fictitious, freedom. And the future belongs to this world.

(Speech at Meeting of Electors of the Kalinin Constituency, Moscow, March 14, 1958. For **Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism**, Moscow, pp. 169-72.)

Imperialist politicians and ideologists, echoed by the modern revisionists, extol bourgeois democracy. To listen to them, bourgeois democracy gives the people complete power, equality and freedom. But life is a grim teacher. The number of simpletons who believe that there is equality between the workers and the capitalists is shrinking. What "equality" can there be when the owners of mills and factories throw their industrial and office workers into the street by the thousand in defiance of the people's

vital interests. According to American press reports, for example, there are more than six million fully unemployed and more than three million partially unemployed in the United States. They are willing to take any job, but cannot find it. Whereas a small handful of monopolists live in luxury and enrich themselves upon the suffering and grief of the people.

Bourgeois democracy is democracy for the rich. The popular masses are kept well away from running production and the state, and deciding social and political matters. Thousands of obstacles are raised to prevent the working class, the working people of the capitalist countries, from electing their best representatives to Parliament or Congress.

(Speech at Meeting of Csepel Iron and Steel Works During Stay in Hungary of a Soviet Party and Government Delegation, April 9, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, p. 318.)

The high level of production in the United States of America by no means signifies that the entire population of that country has the opportunity to satisfy its requirements in food necessities.

The ideologists of capitalism are trying to prove that the teachings of Marx on the development of capitalist production, on the contradictions between labour and capital are outdated, that present-day capitalism has changed. Actually, today's economic situation in the capitalist world, including the United States of America, the most developed capitalist country, fully confirms the correctness and vitality of Marx's teachings. Only the blind or those who hide in the dark because they fear bright sunlight can speak of the teachings of Marx on the laws of the development of capitalism becoming outdated.

The entire course of social development confirms that the contradictions of present-day capitalism are becoming ever more sharper and its sores are being exposed to an ever greater degree. Look at what's happening in the Unit-

ed States. More than seven million are unemployed there: 5.4 million fully unemployed and 1,700,000 partly unemployed. These are official American figures. If there are any errors at all here, it is due to understatement.

The workers of the older generation, who had to work for the capitalists, have a definite idea of what it means to be a victim of unemployment. Some of them were jobless. They know the plight of a person deprived of work. He comes home to his family waiting for his earnings, for food, but the jobless man cannot provide this. Unemployment is a tragedy for the working people. Over there in America the workers frequently purchase household commodities on an instalment plan. But a worker must work in order to pay for these things. If he loses his job, the creditors will come to take away his things, dooming the family of the unemployed to a life of hardship.

At the same time, when production is being curtailed, when there are millions of unemployed and starving in the country, when grown-ups, the aged and children are living in want, the United States of America is suffocating from overproduction of farm produce. The monopolists are wondering what to do with these products. It is clear to ordinary people living in a socialist country that if there is an overproduction of products, then why not give these products to people who cannot feed their families.

The monopolists think differently. They would destroy them to maintain high market prices rather than give these products to the needy. This is a glaring confirmation of the contradictions of capitalism. No speeches, promises or prayers can rid capitalism of its antagonistic contradictions which lie in its very nature. Only when the capitalist system is replaced by socialism and communism will these antagonistic contradictions be removed.

(Our Strength, the Earnest of Future Victories for Communism Lies in the Firm and Inviolable Friendship Between Peoples. Speech at Meeting of Leading Farmers from Transcaucasian Republics in Tbilisi, February 7, 1961. **Communist Construction in the U.S.S.R. and Agricultural Development**, Moscow, 1963, Russ. ed., Vol. 4, pp. 454-55.)

BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY—A MEANS OF DECEIVING THE PEOPLE

History affords a wealth of evidence for comparing socialist and bourgeois democracy. The thing is to determine objectively, without bias, which kind of democracy responds to the vital interests of the people, consolidates friendship among nations and promotes world peace. Does bourgeois democracy do that? No, it does not.

Under bourgeois democracy power is actually in the hands of a small group of exploiters, who are interested in maintaining and consolidating their privileges, in oppressing the millions of toilers, in plundering weak nations. Bourgeois democracy offers no escape to humanity from the tragic *culs-de-sac* into which capitalism has led it. It tries to slur over the contradictions of capitalist society. For that reason we regard bourgeois democracy as one of the means required by the bourgeois ruling classes today to deceive the masses.

(Speech at the Ninth All-German Workers Conference in Leipzig, March 7, 1959. *World Without Arms, World Without Wars*, Moscow, Book 1, p. 200.)

It is quite natural that the imperialists cannot reconcile themselves to the existence of countries where the working class, the working peasants and intellectuals are themselves masters of their country's riches and are successfully developing a socialist economy.

Where are you trying to drive us? What's this "liberation" you shout about? They'd like to saddle the people of our countries with capitalists and landowners. What sort of freedom can they give? Freedom to die.

The capitalists are clever, they are past masters at fooling the working people. They say: "There's complete freedom with us. You're free to vote, free to campaign for your candidates." And how does it work out in reality. Take the U.S.A. with its two main parties, the Republicans and Democrats.

They follow each other to power, but they defend the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Our ideas are attractive because the socialist system guarantees genuine democracy, genuine freedom for the working people. What is their democracy? All wealth is concentrated in their hands, in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the capitalists. The newspapers, radio and all the other mass media belong to them. The capitalists, like a blood-sucking tick, cling to the nation's body; you scrape it off, but its head still stays in your body. The ideologists of capitalism tell us that anyone can be an entrepreneur, a capitalist, under their system. But just try to become a capitalist. For that you have to have big money.

When they throw a working man out of a factory, he may get work or he may not. He may exist like that or he may starve to death—that's his affair. Now that is complete capitalist freedom for you.

(Speech at Meeting of Soviet-Czech Friendship in Ostrava During the Visit to Czechoslovakia of a Soviet Party and Government Delegation, July 13, 1957. *For a Lasting Peace and Peaceful Coexistence*, Moscow, 1958, Russ. ed., pp. 119-20.)

FALSENESS OF "PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM"

We Soviet people are proud that in our country the people, and the people alone, are the masters of all wealth. We are proud that there is no exploitation of man by man in our country, and no unemployment—that terrible scourge of the working people—and that the people themselves administer all the affairs of society.

It is different in the capitalist countries, where those who create wealth are, essentially, without rights.

To camouflage the anti-popular exploitative essence of capitalism, its defenders have lately created many legends about a so-called "people's capitalism". They are singing the praises in a thousand different ways of this "people's capitalism", which they claim now exists in the United

States and some other capitalist countries. These people go so far as to call themselves socialists, although they are, in fact, lackeys and yesmen of the capitalists.

"People's capitalism is the genuine road to socialism," these "socialists" shout like hired barkers of some cheap peep-show at a fair. "Look," they say, "factory and office workers in the capitalist countries are now becoming capitalists like the millionaires and multi-millionaires. They are buying shares and now have the right to call themselves owners of factories, mills and other joint-stock enterprises."

But what actually happens to the workers and clerks who swallow this bait, buy small shares with their savings, and thus become shareholders and "owners" of capitalist enterprises? When crisis developments set in, the real owners take these shareholder "owners" by the ear and throw them out of the enterprises whose shares they hold. The shareholder joins the army of unemployed, which numbers millions. So this "owner" takes his place in a queue, hoping that fortune will smile on him, perhaps, and he will again obtain work to save himself and his family from starvation. How many of these "owners" take part in strikes against the employers, against the exploiting classes and the governments of the so-called "people's capitalist" states!

Isn't this an object-lesson of the falsity of the claims made by the ideologists of capitalism and the revisionists about a change having occurred in the capitalist system—the appearance of "shoots" of socialism in the modern economy of the capitalist countries, and some "special road" along which capitalist countries turn into socialist ones.

Whatever nice cloaks the ideologists of imperialism may use to dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system under which millions upon millions of people are oppressed by a comparatively small number of exploiters—a system where poverty and mass unemployment prevail.

The historical experience of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist countries has shown conclusively that socialism alone rids the working people of exploitation and op-

pression, that it alone gives them true freedom, a real right to work, education and leisure, and ensures a continuous improvement of the people's living standard.

(Speech at Meeting of Electors of the Kalinin Constituency, Moscow, February 24, 1959. *World Without Arms, World Without Wars*, Moscow, Book 1, pp. 119-21.)

SOCIAL INEQUALITY. FANNING NATIONAL ENMITY

Social differences and national barriers are a result of the class structure of bourgeois society. In that society the means of production are in the hands of a small group of people who live at the expense of the labour of others. Under such conditions the material progress of society, not only fails to eliminate social differences, but, on the contrary, increases social inequality and sharpens the contradictions between the exploited and the exploiters.

The expansion of production, the development of technology, everything that promotes material progress, will not in itself make the worker equal to the capitalist or the small peasant equal to the big landowner. Under the conditions of a class society the ruling classes utilise material progress for their personal enrichment, for concentrating new and ever-increasing material values and riches in their own hands. Can social differences disappear under such conditions? Of course not.

Social differences disappear only under the conditions of socialist society, in which there are no capitalists, landed proprietors, financial tycoons and other groups of exploiters.

In socialist society material progress, far from increasing social inequality, serves to make society still more monolithic, improves the material well-being of the whole of society and raises the standard of living of all those who work. You know that the principle of socialism is paying for work in accordance with the quantity and quality of the labour involved. Socialism is the first phase of communist society, in which the requirements of the people will

be satisfied in accordance with their needs and people will work according to their abilities.

As for national barriers, they, too, are a result of the class structure of capitalist society. National discord and enmity are fomented by the ruling classes of the bourgeois states in order that the minority in whose hands the wealth is concentrated may exploit the majority of the people, that is to say, the working classes. The exploiting classes seek to enslave and rob, not only their own peoples, but also the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. Colonialism is a monstrous offspring of the epoch of capitalism. Overlordship in Asia, Africa and South America by the industrially developed countries has brought grave consequences to the peoples in those areas.

Private ownership of the means of production and the capitalist system are inconceivable without the fomenting of enmity between nations. Capitalism has engendered the misanthropic "theories" about the superiority of one nation over another and the inferiority of the so-called coloured peoples. Who doesn't know how the Negro population is treated in the United States? Or remember the notorious "theories" of the German fascists on the necessity of establishing the domination of "Aryans" over all the other nations.

(Interview Given to Correspondent of the *Figaro*, March 19, 1958. For *Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 197-99.)

U.S. GOVERNMENT—COMMITTEE OF AGENTS FOR THE MONOPOLIES

I cannot help but draw attention to Mr. Dulles's exhortation that power should be exercised only when "this reflected the freely given consent of the governed". This is precisely the stand we Communists take, and we fight for this, for it is the people who are the determining force, their will is sacred, it is their interests that the govern-

ments should express if they are really worth anything. In our opinion, it is not the people who must serve the government, but the government which must serve the people.

Perhaps I am saying things which Mr. Dulles does not like. However, I prefer speaking sharply but truthfully to speaking politely but falsely.

Take the Government of the Soviet Union, let us say, or any other socialist country, and compare its composition with that of the Government of the United States of America or any other capitalist country. Who is in power in the one and in the other? The position is so obvious that I don't think there is any need for me to enlarge upon it. In the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries the members of the government, the leaders in all bodies of state power, cannot but serve the interests of the people, for the very reason that they come from the people, they form part of the people, have been put forward by the people.

As far as the bodies both of executive and legislative powers in the capitalist countries are concerned, though Mr. Dulles tries to convince us that "the governed entrust them with government", it is just the opposite. Who does not know that "men of capital" and "adherents of capital" rule there? It would be interesting to hear what Mr. Dulles would say if he were to be asked whose interests were defended by the Rockefellers and the men in their service. How can the class interests of the billionaires be the same as the interests of the workers? Who can believe that the "governed", that is the people, elect the bodies of power in the capitalist countries by their own choice, in accordance with their own interests?

One can only wonder how it comes about that, after all these so-called "free elections", it is as a rule not workers who are in power in the capitalist countries, but men of capital, not those who by their toil create the material and spiritual values, but those who possess the money with which to buy these values.

No, Mr. Dulles, such "miracles" do not happen, and things are fairly simple. You speak of "force and violence" by the Communist Parties, but you know far better what

the force of capital, the violence of capital, are. This is well known by the workers, the small peasants, the clerks, the handicraftsmen, the entire working people, who have themselves experienced it, and who, therefore, know how to measure the sincerity of Mr. Dulles's "indignation" regarding the "violence" of the Communists.

(Letter to Bertrand Russell, March 5, 1958. For **Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism**, Moscow, pp. 121-23.)

All the successes of our country have become possible because we are living under socialism, when the people are the complete masters of their country and take a most active part in all spheres of political, economic and cultural life.

The working people of our country are deeply interested in electing as deputies the best and worthiest representatives of the people. It is precisely for this reason that our people regard the elections to the Supreme Soviet as their own vital concern. Almost the entire electorate takes part in the voting.

There is nothing like that in capitalist countries. For instance, during the last congressional elections in the United States only 57.3 per cent of the people who had reached voting age went to the polls, and in the previous elections, in 1954, there were even fewer—42.5 per cent. Or take the elections to the House of Commons in Britain. At the last elections only 26,760,000 of the 34,852,000 electors voted. Don't these figures speak for themselves? The voters in those countries see that no matter what representative of the ruling classes they elect to Congress or Parliament there will be no change in the state of affairs. It makes no difference whether representatives of the Republican or the Democratic Party sit in the United States Congress, they will defend the interests of the ruling classes—the capitalists, bankers, big landowners and big businessmen.

Take the present composition of the United States Congress. Of the 531 congressmen, more than half are lawyers and one-quarter are employers and bankers. All

of them are representatives of Big Business. How many workers are members of the United States Congress? There are no real workers in the American Congress. Or let us see how many ordinary farmers are members of the American Congress. There are no farmers either. Seventeen and a half million Negroes, or 10.4 per cent of the country's entire population, are citizens of the United States. How many Negroes have been elected to Congress? According to American sources, there are three Negroes in the United States Congress, or 0.56 per cent of the total number of congressmen. Or let us see how many women are members of the United States Congress. In all, 17 women have been elected to Congress, or only three per cent. Consequently the American Congress is actually inaccessible to workers and farmers, to women and to national minorities, who are placed in a position of inequality.

Here you have the so-called "free world", in which the workers, all the working people, are given the right to vote for this or that representative of the ruling classes, but have no right to take part in the activities of the legislative bodies.

(Speech at Meeting of Electors of the Kalinin Constituency, Moscow, March 14, 1958. For **Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism**, Moscow, pp. 167-68.)

The Government of the United States of America is essentially nothing more than a committee of agents for the monopolies, which looks after the interests of the corporations and monopolies instead of the nation's interests. Have a look in any American directory and you will find proof enough.

Who is this Thomas Gates, U.S. Secretary of Defence, who alarmed the nation by his provocative action of putting the armed forces on the alert on the eve of the Paris meeting? He is a member of a Philadelphia family of millionaire bankers, tied up with the house of Morgan. He is

a joint owner of the big banking firm Drexel & Co. Before joining the Government he was vice-president of Beaver Coal Corporation and director of several other companies.

That's no Marshal Malinovsky for you living on a salary. Gates is now being paid both by Eisenhower's Government and by the corporations who set him up in his post as U.S. Secretary of Defence.

Who is this Christian Herter, U.S. Secretary of State, the man who has proclaimed the intrusion of American spy planes into Soviet skies his country's "national policy"? Owner of a large fortune, he is also a relative of one of the founders of the American oil empire, the Standard Oil Company.

Who is this Robert B. Anderson, U.S. Secretary of Treasury, the man who is turning the screws of the tax press ever tighter? Up until his appointment to his present post, he was president of the big American-Canadian Corporation, Ventures Ltd., which is connected with the atomic industry and has investments all over the world. This corporation provides atomic fuel, nickel and other strategic materials. It is closely tied up with the monopolies General Motors, The International Nickel Company and so on.

You could continue this list for ages. But what has been said is enough to give an idea of the people ruling the United States of America today. And they still have the cheek to call their world "free" and "democratic"!

The men who defend imperialism, making use of their control of capital, radio, television, the press, etc., are doing all they can to whitewash their system. Sooner or later, however, their masks will be torn off, and the people, comparing the real state of affairs under capitalism with that under socialism, will see for themselves which system is better.

(By Constructive Labour We Shall Strengthen the Cause of Peace, Secure Victory in the Economic Competition with Capitalism! Speech at the All-Union Conference of Emulation Leaders of Communist Work Teams and Shock Workers, May 28, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960*, Moscow, 1961, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 636-37.)

THE BOURGEOISIE IS PANICKING. CURTAILMENT OF BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC LIBERTIES

The greater the successes of the socialist system and the greater the international army of Communists, the more the bourgeoisie panics. It resorts to fascist methods of government and tyrannical regimes. It musters all its means of propaganda in an attempt to whitewash the capitalist system and to smear socialism and our communist ideas. Bourgeois propaganda is becoming more and more insidious and subtle. It is using anti-communism as its principal weapon in the struggle against the socialist camp and the Communist Parties.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 65.)

Even today bourgeois propaganda is trying to frighten the man in the street with communism. In doing so it resorts, as is its custom, to outrageous deceit and all sorts of provocations. Sometimes it succeeds. There are still those, even among honest men in the capitalist countries, who fear communism. However, this is not surprising. The older generation may recall that in the early years of Soviet power in our country, the working people's enemies also made up quite a few absurd fairy-tales about the Bolsheviks and the proletarian revolution. Their object was to scare and confuse the ordinary people. But our Bolshevik truth has conquered the hearts of men, and has won their sympathies. The same will happen also in the other countries of the world.

(Speech at Baltic Works Meeting During Stay in Leningrad of Polish People's Republic Delegation, November 3, 1956. **For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism**, Moscow, p. 705.)

Imperialist ideologists try to dress up the anti-popular capitalist system. Prominent bourgeois leaders never fail to put in that the Western capitalist countries are "free countries", and the capitalist world, a "free world".

Indeed, there is freedom in the capitalist countries, but for whom? Not for the workers, of course, who have to go into the capitalists' service on any terms to avoid finding themselves in the vast army of people "free" of work. And not for the peasants, who are continuously menaced with being "freed" of their farms through ruin. And not for the intellectuals either, whose creative endeavour is hemmed in by material dependence upon the money-bags and the "spiritual guidance" of various loyalty commissions. Freedom in the capitalist countries exists for those alone who have money and, consequently, power.

The politicians and ideologists of the "free world" like to profess religious morals. But they ought to know from the religious myths about Christ that when he saw traders and money-lenders haggling in the temple he took a whip and banished them. If the capitalists uphold religious morals, why have they turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor? And this, in spite of the Christian parable which says that a camel is more likely to pass through a needle's eye than a rich man is to go to paradise! The "free world" is the realm of the dollar, of profit-making and unbridled profiteering, of cruel exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists.

There was a time when in their struggle against feudalism bourgeois revolutions proclaimed the enticing slogan of liberty, equality and fraternity, but it was proclaimed by the bourgeoisie primarily to elbow aside the aristocracy in order to pave the way for capital. As it consolidated its rule, it ignored the slogan more and more.

Today, though they still take advantage of the slogan of liberty, equality and fraternity, the imperialists turn more and more frequently to outright dictatorship. There are sinister signs in the capitalist countries today of an onslaught of reaction and fascism. This is the reactionary path chosen by West Germany, where the Communist Party has

been banned, democrats are persecuted, and fascist and revenge-seeking organisations are given free rein. The trend towards open dictatorship has taken shape in France, where the democratic freedoms and the gains of the masses are being abused. The onslaught of reaction in France, a country known for its democratic traditions, causes concern to all champions of democracy and progress. The military coups in Pakistan and Thailand have shown that an attack is being mounted on the democratic gains of peoples that have won national independence. The forces of reaction are rearing their head also in a number of other capitalist countries.

We are thus faced with a clear-cut general tendency, which obtains in many capitalist countries, rather than with isolated facts.

The reactionaries are using an old anti-popular weapon—they are doing away with the democratic system and setting up “strong-arm” governments. But just as in the period when fascist dictatorships were established in Italy and Germany, the tendency towards the open dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie is not a sign of strength, but a sign of weakness. Yet it should be borne in mind that under an unlimited dictatorship reaction has a better chance of starting a reign of terror and repression, of suppressing all opposition, of indoctrinating the masses to suit its ends, of infecting them with the poison of chauvinism, and of freeing its hands for military gambles. For this reason, the people must be vigilant. They must be ever ready to repel the reactionary offensive and the threat of resurgent fascism.

Millions of people usually associate fascism with Hitler and Mussolini. But we must not rule out the possibility that fascism will revive in forms other than those which have already discredited themselves in the eyes of nations.

Today, when there is a powerful socialist camp, when the working-class movement has much experience in combating reaction, and when the working class is much better organised, the people have greater possibilities of blocking the advance of fascism. Broad sections of the people, all

democratic, genuinely national forces, can and must join hands against fascism. In so doing, it is very important to stamp out all vestiges of sectarianism, which are liable to obstruct the mobilisation of the masses against reaction and fascism. The unity of the democratic forces, above all of the working class, is the most reliable barrier to the fascist threat.

(Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-65, Moscow, pp. 102-04.)

III. IMPERIALISM IS A THREAT TO PEACE

STRIVING OF U.S.A. FOR WORLD DOMINATION—THE MAIN CAUSE OF INTERNATIONAL TENSION

Soon after the Second World War ended, the influence of reactionary and militarist groups began to be increasingly evident in the policy of the United States of America, Britain and France. Their desire to enforce their will on other countries by economic and political pressure, threats and military provocation prevailed. This became known as the "positions of strength" policy. It reflects the aspiration of the most aggressive sections of present-day imperialism to win world supremacy, to suppress the working class and the democratic and national liberation movements; it reflects their plans for military adventures against the socialist camp.

The international atmosphere was poisoned by war hysteria. The arms race began to assume more and more monstrous dimensions. Many big U.S. military bases designed for use against the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies were built in countries thousands of miles from the borders of the United States. Cold war was begun against the socialist camp. International distrust was artificially kindled, and nations set against one another. A blood war was launched in Korea; the war in Indo-China dragged on for years.

The inspirers of the cold war began to establish military blocs, and many countries found themselves, against the will of their peoples, involved in restricted aggressive alignments—the North Atlantic bloc, Western European Union, SEATO (military bloc for South-East Asia) and the Baghdad Pact.

The organisers of military blocs allege that they have united for defence, for protection against the "communist threat". But that is sheer hypocrisy. We know from history that when planning a redivision of the world, the imperialist powers have always lined up military blocs. Today the "anti-communism" slogan is again being used as a smoke-screen to cover up the claims of one power for world domination. The new thing here is that the United States wants, by means of all kinds of blocs and pacts, to secure a dominant position in the capitalist world for itself, and to reduce all its partners in the blocs to the status of obedient executors of its will.

The inspirers of the "positions of strength" policy assert that this policy makes another war impossible, because it ensures a "balance of power" in the world arena. This view is widespread among Western statesmen, and it is therefore all the more important to thoroughly expose its real meaning.

Can peace be promoted by an arms race? It would seem that it is simply absurd to pose such a question. Yet the adherents of the "positions of strength" policy offer the arms race as their main recipe for the preservation of peace! It is perfectly obvious that when nations compete to increase their military might, the danger of war becomes greater, not lesser.

The arms race, the "positions of strength" policy, the lining up of aggressive blocs and the cold war—all this could not but aggravate the international situation, and it did so.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Party Congress, Moscow, pp. 21-22.)

We see the obvious intention of the aggressive circles of the imperialist powers to aggravate international tension, to continue the arms race for the enrichment of a handful of monopolists at the expense of millions of taxpayers, to intensify the cold war on the basis of the "policy of strength", to halt the disintegration of the colonial

system of imperialism and strangle the national liberation movement of the peoples for freedom and independence. The ruling circles of the imperialist countries are pursuing a policy of further strengthening military blocs, and trying to unite all the aggressive blocs such as NATO, the Baghdad Pact and SEATO, into a single aggressive military bloc led by the United States of America. Is not this policy of the present-day claimants to world domination reminiscent of that pursued by Hitler and Mussolini when they based their policy on strength and built the notorious Anti-Comintern Pact, the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis?

But everyone knows how this fascist scheme ended. Hitler, Mussolini and other fascist bosses have long ceased to keep the world at fever pitch by their criminal adventures, while the Soviet Union is developing and becoming stronger. Today the Soviet Union is not alone in its advance towards communism. This road has been firmly and irrevocably taken by the peoples of many countries in Europe and Asia. Today the world socialist system exists as a powerful factor for peace.

(On Certain Questions Relating to the International Situation. Speech at Meeting of Leading Farmers of the Byelorussian Republic, January 22, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 38-39.)

IMPERIALISM CREATES A BREEDING GROUND FOR WAR DANGER

The course steered by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries towards peaceful coexistence and the peaceful solution of world problems is counterposed by the course held by aggressive circles of imperialism towards continuing the cold war and intensifying international tension. It is they who are to blame for all the crises that arise aggravating the international situation and pushing mankind towards the brink of world war.

The imperialist circles endeavour to find a way out of their difficulties by attacking their own working people's

standard of living, and by stepping up the robbery of economically underdeveloped states. After the world colonial empires have broken down, the designs of the imperialist monopolies have been aimed at preserving and even tightening up the economic enslavement of young national states, at keeping in irons those peoples who still languish under colonial slavery. So, a growth in the national liberation movement supported by all progressive mankind is evident on one side, and a stepping up in attempts by the imperialist powers to repress this movement by all means on the other.

The most bellicose and reckless imperialist circles are looking for a way out of their dilemma through stepping up the arms race and preparing for aggressive war against the socialist countries and the young sovereign states of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

It is becoming more and more evident that these breeding grounds for aggression created by the imperialists harbour sparks which may set fire to a world nuclear-missile war.

The imperialist aggressive forces are tying knots of international tension, which are fraught with dangerous consequences for mankind. The culminating point of this tension was the crisis in the Caribbean.

(The Present International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. Report at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., December 12, 1962. **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Moscow, 1963, Russ. ed., pp. 373-74.)

I shall not be revealing any secret when I say that in recent years some lovers of adventure have several times brought mankind to the brink of war. The policy from "positions of strength" pursued by the United States and its partners in military blocs with the aim of imposing their domination on other countries has already more than once threatened to hurl the world into the catastrophe of war. Let me recall, for example, the events of the last two years in the Middle East: the attack upon Egypt by Brit-

ain, France and Israel, encouraged by the United States, the threatened attack upon Syria, the brazen invasion of the Lebanon by U.S. forces and the occupation of Jordan by the British. As a result of the decisive actions taken by the peace-loving forces, the Anglo-American aggression in the Arab East has been halted. But the situation in the area will continue to remain extremely dangerous, until the U.S. and British forces leave the Lebanon and Jordan.

Today we see yet another deterioration in the world situation—this time in the Far East. Encouraging the reckless intentions of Chiang Kai-shek and his supporters, the United States is interfering in the internal affairs of the Chinese People's Republic. At the same time, the United States wants to mislead world opinion by talk about a "cease fire" and to give a semblance of legality to its aggressive moves against People's China. U.S. aggression creates a serious threat not only to the security of the great Chinese people, but also to the peoples of Asia and the whole world. To prevent the further exacerbation of the international situation and to put an end to tension, the United States must stop interfering in the internal affairs of the Chinese People's Republic and withdraw all its forces from the Taiwan area.

The aggressions in the Middle East and in the Far East are all links in a single chain—and the direct outcome of Dulles's policy of balancing "on the brink of war".

(Replies to Questions Put by Murilo Marroquim de Souza, Brazilian Journalist, October 3, 1958. *For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 670-71.)

In these past years, the forces of war and aggression have jeopardised world peace more than once. In 1956 the imperialists organised, simultaneously with the counter-revolutionary rising in Hungary, an attack on Egypt. In the second half of 1957 the imperialists prepared an invasion of Syria that threatened a big military conflagration. In the summer of 1958, in view of the revolution in Iraq, they launched an intervention in the Lebanon and

Jordan and at the same time created a tense situation in the area of Taiwan, an island which belongs to the People's Republic of China. In April-May 1960 the U.S. imperialists sent their military aircraft into Soviet air space, and torpedoed the Paris summit meeting. Last spring they organised an armed invasion of Cuba by mercenary bands and tried to bring Laos under their sway, to involve her in the aggressive SEATO military bloc. But all those imperialist sorties failed.

It would be a gross error, however, to imagine that the failure of aggressive schemes has brought the imperialists to their senses. The facts show just the opposite. The imperialists continue their attempts to aggravate the international situation and to lead the world to the brink of war. In recent months they have deliberately created a dangerous situation in the centre of Europe by threatening to take up arms in reply to our proposal to do away with the remnants of the Second World War, conclude a German peace treaty and normalise the situation in West Berlin.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress. **The Road to Communism**, Moscow, pp. 41-42.)

Indeed, those who are striving for peace cannot but feel seriously alarmed, since the hotbed of war danger in the heart of Europe is becoming ever more ominous. West German militarism and revanchism, which has brought incredible suffering to the peoples, has once again been nurtured by the U.S. monopolies, and is embarking more and more openly on a course of aggression and adventure. Although Chancellor Adenauer poses as an opponent of the Hitler regime, he leans on Hitler generals and officers and is in effect pursuing a Hitlerite policy. Here are the facts.

During his term in office Adenauer has spent more on West German armaments than Hitler spent on preparations for the Second World War. Hitler's military expenditure from 1933 to 1939 made up 90,000 million marks,

while that of Chancellor Adenauer between 1950 and 1961 alone amounted to 100,000 million marks. Peace-loving mankind cannot but stop to think of these figures, for they are figures of death and suffering for the people. Hitler generals have been entrusted with the command of the NATO ground forces in Europe. Certain European countries are beginning to march to the drum beat of the Bonn revenge-seekers, and even the Great Powers are beginning to dance in time with it.

The West German militarists fiercely resist disarmament and a relaxation of international tension. In 1874 Moltke, an ideologist of German militarism, said cynically: "Everlasting peace is a dream, and an ugly one." Many changes have come about in the world since then. But the cannibal ideology of German militarism is unchanged. Defence Minister Strauss resists all disarmament plans with might and main. The Bonn militarists are reaching out for the atom bomb, and are already close to getting it, as the Athens session of the NATO Council showed.

Bonn makes no secret of its plans for a forcible revision of the results of the last war, for a revision of the German frontiers established under the Potsdam agreements. Minister Seebohm of Bonn says: "Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Soviet Union should not entertain the hope that we no longer lay claim to the territories beyond the Oder and Neisse." He is seconded by von Hassel, Minister-President of Schleswig-Holstein, who says: "Our territorial claims reach far beyond the Oder-Neisse line. We want to regain the old regions of German domination."

Some revenge-seeking politicians, including Herr Brandt, even take the liberty of threatening the socialist countries.

From these threats and from what the Bonn politicians are doing, one might doubt whether they were living in 1962 or whether the hands of their watches had stopped at the time of Hitler's campaigns of conquest.

What the Soviet Union advocates is to write *finis* to the Second World War, conclude a peace treaty with the two German states and on its basis normalise the situation in West Berlin, which is fraught with an explosion.

This is evidently the only possible and sensible stand to take. Yet the U.S., British and French governments are against the conclusion of a German peace treaty. They are trying to perpetuate the occupation regime in West Berlin and keep their troops there. But how can one be reconciled to the fact that in the centre of Europe there is a powder keg with a burning fuse? In what way can this fact answer the interests of the people of West Berlin or any country?

It only meets the objectives of the manufacturers of lethal weapons and the West German revenge-seekers. Strictly speaking, the Western statesmen on whom agreement on the conclusion of a peace treaty depends are aware of this, and the only reason why they do not conclude a treaty is that they do not want to hurt the feelings of Chancellor Adenauer, their ally. West Germany and her armed forces are already becoming the backbone of the aggressive forces of NATO, and are shaping the policies of that bloc to an increasing extent. As for those who believe themselves to be the leaders, they connive with the West German revenge-seekers on the plea that Western unity must not be impaired. Under the guise of preserving Western unity, that is, NATO unity, they take their cue from the aggressive forces in West Germany.

One must not overlook yet another circumstance. The present occupation of West Berlin has long since ceased to be the occupation that was implied at the time the Allies signed their quadripartite agreements following the defeat of Hitler Germany. Those agreements were aimed at abolishing German militarism and Nazism and preventing the threat of a new war on the part of Germany. But occupied West Berlin today is a special kind of NATO military base where the troops of the powers in that aggressive bloc are stationed, a base directed against former allies—the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and a number of other countries who fought against Hitler Germany.

(General and Complete Disarmament Is a Guarantee of Peace and Security for All Nations. Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, delivered July 10, 1962, Moscow, pp. 33-35.)

MONOPOLISTS MAKE A FORTUNE OUT OF THE ARMS RACE

The thirst for profit, an insatiable urge for enrichment and exploitation, gives rise to imperialist aggressive wars. After the Second World War, the capitalist monopolies made war preparation, the armaments race, a composite element of the economic development of their countries. The successes of the socialist countries rouse increasing fear among the imperialists, and hatred of communism. They abhor the imposing achievements of the world system of socialism, the growth of its power of attraction among the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. The ideologists of imperialism see the conceptions by which the capitalist world has been living until now tumbling about their ears. The gap between the industrial and agricultural production of the Soviet Union and the United States is closing year after year, and the day is not far distant when we shall catch up America and start forging ahead of it.

Blinded by their class hatred of the socialist countries, some imperialist leaders make anti-communism the basis of their foreign policy. Those are old tunes, familiar words that go back to the "Anti-Comintern Pact" and the "Rome-Berlin" Axis. But what is left of the latter? The axis has snapped and the ranting authors of the "Anti-Comintern Pact" have been flung on history's waste heap.

It appears that the most aggressive imperialist quarters would like nothing better than to disrupt our plans for the peaceful building of communist society. It is capitalism that fears peaceful competition between countries with different social systems.

The United States and the other Western powers are building up strength for a war. They are putting tremendous sums into armaments. In the last twelve years direct military expenditures in the United States have more than trebled. As much as \$53,000 million are to be appropriated for military requirements this year, and recently the United States President requested an additional appropriation of \$3,500 million. According to official, obviously incomplete figures, West Germany has in the last decade spent about as much on military purposes as Hitler had from 1933 to the

outbreak of the Second World War. In 1961 the military items of Federal Germany's budget have increased by another 18 per cent. The other imperialist powers are also spending tremendous sums on armaments. This shows that the imperialists are again trying to nail to their mast the policy of "rolling back" the socialist countries, proclaimed by Dulles.

(Speech over Radio and Television, August 7, 1961. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 371-73.)

The monopolists long ago turned the production of weapons for the annihilation of people into a source of enrichment, of profit. They do not conceal their fear of the "threat of peace", of disarmament.

In the United States the monopolists widely circulate "theories" that achievement of agreement on disarmament may cause chaos in the country's economic and financial life, that disarmament may deal an irreparable blow to the American economy. The ideologists of imperialism are proving in all earnestness that the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction is profitable for the working people themselves because it gives them work and enables them to maintain their families. They are trying to make people believe that if the production of weapons is discontinued there will appear additional millions of unemployed who will be unable to find jobs in the peaceful branches of industry. This is a monstrous deception of the masses. In order to make profits the monopolists want to perpetuate the situation when the source of subsistence for many millions of workers is their labour applied in the production of weapons for the mass annihilation of people and the destruction of peaceful cities and villages. This shows that capitalism has become enmeshed in insoluble contradictions and thus has outlived itself as a social system.

(**For Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood and Happiness!** Speech at Meeting of Electors of the Kalinin Constituency, Moscow, March 16, 1962. **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Russ. ed., p. 30.)

THE PRICE PAID BY PEOPLES FOR WAR AND ITS PREPARATION

Not only does a mere handful of millionaires and multi-millionaires arbitrarily control the entire wealth of the capitalist world; they make the destinies of entire nations a coin of exchange. Within the lifetime of a single generation the imperialists started two world wars. The price paid by mankind for the policy of the imperialists amounts to about 80 million dead or crippled, to say nothing of the incalculable destruction of material wealth. Some investigators estimate that the cost of the wars and war preparations in the early half of the twentieth century (1900-53) added up in the whole world to a truly astronomical figure—more than \$4,000,000 million.

Let us see what could have been done for man's benefit with these funds. The entire population of our planet could have been supplied free bread for half a century. Comfortable dwellings could have been built with these funds for 500 million families, i.e., for two-thirds of the world population. At present imperialism compels mankind to spend at least \$100,000 million annually for military purposes. If only 20 per cent of that sum were annually spent on helping the underdeveloped countries in the course of 25 years, it would be possible to build power stations totalling 230 million kw and steel works producing 185 million tons of steel a year, irrigate more than 100 million hectares of land, and do many other big things to improve the life of peoples. All this demonstrates once again how urgent the struggle for disarmament is to all the peoples.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 186-87.)

The imperialists are whipping up war hysteria and intensifying the arms race, which causes a reckless squandering of resources. This arms race was started by the Western war monopolies, which are making money out of arms pro-

duction. One can get an idea of what the peoples have to pay for this perilous arms race from, say, the fact that in the 1961/62 fiscal year, the U.S.A. plans to spend \$43,800 million for direct military purposes.

The imperialists are using the labour of millions upon millions of people to the detriment of working people, because this labour is being wasted on the production and stockpiling of death-dealing nuclear-missile weapons. The arms race and the stockpiling of weapons, especially of nuclear weapons, is fraught with extremely great peril for the peoples. Another world war, should the imperialists manage to set one off, would cause such a loss of life and such vast destruction of material wealth as defy the imagination.

(Speech at Meeting in Yerevan on the Fortieth Anniversary of Soviet Power in Armenia and of the Communist Party of Armenia, May 6, 1961. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 109.)

Never before have war preparations proceeded on so gigantic a scale as today. The league of war-industrial monopolies, the “death merchants” and the zealot militarists—this “military-industrial complex”, as ex-President Eisenhower described it—is hotting up the arms race to a frenzy. Competent Western atomic scientists estimate that the “nuclear death potential” in the contemporary world amounts to 250,000 megatons, or 250,000 million tons of TNT. This makes more than 80 tons of explosives for every inhabitant of our planet. Explosives, as you see, are a product that the world population has in abundant supply.

Even according to official figures the world spends \$120,000 million on war needs every year. This is equal to about half the capital investments made in the world economy. It equals about two-thirds of the total national income of all the economically underdeveloped countries. The NATO countries alone spend a million dollars every ten minutes on war preparations!

The United States ranks first for the scale of its war preparations. In seventeen years, from 1946 to 1962, direct

and indirect U.S. military expenditure added up to something like \$900,000 million, or nearly as much as all the capitalist countries combined spent in the Second World War. The other NATO countries are following the same disastrous path of military waste. Their war machine has grown to fantastic proportions.

The arms race is consuming a colossal amount of the people's labour. Today, more than 20,000,000 people are serving in the armed forces, and more than 100,000,000 are giving their energy to military needs. Seventy per cent of the world's scientific personnel are, in one way or another, employed in the military sphere. The threat that militarism will engulf the civilian society is becoming a reality in the Western countries.

(General and Complete Disarmament Is a Guarantee of Peace and Security for All Nations, Moscow, pp. 9-16.)

In stepping up the arms race, the ruling circles of the United States and the other Western powers are demanding ever new sacrifices from their peoples for the sake of expanding war preparations. All this cannot but affect the economic conditions of the working people, who are forced to bear the heavy burden of military expenditures.

The militarisation of the economy of the Western powers has led to a serious disruption of the economy, to a growth of unemployment in those countries and to distress for millions of people. The supporters of the "positions of strength" policy and the stepping up of the cold war spare no pains to inculcate in the minds of the working people that such a policy is in their own interests because it is connected with a rise in military production and therefore, so they allege, leads to greater employment in industry.

They go so far as to frighten the working class with the assertion that if the cold war were to be terminated and the need for an arms race ceased to exist, this would lead to a drop in production, a growth in the army of unemployed and a fall in the working people's living standards.

Are these arguments which are used by the opponents of ending the cold war and the flunkeys of monopoly capital sound? No, these arguments are unsound. First and foremost, they contradict the essence of human life. They are profoundly anti-humanistic, because they are used to convince man, whose function is to engage in creative labour, that he can live only when creating the means of his own destruction.

(Speech at Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty, May 24, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 411-12.)

IMPERIALISM NEEDS THE COLD WAR POLICY FOR REINFORCING THE DICTATORSHIP OF MONOPOLY CAPITAL

The more aggressive imperialist circles are striving to provoke conflicts wherever possible, to intensify the war danger and, in this way, divert considerable manpower and other resources from constructive labour in the socialist countries. Their tactic is to encircle the socialist countries with military bases, create and extend military blocs.

Imperialist reaction pursues the line of maintaining and intensifying international tension. The imperialists are pursuing the policy of cold war and want to maintain the arms drive. The most striking expression of this is the Dulles concept of keeping the world "on the brink of war". Acting in this way they aim at ensuring good business for the U.S. monopolies who, while waxing rich on the arms drive, are adding to the tax burden borne by the working people. For them a let-up in the tension and disarmament are not profitable. Abandonment of the arms drive would force the monopolies to switch industry from a war footing to production for civilian needs. This reorganisation of production would benefit the people, but the monopolists are afraid to put it through because it will cut their profits from war orders. They are haunted by the fear of a worsening economic situation, of increased difficulties in marketing peaceful

goods; moreover, they dread that lessening of the tension and ending of the arms drive would deprive them of the possibility of keeping the working people in a state of fear, of being able to intimidate people with the "bogey of communism" and of using this pretext for repressions against the progressive forces working for peace. The policy of the cold war, arms drive and aggravating international tension is needed by the imperialists for the purpose of reinforcing the dictatorship of monopoly capital.

(Forty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Report to the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., November 6, 1957. Moscow, pp. 71-72.)

FEAR OF A SLACKENING IN INTERNATIONAL TENSION

It is becoming more and more obvious that the imperialist powers and their leaders fear a slackening of international tension because in a tense situation it is easier for them to form military blocs and keep the peoples in fear of an alleged threat from the socialist countries. The imperialists are seeking to involve all countries in the arms race, to tie up the economies of other countries with their own and direct them towards militarisation. This line of action is most clearly demonstrated by U.S. policy towards West Germany and Japan. The U.S. imperialists are deliberately drawing West Germany into the arms race. In the event of the outbreak of war it will be to their advantage to pay for the new adventure mainly with the blood of the German people. At the same time they hope that this policy will exhaust the economy of West Germany and weaken her as a rival in the world market. Much the same policy is being pursued in respect of Japan.

In their talks the leaders of the Western powers do not conceal that their policy is one of arming West Germany. Their argument is something like this—if West Germany does not rearm and does not spend money on armaments, she may become a still more powerful and dangerous rival.

In short, there are some very acute contradictions in the imperialist camp.

In their fear of the future the imperialists are trying to unite their forces and to strengthen their military, political, commercial, customs and other alliances. The reactionaries count on aggression against the socialist countries as a way out. In the pre-war period they placed great hopes on Hitler Germany. Today the role of the chief aggressive force belongs to the United States of America which has become the centre of world reaction. The U.S. imperialists are acting in alliance with the West German militarists and revenge-seekers and are threatening the peace and security of the peoples. In our times, however, it has become dangerous for the imperialists to seek a way out of their contradictions in war.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. **The Road to Communism**, Moscow, pp. 28-29.)

Why are the imperialists reluctant to negotiate with us and reach an agreement? They fear that an agreement with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries would knock the bottom out of the imperialist propaganda about the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist camp wanting to conquer the whole world by force of arms. If they should acknowledge that the so-called "communist threat" is non-existent, they will have to acknowledge the principle of peaceful coexistence of the two systems, and to

- accept the existence of the socialist countries. In that case the entire system of aggressive pacts which they built up—NATO, SEATO, the Baghdad Pact, etc.—will begin to crumble. The fable of a "communist threat" is something like a main thread knitting together the system of military pacts. Speaking figuratively, that system is reminiscent of a knitted article. Pull a single thread out of it and it runs until it becomes a shapeless mass of thread.

The other reason why agreement with the Soviet Union does not suit the monopolists is that any slackening of

the arms race costs them dear. The monopolists are not too squeamish about producing means of annihilation—hydrogen bombs, aircraft and rockets; in a word, all things in current demand. Arms are in great demand when cold war is in progress and international tension has risen to boiling-point. Whereas a *détente* would reduce the demand in means of annihilation and, consequently, reduce the profits derived from arms production.

Moreover, the cold war gives the American monopolists an opportunity of subjugating their allies politically and economically, of exploiting them and saddling them with unequal treaties and agreements. By limiting world trade and hindering their allies from developing commercial relations with the socialist countries, the U.S. monopolists keep them in a subject state and prevent them from developing industries which would compete with their own.

(Speech at Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship Meeting of Moscow Working People, July 12, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 593-94.)

ARMED FORCE—A “MORAL PRINCIPLE” OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Mr. Dulles calls for submission to the tenets of the moral principle on which his creed is based, and anathematizes the tenets of the moral law on which the communist ideology is based, particularly that “variety of communism” which is espoused by the Soviet Communist Party. And here Mr. Dulles makes reference to Marx, Lenin and Stalin. For this reason I take the liberty of again drawing your attention to certain facts.

Mankind has continued for 1,957 years since the birth of Christ alone, but how many thousands of years had it existed before our system of chronology? And as long as mankind has existed, so long have there been wars. They were waged by men long before the word communism ever came into existence, let alone the term “dictatorship of the proletariat”.

On what moral law were those wars based? If we were to follow Mr. Dulles's logic, who but the Communists are to blame for those wars? But Marxism, as a theory, has existed for only just over a hundred years, while the first socialist state created on the basis of communist ideology has only been in existence for 40 years!

Recall the Crusades. The whole of Europe supplied warriors for the armies of the Crusaders. And they went through the land with fire and sword, carpeting it with the corpses of the followers of the Christianity and the bodies of the infidels. And how true is it that these men fought for the tomb of their Lord? Was it not rather for the rich lands of Asia Minor? Was it not in order to take these lands from the Moslem and Byzantine feudal lords and win domination for the European merchants over the trade routes between Europe and Asia that the Crusades were organised by the enterprising zealots of Christianity?

In his letter to you, Mr. Dulles presents the matter as though communism and the Communists are the chief, virtually the only, culprits of wars.

But was it the Communists who organised and waged the Thirty Years' Wars of the Roses in England? Was it they who kindled the wasteful Hundred Years' War between England and France (1337-1453)? Was it they who sent British, French and other troops to the walls of the Russian city of Sevastopol in 1854, where thousands upon thousands of Russians, British and French gave their lives?...

And in the name of what moral law was the First World War started, taking over ten million lives?

When those wars were being fought, priests carrying the cross and holy images marched in the ranks of the warring troops, praying for the triumph of the arms they had blessed.

Is there anyone who does not know that the Second World War was not started by us, was not started by the socialist state? It was started by the governments of the bourgeois countries and by bloody fascism, the offspring of imperialism.

Anyone who follows developments and studies history can discover the crying contradiction between historical facts and Mr. Dulles's statements. And this is only natural, for Mr. Dulles's statements do not conform to historical truth.

It is not communist ideology, but capitalism alone and its highest stage, imperialism, with its irreconcilable contradictions (between the monopoly groups) that gives rise to war. Imperialism has carried the contradictions between the capitalist states to the limit and during the lifetime of just one generation has caused two of the most devastating world wars, inflicting terrible wounds on mankind.

With his characteristic bombast, Mr. Dulles declares that it is not possible to find in the history of the United States any occasion when an effort has been made to spread its creed by force of arms. It is allegedly otherwise with the creed of communism.

Enough of appealing to the history of the U.S.A., Mr. Dulles. Surely you know that at one time the territory of your country was inhabited by numerous brave Indian tribes, valiant hunters and peaceful tillers? Where today are the native inhabitants of America? Can you name just one of them who represents his people in Congress? Can you give us the name of just one Indian who has become a millionaire or multi-millionaire? And where are the tribes themselves? It is said that they have been driven into reservations, and that in some amusement parks, by paying a fee, one can see the descendants of these native inhabitants of America who are put on show. Exterminate completely an aboriginal people, destroy them in the name of capitalist civilisation.... One must have a great belief in miracles to appeal to the memory of peoples and say that in the history of the United States there has not been any occasion "when an effort has been made to spread its creed by force of arms".

I don't want to be misunderstood. I have no intention whatever of accusing the forefathers of the present inhabitants of the United States of America of imposing by force of arms their belief in white superiority over

the aborigines of America. I am only referring to historical facts, and no more. Possibly Mr. Dulles interprets them otherwise. But that is how I have been accustomed to understand them.

Or let me refer to another period in the history of the United States—the period of the war between the slave-owning South and the North. What creed was being imposed by the slave-owners of the rich plantations in the southern States, who turned millions of people like themselves into disfranchised cattle, just because their skin was black? The whole world knows that it was not then a matter of a single “effort made to spread their creed by force of arms”, but of a systematic dissemination of the slave-owners’ creed. Of course, Mr. Dulles may forget this, but the facts of history are unbiased. They refute Mr. Dulles’s assertions.

But why go into the past? Is it not in our own time that in the United States Negroes are being compelled by force of arms, by flagrant violence, to keep their children from schools where white children are taught? Isn’t it in our own time that frenzied racists beat up and kill men with impunity, just because their skins aren’t white?

What about the creed of the superiority of the rich, the monopolists, over the workers and farmers? On what does this creed rest if not on the weapons at the disposal of the monopolists, the handful of millionaires and multi-millionaires? . . .

You will of course remember that in his letter to you Mr. Dulles said that for the United States “there is no need to ‘abandon’ what Lord Russell condemns. On the contrary, it would be abhorrent and unthinkable that there should be introduced into our creed the concept of its maintenance or extension by methods of violence and compulsion”.

But let us resort to facts once more.

Let us recall the United States’ vile war against Mexico, as a result of which Texas and other territories were forcibly wrested from Mexico. Had Mexico attacked the United States? No, this was the most fragrant aggression by the United States against a weaker neighbour. And

what about the Spanish-American war of 1898, unleashed by American imperialism? That was the first war of the epoch of imperialism. As a result, Spanish colonies like Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Philippines became American colonies. Do you remember those wars, Mr. Dulles?

Or by what concept was the United States guided when it sent troops to the Far East during the Civil War in Soviet Russia? And how many indirect, camouflaged wars have been waged by aggressive U.S. circles against other countries? Let us just recall Guatemala, where a democratic government, lawfully elected by the people, was destroyed and a President who enjoyed the support and confidence of the people was forced to leave the country. Or take such an historical fact as the direct interference by the United States in the internal affairs of China, and the open, completely undisguised military support for the bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek clique, and the ignoring of the great Chinese People's Republic.

If one were to take Mr. Dulles's words in good faith, one might assume that he really does believe in non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. But again, when we turn to the facts, we see that his words are at variance with reality.

Are the demands of U.S. leading statesmen that the Great Powers discuss the status and state structure of the East European countries compatible with the concept of non-interference? Does not such a policy bring to mind the activities of a colonialist, who wants to settle the affairs of another country in the same way as he does those of his own estate?

And what is this Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine? It also envisages direct and open interference by imperialist states in the internal affairs of the countries of the Middle East under the guise of fighting communism. Everyone very well knows that this doctrine denies the right of the people to decide their own fate for themselves in the way they think necessary, in accordance with their own interests.

The colonial war in Algeria has been in progress for several years now. There is great bloodshed there. Are the Communists, against whom Mr. Dulles breathes thunder

and lightning, to blame? No, this war was unleashed by the representatives of French monopoly capital, who do not want a peaceful settlement of the Algerian problem, but who are trying to preserve their colonial supremacy in Algeria by armed force and to extort profits.

What moral laws guide those who send French soldiers and mercenaries to "pacify" the Algerian population, and who gave the order for the bombing of the defenceless Tunisian village of Sakiet Sidi Youssef?

The peoples of the colonies and dependent countries want to break away from the yoke of colonialism. Some peoples have already liberated themselves, others are struggling for their freedom and independence, others again are gathering their strength, in order to stand up in the future and break the chains of colonial slavery. The imperialists are trying to keep their colonies, they want to accumulate still more wealth by exploiting the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries.

That is the essence of events in Algeria, Tunisia and the countries of the Middle East.

Such are the facts. They are stronger than words. What, then, are the moral principles Mr. Dulles is talking about?

(Letter to Bertrand Russell. March 5, 1958.
For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with
Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 123-28.)

The imperialists, who are alarmed by the scale of the revolutionary struggle, continue their attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of peoples and states. That is the reason they have reserved, in military pacts and agreements, the "right" to armed intervention in the event of so-called internal unrest, the "right", that is, to suppress revolutions and popular actions against reactionary regimes. The imperialists claim at every turn that the Communists export revolution. The imperialist gentlemen need this slander in order to camouflage, in one way or another, their claims to the right to export counter-revolution.

It is a strange logic these gentlemen have. They are apparently still under the spell of the times when they were able to strangle the liberation movement of peoples. But those times have gone, never to return. The Communists are against the export of revolution, and this is well known in the West. But we do not recognise anybody's right to export counter-revolution, to perform the functions of an international policeman. This, too, should be well known.

Imperialist attempts to interfere in the affairs of peoples who started revolution would constitute acts of aggression endangering world peace. We must state outright that in the event of imperialist export of counter-revolution the Communists will call on the peoples of all countries to rally, to mobilise their forces and, supported by the might of the world socialist system, repel firmly the enemies of freedom and peace. In other words, as ye sow, so shall ye reap.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 39-40.)

U.S. IMPERIALISM—INTERNATIONAL POLICEMAN

It is, naturally, the duty of every government to take the required measures to ensure the security of its country. Governments had to do so in the past, and have to do so today when states with different social systems exist in the world and mountains of mutual mistrust and suspicion have piled up during the years of cold war.

The Soviet Government wants to solve this problem in a manner that would ensure the security of our country without any prejudice to that of other countries. No one can accuse the U.S.S.R. of seeking any unilateral advantages for itself and of attempting to prejudice the security of other states by its proposals to strengthen peace. No one will dare say this if he is capable of impartially assessing our policy in general—and in particular our disarmament proposals or proposals on European security, or our latest

proposals for a peace treaty with Germany and the Berlin question.

We want mutual confidence to develop between states and suspicion to be dispelled. In our view the way to this lies through peaceful coexistence, through the gradual adjustment of outstanding issues, such as the problem of a peace treaty with Germany and the situation in West Berlin, and through agreement on the disarmament problem.

This is the only dependable way towards eliminating the cold war and developing genuinely friendly relations between states. We exclude matters concerning the internal situation and internal policy of any particular country from the sphere of inter-state relations. We do not want to tell the Americans or any other nations how they should live. **Choice of their way of life is the inalienable right of the peoples themselves, and only experience will show which way of life is better and more viable, what will survive and strike root and what will wither away and become past history.**

To judge by the Gettysburg speech, the United States Government holds a different view. The "mutual security" programme it has put forward cannot serve the interests of peace. In substance, this programme is aimed at gross U.S. interference in the internal affairs of other countries, at hitching them more tightly to the military blocs of the Western powers, in which the United States plays the leading role.

The U.S. President claimed in his speech that the American "mutual security" programme would help to preserve freedom in the countries that come within its scope. He named South Viet-Nam by way of an example. He said that the "programme" is meant to preserve the *status quo* in South Viet-Nam as a "free country". Let us see what the "freedom" in South Viet-Nam, for which Mr. Eisenhower is so deeply concerned, really looks like.

In South Viet-Nam 6,000 landlords own one million hectares of arable land, or as much as falls to the share of three million peasants. You can imagine what "equal opportunities" and "equal freedom" the peasants and the

landlords possess there. Yet the President also says the American "programme" is aimed at "creating an ever-growing measure of man's humanity to man". To preserve such relations means to perpetuate the social inequality of human beings, the brutal feudal and semi-feudal relations of exploitation, to doom many countries to being economically backward and their population to being downtrodden. Who stands to gain from that? At all events, it is not the peoples of the countries which this "programme" dooms to a miserable existence as agrarian appendages of the leading NATO countries.

The "freedom" that exists in South Viet-Nam is also illustrated by the fierce terror conducted by the South Vietnamese authorities for many years. Is it not a fact that all patriots who act in defence of the national interests of the Vietnamese people meet with bloody repressions which have become an almost daily occurrence? Only recently the whole world was shocked by the poisoning of 3,000 patriots locked up in camps. This heinous crime was perpetrated by the "champions of freedom" whom President Eisenhower defends so vigorously. The only "fault" of these Vietnamese patriots was that they had stood up for their people, for the unification of their country, for a national policy, and had opposed the subservience of the present regime in South Viet-Nam to certain foreign circles which disregard the true interests of the Vietnamese people.

A fine programme, indeed, which is worked out by one state with the object of keeping a stranglehold on another under the pretext of defending it from external danger.

I dealt with the situation in South Viet-Nam solely because Mr. Eisenhower cited it as an example.

It would seem that in speaking about South Viet-Nam it would be proper, in the first place, to raise a question that is really of international significance: Why is it that South Viet-Nam and North Viet-Nam are still rent apart and the Vietnamese people are not reunified in a single state? It is no accident that the President did not raise this question. The country is torn in two because the United

States, supported in some instances actively and in others passively by its allies in military blocs, is sabotaging the implementation of the Geneva Agreements which provide for Viet-Nam's unification in a single state.

Could not the U.S. Government, jointly with the Soviet Union and other countries concerned, agree to make efforts to implement the Geneva Agreements on Viet-Nam? The Soviet Government would welcome steps in that direction by the United States.

It is evident from the President's speech, however, that the United States Government intends to continue interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, those receiving its military "aid", and, what is more, to place the economic and commercial relations of these countries with other states under its complete control. In so doing it is mainly concerned with preventing the development of economic and trade relations with the socialist countries.

The President illustrated his idea on that score with the example of Japan. He admitted that "at one time she had a thriving trade with Asia, particularly with her nearest neighbours", and that "trade is the key to a durable Japanese economy". He also admitted that the possibilities for the development of Japan's trade with the United States and the other countries falling within the scope of the programme, were very limited. A realistic approach would seem to indicate that the way out of the situation is to promote advantageous commercial relations between Japan and all countries, including the socialist states. Such relations would not make Japan dependent upon the socialist countries, something Mr. Eisenhower fears with no good reason at all. On the contrary, they would furnish Japan with additional profitable markets to sell her manufactured goods and purchase raw materials. What harm, we ask, will this do to Japan? None at all. The only ones it may displease are the ill-wishers of Japan and of the Japanese people.

Who stands to gain from the policy backed by President Eisenhower? A few American monopolies will, perhaps, gain from it. But it is definitely detrimental to all the countries which the United States wants to bar from the

markets of the socialist countries under the pretext of "protecting their freedom". Need I say that there isn't even the faintest hint of "freedom" in that programme.

(Replies to Questions Put by the Editors of Pravda. World Without Arms, World Without Wars, Moscow, Book 1, pp. 258-62.)

Whenever the peoples rise for their freedom and independence, the U.S. imperialists hasten to the aid of reactionary forces suffering defeat under the onslaught of the people. It is rightly said in the recent Statement of the Communist and Workers' Parties that American imperialism is the chief citadel of international reaction and an international policeman. At present, this policeman is rushing to and fro like a fire brigade extinguishing a fire. It directs its efforts against Cuba to restore the rule of its monopolies and eradicate the gains of the revolution, then plots against the lawful Government of Laos, which has declared that it will pursue a policy of neutrality, that is, a policy of non-alignment with military blocs, and interferes in the internal affairs of the Congo, in order to prevent the Congolese people from pursuing the independent policy proclaimed by the lawful government of Prime Minister Mr. Lumumba.

And all this is being done by the Eisenhower Administration, which has continually demonstrated its aggressiveness. Even now, as it lives its last days, this Administration is pursuing an extremely dangerous policy, trying to suppress the Cuban revolution. The present U.S. Administration has revealed itself to the world as a government that conducts an extremely reactionary policy in the interests of the bellicose monopolists and colonialists. It was no accident, therefore, that the Eisenhower Administration voted with the colonialists when abolition of the infamous colonial regime was put to the vote in the United Nations.

(Speech at a Reception at the Embassy of the Republic of Cuba, January 2, 1961. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 8-9.)

The imperialists are going to all lengths to preserve their domination and keep the colonies in a state of dependence. They are looking for new forms of keeping the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries dependent upon them. They are building up aggressive pacts and alliances, such as NATO, the Baghdad Pact, SEATO, and others. With this object U.S. and British imperialists conclude diverse bilateral treaties and military agreements with a number of countries.

But all these pacts, blocs and agreements are nothing but an artfully camouflaged form of the same old imperialist policy of keeping these countries in complete subjection to the principal imperialist powers under the pretext of defending them from the "communist threat", and paralysing the struggle of their peoples for liberation from colonialists, from these dyed-in-the-wool imperialist exploiters.

The imperialists stop at nothing to appropriate the resources of the peoples of colonies and dependent countries. Aided by corrupt men occupying high government posts in some of the dependent countries, the imperialists try to drag these countries into their own camp so they should themselves help the imperialists in shoring up rotten and corrupt regimes and keep the peoples in these countries in colonial slavery. The most prominent part in this belongs to the imperialists of the United States, Britain and France.

But the peoples are carrying on their fight against imperialism and colonialism. Take the recent revolution in Iraq, which was considered a staunch support for the imperialist countries in the Middle East. Yet the Iraqis managed to break out of the imperialist trap, into which their country had been lured by the reactionaries headed by a traitor king and a corrupt government obedient to the will and directives of foreign monopolists and acting to the detriment of the interests of their country and people.

It was in this Iraq, thought by the imperialists to be a reliable Baghdad Pact bastion, that the revolutionary events broke out, which left the Baghdad Pact without Baghdad. Today Iraq is an independent republic conducting a policy of peace.

This has greatly frightened the imperialist powers and Iraq's neighbours, who are members of aggressive imperialist blocs. The kings and rulers of these countries are trembling in their boots. And it is not communism, not the Soviet Union, which has put fear into them. It is their own people whom they fear. In each of these countries each king and ruler now feels the hot breath of the events that occurred in Iraq. For this reason they fear and tremble before their own people and rush from extreme to extreme, soliciting support for their tottering thrones and corrupt cliques. It is not in their own people that they seek support. They make no effort to get a better understanding of their people's needs, to satisfy their wishes, to give them democratic freedoms and an opportunity of stamping out social injustices, to find better methods of government, and to improve social conditions. The kings and rulers seek support in those who install colonial regimes, who oppress and plunder the peoples, who are intent on playing the part of modern international policeman.

The United States and Britain willingly assume the functions of international policeman. During the revolutionary developments in Iraq they sent their troops to the Lebanon, and to Jordan. Their agents roam about in other countries, offering their police services at what would appear a trifling price. But in reality the price of their services turns out to be very high.

At present the rulers of some capitalist countries agree to shackling treaties with the United States. But to conceal this in some way, they claim that these treaties are allegedly defensive and a safeguard against the Soviet threat, although it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union has never threatened anyone, and does not threaten anyone now. Our enemies harp on some Soviet "threat", while the kings and rulers of certain states have something else in mind. They fear their own peoples, and they want the United States to back them, to protect them from the righteous wrath of the people.

U.S. ruling circles undertake police functions against the peoples of many countries where poverty reigns and millions die of starvation and disease as a result of colo-

nial domination. These peoples wage a gallant struggle for freedom, for their rights, for a better life. And no police force—neither internal, nor external—will save the kings and rulers who do not heed the interests of their countries, but seek the support of external imperialist forces.

In hammering together their military blocs, the imperialists do not conceal their aggressive designs. Generals in countries that are party to these aggressive blocs often make provocative statements against peaceful nations.

(Some Questions Concerning International Situation. From Speech at Reception for Graduates of Military Academies, November 14, 1958. For Victory in Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 750-53.)

The politicians and ideologists of imperialism grieve that Cuba, a country in the Western Hemisphere, is closer to the socialist countries than to various groups of Latin American states under the aegis of the United States. They claim the revolutionary movement in Latin America is being directed by some invisible "hand from Moscow". You are wrong, gentlemen. There is no "hand from Moscow" here, and there are no "Kremlin intrigues".

I shan't be letting out a special secret if I tell you that the principal disseminators of revolutionary propaganda in Latin America, however great a paradox it may seem, are the U.S. monopolies which are taking the wealth of these countries and dooming them to backwardness and poverty. It is the North American monopolies arm in arm with the big boys among the local bourgeoisie and the landowners who provoke the ire of the people and create a situation where the only way out for the working people is revolution. So, when we are talking of causes behind the aggravation of contradictions between labour and capital, we should say that these contradictions are sharpened by the policy of plunder on the part of the American monopolies and Wall Street.

The experience of Cuba goes to show that revolution cannot be brought from without, on the end of bayonets. It cannot be carried in from abroad by coach, like the Bourbons were once upon a time. You wouldn't get across the ocean in a coach anyway!

It is the people who make revolution when the necessary conditions mature for it. Even the most desperate opponents of the Cuban revolution cannot deny that the dictator Batista's regime was rotten to the core and that revolution in Cuba was knocking at the door. The Cuban revolution ripened among the people. It became the affair of the people themselves, their common creation, their aspiration, their happiness. The Cuban revolution won and is winning broad support from the peoples not only of Latin America but of the whole world.

Revolution against tyrants, exploiters and foreign vultures is the sacred right of every nation, it is its internal affair. There was a time when the American nation courageously launched revolution—broke the grip of the British colonialists, chased out the viceroys and founded a republican form of government. All progressive people at that time were on the side of the American nation. The fathers of American democracy wrote then in the Declaration of Independence: "That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive... it is the Right of the People to alter or abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organising its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

Fine words! After two centuries they still ring true. Yet why is it the powers that be in the U.S.A. don't recognise this right for other nations, a right which the founders of the U.S.A. considered just and natural for the American nation?

By what right do the U.S. imperialists accord themselves the right not to recognise that other nations can have the system they choose for themselves? This is an obvious confirmation of the fact that the U.S. monopolists have assumed the functions of international policeman.

However, dear international policemen gentlemen, even though you have assumed these functions and don't feel like giving them up, times are changing, and they are not changing in your favour. Today imperialism is not the great almighty. Imperialism's desires and appetite remain the same, but even such a powerful imperialist country like the United States of America can no longer carry out the functions of international policeman as it used to. There are forces about in the world, born of the Great October Revolution, able to curb the imperialist aggressors, to restrain the international policeman. These forces are above all the Soviet Union and the mighty socialist community. Just like its predecessor, feudalism, the bourgeois system is not eternal. The time is coming when all nations will finish with capitalism for good and ever.

(Speech at Friendship Meeting Between the Soviet and Cuban People, May 23, 1963. **Pravda**, May 24, 1963.)

IV. IMPERIALIST INTEGRATION—THREAT TO THE PEOPLES

After the Second World War the trend towards integrating the foreign policy and the economies of the capitalist countries became more pronounced. We saw the rise of international organisations such as the European Coal and Steel Community, the Common Market, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and others. The rulers of the Western world, notwithstanding all their antagonisms, have partly succeeded in forming inter-state alliances the activities of which create difficulties for the newly-emergent countries in Asia and Africa and also in Latin America.

How is it that the imperialists, despite their antagonisms, have managed in a measure to co-ordinate on an international scale economic co-operation in a number of important spheres?

First, we see manifested here, although on a contradictory basis, the objective trend towards greater internationalisation of economic life, rendered more pronounced in our days by the rapid scientific and technological advance. State-monopoly capital on its part is anxious to encourage this trend and to use it for its aggressive military-political aims. By forming their inter-state economic associations, the imperialists are trying to counteract the negative consequences of the spontaneous development of the capitalist world economy.

Second, faced with the fact of the growing might of the socialist system with its planned economy, and faced with the fact of the rapid advance of the emancipation movement of the peoples, the imperialists are forced to

find ways and means of easing the antagonisms in their camp. Dreading peaceful economic competition with the socialist countries, they are trying to tone down their internal antagonisms in view of the basic contradiction of our epoch—the contradiction between capitalism and socialism.

The Common Market signifies big advantages for the imperialist monopolies. At the same time it threatens the interests of the working class, the peasantry and the middle sections of the urban population. The small countries will, increasingly, be more dependent on this imperialist alliance which, in substance, is a new form of the division and redivision of the capitalist world market. The aggressive forces want to use the Common Market for the purpose of reinforcing NATO and stepping up the arms drive.

With the formation of the international imperialist alliances, the smaller countries of the capitalist system, losing their previous role and their sovereignty, are forced to follow in the wake of the United States and the other big imperialist powers. The rulers of these countries are going so far as to forego even their independence, because they see in the Common Market and in other organisations of its kind a certain defence against the onward march of socialism and against the pressures coming from the working people.

Here we see manifested yet another aspect of the military-political alliances of the imperialists—more and more openly they are assuming the role of international policeman for the purpose of crushing the movement of the peoples for freedom and social progress.

The imperialists and their propaganda depict the movement of the peoples for freedom and the struggle of the working people for their rights as the penetration of communism from "without", as an external force upsetting the political balance in the world. These arguments are designed as a screen for their dread of the growing discontent of the popular masses. And they try to distort the obvious truth that the communist movement, far from being brought in from outside, grows inside the capi-

talist countries on the soil of class struggle, on the soil of the mounting antagonism between the working class and the capitalists, between all working people and their exploiters.

The rulers of the Western world cannot but see that the balance of forces is tilting more and more in favour of socialism. The old world of exploitation, colonial tyranny and oppression of the working masses, is staggering under the powerful blows of the emancipation movement of the peoples, is cracking up, threatening the ruling classes with catastrophe. And in the endeavour to maintain the peoples in subjection, the imperialists are forming aggressive military blocs like NATO and SEATO which, on the one hand, are spearheaded against the socialist system as the main bulwark of the freedom and happiness of the peoples, and, on the other, fulfil functions of the police in relation to the national liberation movement and the working masses striving to overthrow the rule of the exploiters. The so-called economic alliances of the imperialists are designed for precisely the same purposes. The Western rulers do not even bother to conceal the direct link and interdependence which exist, for example, between the economic organisation of the Common Market and the aggressive NATO alliance. They delight in stressing that their economic unions are also called upon to fulfil important functions for the so-called defence of the West, by which they mean the aggressive policy of the imperialists.

It goes without saying that one should not exaggerate the possibilities of these international unions of the imperialists. No matter how much they talk in the West about European integration and its results, one cannot get away from the fact that the formation of these unions cannot rid the capitalist world of its deep-going antagonisms and defects. Dominated by the United States, the military blocs and alliances are frequently in a state of crisis arising from the deep-going contradictions between the main imperialist powers. The interests of the small group of imperialist powers conflict with the interests of the other capitalist countries and with the interests of all nations.

This state of affairs, obviously, cannot but weaken the imperialist amalgamations and unions.

But if we do not exaggerate the strength of the adversary this does not mean that we should ignore it. It would be unwise not to pay attention to the designs and actions of the men behind the European integration. The Communists are combating the attempts to use the Common Market and other amalgamations of this kind for the purpose of preparing another war, of stepping up the arms drive, for purposes of exerting economic and political pressure on other countries and especially on the newly-emergent states. We have exposed and we shall continue to expose the dangerous consequences of the capitalist integration for the working people.

At the same time we take into consideration the objective trend towards internationalisation of production which can be observed in the capitalist world and, in keeping with this, we are designing our own policy and our own economic measures. And this brings us to the question of the possibility of economic co-operation and peaceful economic competition not only between the separate countries with differing social systems, but also between their economic amalgamations.

We can see the danger contained in the striving of the imperialists to utilise the advantages flowing from West-European integration for the purpose of forming exclusive inter-state economic groupings bearing an aggressive character. By means of this policy the West is erecting barriers in the way of world trade and economic co-operation between the economic unions of the two systems.

(Vital Questions of the Development of the World Socialist System, Moscow, pp. 14-17.)

At one time, missionaries used to come as the advance guard for the colonialists, clearing the way for capital with the aid of the Bible and the cross. Behind the missionaries came a procession of merchants, capitalists and,

finally, soldiers, who completed the occupation. Now the situation is quite different. Nowadays the imperialists are forced to resort to other methods, to the services of rather different people in order to pave the way for new markets and raw materials. To these ends they brazenly exploit the thirst for knowledge and striving for economic progress on the part of the people in the economically underdeveloped countries.

The U.S. Government has recently established the so-called Peace Corps, whose soldiers are engineers, doctors, teachers and students. The imperialists fully appreciate that today it is out of the question to lord it over people merely by means of the Bible and the armed forces. Alongside of brute force the imperialists are endeavouring to preserve their domination in the former colonies with the help of an ideological barrage on the population and the utilisation of economic levers of enslavement. But these tactics, too, won't save them from defeat. It is as clear as day that the so-called Peace Corps or the Alliance for Progress in Latin America are nothing but tools in the hands of the imperialists.

That former colonies have won political independence is an important step on the road to their complete liberation from all kinds of dependence, from the exploitation by the imperialist monopolies. Life, however, demonstrates that winning political independence does not yet mean an end to the domination of finance capital in the economies of the liberated countries. Imperialism is doing its damnest to hit on new means of attaining its colonialist ends and is striving to launch a common offensive on the young national states. In recent years the Common Market has been carrying particularly great hopes for the imperialist monopolies.

The imperialist ideologists laud this set-up to the skies, painting a picture of the wonderful bounties that will accrue to the participants in it. But their claims are way off the truth. In actual fact, the Common Market is a state-monopoly concord made by the finance oligarchy of Western Europe, a concord which threatens the vital interests of all peoples and the cause of world peace since the aggres-

sive circles of imperialism make use of it for bolstering NATO and stepping up the arms race.

The Common Market is also directed against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. But our countries have now become such a mighty force that no Common Market presents any danger for us. It is quite another business for the newly-emergent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America who have only just won their political independence and do not yet have economic independence.

One of the principal aims of the Common Market is to bind a number of newly-free countries to the economies of the imperialist states and keep them in subservience. Sure enough these designs are wrapped up in fancy phrases about "aid" to people in backward countries, about the advantages of duty-free sales on the Common Market, and all the rest of it.

How does it turn out however? The imperialists force those countries who tie up their fate with the Common Market to maintain the former, deformed colonial pattern of the economy. Here's how they put it: "You produce cocoa or peanuts, so carry on these crops, let them into Europe a bit cheaper. As regards all the rest, especially industrial goods, open up your market duty-free to European commodities, buy them at the monopoly-fixed prices." And it's no use trying to get a national industry going because the duty-free European goods will beat it down, will kill off the young shoots of national production.

The imperialists appreciate that industrialisation is the foundation of independent development and economic progress for the newly-emergent states, a means of consolidating their independence. That is precisely the reason why the brains behind the Common Market lay insurmountable obstacles in the way of national industry.

Through the Common Market the imperialists want to flood the African countries with their industrial commodities, which are no match for the infant industries of these countries, as we all know. At the same time the imperialist monopolies aim at presenting all kinds of obstacles before the newly-independent states in the sale of their

farm produce on the West-European and American markets.

Subordination of the young sovereign states of Africa to the Common Market would signify their agreement to remain as agrarian-raw material appendages of the former colonialist countries. But it was not for this that the peoples of Africa arose for a righteous struggle against colonialism. During the struggle they learned a lot. They accumulated no mean experience in the political struggle. Their desire to hold on to and fortify their independence, for which they paid so high a price, is becoming stronger and stronger.

Young nations now have leaders who are on the alert to the designs of imperialism. President Modibo Keita, expressing the feelings and desires of the people of Mali and of other newly-free African countries, was right when he told Mali journalists on March 17 that Africa was a preserve for the Great Powers, an appendage of their economic system of exploitation, and that Mali refuses to be an appendage of this economic system of exploitation. He spoke of the necessity of preventing a return to the economic system which would permit colonial domination to remain.

True enough, you can find an antidote for any poison. Many newly-independent countries are already instituting a system of strict state control over foreign trade and currency operations and are taking steps leading to the establishment of a state monopoly over foreign trade. They plan to set up their own regional commercial and economic associations independent of the imperialist monopolies and counterposed to them.

The time is past when the imperialists could drive the peoples of the poorly developed countries into a blind alley without much effort and condemn them to slavery. It is now much easier for the peoples liberated from the colonial yoke to contend with imperialism. The world socialist community acts as a dependable shield for the peoples fighting for freedom and progress. The opportunities for the socialist countries to offer support to these peoples are steadily growing. At the same time, since the newly-independent Peoples are now becoming masters in their own house,

wonderful prospects are opened for them in utilising their own natural wealth, material and manpower resources and all their internal opportunities for obtaining complete independence. Far-reaching prospects exist for the national revival of these countries. International economic relations of a new type which are free from the monopolies' *diktat* are being consolidated.

The vital interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America demand a radical change in the system of international trade. It has long been necessary to rid international commodity exchange of those methods whereby the strong make a fortune out of the weak through trade. It is exactly vile conditions like these that lie at the heart of Common Market policy in regard to the young national states.

(Speech at Friendship Meeting Between the Soviet and Mali People, May 30, 1962. **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Russ. ed., pp. 135-38.)

V. THE STAND OF THE C.P.S.U.: CONSISTENT BATTLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND ITS WAR VENTURES

**EXPOSE THE BELLICOSE DESIGNS OF THE IMPERIALISTS,
TEAR THE MASK FROM THOSE WHO WHITEWASH
THE POLICY OF THE IMPERIALIST STATES**

It is necessary to unmask all those who want to white-wash the policy of the imperialist states, which are carrying on with the arms race. Things should be called by their names. The aggressive circles of those countries want to solve international disputes by war. All the pacts and alliances created by the imperialist states are camouflaged by false claims that they are a defence "against the communist menace". But these claims are not new, and they have repeatedly been exposed by life itself.

What is this "communist menace" that the capitalists have been fighting against for over a century now? History has shown that this menace does not emanate from without, from some particular country, but is inherent in the very organism of the capitalist states.

The present military alliances and blocs of the capitalist states have been set up for the same purposes for which the tsars, emperors and kings once set up the so-called Holy Alliance to fight the revolutionary movement and to preserve their thrones. In the past century they created such "holy alliances" to help this or that throne if it began to totter.

(From a Speech at a Mass Meeting in Novosibirsk, October 10, 1959. *World Without Arms, World Without Wars*, Moscow, Book 2, pp. 368-69.)

The experience of history has shown that war is as inherent in imperialism as the struggle against imperialist wars and the policy of the consolidation of peace are inherent in socialism. Human memory cannot forget the events inscribed in the annals of history not in ink but in the blood of millions. From the time the U.S.A. unleashed the first war of the epoch of imperialism in 1898, imperialism has plunged the peoples into a succession of "local wars", and has twice hurled mankind into world holocausts of unparalleled fury. Moreover, the ruins of towns and villages were still smouldering and the wounded hearts of millions who had lost relatives in the Second World War had not yet healed when the U.S. imperialists already "staked their claim" to a third world war.

In the imperialist camp, and first and foremost in the U.S.A., groups are operating who behave like reckless gamblers. They give no thought to the calamity that the new war they are hatching would bring mankind.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, p. 279.)

Spokesmen of the Western ruling circles say for all to hear that they prefer atomic death to the victory of communism. Mr. Pella, for example, the former Foreign Minister of Italy said, "Italy would rather run the risk of a Soviet atomic attack than fall under communist domination." Lord Birdwood said in the House of Lords on February 11, 1959, "I would rather prefer destruction to life in a communist world." Rodney Gilbert, an American author, said in his book, *Competitive Coexistence—The New Soviet Challenge*: "Peace without a victory over communism be damned!" Even one of the Right-wing Labour leaders, Donnelly, exhorts, "Better dead than Red."

Those are very dangerous things to say. They show that some Western spokesmen want to transfer competition from the economic sphere, the sphere where the advantages of one system over another are tested by history, to the sphere of war. This means that many defenders of imperialism have

lost confidence in capitalism's ability to win the competition with socialism and are prepared to start a destructive world war, to put to death millions upon millions of people for the sake of preserving capitalism.

(General and Complete Disarmament is a Guarantee of Peace and Security for All Nations, Moscow, p. 27.)

HARBOUR NO ILLUSIONS ABOUT IMPERIALISM

In the present conditions premises have been created for socialism to determine more and more the character, methods and trends of international relations. This does not mean that imperialism is an "insignificant factor" which can be thrown off the scales. Not at all. Imperialism is still very strong. It controls a powerful militaristic machine.

Imperialism has built up a gigantic peace-time war machine and a ramified system of blocs, and has subordinated economy to the arms drive. The U.S. imperialists are bent on bringing the whole world under their sway, and are threatening mankind with nuclear-missile war. Modern imperialism is increasingly tainted by decay and parasitism. Marxists-Leninists do not, and must not entertain any illusions with regard to imperialism in their evaluation of the prospects of international development.

The facts indicating that the imperialists are pursuing a policy of outrageous provocations and aggressions are countless. That is no novelty. The novelty is that all the intrigues of the imperialists are not only being conclusively exposed, but also firmly repelled, and their attempts to start local wars are being frustrated.

The present balance of world forces enables the socialist camp and the other forces of peace for the first time in history to set themselves the entirely realistic task of forcing the imperialists, under pain of the downfall of their system, to refrain from starting a world war.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 21.)

SUBVERSIVE ACTIONS, PROVOCATIONS AGAINST SOCIALIST COUNTRIES—OFFICIAL U.S. POLICY

Friendship with states having a social and economic system differing from that of the United States evidently was not to the liking of the Government of the United States, and not only to that Government. In the post-war years, politicians have come to power in the United States of America who have taken it into their heads that the United States can succeed in tilting the balance of forces in its favour and eliminating the socialist system in the People's Democracies, a system established by the peoples of these countries. Not daring to attack the Soviet Union directly, these politicians have concentrated their efforts against the East European countries, as they call them, trying to make the peoples of these countries swerve off the road they have chosen and accept the way of life favoured by certain circles in the United States of America. It is obvious that such calculations are not the result of sound reasoning or a correct evaluation of the situation and correlation of forces in the international arena.

Having set before themselves the fantastic task of eradicating socialism all over the world, these politicians would like to solve that problem in stages because they lack the means even to dare to hope for more. At the same time they continue to act against the world's first socialist state, the Soviet Union, pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into subversive activities against it.

(Speech at Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty. **For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism**, Moscow, p. 415.)

The ruling circles of certain imperialist powers have elevated subversive activities against the socialist countries to the level of national policy. The United States of America expends, with frank cynicism, hundreds of millions of dollars on espionage and sabotage against the socialist countries, and organises so-called "guerilla units" made up of criminal elements, of cut-throats, who are prepared

to undertake the vilest of crimes for money. For several years in succession provocative "captive nations weeks" have been held in the United States. The paid agents of the monopolies call "captive" all those peoples who have liberated themselves from imperialist bondage and have taken the path of free development. Truly, imperialist demagoguery and hypocrisy know no bounds! Monopolists who howl about "captive nations" are like the crook who has his hands in somebody's pocket and shouts, "Stop thief!"

The intrigues of the imperialists must always be kept in mind. Our gigantic successes in building the new way of life must not lead to complacency and relaxation of vigilance. The greater the achievements of socialism and the higher the living standards in each socialist country, the more solidly the people will muster around the Communist and Workers' Parties. That is one aspect of the matter, and a very encouraging one. There is, however, something else that must be borne in mind. As the unity of the peoples of all socialist countries grows the hopes the imperialists have of restoring the capitalist regime, of the socialist countries degenerating, are gradually fading away. World reaction, therefore, is more and more turning to the idea of striking a blow at the socialist countries from outside in order to regain capitalist world dominion through war or, at least, to check the development of the socialist countries.

The most rabid imperialists, who act in accordance with the principle "after us the deluge", openly voice their desire to set out on a new war venture. To intimidate the peoples the ideologists of imperialism are trying to instil into them a kind of philosophy of hopelessness and despair. "Better death under capitalism than life under communism," they cry out hysterically. They, you see, do not like free peoples to prosper. They are afraid that the peoples of their countries will also take the path of socialism. Blinded by class hatred, our enemies are prepared to plunge all mankind into the holocaust of war. The possibilities the imperialists have of implementing their aggressive plans are, however, becoming fewer. They behave like a feeble and covetous old man whose strength is exhausted, whose physical capacity is low, but whose desires persist.

The imperialists, of course, may set out on dangerous adventures, but they have no chance of success. They are prepared to try other ways as well. To weaken the socialist community the imperialists try to set the peoples of the fraternal countries at loggerheads or to sow discord among them, to revive the remnants of national strife and artificially stir up nationalist sentiment.

A great historical responsibility rests with the Marxist-Leninist parties, with the peoples of the socialist countries—to strengthen tirelessly the international brotherhood of the socialist countries and friendship between nations.

As long as the imperialist aggressors exist we must be on the alert, we must keep our powder dry and improve the defences of the socialist countries, their armed forces and their state security organs. If the imperialists, contrary to all common sense, venture to attack the socialist countries and hurl mankind into the abyss of a world war of annihilation, that mad act will be their last, it will be the end of the capitalist system.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 22-24.)

SETTLING THE GERMAN QUESTION IS THE WAY TO CONSOLIDATE PEACE IN EUROPE

After the war people hoped that a lasting peace would be established and problems of peaceful adjustment reasonably solved. Their hopes, however, have not been realised. In the western part of Germany a militarist, revenge-seeking state, the German Federal Republic was created with the help of the aggressive circles of international imperialism. However many words the West has expended on attempting to justify the present policy of the imperialist powers, you cannot get away from the fact that the preservation in the heart of Europe of a hotbed of tension is feeding the cold war and making relations between nations red

hot; and this particularly applies to relations between West Germany and the socialist countries. People expect the German question to be settled so that more favourable conditions will be created for the peaceful development of friendship and co-operation between nations.

What has to be done to strengthen peace in Europe and, consequently, throughout the world? The remnants of the Second World War must be cleared away and a peace treaty must be concluded with Germany. I have spoken on this question more than once, but let's have another look at this question and see what the conclusion of a peace treaty would bring to the German people and to people all over Europe.

Signing a peace treaty would not only be a gain for the people of the Soviet Union and other countries fighting for peace. It is just as much needed by the other European states and the people of the whole world. And above all, it would meet with the interests and aspirations of the population of West Germany.

Let the Germans residing in West Germany think it over. Let German workers, farmers, intellectuals, businessmen and government leaders think it over. Let them with solid German reason weigh up the pros and cons: in whose interests is it to preserve today the remnants of the world war and tension in Europe? And if they take an unbiased, realistic and sober look at things, if they consider the plus and the minus, they will clearly see that the interests of the German people demand an end to the remnants of the war and causes of tension and the normalisation of the situation in Central Europe.

This course would open wide horizons for fruitful economic co-operation between the German Federal Republic on the one hand, and the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist countries on the other. More and more thinking Germans in West Germany are pondering over this question. They are beginning to realise more profoundly and clearly that it is imperative to do away once and for all with the policy of militarism and revenge-seeking.

This policy especially weighs down on the life of the West Berliners who are in the greatest need for a normal-

isation of the situation. And this can only be brought about on the basis of a peace treaty. Only then can stability come to the life of the West Berliners and favourable prospects appear for economic development.

What is the proposal of the Soviet Union which has pressed for the speediest removal of the remnants of the Second World War? We don't propose anything that would bring any changes in the conditions and situation at present obtaining in Europe and resulting from the rout of Nazi Germany. What we just want is to give a legal status to the existing situation, thereby making it harder for the revenge-seekers to prepare to unleash another war.

In the West there is still a lot of shouting about the Berlin wall. Yet, what they in the West call a "wall" is the legal frontier of the German Democratic Republic. It permits the working people of the G.D.R. to block the path of any provocative action against their country and other socialist states. And that goes to show that the Berlin wall serves the cause of normalisation of relations between states, the cause of peace.

To be sure, things have to be viewed in a sober way. It must be understood that the G.D.R. is no myth but a real live state, with its own government and its own laws, its own system and its own frontiers. Every sovereign state has the right to safeguard and control its own frontiers.

Many shout that the Berlin border interferes with contact between the citizens of West Berlin and those of the G.D.R.'s capital. But this isn't true. Only persons who would like to use penetration in the G.D.R. for illegal activities against the people could make such assertions. We know that those who genuinely want to establish friendly exchange and contact with the G.D.R. working people, who come with pure heart and open mind are met by the working people of socialist Germany with cordiality and hospitality. If there is any hardship over the matter of contacts between the West Berliners and the citizens of the G.D.R.'s capital, then the blame for this lies with the occupation authorities and the West Berlin administration.

The Second World War altered the political map of Europe, and this has to be taken into account. Certain short-

sighted people vainly think that by stirring up the cold war, by reviving the policy of brinkmanship, they can force the working people of the G.D.R. to give up their socialist state of their own accord. The working people of the G.D.R. are aware of the great honour of being the first to raise the red flag on German soil. They will never agree to put the capitalist yoke on themselves again. They will never let landowners and capitalists back onto their soil.

What I mean is that the working people will never agree to this voluntarily, and if enemies venture to try it by force, they will find that they have no such force strong enough.

The revenge-seekers won't even hear of the conclusion of a peace treaty. Their aim is to wipe out the G.D.R., to swallow it up. But it is pretty obvious to them that they wouldn't get anywhere with their own forces alone: the stomach is weak, you wouldn't digest it, and anyway you wouldn't get such a piece down your throat. That is precisely why they were so persistent in their efforts to get into NATO—the aggressive military bloc of the Western powers. The surviving Nazis saw in NATO an opportunity for realising their dream of taking revenge for defeat in the Second World War. In turn, aggressive circles in the West wanted to make use of West Germany as the principal strike force against the socialist countries. It was here, on the basis of their malicious plans, that their interests coincided.

On whom did the West German revenge-seekers count? They placed their hopes on the U.S.A., a country which far from having suffered during the war, made a fortune on war profits. Particularly alluring to the West German militarists was the American atomic weapon, which at the time was the monopoly of the United States of America.

Remember the stake the reactionary forces of imperialism made on the atomic weapon in their striving to destroy the socialist countries. The late John Foster Dulles, considered by Adenauer to have been the spiritual leader of the NATO aggressive bloc, formulated these aims more forthrightly than anyone else. You will recall his policy of "rolling back communism" and his "brinkmanship", which boiled down to wiping out socialism in Eastern Europe with the aid of military force. These designs on the part of the

imperialists were first and foremost directed against the German Democratic Republic. This was the very aim of the so-called reunification programme, on which all the reactionary circles of the Western powers aligned themselves.

In the language of the imperialists reunification meant the swallowing up of the G.D.R. Germany's division is not so much a national as a socio-political problem. One part of Germany is building socialism, the other is following the capitalist path. Behind the word reunification, therefore, is concealed the striving of the imperialist powers to liquidate the first workers' and peasants' state in Germany—the German Democratic Republic. It didn't come off and it never will come off, dear revenge-seeking gentlemen!

We appreciate the aspirations of Germans who want to see their homeland reunited, to have a single peace-loving and democratic German state. That is a natural and rightful desire. The policy of peace and co-operation brings this future nearer. The policy of war and revenge pushes it further away.

I have no wish to conceal my sympathies and I think it won't be news to anyone if I say that the best way to decide the question of reuniting the two German states is to do away with capitalism in West Germany and create a single German state on socialist lines. This way would be the most progressive and would correspond to the spirit of the times, to the interests of the German people and to the working people of the entire world. But, to be sure, when and how this will come to pass is a matter for the future, the affair of the German people themselves and the German people alone.

It is impossible not to see that the imperialist forces are trying to play on these natural desires of Germans for their own ends and do away with the German Democratic Republic.

This way of solving the German question is impossible today. It is the way to civil war, it is the way to world war. And what does war in modern conditions mean, with nuclear rockets at hand? Even Chancellor Adenauer, a man who most of all is afflicted by revenge-seeking, understands that if war were to break out, West Germany would be the

first to go up in flames. Even the most desperate representatives of capitalism are getting it into their heads that war in modern conditions is suicide for any aggressor.

Just as vain and futile are the attempts of revenge-seekers and reactionaries to undermine the German Democratic Republic from within by means of incitement and provocation. Not long ago in West Germany a devil's sabbath was whipped up in connection with the tenth anniversary of the fascist putsch in Berlin, which ended in humiliating failure. On this occasion the leaders of the F.R.G. made speeches imbued with the spirit of bellicose revenge-seeking. What can be said on this account?

I think that we can somehow understand the Chancellor on his way to retirement when he says obviously stupid and unfounded things in attempting to justify the policy he has stubbornly pursued for so many years. But how are we to take the future Chancellor when he takes on himself this burden, this pile of stupidities and unrealised aspirations? Surely he has to sweep away this pile and sooner or later look for new paths, new methods of approach. Why does he immediately make his task harder, tottering around with the back-breaking burden of the past on his shoulders? It is hardly a sensible policy.

Government leaders in the German Federal Republic talk about good relations with the Soviet Union on condition that there is a change in the policy and social system of the German Democratic Republic. We are entitled to ask them: "Gentlemen, are you serious? Can you seriously and soberly evaluate the situation which has taken shape in the world, your own position and ours? And as you gathered to mark that day, you should have said how your hopes were blown to smithereens ten years ago, just as your vain efforts to do away with the G.D.R.

The revenge-seeking gentlemen should recall that that was 1953, and now it is 1963. And if they didn't succeed in putting the G.D.R.'s development in reverse then, they won't succeed now by a long chalk. The world has seen great changes since then, and these changes are not in these gentlemen's favour. If they relied at that time on the blackmail of the American atom bomb and still didn't gain their

ends, can they scare us now? They know full well that if they unleash war, they themselves will perish in it in the first hour.

(Speech at a Meeting in Berlin, July 2, 1963.
Pravda, July 3, 1963.)

**U.S. AGGRESSION AGAINST PEOPLE'S CHINA.
AN ATTACK ON THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
IS AN ATTACK ON THE SOVIET UNION**

President Eisenhower gave an absolutely incorrect interpretation of the statements made by the Soviet Government on the developments in the Taiwan area. One can only express surprise at the arbitrary way in which the Soviet Union's stand has been distorted. I would never have believed that such methods would be employed. I am still convinced that the President of the United States correctly understands our statements pertaining to the situation in the Taiwan Straits. And if distortions are nonetheless made of the Soviet Government's statements which are dictated by a desire to preserve peace in the Far East, this merely proves that those who resort to such methods are guided, not in the least by the interests of peace, but by the interests of a certain exclusive group in the United States which, for the sake of enrichment, is pursuing a policy of increasingly aggravating international tension and preparing for a new war.

But the assertions—patently at variance with the facts—with the aid of which certain people seek to represent the Soviet Government's stand in a distorted light cannot yield the results expected by their authors. The Soviet Union's stand is clear-cut, consistent and well defined. The Soviet Government has unequivocally stated, in its messages to President Eisenhower in particular, that if the United States should unleash war against our friend and ally, the Chinese People's Republic, the Soviet Union would fully carry out its obligations under the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance

with the Chinese People's Republic, and that an attack on the Chinese People's Republic represents an attack on the Soviet Union.

Is there the slightest hint in this that the Soviet Union, as President Eisenhower insists, is prepared to take part in the civil war in China? We have declared, and declare once again, something entirely different—the Soviet Union will come to the assistance of the Chinese People's Republic if it is attacked from without—to put it more concretely, if the United States attacks the Chinese People's Republic.

The Soviet Government has found it necessary to issue this warning because the situation in the Far East has been developing in such a manner that interference by the United States in China's domestic affairs has brought the U.S.A. to the very brink of direct military conflict with the Chinese People's Republic. And if the United States goes over the brink, the Soviet Union will not remain on the side lines. But we have never interfered, and do not intend to interfere, in the civil war which the Chinese people are waging against the Chiang Kai-shek clique.

It is the inalienable right of every people to arrange their domestic affairs as they see fit. The intention of regaining their islands of Chinmentao and Matsutao and liberating Taiwan and Penghulletao is an internal affair of the Chinese people. It is common knowledge that these lands belonged to China long before Columbus discovered America. And the U.S. Government's attempts to prevent the Chinese people from completing their struggle against the Chiang Kai-shek clique expelled from the mainland, and from liberating ancient Chinese territory constitute gross and open interference by the United States in the civil war in China.

This President Eisenhower prefers to ignore.

In conclusion, I consider it necessary once again to underline that the U.S. Government is assuming an exceptionally grave responsibility in the face of the peoples and of history for all the consequences which may result from the intolerable interference by the U.S.A. in China's

internal affairs and the aggressive actions of the American armed forces in the Taiwan Strait area.

(Reply to a Question Put by TASS Correspondent. Reported in *Pravda*, October 6, 1958. For *Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 676-78.)

The present attitude of the United States and certain other Western powers to the Chinese People's Republic is causing serious concern to world opinion. People's China is a great country with a population of 650 millions, a country which is undoubtedly playing a tremendous role in international affairs. But the ruling circles of the Western powers would like to turn China into a second-rate power. In the West, they are still trying to suggest that there exist two Chinas and not one. But every schoolboy knows that there is only one China, and that the capital of the Chinese People's Republic is Peking. No one has ever heard of a China called Taiwan, and Taipei has never been China's capital, nor will it ever be.

Furthermore, due to the attitude of the United States and its allies, the rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations have not yet been restored, although this is contrary to common sense. China fought together with the allies against Japan. She is one of the founders of the United Nations and one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. But her seat in the United Nations is at present occupied by impostors who as a result of the victory of the great revolution in China have by the will of her people been stripped of the right to represent China. These individuals have no more right to speak for China and the Chinese people than, say, Kerensky, who is ending his days in emigration, has a right to speak on behalf of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government.

It is well known that ten years ago the old, decayed regime was overthrown in China and the Chiang Kai-shek government thrown out as a result of the victory of the people's revolution. The Chinese People's Republic came into being. The Government of the Chinese People's Re-

public enjoys a prestige and trust inside the country such as no government has enjoyed throughout the long centuries of Chinese history. The Soviet Union has the friendliest relations with the Chinese People's Republic and its Government. Now that the Chinese People's Republic has entered the second decade of its existence, carried out great political, social and economic reforms and made outstanding progress in economy and culture, those who advocate the absurd idea of "two Chinas" look more ridiculous than ever.

Ignoring the obvious facts and the trend of history, the United States continues to cling to the remnants of the overthrown Chiang Kai-shek regime; it helped the Chiang clique to entrench itself in Taiwan, and protects it by force of arms. Thereby an attempt is being made to prevent the completion of the process of the country's revolutionary liberation and the extension of the political system now existing throughout the rest of Chinese territory to Taiwan and other Chinese areas.

Interference in China's internal affairs and attempts to "correct" geography and create an artificial situation of "two Chinas" run counter to the peoples' desire to end the cold war, and cause tension in the Far East.

China was one of the subjects touched on during the conversations I had in the United States. On that occasion I stated the Soviet point of view both on the so-called Taiwan question and on the question of restoring China's rights in the United Nations. But shortly afterwards Mr. Herter, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Dillon, his assistant, in their public statements began something in the nature of a psychological attack on the Soviet Union, deliberately misrepresenting the nature of Soviet-Chinese relations, and questioning the sovereignty of the Chinese People's Republic in dealing with matters of internal and foreign policy.

I do not know how it sounds in American, but in Russian such attempts may be described as horse logic. Surely it is clear to anyone that People's China is a great sovereign state and that her Government is carrying out an independ-

ent internal and foreign policy. And it is only right that Americans themselves laugh at the views expressed by the two State Department spokesmen. To give an example, the well-known American journalist, Walter Lippmann, correctly stressed that such utterances can only injure the cause of improving international co-operation and that it does not become U.S. statesmen to make in public that kind of official comment on the relations between the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. Mr. Herter and Mr. Dillon should have known that such methods are useless in the case of the Soviet Union and People's China.

As regards the essence of the matter, it will be recalled that following the defeat of Japan the Island of Taiwan—the Americans prefer to call it Formosa—was restored to China. China's title to Taiwan is set down in the Cairo Declaration, whose signatories included the late U.S. President, Mr. Roosevelt, and in the Potsdam Declaration, signed by ex-President Truman, as well as in the Act of Surrender of Japan. At one time the U.S. Government recognised that Taiwan had been restored to China and that the problem was thus settled for good. In 1950 Mr. Truman, then U.S. President, stated that Taiwan had been restored to China and that the United States and the other Allied Powers had agreed to the Chinese Government exercising authority over the island.

Hence the so-called Taiwan question is a question of relations between Chinese, a purely domestic affair of China. No international complications would have arisen but for interference in the internal affairs of China, and for the situation artificially created in Taiwan as a result of U.S. military support and protection of the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek regime.

We are convinced that Taiwan and the other islands will be reunited with the rest of China. Threats, whether explicit or implicit, are utterly useless in this matter. It should be borne in mind that even a small country can not be often stopped by threats when it is intent on realising its national aspirations. Threats are all the more useless in the case of a country as great as the Chinese People's Republic.

Those who speak of Soviet responsibility for China's actions should know that the Chinese People's Republic has no need for anyone's tutelage. The People's Government is pursuing a policy of its own and is a worthy spokesman for its people and the Chinese People's Republic.

However, speaking of the Soviet Union as an ally of the Chinese People's Republic, we are willing to bear responsibility. The Soviet Union appreciates and sympathises with the desire of the Chinese people and Government to restore to the Chinese state Taiwan and the other islands belonging to China but occupied by foreign troops. We fully support the Government of the Chinese People's Republic in this matter and shall continue to do so until it achieves a solution, for legally and morally it is in the right.

(The International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. Report at the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. October 31, 1959. *World Without Arms, World Without Wars*, Moscow, Book 2, pp. 394-97.)

CUBA IS NOT DEFENCELESS IN FACE OF AMERICAN AGGRESSION

We solemnly declare that the Soviet Union was and still remains with revolutionary Cuba. And we shall continue to help the Cuban people build a happy future. The overcoming of the crisis enables them to return to peaceful labour. Nevertheless the peace forces must remain on the alert.

The Soviet Government hopes that the obligations that the United States of America has taken on itself in regard to Cuba will be strictly observed. For the violation of these obligations would threaten more than one specific area since it would inevitably engender a new and severe conflict and would create another threat to peace. Furthermore, every grain of faith in such obligations would be shattered resulting in the preclusion of the future possibility of using the method of peaceful settlement which has played such a positive role in solving the crisis around Cuba.

From our side we shall strictly adhere to the agreement reached as a result of the exchange of messages with the U.S. President. We would like to make a clear warning that our obligations are valid only as long as the other side fulfils this agreement. If the agreed pledges are not fulfilled by the other side, we shall be duty bound to take whatever action the circumstances demand.

Everyone must get it clear that our country will never leave revolutionary Cuba in the lurch. The Soviet Union will fulfil its promise to help revolutionary Cuba. She will not remain defenceless.

Nowadays the imperialists cannot but take account of the growing might of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. We have a sufficient number of powerful inter-continental missiles to enable us to hit back at an enemy if he were to unleash war.

Those militarists who boast that they have submarines with Polaris rockets on board and other "surprises", as they say, against the Soviet Union, ought to bear in mind that we also know a thing or two.

(The Present International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Russ. ed., pp. 386-87.)

However much imperialist reaction, with the United States of America at its head, has endeavoured to stop or restrain the great revolutionary process of liberating mankind, it is powerless to do so. People who rise up to fight for their freedom and independence are able to preserve their gains with the support of all the forces of peace and socialism. The events in the Caribbean at the end of last year are proof enough of this.

Today, six months later, the full extent of the danger which hung over the world as a result of the treacherous action of the aggressive American imperialist forces has become even more obvious. Bellicose circles in the United States at that time resorted to measures which brought mankind to the brink of world thermonuclear war.

The Caribbean crisis was one of the sharpest clashes between the forces of socialism and imperialism, the forces of peace and war, in the entire post-war period. In preparing armed intervention into Cuba American aggressive circles counted on the inability of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to offer effective aid to the Cuban Republic.

The imperialists reckoned that the geographical remoteness of Cuba from the socialist countries would enable them to pounce on the Cuban people and destroy their revolutionary gains by making use of the overwhelming U.S. military superiority in this area. As is common knowledge, the American imperialists have no mean experience in suppressing the liberation struggle in Latin America and other places around the world.

The plans of the imperialists to strangle the Cuban revolution were stymied due to the firm stand of the Cuban Republic's Government headed by comrade Fidel Castro, the fighting spirit and solidarity of the Cuban people, the military aid from the Soviet Union and also the powerful political and moral support of the socialist countries, of all peace-loving peoples who joined the united front to defend the heroic Island of Freedom. Since a real danger of military conflict between the two nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the U.S.A., arose, the Cuban crisis turned from a local to a world-wide crisis. In these conditions it was necessary to find a way out of the situation through sensible compromise.

This solution of the Caribbean crisis meant the frustration of the plans of the American military clique. The unity and solidarity of the peoples who combined to rebuff the most reckless imperialist circles, tied the hands of those who were ready to destroy millions of people in their own selfish interests. It was a triumph for the policy of peace and peaceful coexistence, thanks to which the revolutionary gains of the Cuban people were defended. The prestige of the socialist countries was raised even higher; the threat of world thermonuclear war was averted, a war that would have brought the people of all countries untold suffering, sacrifice and destruction.

In the United States of America the voices of the "wild men" are once again heard calling for a blockade and even for a military attack on Cuba. Some of the senators and leading figures in the Pentagon have been talking of the necessity of conducting a more stringent policy in regard to Cuba. All this cannot but make us prick up our ears. Are these people once more thinking of creating a crisis like the one that took place in the Caribbean last October?

I must declare in all seriousness that if the U.S. Government does not display the necessary common sense and understanding of the situation and allows itself to be drawn onto a dangerous path, a situation may arise in the world even more threatening than that of last October. If such a situation is created by the aggressive forces of imperialism it will surely be considerably more difficult to find a way out of the crisis than it was in 1962.

Violation of the pledges given by the United States of America could be judged in no other way than perfidy. It would gravely undermine good faith and, consequently, make the possibility of reaching agreement harder. From this it is clear that if the United States Government does not closely follow the attained agreement and if it causes the situation to worsen, then the world can be in even greater danger than it was at the time of last year's Caribbean crisis.

In that event we shall be obliged to fulfil our internationalist duty, our pledges to the fraternal Cuban people, and come to their aid. In all gravity we must say: don't play with fire, gentlemen, and don't play with other people's destinies!

We consider that a normalisation of the Caribbean situation could be obtained on the basis of the implementation of the well-known five points put forward by Fidel Castro, the Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of the Cuban Republic. The just demands of the Cuban people are backed up by the Soviet Union, by all socialist countries and by all progressive mankind.

(Speech at Friendship Meeting Between the Soviet and Cuban People, May 23, 1963. Pravda, May 24, 1963.)

AGAINST THE CRIMES OF COLONIALISM

Imperialism turned entire continents into prisons for the peoples. It put chains of slavery on hundreds of millions of people and fenced them off for centuries from civilisation. It warped the economies of the Asian, African and Latin American countries, making them one-sided, with an emphasis on agriculture and raw materials.

... In terms of the capitalist economy countries inhabited by more than two-thirds of the population of the non-socialist world produce as little as about one-tenth of the output of the manufacturing industry, approximately 3 per cent of the machinery and equipment, and 5 per cent of iron and steel. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa the annual income per head of the population is 20 to 25 times lower than in the United States of America.

After the many years of "care" which the capitalist "civilisers" dispensed to the colonies, millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are literally starving to death. The average life span in those regions is about half of what it is in the former metropolitan countries. In Africa child mortality is extremely high. Over 80 per cent of Africa's adult population and over 40 per cent of Latin America's can neither read nor write. Such is the terrible price paid for the so-called civilisation of the "free world". It is only natural that the peoples are tearing down the disgraceful system of relations created by the colonialists.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. **The Road to Communism**, Moscow, pp. 181-82.)

There is a lot of talk in the West about freedom, equality and brotherhood. They talk about them even in the colonial states. The ruling circles of these powers try, in all seriousness, to claim that the colonial system is a progressive thing; they call this system of bondage "giving aid to backward nations" and "bringing these nations to the higher civilisation". However, tens and hundreds of millions of

people in Asia, Africa and Latin America know full well what this "higher civilisation" actually means for the people.

Due to this "civilisation", in a number of colonies, like, for instance, the Congo, the population has been virtually cut down by half. Everyone knows how the aborigines of Australia were annihilated. Mr. Menzies, who has spoken here, ought not to forget this. The same thing happened in the United States where many native inhabitants, Indians, were exterminated and the rest driven into reservations.

Although American Negroes eventually achieved freedom after the abolition of slavery, they still suffer from discrimination, and their elementary rights are reduced to the limit. In many American States Negro children cannot go to the same school as whites. Negroes are refused admittance to hotels, theatres and restaurants frequented by white people. There's the real face of "civilisation" for you, on which the imperialist colonial powers plume themselves! There's your civilisation! It was forced upon the peoples against their will. The colonialists sent troops, cannons, machine-guns, and after the troops came the missionaries with the cross.

Mr. Macmillan not so long ago drew a striking picture for us of the good deeds of Britain in relation to the colonial peoples. The British press, however, describing the real state of affairs in the colonies, reports that Kenya, Rhodesia and other colonies are seething! In Rhodesia the colonialists are forced to send in reinforcements. What sort of reinforcements are they? Bread, medical supplies, doctors, teachers? No, they are reinforcements in the form of troops, machine-guns, shells and bullets. "Send us more bullets!" cry the colonialist benefactors.

True enough, you cannot cover up the nakedness of colonial slaughter with prayers nowadays. The peoples whom the colonialists want to graft with "civilisation" know that this "grafting" has cost the lives of their brothers. The mask must be decisively torn from the colonialists and the real face must be revealed of those who brought disease, poverty, starvation and death to the countries they enslaved. The colonialists must not be allowed to continue to hide under false phrases about "rendering aid" and "bringing civilisa-

tion", and by talk about the colonial peoples not having matured yet for self-government.

All this is the ravings of slave-traders and slave-owners. No, it is not civilisation they want to bring. They want to enjoy the cheap labour of the colonial peoples as before and to continue to exploit the wealth of these countries, to make fortunes and grow fat on the plunder of the peoples they oppress.

(Speech to the U.N. General Assembly on the Necessity for Reviewing at a Plenary Session the Question of Giving Independence to the Colonial Countries and Peoples, October 12, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*, 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 480-81.)

It is completely secondary to me whether the colonialists are after uranium, after cobalt or after the devil himself. They go to plunder the colonial peoples, to make a fortune at their expense, to annihilate the peoples of the countries they enslave. When the Belgian colonialists came to the Congo the population numbered more than twenty million. Today, when the colonialists have cleared out after many years there the population has not only not increased but has been cut down by nearly half. Why is this? Do Africans give birth to fewer children? No. They have children, perhaps even more than Europeans have. But they are made to exist in such unbelievable, inhuman conditions that their children don't survive. And those who don't die in childhood, don't live very long. Their life expectancy is not the same as that of the people living in normal human conditions. Or take the Australians. You heard Mr. Menzies speak at the U.N. Assembly. He could have told the story of how Australia was conquered, how the colonialists trampled over and destroyed people like wild beasts. They exterminated virtually the entire indigenous population. And they call that civilisation! The people won't forget that "civilisation". Hatred for the enslavers will live on for ages.

We are against the policy of the colonialists. With all our heart and soul we protest against this policy and we

shall do everything within our power to speed up the death of this accursed, moribund slave colonial system of bondage so that all people may gain freedom and independence.

(Let Everyone Unite Efforts in the Fight for Peace. Meeting with Reporters at the U.N., October 7, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*. 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 433-34.)

THE COLONIALISTS HAVE NOT ABANDONED THEIR ARMS. COLONIALISM IS HARBOURING THE DANGER OF WAR

When Britain, France and Israel attacked Egypt, the ruling circles in the U.S.A. declared that they condemned this aggression. But it is quite obvious that if they had really condemned this aggression, Britain and France who are very much dependent on the U.S.A., not to speak of Israel who lives off American sops, would have sat still; they would have kept their hands by their sides. In actual fact, this was merely a distribution of roles among the imperialists. The idea was that while the United Nations was in session discussing the situation, the imperialists in the meantime would complete their dirty work and set up a puppet government in Egypt made up of Arabs ready to carry out the colonialists' policy.

This scheme was frustrated due to the rebuff from Egypt, from all the Arab peoples and due to the action of other peace-loving countries, including the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union told the United States of America that if it actually intends to condemn and stop the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression, we should take joint action against the aggressors. We knew that the U.S. rulers, in view of their real part in the three countries' attack on Egypt, would not accept our proposal. By rejecting our proposal, however, they exposed their own insincere policy, showing it to be a policy aimed at leading the Arab world astray and creating the impression that the United States of America was ready to protect the Arab countries. We therefore consider that the Soviet Union, having given the aggressors a grave warning, played quite a part in stopping the attack on Egypt.

When the policy of the French and British colonialists was discredited, the U.S.A. decided to make a show of coming to their rescue. In particular it advanced the notorious Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine. But this "aid" on the part of the U.S. imperialist rulers, which was intended to preserve imperialist influence in the Middle East, rather reminds one of aid given by the hangman's rope. While creating the appearance of supporting the interests of Britain and France, the U.S.A. in actual fact is doing all it can to oust Britain and France out of the countries of the Middle East, to undermine their influence in the colonies and dependent countries and take their place. In order to attain these ends they are conducting a more disguised colonial policy than the British and French colonialists conducted.

What this leads to is shown by the example of Viet-Nam. When the national liberation movement broke out there the Americans made strenuous efforts to push France into battle against the Vietnamese people. It is well known that as a result of the courageous resistance of the Vietnamese people the French colonialists burnt up their resources and suffered defeat. In one half of Viet-Nam, that is in the northern part, people's democratic power was set up, and in the southern part of Viet-Nam, from where the French were also driven out, the dominant positions were taken by the Americans.

U.S. ruling circles proclaimed the so-called Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine, declaring that they would tolerate no vacuum in the Middle East. The "vacuum" policy, if we put this word into plain language, means that the American imperialists do not recognise the nations' right to decide their own fate by themselves, without somebody's patronage. But such times have gone never to return!

The American imperialists conduct their colonialist policy in more contemporary forms, in white gloves if we can put it that way, but their victims don't have it any easier. They are ousting British and French imperialism out of the Middle East area. The smell of oil goes to the head of

the imperialists; they lose control of themselves and are prepared to resort to any means so that their monopolies grow rich.

Thus, when the Arab countries, and in particular Egypt and Syria, put up resistance to American imperialism, when the Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine met with a rebuff, the U.S. imperialists decided to overthrow those governments which did not suit them. They began to prepare a revolt and search out traitors within the Arab countries. When they had no success in this direction they attempted to organise an attack by Jordan and Iraq on Syria. But they had no success either. They failed not because the Governments of Jordan and Iraq did not feel like being drawn into this reckless act, but mainly because they were not sure of their own armies. They told the Americans outright that if the troops of Iraq and Jordan were put in action they would go over to the side of Syria and Egypt.

The Americans knew that, despite Israel's desire to fulfil the function of policeman, an attack on Syria by her would be very unpopular. They knew that an attack by Israel would evoke anger and protests from the Arab peoples. They therefore ordered Israel to sit still and not move. They decided to use Turkey, a Moslem country, against Syria. As you know, this plan too, however, was frustrated due to determination displayed by the peoples of the Arab countries, and particularly by Syria and Egypt, and also by the actions of the peace-loving states, including the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Government gave warning that if the imperialists were to unleash war in the Middle East, the Soviet Union would not stand aside. In doing this, the Soviet Union had no kind of political or economic end in mind. Its only interest was to preserve peace and people's security. The Soviet Government made well-known declarations and we consider that thanks to the efforts of peace-loving forces, the initial stage of the fight to repulse the aggression which was being prepared against Syria has come to a successful end.

But we have to be on our guard since the colonialists have not completely retreated, since oil is a force which,

like a magnet, attracts the imperialists. They will be looking for new means of achieving their ends.

(Interview Given to the Editor-in-Chief of the Egyptian Newspaper **Al Ahrām**, Mohammed Hassanein Heikal, November 18, 1957. For a **Lasting Peace and Peaceful Coexistence**, Russ. ed., pp. 268-71.)

The events in the Middle East, when certain Western circles launched an open military attack on Egypt, are still fresh in everyone's memory. By organising the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt, those circles planned, under cover of the hue and cry raised over the Hungarian events, to suppress the national liberation movement in the Middle East, to restore their colonial domination both in Egypt and in the other countries in that area.

The heroic resistance of the Egyptian people, and also the firm stand and assistance of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other countries of the socialist camp, had a sobering effect on the bellicose circles of Britain, France and Israel and made them end the aggression and withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory.

The successful struggle of the Egyptian people against the foreign invaders resulted in the consolidation of the freedom and independence, not only of Egypt, but of other Arab states as well. Seeing in this a threat to the domination of the American monopolies in the Middle Eastern countries, the United States put forward the so-called Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine. This doctrine has the aim of facilitating—under the pretext of filling the “vacuum” allegedly formed following the defeat of Britain and France—the American monopolies' task of replacing Britain and France in the Arab East and putting down the national liberation movement in Africa and the Middle East.

It is common knowledge that the Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine met with resistance in the Middle Eastern countries, whose peoples have learned sufficiently well from their own experience what colonial oppression is like.

Having suffered a defeat in this fresh attempt to establish their domination in the Middle East, the initiators of this colonialist doctrine began to hatch plots against Syria. By conspiring against the lawful Syrian Government they counted on creating a military conflict between the countries of this area, on aggravating the situation in the entire Middle East, on strangling Syria's independence and thus attaining their own selfish ends.

At this difficult moment the Syrian people received the help and support of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries, which prevented the aggressive circles from carrying out their plans.

The war against the Algerian people, who are upholding their lawful right to self-determination and independence, is still continuing. A peaceful settlement of the Algerian question through the satisfaction of these just demands of the Algerian people and with due consideration for the historical relations between France and Algeria would meet the interests of world peace. We are deeply convinced that such a settlement will be in keeping with the interests of the peoples both of Algeria and France.

By ending the war against Algeria and thereby eliminating the possible danger of its growing into a large-scale military conflict, which cannot but alarm the Soviet people, France would contribute greatly to the strengthening of world peace.

The systematic raids by British troops on the peaceful towns and villages of Yemen are also continuing.

These actions of Britain, inflicting numerous losses among the peaceful Yemeni population, are arousing the just anger of all decent people.

An object of foreign intrigues and dangerous provocations at the present time is the Lebanon, where the Western powers are openly meddling in the internal affairs of that state with a view to establishing a colonial regime there and dealing a blow at the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab East in general.

Some states which are members of the aggressive SEATO bloc have embarked upon the path of military interference in the internal affairs of the Indonesian Republic where

they are rallying together the local reactionary forces, supplying them with arms, and even smuggling armed hirelings into the country to fight against the lawful Government of Indonesia.

Recent events show that the ruling circles of the Western powers continue to do everything to step up the arms race, from which a handful of monopolists are enriching themselves at the expense of millions of ordinary workers, and continue to oppose the easing of international tension and to cling to the cold war policy.

(Speech at Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty, May 24, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 397-99.)

The landing of troops there envisaged not only what had already taken place, but also a subsequent attack on the Republic of Iraq and its liquidation, the unleashing of war in that area in order to destroy the United Arab Republic and thereby create conditions for a return to the old colonial system which formerly existed in those countries. Times have changed, however. All this proved to be not so easy to accomplish as the initiators of those plans had imagined. The people of Iraq have successfully carried out a revolution. Complete order has been established in the Republic of Iraq. The people are supporting the new government and the republican system that has been established in the country. A wave of popular protest has swept all countries, including those whose governments have sent troops into the Middle East, especially Britain. The aggressors are therefore compelled to camouflage their predatory actions. But the danger has not as yet been removed. The interventionists have so far been stopped—they have now put a halt to their active operations in carrying out the task they had set themselves. But the build-up of forces is continuing. In these conditions the peaceful countries must be exceptionally vigilant. All peoples must raise their voices still louder and vigorously press for the withdrawal of the troops of the United States and Britain from the Le-

banon and Jordan, and must put an end to the intervention of the colonialists in the internal affairs of the Arab countries.

It should be noted that the fact that nearly 1,000 million people are now building their life in accordance with socialist principles is of great importance in the struggle for peace and its consolidation. This is a great force that is restraining the aggressors and all who have not given up attempts to unleash war.

Nor should it be forgotten that the newly-free peoples are determined to defend the cause of peace, since only in an atmosphere of peace can they ensure the economic development of their countries, which have won their national independence. Among them we have such a great country as India, whose lofty moral principles are known to the whole world and deserve great respect.

Needless to say, the Soviet Union is playing a great role in the defence of peace. The very existence of such a peaceful and powerful state as our country has an exceptionally beneficial significance for mankind and acts as a powerful deterrent to aggressors. I would like to stress that the existence of such a mighty state as the Soviet Union instils in the hearts of all people, who are longing for peace, the hope of preserving and strengthening world peace.

Colonialists are people with rather low morals. In their public statements they very often appeal to God, and at the same time hold a concealed dagger which they are ready to use against the weak in order to seize their wealth—their oil or other assets. The colonialists are now raving especially against the Soviet Union, trying to discredit it in the eyes of the peoples. Why are they doing this? Because they see that the Soviet Union has won great respect among the peoples, since it bases its policy on high moral principles.

The Soviet state and all the socialist countries desire peace and not war, peaceful co-operation and not enmity. All the more do they oppose the subjugation of one people by another. The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all socialist countries are resolutely opposed to colonialism. The Soviet Union has the proper means available for dealing with colonialists if they do not come to

their senses. Colonialists should not be allowed to endanger peace and subjugate small nations with impunity. The voice of the Soviet Union in defence of colonial peoples and its possibilities of exerting influence on the aggressors are bringing the latter to their senses. Sometimes the colonialists are compelled to sing and serenade in order to lull the vigilance of the peoples and to make a verbal show of their peaceful disposition.

(Interview with Indian Journalists, July 29, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 633-35.)

Life, however, brings it home every minute that the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for their national freedom is far from completed. On the other side of the barricades in this struggle stands a strong and experienced enemy who by no means intends to surrender his positions, who will stoop to any crime in order to suppress the natural upsurge of the peoples for freedom, and wherever possible to restore its former domination.

The Portuguese colonialists seek to drench in blood the national liberation movement in Angola and commit to fire and destruction towns and villages in that country.

The intrigues of world imperialism in the Congo are becoming ever more refined.

And just look how the Dutch colonialists fumed when the Indonesian Government presented the lawful demand that West Irian, ancient Indonesian territory, should be liberated.

United States intervention in the domestic affairs of South Viet-Nam has been openly effected for a number of years. No longer relying on their placemen, the American brass themselves started an undeclared war against the Vietnamese patriots who are fighting for the peaceful reunification of North and South Viet-Nam.

There are many other seats of tension and unrest due to the attempts of the imperialists to stand in the way of the peoples who are fighting for their national independence.

The American imperialists pay lip service to the establishment of an independent Laos which would carry through a neutral policy. But precisely after the Laotian Government announced that Laos would pursue a neutral policy, the United States Government prompted the reactionary forces to unleash war against the lawful Government of Laos. The United States planted the so-called rebel government, armed the reactionary forces, and supports them now.

We do not doubt that the imperialist intrigues will fail. The people of Laos will be victorious and will have a government that will carry through a policy in the interests of the people, and not in the interests of the imperialists.

The imperialists can no longer shape the destinies of the peoples. The peoples of all countries, whether small or large, have the right to independent existence, to choose the social system they wish to establish in their country.

(For Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood and Happiness! **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Russ. ed., pp. 34-35.)

The colonialists have not abandoned their weapons. Through interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states they endeavour to undermine, and often by force, their independence and sovereign rights and place barriers in the way of the people's revolutionary liberation movement. By their interference in the people's liberation struggle the imperialist colonialists have created hotbeds of tension, conflict and armed clashes in every corner of the world.

Look at what is going on in the Yemen. For ages the Yemeni people suffered oppression, exploitation and injustice. And now, at last, revolution has triumphed in the country. The people are heading through the thick of the middle ages to a new life, like a plant in the desert which receives a drop of moisture and pushes its way up through the ground. And they are immediately set upon by the allied forces of imperialism and reaction. Who was it who took up arms against the Yemeni revolution, against progress? It was Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

To be sure, the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Jordan, whose own fate, one might say, hangs by a thread, would not dare to throw their forces against the Yemeni Republic if they were not being egged on by more powerful states. Who is it that is helping the Saudis and Jordanians? Who is supplying them with arms and for what purpose? The peoples of the Arab East know full well that it is Britain and the U.S.A., which call themselves "free countries", that are putting arms into the hands of the Saudis and Jordanians so that Arab shoots on Arab.

So it turns out that the so-called free world aids Saudi Arabia, which until recently officially had slavery, and in fact still does have. And this country is supplied with arms to bring "freedom to Yemen". It is easy to imagine what sort of "freedom" Saudi Arabia would bring to Yemen and who are these "free countries" that are giving her a hand in this venture!

The Soviet Government condemns the imperialist intrigues against the Yemeni Arab Republic and declares its deep respect and support for the just national aspirations of the Yemeni people.

Not only in Yemen, but also in other areas of the world the imperialists are endeavouring to strangle the national liberation movement. Suffice to recall events in the Congo, Angola, South Viet-Nam and South Korea. And now an uprising has flared up in the Brunei Protectorate in Borneo, and the British colonialists are hurrying to extinguish it.

(The Present International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Russ. ed., pp. 405-06.)

Though doomed, colonialism still has considerable power of resistance and does untold harm to many peoples. All the moribund and reactionary elements are rallied round it. Colonialism is the direct or indirect cause of the many conflicts that threaten humanity with another war. Colonialism,

which has caused bloodshed on so many occasions, is to this day a source of the war danger. It manifests itself again and again in outbursts of malicious fury, as eloquently illustrated by the bloodshed in Algeria, the Congo and Laos; it still holds tens of millions of people in its tenacious clutches. And not all the countries that have won independence enjoy its fruits, because their economies are still dominated by foreign monopolies.

The peoples of the socialist countries, the Communists and progressives all over the world, see their duty in abolishing the last remnants of the colonial system of imperialism, in safeguarding from the intrigues of the colonial powers the peoples now liberating themselves, and in helping them to realise their ideals of liberation.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 59-60.)

It is amazing how appeals for humanity combine with colonial plunder in the politics of the Western powers.

Wherever the oppressed peoples rise to fight for their independence, for liberation from colonial oppression, the imperialists instantly bare their swords and try to maintain colonial systems of bondage by force. They respond with bloodshed, terror, bombs and napalm to the righteous demand of the colonial peoples for freedom. They burn down villages and kill defenceless people—old men, women and children.

No matter what they say, they will never obscure the imperialist policy aimed against the peoples fighting for their independence and their freedom.

Whenever many countries speak out in the United Nations against colonial piracy, some spokesmen of the imperialist powers, those very powers that today dispense words of love for fellow men, offer support to the colonialists, and those who say nothing side thereby with the colonialists.

Mankind cannot reconcile itself to their bloody crimes. Colonialism cannot be destroyed by pious wishes. The fight against colonialism calls for the joint efforts of all the freedom-loving peoples. It is obvious that success in the struggle of the peoples against colonialism largely depends on how firm and united is the common front of all the forces working for peace and progress, against aggression and the oppression of nations.

(Speech at a Soviet-Indian Friendship Meeting, September 8, 1961. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 410.)

THE U.S.S.R. IS ON GUARD OVER THE INDEPENDENCE OF YOUNG SOVEREIGN STATES

We have only one desire: the strengthening of the positions gained by the Arab peoples, and above all the United Arab Republic. In this you are backed not only by the Soviet Union, but by all progressive mankind. The peoples of the socialist countries applauded when you were selflessly striving, and they applaud when you now strive so selflessly for your independence, for reinforcing your national economy, for raising the standard of living of your peoples.

Grossly distorting our peace policy, the imperialist circles scream about the Soviet Union's "special" interest in this area. We indignantly deny these utterly false assertions. In our disinterested aid to the Middle Eastern countries we have never pursued any selfish aims. The concepts and methods of the colonialists, who believe that if they do not oppress this or that nation, others must do so, are alien to the Soviet socialist state. We Communists maintain that no one may impose his will on the people. The people themselves are the masters of their land, and only they can and must establish the way of life they prefer to have in their countries.

The imperialists, who are accustomed to oppressing the peoples they have subjugated, at one time established

the disgraceful system of colonialism. They are so used to it that they regard the system of colonial oppression as a just and lawful system. We saw this particularly clearly in April 1956, when we visited Britain and had talks with Anthony Eden, Selwyn Lloyd and other statesmen. In one of our talks Sir Anthony Eden bluntly said that if the Arab nations did not supply oil to Britain, then Britain would be ready to go to war.

"We beg your pardon," we said then to the British statesmen, "but the sources of oil belong to the Middle Eastern peoples, and we presume that no one has the right to deprive these peoples of the wealth that belongs to them." It would be much more reasonable, we advised, not to try and seize this wealth by force, but to conduct mutually beneficial trade with those to whom those sources of oil belong. The Arab states would, of course, not sell their oil to those who did not offer a good price for it. The policy of colonial oppression and plunder was now unthinkable; it was doomed to failure.

The British statesmen then told us that the correlation of forces in that area was not in favour of the Arabs and that Israel could defeat the Arab states. We retorted by saying that those who thought so were cherishing vain hopes. The population of Israel amounted to approximately one and a half million, whereas the population of the Arab states was over 70 million. We said that if Israel were to unleash a war against the Arabs, the Arabs would, in our opinion, start a holy war against the invaders. And such a war would inevitably end in the defeat of the aggressors. All progressive mankind would be on the side of the Arab people. In such a case, moral support for the Arab people might entail material support and also the participation of volunteers in the Arab struggle against the invaders.

We advised the British statesmen not to start a war against the Arabs, but they did not heed our counsel, launched aggression against Egypt and suffered a disgraceful failure.

We should like the colonialists to draw the correct conclusion from this and to refrain from using arms to an-

nex foreign territories and subject other peoples to their policy. We want peace throughout the world. Second to Western Europe, where concentrations of large forces are facing each other, the Middle East is one of the most inflammable spots.

The Soviet Government has proposed that a summit meeting be held in order jointly to find ways for solving urgent international problems. But the summit meeting and talks must be conducted with due regard for the interests of all countries, on the only acceptable principle of non-interference in the affairs of other states. We must reach mutual agreement, not at the expense of any other country.

(Speech at a Luncheon in Honour of Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic, April 30, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 356-58.)

Our sympathies are always with those who struggle for their freedom, their independence, their liberation.

Some people abroad say: Look, Khrushchov says he is for peace, but is really calling for war. That is a crude distortion of our views. We are for peace among states, but we are for class struggle, we are for the struggle against the colonialists, we are for national liberation wars. The peoples kept in colonial bondage have no other alternative but to struggle for their liberation. What will you do with a highwayman if he holds a knife over you? Will you drop to your knees, begging him for mercy, will you implore him to spare you? But your pleas will not save you, the robber will stab you all the same. What do you have to do? You have to take the robber by the arm and wrench the knife out of his hand. This is also true of the colonial peoples.

The Soviet Union submitted a proposal to the U.N. General Assembly to end colonialism. This proposal was passed. Even delegates of the colonial powers voted for it. But what happened after that? The proposal was passed,

but the blood of the oppressed peoples is still being shed. The colonialists of Spain, the colonialists of Portugal, of France, of the Netherlands and of other countries continue to suppress the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. Mark you, I speak of the colonialists, not of the peoples of France, Portugal, the Netherlands and Spain. Those are entirely different conceptions.

So what are the exploited peoples to do? The imperialists, the colonialists, are waging a war against them. But does not the right of self-defence exist? It exists alright. The working class has that right, and so have the peoples battling the colonialists. No people may be deprived of this sacred right of defending its freedom and independence. What is more, it is the sacred duty of every nation, if it is able to assist this struggle for freedom and independence. And we have done so, and will do so, to the full extent of our resources.

(Speech at a Friendship Meeting in the Bulgarian Village of Obnova, May 18, 1962. *Prevent War, Safeguard Peace*, Russ. ed., pp. 88-89.)

The aggression of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt is an example of a local war started by the imperialists. They wanted to strangle Egypt and thereby intimidate the other Arab countries fighting for their independence, and also to scare the rest of the peoples of Asia and Africa. When we were in London, British statesmen, Mr. Eden included, spoke to us quite frankly about their desire to settle accounts with Egypt. We told them plainly: "If you start a war, you will lose it. We shall not be neutral." When that war broke out, the United Nations formally condemned it, but this did not make the least impression on the aggressors; they went ahead with their dirty business and thought they would soon reach their goal. The Soviet Union, and the socialist camp as a whole, came to the defence of Egypt. The stern warning which the Soviet Government issued to Eden and Guy Mollet stopped the war. Local war, the gamble in Egypt, failed ignominiously.

That was in 1956 when the balance of forces between the socialist and imperialist countries was not what it is now. We were not as powerful then as we are today. Moreover, the rulers of Britain, France and Israel expected to profit by the difficulties that had arisen in Hungary and Poland. Spokesmen of the imperialist countries whispered to us, "You have your difficulties in Hungary and we have ours in Egypt, so don't meddle in our affairs." But we told the whisperers where to get off. We refused to shut our eyes to their knavish acts. We intervened and frustrated their aggression.

There you have an example of how a local war started by the imperialists was thwarted through the intervention of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 40-41.)

**IMPERIALISM IS DANGEROUS, BUT CAN BE THWARTED.
THE MIGHT OF THE U.S.S.R. AND ALL PEACE-LOVING
FORCES IS A RELIABLE BARRIER IN THE WAY
OF THE AGGRESSORS**

The classical definition of imperialism given by Lenin is well known. Lenin's definition of imperialism reveals the reactionary, aggressive character of imperialism, the last stage of capitalism. Imperialism is inseparably bound up with wars, with the struggle to divide and redivide the world, to enslave the peoples and bring them under the rule of monopoly capital. It is capable of any adventurous undertaking.

This appraisal of the nature of imperialism fully retains its validity. Our Party, far from denying the accuracy of this appraisal, reaffirms it, and proceeds from it in shaping its policy, in elaborating the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle, as our draft Programme clearly shows. At the same time the Party must, if it is to adhere

to creative Marxism-Leninism, take account of the important changes that have come about in the world since Lenin furnished his analysis of imperialism.

We are passing through a time when there exist two world systems, when the world socialist system is making rapid progress and the day is not far off when it will also surpass the world capitalist system in the production of material benefits. As regards science and culture, in a number of spheres the countries in the world socialist system have already outstripped the capitalist countries considerably. Today the world socialist system is more powerful than the imperialist countries in the military sphere as well.

That being so, it is no use saying that nothing has happened or changed in the world within recent decades. Those who say so are out of touch with reality and see nothing of the important changes taking place in the balance of the world forces.

It is true that the nature of imperialism, its aggressive character, has not changed. But the possibilities it now has are different from those it had at the time of its undivided rule. As matters stand, imperialism can no longer dictate its will to all, or pursue its policy of aggression without hindrance.

The predatory aspirations of the imperialists, who are intent on redividing the world and enslaving other peoples, are checked by the invincible forces of the world socialist system, above all of the Soviet Union. These forces subdue the wolfish appetites of the imperialists. Hundreds of millions of people in the peace-loving countries, and in fact all the peoples, are championing peace. This is the important thing, and it has to be understood.

Here is an example to make clear the idea I have just expressed. The tiger is a beast of prey and will be one as long as it lives. But a tiger will never attack an elephant. Why? After all, the flesh of an elephant is hardly less tasty than that of any other animal, and a tiger would probably not mind feasting on it. But it is afraid to attack the elephant because the elephant is stronger than the tiger. If a tiger were mad enough to attack an elephant, it would be sure to lose its life—the elephant would trample it to death.

In films on Africa or Asia, you must have seen kings, princes, rajahs and other notables go tiger shooting on elephants. They do so because they know that it is safe to hunt tigers in that way. To continue the simile, it must be said that the Soviet Union and the socialist world are today a tougher proposition for the imperialists than the elephant is for the tiger.

Imperialism is much in the same position as the tiger. Today the imperialists are compelled to bear in mind—not so much because they are reasonable as because, if I may say so, their instinct of self-preservation suggests it—that they cannot crush, plunder and enslave everyone with impunity. The imperialists are forced to take into account the mighty forces blocking their road. They realise that if they start a world war, the imperialist system, which is so hated by the people, is bound to fall.

The might of the world socialist system is now greater than ever. That system already constitutes more than one-third of mankind, and its forces are growing fast; it is the great bulwark of world peace. The principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems is of vital importance today.

This is not seen only by hopeless dogmatists who have learned general formulas on imperialism by heart and obstinately ignore reality. And this is the stand which the hard-headed Molotov still takes. He and his like do not understand the changes that have occurred in the world, nor the new phenomena of life. They are trailing behind developments, and have long since been a handicap and a dead-weight.

(Concluding Speech at the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 131-34.)

The imperialists would like to settle international problems in their own way: strangle Cuba, drown in blood the national liberation movement of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, annex the German Democratic Republic

and, if it were possible, the other socialist countries too. But we have told them and tell them again: you, gentlemen, do not think realistically! The balance of forces in the world today is not what it used to be. The age of the undivided rule of the exploiters is over. Only madmen can dream of again shackling peoples with the chains of colonialism and imperialism. Nothing will come of it, gentlemen! Nothing will ever come of it!

Naturally, the predatory nature of imperialism has not changed. Imperialism has not become peace-loving. Its rapacity has not diminished. The fact is that the world has changed tremendously. Some imperialists should have their brains scrubbed to appreciate this fact better. With the emergence of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which already have a population of over a thousand million, with their successes in the development of economy, science and technology, the international working class has acquired a mighty material basis to curb the aggressors and prevent wars between states. It now has something to oppose the forces of war.

Formerly we had only the solidarity of the working class, our ideas, to counterpose the forces of imperialism. But the imperialists had arms, they could start war at their discretion. The situation in the world today is different. Today, in addition to proletarian solidarity, in addition to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, there are in the world socialist countries with their population of more than a thousand million. These countries have powerful armies, a flourishing economy, highly developed engineering, progressive science and culture. Therefore, speaking of the possibility of preventing world war we do not resort to prayers to rid us of wars but we point to the forces, to the might of the socialist camp, the strength of Marxist-Leninist ideas, the strength of the peoples fighting for peace! If an aggressor starts war, the Soviet Army will reply to the aggressor's blow with its own mighty devastating blow!

(Speech at the Fifth World Congress of Trade Unions, December 9, 1961. *Communism—Peace and Happiness of the Peoples*, Moscow, Vol. 2, pp. 374-75.)

Our policy of peace is a principled, outspoken, socialist policy. We are defending the cause of peace not because we are weak. We were able to rout our enemies and ensure ourselves conditions of peace even when the young socialist republic was besieged on all sides by the imperialist wolves, when it was incomparably weaker than the imperialists in the military and economic sense. During the Second World War the Soviet Union made the decisive contribution to the defeat of the Hitler war machine, and saved humanity from fascist enslavement. Can there be any doubt of the fate that awaits the imperialist maniacs if they dare attack the socialist gains of the peoples in the new situation, now that the Soviet Union has tremendous might at its disposal, now that the powerful socialist community is marching by its side in serried ranks, now that we are backed by hundreds of millions of people all over the world? In these conditions the launching of a war will mean the end of the anti-popular imperialist system.

Our unshakable confidence in this does not mean that we are underestimating the forces of imperialism in the slightest. We know that imperialism is still strong. The possibility of a new war being unleashed by the imperialists cannot be written off. The imperialist maniacs may dash headlong into adventures, in an attempt to stay the course of history. In a situation like that we have only one path—we must strengthen our might, create the most powerful weapons, and be prepared at any moment to hurl back any attacks made by the aggressors. We have declared more than once, and we declare again, that we are prepared to disband our army, and sink our atomic bombs and our rockets in the ocean, but of course only given general and complete disarmament under strict international control. Until the imperialist powers agree to that, we shall see to it that our Armed Forces possess the most up-to-date means for the defence of our homeland—atomic and thermonuclear weapons and rockets of every range—and that all types of armaments are maintained at the due level. The strengthening of the U.S.S.R.'s defences and of the might of the Soviet Armed Forces—such is the paramount task of the Soviet people.

Communists are in duty bound to look history boldly in the face. As long as the war danger exists, as long as there are in this world imperialist jungles inhabited by preying tigers, we must educate all our people, our youth, in a spirit of devoted love for the homeland, readiness to defend it, sparing neither strength nor life itself. Our cause is a great one, and to defend that cause the Soviet people will give their all. If the imperialists challenge us to war, we shall not only take up that challenge without hesitation, but, with all the devoted gallantry and courage inherent in Communists, we shall deal the enemy a devastating blow.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 283-84.)

Today even many of our adversaries are compelled to recognise that year by year and step by step the balance of forces on the world scene is steadily changing in favour of the socialist countries and to the disadvantage of the imperialist camp. Before the Second World War imperialism was obviously ahead of socialism economically and militarily. It should be said that after the Second World War, too, the imperialist camp did for some time consider itself stronger than the socialist countries. The imperialists exulted in the nuclear weapons monopoly and tried to dictate and impose their policy on the whole world. They followed a frankly aggressive and offensive policy against the socialist countries. That was the time when the notorious tactics of combating communism appeared, as formulated by Dulles—the policy of “rolling back communism”, “liberating the East European countries”, and the policy of “balancing on the brink of war”.

All of you know that this policy has suffered complete failure, yielding neither honour nor glory to its makers. Not only did the imperialists fail to “roll back” communism, to weaken its power. Quite the reverse. They themselves kept losing their positions in the world. In the post-war period dozens of countries have flung off the imperialist and colo-

nialist yoke and embarked upon independent development.

Imperialism's increasing weakness is also evidenced by the fact that the ruling quarters in the imperialist countries have lately been resorting more and more to persecution and terrorist acts against the progressive, democratic forces in their countries. The days are gone when the United States took pride in its Constitution being the most democratic. It is violating this Constitution and the elementary democratic rights and freedoms of the working people ever more grossly. Communists are flung into prison and persecuted in every way for their political convictions, their ideas. To vindicate their disgraceful police acts in some way, the American authorities have made up the fable that the U.S. Communists are "agents of Moscow". But nothing will help the reactionaries of all shades and in all countries to block the triumphant march of communist ideas.

Lately, due to the change in the relation of forces on the international scene, the struggle between the two world systems entered a new phase. The imperialists have been divested of their nuclear weapons monopoly once and for all, and have long since lost their superiority in means of delivery of nuclear weapons to the target. The United States, the leading power of the imperialist world, has lost the advantages it enjoyed through its geographic disposition and has become vulnerable to retaliation.

The new balance of forces in the international arena favours unity of the peace champions, the development of the world working-class and national liberation movements, and has a sobering effect on some sections of the imperialist ruling circles. The more sober representatives of the Western countries, who assess the balance of forces realistically, admit more and more often that disputes with the socialist countries should be settled not by war, but by negotiation. These are indubitably new trends. But we must naturally always bear in mind that the forces of reaction and war are highly active. They are adding strain to the international situation and hatching maniacal plans of a world thermonuclear war. The arms race continues. What is more, it is being stepped up. It is therefore essential that the socialist countries, the Communist Parties, the international working

class, the newly-free countries and all the peace-loving forces join more and more closely in the struggle to prevent a thermonuclear war and make peace more secure.

As for the world socialist system, we have always stood, and now stand, for the strengthening of peaceful coexistence, for peaceful economic competition between the two systems, and for the settlement of disputed questions by negotiation. He who confidently follows the path of growth and progress, who looks optimistically to the future, does not need war and has a vital interest in peace. And, comrades, we have no grounds for pessimism.

Political leaders and statesmen have no right to forget their responsibility to the peoples. We have had the honour to be the first in the world to raise high the banner of struggle for socialism, for communism. The Soviet Union, the entire socialist community, is like a granite rock standing against the capitalist world, and all storms are broken as they run against its mighty foundation. It is not for us Communists, people of progressive ideas and convictions, to indulge in adventurism and thus offer an opening for the aggressive forces of imperialism, which are losing confidence in the triumph of their system, to unleash a world war. I repeat, comrades, this would not be a display of reason, or of heroism. It would be a lack of faith in the strength of the working class, the strength of socialism.

We still have big battles ahead in the struggle for the victory of socialism and communism. Year after year we are strengthening and consolidating the foundations of our common home. It is rising higher and higher over the world. Today the imperialist camp is obliged to reckon with our forces, is obliged to reckon with the fact that His Majesty the working class of the world and its vanguard, the working class of the socialist countries, is developing and gaining strength.

These forces will grow and speed their advance until a complete victory of the ideas of communism is achieved, until happiness and prosperity triumph all over the world, until our Red Banner flies over the entire world.

That hour will come, comrades, we are firmly confident of this.

The economy of the socialist countries is growing and gaining in strength, greatly outstripping the capitalist world in rates of advance. The industrial output of the socialist countries was about 70 per cent greater in 1962 than in 1957. The gain in the capitalist countries over the same period amounted to just 25 per cent. At present the industrial output of the socialist countries is about 64 per cent of that of the economically developed capitalist countries. The working people of your Republic and the workers, peasants and intelligentsia of People's Poland, Czechoslovakia, the People's Republic of China, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, of all the socialist countries, are making a big contribution to the development of the socialist economy.

The new relation of the socialist and capitalist forces on the world scene is having a beneficial effect on the situation of countries that have only recently won national independence.

In the past, U.S. imperialism refused to recognise the neutralist policy of the newly-free countries. Now, the United States are compelled more and more frequently to recognise that the neutralist policy of some of the Asian and African countries is both admissible and lawful.

To be sure, it would be naïve to think that these changes in the imperialist policies stem from the fact that Western statesmen have grown more enlightened and progressive. No, that is not the case. The imperialists are compelled to reckon with the realities, whether they like it or not. They have no other choice. When framing their policy they are compelled to reckon with the growing strength of the socialist countries, with their economic and military power, with the development of the national liberation movement of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples in the struggle for their independence, against imperialism. They are compelled to reckon with the mounting struggle of the masses in the capitalist countries against the monopolies. All this weakens imperialism's positions in the world arena.

(Speech at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, January 16, 1963. Moscow, 1963, Russ. ed., pp. 19-23.)

It is precisely to the gigantic development of the productive forces of the Soviet Union and of the socialist system as a whole that we owe the fact that present-day imperialism has to reckon with the world socialist camp, with the real might of socialism. As is generally recognised by the world progressively-minded public, this might of the Soviet Union and other socialist states constitutes the main obstacle to the unleashing of imperialist aggression, the unleashing of another world war. For successful struggle against imperialism mere slogans are insufficient. There must be real possibilities of waging this struggle victoriously. The material forces of victorious socialism play the decisive and ever-increasing role among these possibilities.

(The Present Stage of Communist Construction and Party Tasks in Improving the Management of Agriculture. Report to the Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., March 5, 1962. *Communist Construction in the U.S.S.R. and Agricultural Development*, Russ. ed., Vol. 6, p. 340.)

... When the U.S.S.R. becomes the foremost industrial power in the world, when the Chinese People's Republic becomes a mighty industrial power and the industrial output of all the socialist countries combined is more than half the world industrial output, the international situation will change radically. The successes of the socialist countries will no doubt have a tremendous influence towards strengthening the forces of peace throughout the world. By that time the countries championing a durable peace will no doubt be joined by new countries that will have thrown off colonial oppression. The idea that war is impermissible will take still firmer root in the minds of men. The new alignment of forces will be so obvious that even the most die-hard imperialists will clearly see the futility of any attempt to start a war against the socialist camp. Backed by the might of the socialist camp, the peaceful nations will then be able to make bellicose imperialist groups abandon their plans for a new world war.

(Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-65. Moscow, p. 85.)

IMPERIALISM IS IN NO STATE TO STOP MANKIND'S PROGRESS

In the course of the peaceful competition between the two systems capitalism has suffered a crushing moral defeat in the eyes of all peoples. Ordinary people are becoming daily convinced that capitalism cannot solve any of the urgent problems facing mankind. It is becoming ever more obvious that these problems can be solved only through socialism. Faith in the capitalist system and the capitalist path of development is dwindling. Monopoly capital is losing its influence and resorting more frequently to the intimidation and suppression of the people, to methods of open dictatorship to implement its home policy and to acts of aggression against other countries. The masses, however, are offering increasing resistance to reaction.

It is no secret that intimidation and threats are not a sign of strength but are evidence of the weakening of capitalism and the deepening of its general crisis. As the saying goes, "If you couldn't hang on by the mane, you won't hold on by the tail!" The reactionaries in some countries are still able, in defiance of constitutions, to dissolve parliaments, cast the best representatives of the people into prison and dispatch cruisers and marines to subdue the "unruly". Such measures of repression may put off for a time the fatal hour of capitalist rule, but they expose, to a still greater extent, the predatory nature of imperialism. The imperialists are cutting off the branch on which they are sitting. There are no forces in the world that can stem mankind's advance along the road of progress.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 15-16.)

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics