

WORLD
COMMUNISM
and
U.S. FOREIGN
POLICY

by EARL BROWDER

Published 1948
by The Author
New York City

As I See It

This work is indispensable to anyone wanting a quick, accurate understanding of our troubles to lay out a sure forecast of the way out.

Browder's thesis can be stated briefly: Sooner or later we shall be compelled by self-interest to recognize the new balance of power in Europe and Asia that arose during & since World War II. This will call for abandonment - in its major premise - of the Truman-Marshall Doctrine. The longer we delay, the more enemies and fewer friends we shall have when the inevitable recognition of Soviet interests, which of course embraces the interests of the nascent Democratic societies

WORLD COMMUNISM and U. S. FOREIGN POLICY

A Comparison of Marxist Strategy and Tactics
After World War I, and World War II

by

Earl Browder

Published 1948 by The Author
55 West 42nd Street, New York City

(next page)

created in Europe & Asia by the
struggle for national liberation
from Fascism. ^{occurred} Therefore, simple
self-interest ^{dictates} the
earliest possible recognition, the
correct goal of all progressive
forces in America today.

Copyright 1948 by Earl Browder

65

It seems to me that this whole
issue may be clarified by
elaborating the close historical
analogy between the periods
1917-33, and 1946, et seq. After
the Soviet State's birth in 1917 the
U.S. refused recognition, awaited
an expected early collapse, inter-
vened directly out of impatience to
speed that collapse, failed in
the intervention, and
pursued for 16 years a consistent
policy of non-recognition, during

which period the relative power
altered sharply in favor of the
Soviet State. Our efforts
aroused hatred & created
suspicion & enmity as a
political failure; our efforts
aroused economic collapse in Europe as an

AUTHOR'S NOTE.

This booklet is a personal expression of opinion by the
author and is not made on behalf of any other individual, group
or institution of any kind. The author bears sole and complete
responsibility for it.

The author is, however, in his business capacity of American
representative of Soviet Publishing Houses, registered with the
Foreign Agents Registration Section, Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C., where his registration statement is available
for public inspection. While this booklet has no connection
with such foreign representation, the author is publishing this
notice in conformity with any possible interpretation of the
law dealing with such matters, and is filing copies with the
proper authorities.

economic front of this U.S.
Diplomacy.

In 1933, F. D. R. appeared
as spokesman for the
U.S. capitalists who had at
last awakened to our policy.
We recognized the Soviet,
courted its favor, and used

This mutual self-interest to restore our economy & eventually, to save our engine, is not our very lives, against Hitler's onslaught.

But in 1945-46, after F.D.R.'s death, U.S. Diplomacy, faced with the same problems but on a higher level of power-jugglers against us, reverted to the old, unworkable policy of non-recognition of the emerging democracies.

But the tempo of change is now so great that we have, very quickly, over-extended ourselves & come up against the shadow of the coming collapse of our Diplomacy (next page).

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. The Different Character of the Two Wars.....	1
2. The World Relationship of Forces.....	7
3. The Resistance Movements and the National Front.....	13
4. The Possibility of Peaceful Transition to Socialism.....	18
5. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.....	23
6. Strategy and Tactics of Coalition.....	26
7. American Imperialism as a Stage of Capitalism.....	30
8. America's Course After Roosevelt's Death.....	38
9. The New Communist Information Bureau.....	43
10. Conclusion.....	50
—————	
Other Works of Earl Browder.....	53

Walter Lippmann has already
perceived this fact. Note that in
the attached column he forecasts
both our failure, & our
inevitable adoption of the
more realistic & workable policy
of political reconstruction to
precede & guarantee economic
reconstruction (next to last paragraph).

I believe also that
Churchill has already seen
a glimmer of the ghost. Recall
that recently he urged coming
to an immediate understanding
with Russia, & added the
for him — conciliatory obser-
vation that he had always found
the Soviets to be realists who
could be depended on to keep
their bargains when it pleased
(see page 511)

1. The Different Character of the Two Wars.

A chief characteristic of Marxism, as a guide to the strategy and tactics of the workingclass in its struggle for power, and for socialism, is that it always proceeds from an analysis of the actually existing situation in each country and in the world as a whole. It does not draw its strategy and tactics from dogma, from formulae and slogans carried over from former periods of experience, but constantly changes them under the impact of new facts and new experience. When these changes attain a certain volume, they take on a qualitative character and mark a new period of development, in which there is a general readjustment and change of strategy and tactics. Such a qualitative change is revealed when we compare Communist strategy and tactics after World War I with those being followed after World War II.

The most obvious of these changes are the following:

After World War I, the Marxists initiated the formation of the *Communist International* with the central slogan of immediate struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in all advanced countries, to be realized through a Soviet type of government. In the course of World War II, the Communist International was voluntarily dissolved, and after the War, the predominant opinion of world Marxists was expressed by Joseph Stalin when he stated that any attempt to revive the Communist International would be "Utopian and quixotic"; by Dimitrov of Bulgaria, when he said that his country would realize socialism through its own forms, not necessarily by a dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviets; by Tito of Yugoslavia, in the statement that the program of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia contains nothing beyond the program of the Peoples' Front; by Marxist leaders of most countries in Eastern and Central Europe, who declared

Crisis Political

that the "new democracy" emerging from the war opens up for these countries the possibility of a transition to socialism without civil war . . .

These primary facts are sufficient to establish that Marxist strategy and tactics after World War II differ so fundamentally from those following World War I, as to require a general re-examination and reevaluation of all problems of strategy and tactics.

The primary factor in defining the difference between the two postwar periods is, of course, the different character of the two wars.

World War I was an imperialist war, in that both camps were dominated by monopoly capital, aiming at extending their respective empires; a victory for either side would result, chiefly, in extending one empire at the expense of the other. What was progressive in that war came, not from the victory of the winning coalition, but from the overthrow of one of its members, the Czarist Government, by a proletarian revolution which established a new socialist system in face of bitter opposition not only from Germany but also from Britain, France and the U.S.A. The progressive results that came out of World War I arose, and could only arise, from a strategy which rejected both sides of World War I and directed itself to transforming the imperialist war into civil war.

World War II, on the contrary, was a war of imperialist conquest on the part of Germany and her Axis partners, but a peoples' war of national liberation on the part of the victorious United Nations. The chief progressive result of World War II came directly from the victory of the Allied powers, and the Marxist strategy and tactics during the war were determined by this goal of victory, which brought with it the downfall of three of the six imperialist world powers and the release of the long-suppressed European movement toward socialism.

This different evaluation of the two wars was summed up by Joseph Stalin in the following words:

"As distinct from the First World War, the Second World War against the Axis States from the very outset assumed the nature of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was also to re-establish democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis States

OK
Cleared up by next page
OK

could only strengthen--and actually did strengthen--the anti-fascist and liberating character of the Second World War." (Speech of February 9, 1946.)

The victorious coalition, the United Nations, was of a historically unique composition. It contained the United States, the most powerful capitalist-imperialist government; Great Britain, the oldest and formerly most successful world empire, whose proudest boast was that the sun never sets on her far-flung territories; and the Soviet Union, the new socialist system which arose in 1917 out of the wreckage of the barbaric Czarist regime to re-make, in the course of a quarter-century, its peoples and resources into the second most powerful state in the world. These three powers formed and led jointly the United Nations which emerged victorious from World War II.

Marxists were, of course, always sharply conscious of the deep contradictions and antagonisms inherent in the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. So much so, that, until the invasion of the Soviet Union, they had interpreted the inactivity of British and French forces and the preliminary neutrality of the United States as infallible signs that World War II had the same fundamental character of World War I, with the primary aim on both sides being to crush the Soviet Union.

When Hitler's armies drove into the territory of the Soviet Union on June 21, 1941, the true character of the war was soon revealed. France had fallen almost without a fight, and the British suddenly awoke to their terrible danger from which they could be saved only if the Soviet Army broke Hitler's power. America became aware, for the first time, that the Far Eastern Red Army had been her protection from Japanese aggression, that with the Soviet forces fully engaged in the West, the Japanese were sure to strike--as they did on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor. The Axis Powers became so swollen with conquest that nothing stood between them and world rule except the Soviet Union and its fighting forces. For all other nations the issue had become a question of their very survival, with the decision resting in Soviet hands. The world was so much aware that the Soviet Union saved it from Hitlerism, that American churches, long-drilled in anti-Sovietism, openly thanked God for Stalin and prayed for the success of the Red Army.

Notes: It is highly revealing that Walter Reuther in October 1945, shortly before this in a letter to me in 1945.

* hate this well

Establishment of the character of the war as being one of national survival and liberation on the side of the United Nations did not, of course, resolve the contradictions within the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance. Not for nothing had Hitler relied upon these contradictions to prevent, or to disintegrate, any alliance against him. Britain, under Churchill's leadership, delayed the attack against Germany through France for two years after it had been promised—for the obvious purpose of putting the full military burden of the war upon the Soviet Union, in order ultimately to dictate the peace. Churchill planned to throw British and American forces into the Balkans (instead of into a decisive blow through France), a strategy which was directed as much against the Soviet Union as against Hitler. Obviously the most reactionary Anglo-American imperialists never for one second forgot their aims or ceased to fight for them. They were inside the camp of the peoples' war for national liberation, but working with all their forces to subvert it, to turn it back into the pattern of World War I.

Churchill's plan failed, because Roosevelt refused to join him and instead led America into another course.

Roosevelt, at the head of the American government, moved steadily towards a close alignment with Stalin, to establish a real *coalition strategy* for the war and to enforce it upon Churchill. He forced Churchill to commit himself to the slogan of "unconditional surrender", to guarantee against a deal with Hitler that would doublecross the Soviet Union. He initiated the Teheran Conference, where he boldly joined Stalin to overrule Churchill, and made the first long-range commitments that recognized Soviet interests on an equal plane with those of America and Britain. He forced the belated execution of Anglo-American promises regarding the second front. At Yalta, he extended the policy of recognition of Soviet interests, when victory was already in sight. Before his death, he charted the main decisions that Truman executed for America at the Potsdam Conference. Thus he laid a real, not merely formal, foundation for his project of a United Nations Organization which should guarantee peace for generations to come, in accordance with the promise of the Teheran Declaration of the "Big Three".

Roosevelt's role was decisive in preventing the disintegration of the victorious coalition before the end of the war, in ensuring

the destruction of the Nazi armies, in hastening the victory, and in establishing at the war's end the real possibility of a long-term peace.

Marxists never doubted the ability of the Soviet Union, under Stalin's leadership, to emerge victorious from the war even if deserted by her great allies. But neither were they under any illusions that victory under such conditions would not be enormously more costly and less immediately complete. That America under Roosevelt's leadership played on the whole a *positive progressive role*, in alliance with and leaning upon the Soviet Union, until the war's victorious end, was of far-reaching historical import. It shaped the whole character of the post-war period and all its problems.

It cannot be said that Marxists generally foresaw the progressive role that was to be played by America in the war. There was considerable surprise, and even skepticism, among Marxists of all nations, when Roosevelt boldly sealed his war policies in the Teheran agreements. This surprise was repeated when the Yalta Conference carried these agreements still further. It is perhaps not too much to say that most Marxists would *not* have been surprised if Roosevelt had turned back toward the Churchill policy, at least when the military defeat of Hitler was definitely established as only a matter of time.

But Roosevelt never wavered in his course directed toward a real and sound coalition with the Soviet Union, for the war and for the peace to come. He understood that this could be a realistic policy only if the books were closed on the old ambition of the capitalist world to eliminate the Soviet Union and its socialist system. He knew that only by acceptance of the Soviet Union as an equal, by accepting a future based on cooperation between two systems, could a long-term peace be secured. He acted consistently upon these conceptions.

Roosevelt's policy secured majority support in the United States. But powerful forces, the reactionary circles of finance capital, were always against Roosevelt and were doubly against his policy of full coalition with the Soviet Union. With Roosevelt's death, these reactionary groups gradually took over control and cancelled Roosevelt's policies step by step, culminating in the dismissal of Henry Wallace from the Cabinet in the fall of 1946, and in Truman's message to Congress in March, 1947.

announcing the so-called "Truman Doctrine". The U. S. faced the post-war period with a program flatly contradicting that on which it had fought the war, an open anti-Soviet program as opposed to the Roosevelt program of a coalition of equals for war and peace.

Marxist world opinion remains, predominantly, firm in the judgment that the Roosevelt policy, if it had continued to guide the U.S.A. in the post-war world, would have guaranteed the perspective announced at Teheran of peace for several generations. Communist spokesmen of the Soviet Union and most European countries have consistently reflected this judgment. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. has made the reinstatement of Roosevelt's policy its main immediate goal.

The different estimate given the two World Wars by the Marxists is thus fully reflected in the quite different strategy and tactics with which they face the present post-war world.

To the extent that Roosevelt's policy determined the progressive character and outcome of World War II, to an equal extent has the possibility of a long-term peaceful co-existence of the socialist and capitalist systems been created.

The strategic and tactical concepts of world Marxism are today dominated by the task of realizing this possibility. It is a struggle to prevent a new world war, it is the struggle for peace. The forms this struggle takes are profoundly different from those which characterized the period following World War I. The starting point for fully understanding these post-war differences must be from the fundamentally different character of the two wars.

This chapter, as history is excellent.

2. The World Relationship of Forces.

"Men make history, but they do not make it out of whole cloth." They must work with the materials that past history has provided for the current task. If the present post-war period differs so fundamentally from the previous one, as it does, then the understanding of this difference must include a definition of the changes that have taken place in the world relationship of forces since World War I and in the course of World War II.

Stalin and Roosevelt were the two men who most decisively made history in this generation. They worked in collaboration at the most decisive moments. But they worked from opposite bases; the first from the base of the new, rising socialist system of the Soviet Union, created in a life-and-death struggle against the old capitalist world; the second from the base of the stronghold and center of world capitalism in its highest stage of development. Stalin was guided by the single aim of preserving the Soviet socialist system, of making it invincible, and of advancing the democratic forces in the whole world; Roosevelt was guided by the single aim of preserving American capitalism from revolutionary change in a generally disintegrating capitalist world, the aim of survival.

Without the most profound study of the changes in the world relationship of forces, it is impossible to give a rational explanation of the history-shaping collaboration between Stalin and Roosevelt, which expressed the relationship between the Soviet Union and America—the opposite poles of social development. Only changes going to the roots of history could explain this unique, unpredicted, and unpredictable development at its summit. It is the peculiar and unavoidable task of Marxists to find and trace a rational explanation, and to make a considered judgment regarding its significance for the future.

C.F. New Masses cartoon of 1933

The over-all character of the shift in world force relationships is the rise of a new social and economic system in the Soviet Union, with a powerful state organization, while the capitalist world, including first of all its most advanced and powerful segment, the U.S.A., is in general crisis, expressed even by decay and disintegration in its weaker segments. Socialism has emerged as an expanding world power, for the first time in history; capitalism is in growing difficulties which it is unable to meet except by emergency stop-gap measures, or by fascist retrogression to the doctrines of brute force and violence.

Stalin was the leader and symbol of the rising new socialist system. Roosevelt and Hitler came to power in the U.S.A. and Germany as the result of the crisis of capitalism.

Early aim of Marxist estimate of F.D.R.

The first judgment of Marxists in 1933 was to evaluate the historical significance of Roosevelt and Hitler in analogous terms. Both were swept to power by the effects of capitalist crisis, and their immediate measures to meet the crisis bore more than a superficial resemblance. Roosevelt suspended the anti-trust laws, Hitler formed a direct amalgamation with German monopoly capital; Roosevelt devalued American currency and took gold out of circulation, while Hitler set up the intricate fascist system of managed currency; Roosevelt sacrificed the international economic conference in London to the exigencies of America's immediate problems, while Hitler announced the policy of "autarchy" and launched a state-subsidized drive to capture world markets; Roosevelt put the unemployed to work with government funds, and so did Hitler. Roosevelt even had as close assistants men like Hugh Johnson, who openly expressed their admiration for Hitler and Mussolini and copied their ideas and methods.

Stalin gave a sharp correction to this first Marxist evaluation of Roosevelt, early in 1934, in an interview with Walter Duranty, in which he characterized Roosevelt as an intelligent and outstanding statesman. Already Stalin's thought had penetrated beneath the deceptive appearance of events to recognize a deeper trend of opposite significance. America and Germany were not taking the same road. While Hitler was whipping up his anti-Communist crusade, Roosevelt was dispersing its counterpart in America and ending this country's 15-year old policy of boycotting the Soviet Union. While Hitler was crushing

the German trade unions, Roosevelt was encouraging and helping the trade unions to rise to new heights of organization and influence. Under the compulsion of events and the stimulus of Stalin's thought, Marxists everywhere carried out a cautious but drastic re-evaluation of Roosevelt and of America's world role. At the same time the anti-fascist front was being formed everywhere. In America it took its broadest and most influential form in the rallying of the masses of the people in support of Roosevelt.

It was certainly a decisive factor in fixing the world relationship of forces for World War II and its aftermath, that America moved under Roosevelt's leadership away from Hitler Germany toward the eventual war alliance with the Soviet Union.

Roosevelt was able to make this history-shaping swing of America away from the reactionary pole of world developments because there existed an opposite powerful center of attraction—the Soviet Union and the anti-fascist peoples' fronts all over the world.

During World War I, all governments were in the hands of imperialists and their puppets. The Soviet Union emerged from that war as the only state governed by the masses, with a hostile world arrayed against it, and a wrecked and backward country as its inheritance. The world Marxist movement in the post-war period was dominated by the single idea of extending this historical initiative as widely as possible, and of defending at all costs its first victory from a world of hostile governments.

World War II, however, was dominated by that same Soviet Union which in 1918 was a young and daring experiment. Between the two wars, in sharp contrast to the rest of the world, the new socialist system had proved itself by transforming a backward and wrecked country into the most powerful modern industrialized land outside the U.S.A. It was now to prove its capacity for survival in the most cruel of all wars. It bore by far the main burden of that war, and emerged stronger than ever. Only because the Soviet Union was strong in its own right, able to win the war if necessary alone, was she able to gain and hold the alliance with Britain and the U.S.A. until victory was achieved. Without Soviet strength as its foundation, Roosevelt's policy could not have dominated and guided America, it could not have been more than a brilliant aspiration.

The course of the war, due first of all to the dominant position of the Soviet Union, liberated a series of countries in a manner to enable their peoples, who had united to resist Nazi conquest, to continue their war-time unity in governments of a *new democracy* which arose in the course of liberation. The old ruling classes, bankrupt and discredited by their anti-national role as quislings for Hitler, were swept into the waste-basket. The course of the war itself did much of the work which during and after the previous war could be done only by civil war, revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet power. It eliminated the most reactionary imperialist powers, Germany, Italy and Japan. The new democracies that arose out of World War II did not abolish capitalism and establish socialism, but they created peoples' governments which made possible the peaceful transition to socialism at whatever pace these peoples should decide for themselves.

During World War I and in the following period, the national liberation movements of the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial empires, who comprised the great majority of the world's population, were in their infancy. During World War II, the colonial liberation movement, was already vast and powerful. It received further impetus from the pitiful crumbling of British, French and Dutch rule throughout Asia under the first blows of the Japanese attack. White imperialist rule of Asia after World War II had become an anachronism against which hundreds of millions of formerly passive colonial subjects were aroused and ready to fight to the death.

The reactionary camp in world affairs is thus, after World War II, in quite a different position from that of the gentlemen who gathered in Versailles after World War I, who proceeded to settle the affairs of the world as a problem of "deals" between "gentlemen" who, after all, understood one another and had similar class interests. At Versailles, the "peacemakers" could exclude the Soviet Union entirely, and in their spare time organize military invasions into her territory to overthrow the "upstart" government. "Their" colonies were, as a matter of course and without serious difficulty, immediately restored to the *status quo ante bellum*. That is not possible after World War II.

Peacemaking today, the settling of the main outlines of the post-war world after the latest war, is a very different matter from Versailles.

Today the Soviet Union and the new democratic states allied with her have a decisive voice in the making of peace. No world settlement is possible without their agreement and cooperation. They cannot be coerced into accepting any new world order that violates their fundamental interests. Even the threat of opening up a new major war against them, the threat of World War III with America's latest gadget, the atomic bomb, as its central weapon, cannot intimidate them into accepting a subordinate role and a peace settlement dictated by anti-Sovietism.

This new relationship of world forces, so radically transformed from that which prevailed after World War I, is by no means reversed by the fact that America has abandoned Roosevelt's policy and swung over to lead the anti-Soviet camp. The new relationship of forces was confirmed and strengthened by the war and its outcome, with America's help and participation; it can be challenged only by another war, in which even the advocates of anti-Sovietism, except those entirely drunk on the new atom-bomb whiskey, admit that they have no prospects of success.

The principle of unanimity of the great powers, written into the charter of the United Nations and the procedure set up for making the peace, is thus fully grounded in the real relation of forces in the present-day world. It does not depend upon a piece of paper which can be rewritten by a majority vote of any conference. It is inherent in the structure of power existing in the world. It is an existing fact. And, as wise men long ago learned, facts are stubborn things.

It is the most basic concept of Marxism that facts, the material things of the world, are primary and that ideas are secondary, derivative, and controlled by facts.

It is, therefore, obvious that Marxists are the first to recognize that their strategy and tactics in this post-war period are, and must be, quite different from the strategy and tactics followed after World War I. There are certain constant factors common to both situations, in that two rival economic and political systems, capitalism and socialism, co-exist in the same world. But since the relationship between these two main forces has been

materialistic determinism

This explains why I will not delay in post-war settlement now.

This is the cry of the anti-Soviet camp. It flows off to the plan, to the partitioning, etc.

radically transformed, in favor of socialism, the strategy and tactics that are guided by Marxist thought must be equally radically transformed. If anyone could think that the slogans and formulations of Marxists in the period from the First World War to the rise of Hitler, can now be valid for the new situation, such a person would not be a Marxist at all. He would be little better than a parrot or a phonograph record. A Marxist is, above all, a person who *thinks*, not one who repeats.

3. The Resistance Movements and the National Front.

Before World War II, and especially during its course, the old social and economic order seriously involved itself with Hitlerism in every European country. In some countries (Finland, Bulgaria, Roumania, Hungary) the ruling classes, landlords and bourgeoisie, moved as a body into the Axis camp; in others they adjusted themselves to the Nazi invasion and cooperated with the conquerors (Greece, Poland, Yugoslavia, and to a more limited extent France and Czechoslovakia). Those sections of the upper ruling classes most closely associated with Britain fled to that country and set up "governments in exile," ostensibly to "direct the resistance" but actually to conduct relations with the Nazis against the resistance, with the single aim of restoring the old order regardless of which side won the war.

In every nation subjected to fascist conquest, these arose a spontaneous movement of resistance and liberation. It came primarily from the workers and peasants, but was joined by patriots of all classes. It arose among former adherents of all the old political parties, but in every case the Communists furnished the best organized, most clear-headed and courageous sectors, and therefore played the leading role. This leading role of Communists in the resistance movements was so strong, and played such an important role in defeating the Nazis (especially in Yugoslavia), that Roosevelt, as the chief executive of the U.S.A., early in 1944 publicly expressed his opinion that it was desirable for Communists to be included in all governments which were being provisionally established for the liberated countries. Roosevelt went so far on this point as to withhold recognition from deGaulle until he had included French Communists in the provisional government he headed, and only

finally recognized deGaulle when the French Communists urged this step.

Thus it came about that the *universal type* of government for European countries that emerged from the defeat of the Axis was the *coalition* of all parties and groups that had united in the liberation movement, including the Communists.

The perspective announced by the Big Three at Teheran and Yalta of a long-term peace, organized in the United Nations, had as one of its foundation stones this system of *coalition governments*, supporting programs transitional toward socialism with nationalization of key industries as a central feature.

But early in 1945, even before Yalta, the British government, under Churchill, struck a heavy blow against this program by violent military intervention in Greece to expel the liberation movement (EAM) from the Greek government along with the Greek Communists. Greece was thrown into violent civil war even before ejection of the Nazis had been completed. Churchill did not hesitate to carry out this *coup d'etat* through the instrumentality of military and police formations which had been openly in the service of the Nazi occupationists. The U.S.A., so long as Roosevelt lived, openly disapproved of Churchill's Greek adventure; but by March, 1947, it was the U.S.A. which started a general assault against all the war-born *peoples' coalitions* which secured the exclusion of Communists and associates of the liberation movements from the governments of France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, and so on, and reconstituted these regimes to include the extreme right and remnants of fascism.

The attack launched against the Soviet Union and the new democracies by Anglo-American reaction in 1946-47 attained only partial and temporary success in Western Europe; in Central and Eastern Europe those elements that could be controlled and directed by Anglo-American reaction were too weak and discredited to make a major bid for power. Their desperate efforts in that direction, under stimulus from Washington and London, only exposed and isolated them, and resulted in their elimination from public life. The *peoples' coalition* came more firmly together than before, and answered the blows of U. S. withdrawal of economic collaboration by speeding up their

programs of nationalization and drawing closer to the Soviet Union.

Thus, the main pattern for the reconstruction of Europe, envisaged in the Roosevelt-Stalin plan at Teheran and Yalta, survived even its desertion by U. S. and Britain, and survived the general offensive launched by Anglo-American reaction. Even in Western Europe, above all in France and Italy, the basic concept of the *liberation coalition* as the force to rebuild these countries remains a main political influence among the masses, a chief obstacle to the schemes of reaction.

Against the background of this development of post-war Europe, it is easy to see the sharp differences it shows from the period after World War I, from the point of view of Marxian strategy and tactics.

After World War I, the camp of reaction had a *monopoly of legality* everywhere outside the Soviet Union. Therefore Marxists had to direct the workingclass and its allies toward breaking that *monopoly* at all costs, as the first price of any freedom of action; this could be accomplished only by defying and breaking the monopoly of legality, that is, by *illegal* action. This is why, in that period, the Marxists, under the leadership of Lenin, poured such scorn upon the opportunist leaders who advised the workingclass to keep within the framework of a *legality* which was determined entirely by the camp of reaction; this is why, in that period, *illegality* was in Europe synonymous with *freedom* of action for the people, the first condition necessary for any progress.

After World War II, the condition is radically different for the largest part of Europe. *Legality* is now a weapon in the hands of the people, exercised through the *coalition* of all their forces that won liberation from the Nazis. *Illegality* is today the slogan, in these countries, of the forces of reaction. It is a sign of the times that *conspiracies*, underground organizations, and all the paraphernalia of *illegality*, are to be found in a large part of Europe exclusively under the guidance and with the material support of agents operating under direction from Washington and London; it is a *reactionary* underground composed of the remnants of the shattered old order of semi-feudal landlordism allied with international finance capital.

The decisive role that has been and is being played by the national liberation movements and the new democratic governments which they created in Eastern and Central Europe, and the *coalitions* which lead and unite them, brings about another sharp difference between the present strategy and tactics of Marxists and those followed after World War I. Whereas in the former period, Marxists gave first and predominant emphasis to slogans and forms of struggle which were common to all countries, today Marxists must give major attention to *national peculiarities and national forms*. Whereas, in the former period, the main Marxist effort was directed toward *uniformity*, in the present period this aim is disregarded without compunction whenever it conflicts with the *most expedient and effective* solution of pressing national problems.

For example, the *state forms* of the new democracies in which the Communists play a leading part are most varied. In Bulgaria the old monarchy was obliterated with a minimum of delay, because it was inextricably entangled with Nazism and responsibility for national catastrophe. In neighboring Roumania, however, the monarchy still exists at this writing and the new democracy functions quite effectively with these old forms; if it is quickly abolished, this will probably be the result of a revolt by monarchist cliques. In Yugoslavia, the new federative republic that unites several nations bears some striking similarities to the governmental structure of the Soviet Union, while in Czechoslovakia, the *forms* of government are but little changed from pre-war times.

Similarly, wide variations appear between the countries in the degree to which nationalization of industries is projected, and the speed with which it is carried out. All these questions are regulated not by any aim of uniformity among the Marxists of Europe, but almost entirely by the national peculiarities of the particular country, the stage of its economic development, the role of various classes in its liberation, and its past history and traditions.

Such an outstanding Communist as George Dimitrov, Premier of Bulgaria, former secretary of the Communist International, does not hesitate to declare that his country is finding and will continue to find its own peculiar road of development toward the general socialist goal, that it is not following any universal

theoretical pattern. In the period after World War I, such a statement by a Marxist leader would have been generally considered by Marxists to be "revisionism"; today it has become the new orthodoxy.

In such concrete examples does one find a measure of the profound changes that have taken place in the world, and in particular as a result of World War II, that makes the present post-war period qualitatively different from that of a quarter-century before, and requires, therefore, a profoundly new strategy and tactics from Marxists.

4. The Possibility of Peaceful Transition to Socialism.

Marxism is, everywhere and always, the science of the transition from capitalism to socialism. In contrast to all other schools of socialist thought, Marxism identifies the motive force of history with the class structure of society and the consequent struggle between classes. It finds in the modern industrial workingclass, resulting from the rise of the bourgeoisie, and the industrial revolution created by machinery, modern power and scientific technique, the historical bearer of the new socialist system which is destined to replace capitalism everywhere. The rise of the workingclass to the leading position in society, which is the necessary culmination of the growth of democracy, is bound together with the victory of socialism over capitalism.

Marxism finds in history that the rise of a new and more progressive social-economic system has always taken place through prolonged and intense struggles between the classes in society which represent the rival systems. The culminating points in such struggles have, in the past, always occurred in the form of violent revolutions, civil wars and wars between nations. The Cromwell "republic" in England, the French Revolution of 1793, followed by the Napoleonic wars, the 1848 upheavals through Europe, and the Civil War in America of 1861-65, were the decisive moments of struggle, violent and bloody, which marked the rise of the bourgeoisie to power and the defeat of feudalism. Only when the power of the feudal landlord and clerical ruling classes had been violently broken, could the way be opened for the rise of modern capitalism.

Marxism finds no grounds to expect that this universal lesson of past history is not also valid for the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, as well as for the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in that large area of the world

still existing under pre-capitalist social-economic conditions. The first system of socialist states, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, arose and established itself in violent revolution and civil war, and had to defend itself within a generation in the most destructive war of all history. New social-economic systems have always had to undergo the test of war, to prove their ability to survive with arms in hand. The war of independence that gave birth to the American Republic was but following this universal pattern of history.

When, in the present period following World War II, however, we find well-grounded Marxists in various countries posing the question that these lands have gained the conditions in which a peaceful transition to socialism has become possible, it is quite wrong to suspect that these men have succumbed to pacifism, that they have reverted to the old discredited pre-Marxist theories of socialism, that they are "revising" Marxism. Something new has entered upon the scene, but the new *idea* has a very *material* foundation, viz., that the reactionary forces that would hitherto have been expected to resist the introduction of socialism by violence, by arms, no longer have the power to make that challenge. In these countries, those class forces hostile by their nature to socialism no longer exist in sufficient strength to obstruct the introduction to socialism by violent means. There remains in these countries only the question of how, when, at what tempo the people (primarily workers and peasants) wish to introduce socialism, and these questions they can now decide by peaceful consultation among themselves.

This new situation, this new relationship of forces, is a result of World War II. It arises from the fact that the reactionary groups and classes within these countries, having in the main cast in their lot with Hitlerism in its bid for world conquest, shared fully in the crushing military defeat that ended the Hitlerian adventure. In the course of the war they had fully revealed not only their reactionary character in social-economic questions; they had further unmasked themselves as *anti-national*, as traitors to their own nations, as *quislings* in the service of a foreign conqueror.

In the course of the war, the workers and peasants of the Nazi-occupied nations engaged in a stubborn resistance to the temporary conquerors that in all these countries became, in

various degrees, a war of national liberation conducted by partisan, guerilla forces which in some lands (notably Yugoslavia) became full-fledged modern armies in the course of the fighting. Workers and peasants not only contributed the great bulk of such forces (that is true in modern times of all wars and all armies), but they furnished the chief leadership and formulated the strategy, tactics and program of the fight. Small sections of other classes joined them, but not in sufficient force to determine their character and leadership. The new leaders thus thrown up by the war united the body of the nation around them. They were the *nation in arms*; all who opposed them were traitors.

This new *national unity*, forged in the terrible fires of war, was carried over into the post-war period, and assumed the tasks of *national reconstruction*. From its class composition and the character of its leadership, it moves in the general direction of socialism, and begins the task of reconstruction by the nationalization of the most important industries, banks, systems of communication, and so on.

These new democracies have the general historical character of being *transitional*, they move in the direction of socialism, but they are not yet socialist. Their social-economic programs and patterns correspond rather closely to what Lenin had in mind, when he said (at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, Nov. 13, 1922):

"All these economic elements (1. patriarchal; 2. small commodity production; 3. private capitalism; 4. state capitalism; 5. socialism) were represented in Russia at that time. I set myself the task of explaining the relation in which these elements stood to each other and whether one of these non-socialist elements, namely state capitalism, should not be appraised higher than socialism. I repeat: It seems very strange to everyone that a non-socialist element should be appraised higher than, should be regarded as superior to, socialism in a republic which declares that it is a Socialist Republic . . . Although it is not a socialist form, state capitalism would be for us, and for Russia, a more favorable form than the existing one. What does that mean? It means that we did not overestimate the rudiments, or the principle, of socialist economy, although we had already accomplished the social revolution; on the contrary, already at that time we realized

to a certain degree that it would be better if we first arrived at state capitalism and then at socialism."

Much in the same sense, then, that Lenin used the term in regard to the economy of the Soviet Union in 1922, the pre-dominant economy of the new democracies in Europe must be characterized as state capitalist. It is transitional toward socialism, it has the possibility of *evolving peacefully into socialism*, but it starts from the point which Lenin described as being *state capitalism* (with accompanying survivals of even pre-capitalist forms). And as Lenin in 1922 considered such state capitalism better for Russia than an attempt to jump directly into socialism, it is doubtless true also for the countries of the new democracy for a certain period, the length of which we cannot at this moment estimate.*

It is, of course, not *solely* because of the defeat and dispersal of the reactionary classes within the country that the new democracies can realistically speak of the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism. This is due, at least equally, to the fact that in *world relations* the Soviet Union, representing developed socialism, has attained an impregnable position which the reactionary camp can no longer realistically hope to destroy by military means. The anti-Soviet camp in world affairs has been driven, in desperation and to console itself, to the expedient of borrowing phrases from Marxism in order to speak of some dim future when "the inner contradictions of the Soviet system" will bring about its downfall! ! ! !

This impregnable position of the USSR in world relations serves as a bulwark to the new democracies, preventing the reactionary world camp from utilizing the remnants of the old ruling classes within the countries of the new democracy for an armed attempt to restore the old order. All the efforts along that line, directed from Washington and London have collapsed.

* I am aware of the fact that there is a difference of opinion on this point among Soviet economists. This was revealed in the records of a discussion held in the Institute of Economics, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, concerning Eugene Varga's book entitled *Changes in Capitalist Economy as a Result of the Second World War*, which were reported in the *Izvestia of the Academy* No. 4 (July-August) 1947, pp. 279-290, and the article by M. Gladkov in *Bolshevik*, No. 17, Sept. 15, 1947, pp. 57-64. These discussions are evidently continuing, and are not yet available in the English language.

Any dreams of their more effective revival are entertained only by the irresponsible adventurers who drunkenly speculate that with the atom bomb they can conquer the world. Only in such grandiose fantasy can even the dreams of restoring the old order survive in the cold realities of the present-day world.

It is, of course, only in these countries of the new democracy, where the reactionary classes have been defeated, discredited and dispersed, that there is a solid body of Marxist opinion which speaks with confidence of the possibility of the peaceful development of socialism without major upheavals and civil struggles. In relation to other countries, the question has been raised for discussion as to whether the new relationship of forces on a world scale does not give some validity of a general nature to this concept of "peaceful" development. There is, however, no decisive answer to this question that is generally accepted by Marxists, except as to the possibility of a *long-term peace between nations*; but as to an equal possibility of avoiding *civil wars* as a general rule there is no such confidence. And there is no doubt whatever among Marxists that *national liberation wars* conducted by the peoples of the colonies and subject countries are unavoidable for some time. When the U. S. abjectly scuttled Roosevelt's plans for securing systematic liberation of the colonies through the United Nations, and instead re-joined the company of British, French, and Dutch colonial imperialists against the subject peoples, the prospect for peaceful solution of the colonial problem vanished. It can be restored only by a full and complete restoration of the Roosevelt policies in control of the American government.

In the new democracies of Europe, the tempo, the rate of speed, with which these countries move toward a full socialist system will doubtless be greatly influenced by the world situation. If the U.S.A. continues its anti-Soviet reactionary policies, and its attempts to interfere in the inner life of the new democracies, this will force these peoples to move much more rapidly toward full socialism. If the U. S., on the contrary, finally makes a realistic settlement with the Soviet Union on such key questions as Germany and Korea, and undertakes a program of economic collaboration with all Europe *without any reactionary political conditions*, then the new democracies will be able to adopt a less hurried (and thereby more sound) tempo of socialist development.

5. The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

A characteristic feature indicating the profound difference in Marxist strategy and tactics in the present post-war period, in contrast with that after World War I, is the different role that is played by the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat outside the Soviet Union.

In none of the countries of the new democracy, in which Marxists play a leading role in the governments, has the dictatorship of the proletariat been put forward as an immediate goal or as a major propaganda slogan.

How different this strategy is from that of a quarter-century before! In the previous post-war period, the key to Marxist strategy was that expressed by Lenin, in the words:

"Those who have read Marx and have failed to understand that in capitalist society, at every acute moment, at every serious conflict of classes, only the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible have understood nothing about the economic or the political doctrines of Marx." (April 15, 1919). ". . . The overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of a Soviet Republic and a proletarian dictatorship—this is the main task of the historical period through which all the advanced (and not only the advanced) countries are now passing." (April 27, 1920).
(Selected Works, Vol. 10, pp. 37, 135).

Obviously, in the present period, the realization of the triumph of popular democracy and the opening of the road to socialism is taking a different form than that envisaged by Marxists in 1919-20. *For now Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat are not spoken of in the same immediate sense even though the*

This thought made elaboration I think!

power of the revolutionary movement of the masses is far broader and deeper than it was in the former period, and Marxist leadership is much more firmly established.

Tito, Premier of Yugoslavia, declared in a recent speech that the program of the Communist Party of his country contains nothing that is not in the program of the National Front, the coalition of all national liberation forces forged in the struggle against Nazi occupation. That program does not contain the dictatorship of the proletariat or the Soviet form of government.

The situation is similar in all the countries of the new democracy.

In other European countries, first of all in France and Italy, where the national liberation unity has been broken, where the reaction rallied by Washington and London has taken power and has excluded the workers' organizations (especially the Communists) from the governments, there the problem is more complicated but similar. It is more complicated, in that the camp of reaction holds state power and is driving in the direction of civil war; it is similar in that the Marxist strategy is directed toward taking the same general path as that established in the countries of the new democracy. Not in Italy and France, any more than in other countries, do the Marxists operate under the immediate slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is, of course, not excluded that if the reactionary camp forces the development of civil war in France and Italy, this event may bring the necessity of rapid changes in the strategy of Marxist leadership in these countries. But even under such conditions, there seems little likelihood of anything resembling a simple return to the strategy of the previous period.

What seems to be established as the preponderance of Marxist opinion throughout the world is that in the present post-war period, when the forces of the workingclass and its allies are incomparably stronger and more mature than in the period after World War I, the correct strategy of struggle for historical progress is no longer immediately and directly for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet power.

It must be especially emphasized that this major modification of Marxist strategy is not a retreat or compromise dictated by the weakness of the workingclass forces. It is a deliberate choice of a better course, more suited to the actualities of the

new situation. The much higher stage of workingclass power and maturity now existing is precisely what makes possible and necessary this new course.

It may seem strange that for Marxists the non-socialist forms of the new democracy should be appraised higher than the direct socialist form of the Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat. But it is no more strange that the previously cited fact that in 1922 Lenin appraised state capitalism higher than socialism for the Soviet Union in its then existing stage of development.

It is not the task of this examination of the problem to furnish the theoretical analysis required for the full estimation of the significance of such a fundamental change in Marxist strategy, namely this retirement of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the foreground of practical policy in the non-Soviet lands. It is sufficient for the immediate purpose to establish the fact as a general phenomenon, to show that it is a part of a general pattern of strategy adjusted to a new and different period, and to indicate that it is not a revision of Marxism but, on the contrary, a correct application of Marxism to a more advanced stage in the general historical transition to socialism.

To quote the words of Lenin, uttered in a different connection: "This is proved, not by theoretical analysis, but by practical experience which, I think, is more important than all the theoretical discussions in the world."

6. Strategy and Tactics of Coalition.

One of the chief differences in the two post-war periods lies in the different role played by *coalition*. After World War I, *coalition* governments of the *left* played an ephemeral role and very quickly passed from the scene; after World War II such *coalitions* have been a universal tactic of the left and have displayed a growing stability instead of declining.

The greater vitality of left coalitions in the present, compared with the previous, post-war period, reveals two factors of somewhat contradictory significance. First, it reveals that the broad democratic mass movement is much stronger and more mature; it is much more difficult today than 30 years ago for the camp of reaction to split the left coalitions and smash them by a combination of internal disruption with outside pressure and blows. Second, however, it shows that the broad left movement is still not fully consolidated and homogeneous, that *coalition* remains a necessary form to achieve sufficient unity to direct the given nations most effectively, that *no single party* as yet has won and consolidated a sufficiently firm majority to render expedient the system of one-party government.

Thus the present coalition form of government that prevails in the new democracies (and is put forward by Marxists for the other countries also), is a sign of the *strength* of the mass movement to the left, toward socialism, of its *unity* against the camp of reaction; but it is, at the same time, a sign that more time is required for the full unification of this movement, for the maximum mobilization of its strength. Coalition is a transitional form of government.

It is the task of the Marxists to ensure that such coalitions move in the direction of socialism. Since such coalitions inevitably

contain a wide range of political trends, *including groups which desire a transition backward toward the old social order*, the coalition is not only the instrument for unity but also is a battlefield between these two trends. It is a central task of the Marxists to so guide the inevitable inner struggle within the coalition that it does not narrow the coalition or shake its stability, but on the contrary, broadens and consolidates it.

Of such far-reaching importance has the coalition form become, that it is perhaps no exaggeration to say that the maturity and adequacy of Marxist leadership may be measured, from country to country, by the degree of success it displays in extending and stabilizing the democratic national coalition.

In a series of countries, notably in France and Italy, the local camp of reaction, with the help of Washington and London, has succeeded in breaking up the coalition regimes that emerged from the war under the combined influence of the war experience and the encouragement of the Roosevelt-Stalin policies which still dominated through 1945 and part of 1946.

Roosevelt actively encouraged the formation of coalition governments, including the Communists, for the liberated countries. Doubtless he saw in such coalitions a factor that would facilitate the realization of his key project for a long-term peace guaranteed by close cooperation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. When the Washington government departed from Roosevelt's line, and took the path of anti-Sovietism, it necessarily undertook to break up and disperse the war-born coalitions of national liberation and reconstruction.

In the countries of Eastern and Central Europe, the reactionary offensive directed from Washington failed miserably, and resulted in exposing and isolating those leaders and groupings that attached themselves to the reactionary camp, and they were soon eliminated from the coalition governments. In the West, the reactionary camp attained a tactical victory in breaking up the coalition governments of national liberation, replacing them with new coalitions of the extreme right and vacillating center, resting directly upon American dollars and tending toward military dictatorship, (as shown by de Gaulle in France).

What is characteristic of the new period is that throughout all these events, under the impact of temporary defeats as well as victories, the tactic of coalition that expresses the strategical

orientation of Marxists has remained firmly established. The setbacks which such coalitions have suffered in Western Europe have not resulted in changing or weakening the position of Marxists in advancing *coalition* as the characteristic form for this period. The validity of the coalition tactics was clearly based upon factors more permanent than the current success or failure in its application in particular government regimes.

It is worthy of special study and attention that the project for a democratic coalition government for China was the occasion of a joint declaration of policy by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. as late as December 1945. This was one of Roosevelt's most cherished policies, upon which he placed much of his hopes for the success of the larger concept of a long-term peace. When after Roosevelt's death Washington began to scuttle his policies, it found it most difficult to formulate any alternative policy for China. General Marshall spent a year in China, ostensibly trying to effect the coalition, but, as has since become apparent, in reality trying to cancel the project and come up with something else. The cancellation of Roosevelt's policy was carried out, but the "something else" to take its place is still to be found. Marshall accepted his "defeat" in China at the hands of the Kuomintang with such equanimity as to prove beyond question that he did not go there to attain his declared object, the democratic coalition. This masked scuttling of the Chinese coalition, which surrendered China to prolonged civil war, preceded the America-inspired break-up of the coalition governments in Western Europe, and indicated the direction of the new policy in Washington. Instead of peace and stabilization, Roosevelt's goals, America's course moved to inner strife and even civil war in country after country.

Thus the pattern of Greece, where the coalition had been broken by British military intervention against which Roosevelt had protested, became the pattern and the symbol of American policy now known to the world as the "Marshall Plan."

The Marshall Plan was born in the betrayal and break-up of the democratic coalition governments wherever Anglo-American hands could reach. Its highest products are the corrupt feudalistic regime of Chiang in China, monarchist neo-fascism in Greece, feudal-militarist Turkey, and the rising threat of a de Gaulle

military dictatorship in France. It was born as the betrayal of democratic coalitions.

The struggle against the Marshall Plan is being organized under the banner of broadening and strengthening the democratic coalition governments where they have survived the Anglo-American betrayal, and to establish similar governments in the other countries.

The goal of the democratic coalition survives all temporary defeats. It is a characteristic feature of the period after World War II. It is one of the hallmarks of Marxist strategy and tactics in the present period.

note well; this difficulty not only persists; it enlarges itself.

7. American Imperialism as a Stage of Capitalism.

The Truman-Marshall "Doctrine" or "Plan" is the name given to the present reactionary course of U. S. foreign policy. It is a reversal of the policy known all over the world as "Roosevelt's" policy, and which was hailed everywhere as *democratic and progressive*. These two opposing concepts of America's role in world affairs are at this moment the two opposing poles of American political life.

There has grown up a generally-accepted practice of designating the Truman-Marshall policy as "*imperialist*", to define its difference from the Roosevelt policy. In the loose, colloquial, "popular" use of words this is quite natural and inevitable. It has one most serious objection, however, from the viewpoint of Marxism. It tends to perpetuate and spread the *Kautskian* concept and definition of imperialism, at the expense of hiding and confusing the *Leninist* (the only consistent Marxist) concept and definition of imperialism.

If we follow Lenin's understanding of imperialism as "the highest stage of capitalism", then we unavoidably see that both the Roosevelt and the Truman-Marshall policies, however much they contradict each other, are equally expressions of the existing American social-economic system, are equally bound within its framework, equally aim at its preservation, and are therefore equally "imperialist" in the Leninist sense that America is "capitalism in that stage of development in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the great capitalist powers has been completed." They

are not equally "imperialist" only according to Kautsky's definition of imperialism as a *policy*, a policy preferred by finance capital.

Marxist scientific understanding of this question has been greatly hampered in America by the emotional revulsion of those who support the Roosevelt policy against any identification of it with imperialism. They refuse to support imperialism, therefore if Roosevelt's policy is an imperialist one they would have to abandon it. They solve their problem by denying that the Roosevelt policy is imperialist. That may be helpful for emotional reasons, but it throws the scientific problem into confusion.

It is, of course, impossible to explain Roosevelt's policy by using Kautsky's definition of imperialism. But it is possible by means of Lenin's concept.

Roosevelt came to power in America as a result of the world crisis of capitalism, at almost the same moment Hitler came to power in Germany as a result of the same crisis. We have already noted in previous pages how Roosevelt's and Hitler's paths diverged until they led their two countries into opposite sides in the great War, so deep was the contradiction between them. But both paths had something more deeply in common than these surface aspects already noted. Both accepted the existing capitalist system (imperialism), and both made its preservation the key to all their detailed policies. The goal of preserving imperialism they held in common; the means of reaching this goal (that is, their policies) became completely different, so different that Roosevelt led America into war against Hitler, and into alliance with the U.S.S.R., the country of a rival system, of socialism. But Roosevelt never abandoned his goal of preservation of the American system (imperialism). Roosevelt's *policy* proved more successful than Hitler's.

One can deny that Roosevelt's policy was of an imperialist character only by repudiating Lenin's whole analysis of imperialism. Such a denial would have to explain how America, the most advanced imperialism of the world, by "accident" and without social upheavals, had a "non-imperialist" President shaping its policy for more than 12 years, and then, without upheavals and by "accident", relapsed into imperialism. It would have to explain how under that "non-imperialist" leadership, American imperialism climbed out of its crisis and expanded its

New part

power over the world on a scale dwarfing its previous wildest dreams.

Of course there can be no such "non-imperialist" explanation of Roosevelt and his policies, except by abandoning all pretense of Marxism and having recourse to the most extreme philosophical idealism. Roosevelt was a favored son of the bourgeoisie, of its most aristocratic strata, and despite the ranting of his reactionary enemies, he was no "traitor to his class" but represented its interests with the greatest effectiveness. Roosevelt was an imperialist, an enlightened one but an imperialist all the same. His policies served imperialism, American imperialism, and raised it to a new high level of power.

If American Marxists' strategy had placed the overthrow of American imperialism as the immediate task, superior to all other tasks, then it would have been impossible for them at any time, before or during the war, to support Roosevelt and his policies, for these policies were the most effective restorers of imperialist power in America. And if now American Marxists placed the overthrow of imperialism as the first task, to which all other tasks are subordinated, they would have to stop calling for a return to the policies of Roosevelt which built up American imperialism far more effectively than the stupid blunderings of Truman and Marshall.

But American Marxists (with the approval of Marxists all over the world) did support Roosevelt before and during the war, and now in the post-war period, they demand the restoration of Roosevelt's policies as the immediate answer to the Truman-Marshall Plan. That only proves that Marxists, sworn enemies of imperialism on a world scale, found in imperialist America, under the Roosevelt type of leadership, the still-existing capacity for a progressive role, sufficiently important in its world effects to demand the open and direct support of the Marxists.

According to a new dogmatism that has temporarily established itself but recently among American Marxists, to speak of anything progressive coming out of American imperialism is the "crime against the Holy Ghost", it is the "original sin" of "revisionism", it is the unspeakable word which puts the man who utters it outside the pale, to be shunned like a leper.

But was Roosevelt progressive? And was Roosevelt first, last, and all the time an American imperialist? The answer to both questions is an inexorable Yes!

Our new dogmatists of Marxism try to dissolve this problem in a fog of words resembling in their general effect, as intellectual processes, an explanation by a Christian theologian of the immaculate conception, the holy trinity, and the miracles. It is true, the chatter runs, that Roosevelt had a class mother, but his father was pure spirit drawn from the toiling masses; it is true that he was an imperialist, but that was only one member of the trinity since he was also an anti-imperialist and a non-imperialist, and Marxists supported only one member of the trinity; and the whole history of the Roosevelt administration and its development is a cycle of miracles defying the Marxist analysis of the role of classes in society.

The difficulty in finding a Marxist understanding of Roosevelt and his role in history must not be blamed on Marxism. It is an inadequacy of particular Marxists.

Marxism finds its basis not only in the uniformities of history but also, and especially, in the departures from uniformity, in the *new things* that emerge from the old and established. Marxism is never at a loss in facing and recognizing a fact; it never grows red-faced and embarrassed because the new fact does not bear a certificate of its legitimate birth signed by Old Doc Tradition. If Marxism can be said in any sense to have a dogma it would be the primacy of fact before theory, of the material thing before the ideas about things. And Roosevelt was a fact, with all his contradictions, a history-making fact—a great progressive bourgeois leader of American imperialism in a period of imperialist crisis and decay, the first such leader of great stature to arise in America since Lincoln.

There is no basis for assuming that the appearance of Roosevelt on the stage of history cancels—or weakens—the basic Marxist analysis of the deepening general crisis of capitalism, of the inherent drive of imperialism in general and American imperialism in particular toward domination and oppression of other nations, of the rapidly increasing parasitism of imperialism and so on. On the contrary, it is only by taking these factors fully into account—and in particular the deepening general crisis of

*I believe this may have been
Marx's error.*

capitalism—that any coherent estimation can be arrived at on the role of Roosevelt.

Roosevelt as a major political figure was a product of the deepening general crisis of capitalism as a world system. Capitalism, tied in the knot of its contradictions, unable to solve the problem of markets, was headed rapidly toward an explosion, an effort to cut through the knot with a sword. Hitler secured the support of the main body of European capitalists by his promise that the sword would, first of all, cut down the Soviet Union and restore it to the capitalist world. Armed force, violence, was deliberately chosen by the leaders of world capitalism (Americans were also involved) as the only way out of the crisis. Hitler came to power in Germany as a result of that decision; he rose to power not only as the expression of German reaction, but also of world reaction. Without international capitalist support, Hitler's conquest of Germany would have been impossible. But Hitler, his power aggrandized so swiftly and gigantically, automatically received from these events the suggestion that German imperialism could (and therefore should) dominate the world, and not merely share it with Britain and America, as the price of "solving" the crisis for world capitalism. The contradiction within the capitalist world exploded into war even before the contradiction between the capitalist and socialist worlds—and thereby threw Britain and America, as a simple measure of survival, onto the side of the socialist Soviet Union in the final showdown. Roosevelt became a world-historical figure as leader of the Anglo-American choice of survival as allies of a growingly powerful socialist system, rather than defeat and assimilation into a triumphant Hitlerite imperialism.

One can no more deny that this decision, this choice, had a great historically progressive significance putting its mark on World War II and its outcome, than one can deny that in Anglo-American ruling class circles the decision was entirely for the preservation of their own particular brand of imperialism. Anglo-American imperialism simply judged it better to live in a world where socialism was getting stronger, rather than be dead in a German imperialist world.

Of course this decision was not unanimous. In America, for example, Herbert Hoover and his kind never wavered in their judgment that it was better to permit Hitler to conquer the

entire world rather than come to any terms with the Socialist Soviet Union and the democratic masses of the world. Hoover even repeats this view after the Hitlerite power has been destroyed.

The Anglo-American decision for alliance with the Soviet Union against the Axis was progressive, and therefore commanded Marxist support to the alliance as a whole in the war.

There was a definite difference, however, between the British and American roles within this alliance. It is an apparent paradox that Britain, the lesser, weaker imperialist partner was less progressive (or more reactionary), while the stronger imperialism, America, was more progressive (or less reactionary). This was expressed most dramatically in the struggle between Churchill and Roosevelt over the strategy of the war; Churchill wanted a very limited alliance with the Soviet Union, to be changed into hostility as soon as Hitler's defeat was assured, while Roosevelt demanded ever closer cooperation with the Soviet Union, laying the basis for a post-war alliance to guarantee a long peace. Roosevelt joined Stalin to enforce this course upon Churchill at Teheran and Yalta.

The apparent paradox, that the strongest imperialism played the more progressive role, is fully to be explained within the terms of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of imperialism, which by no means excludes the influence of intelligence upon the course of history. Roosevelt's greater progressivism, in comparison with Churchill, arose from his more intelligent understanding of the realities of the war, and not from a less single-minded devotion to the preservation of capitalism.

Roosevelt was no Marxist. But he did have a keen understanding that the war was itself only the supreme manifestation of a general crisis of the capitalist system. He had been battling with that crisis, as President of the U.S. since 1933, with limited success and constant setbacks. His running battle with the "economic royalists", as he called the reactionary circles of monopoly capital, had convinced him of the fatal danger of a leadership guided by short-sighted greed and old established prejudices. He knew that the greatest danger to the preservation of capitalism was the stupidities of the capitalists themselves. He has been correctly compared, in one respect, with the well-known British economist Maynard Keynes; like Keynes, Roosevelt could

substitute for logic & clarity: "some of the capitalists"

The evidence of this point seems to be based
circumstantial, but nevertheless convincing as the
evidence of London
of 1945 =
6-7-8.

see the weakness and danger-spots in the capitalist system. As Lenin said of Keynes: "He arrived at conclusions which are stronger, more striking and more instructive than any a Communist revolutionary could advance, because they are conclusions drawn by an acknowledged bourgeois . . . Keynes arrived at the conclusion that Europe and the whole world . . . is heading for bankruptcy." (Sel. Wks. Vol. X, p. 184) "I do not think a single Communist manifesto, or any revolutionary manifesto, could be compared with those pages in Keynes' book in which he depicts Wilson and 'Wilsonism' in practice." (p. 188) Yes, Roosevelt had such a mind as Keynes, seeing clearly the bankruptcy of his world, although he had no fundamental program, and he believed in no "ism", not even "Keynesism."

Because of his deeper intelligence and understanding of the weakness, the general crisis, of capitalism, Roosevelt knew that Churchill's proposed strategy was stupid, that it would inevitably fail and might even lose the war. He knew that American capitalism could not survive another war. Therefore he set himself the goal to prepare a long-term peace. He knew that socialism could not be eliminated from the world. Therefore he accepted a future in which socialism and capitalism must co-exist - and cooperate. He knew that the Soviet Union and America would be the two outstanding powers after the war. Therefore he worked to lay the foundations for a long-term peacetime alliance between them.

In all this Roosevelt never went beyond the framework of bourgeois thought and motivation. His goal was to save American capitalism from being engulfed in the whirlpool of general capitalist bankruptcy. He was the best representative of bourgeois leadership and intelligence, truly representing the basic and long-term interests of his class, even when in bitterest struggle against its inherent reactionary trends and its "normal" stupidities. It was the Roosevelt type of bourgeois intelligence to which Stalin appealed in 1939, when he said the Soviet leaders rely upon, among other things, "the good sense of the countries which for one reason or another have no interest in the violation of peace," and which Molotov had in mind when he said, on Nov. 6, 1947:

It is significant that Stalin also spoke a few months ago sub

"A sober attitude to the matter shows simultaneously that in our time new imperialistic adventures constitute a dangerous game with the destinies of capitalism.

"Certain Ministers and Senators may fail to understand that. But if the anti-imperialist and democratic camp consolidates its forces and utilizes its opportunities, it will force the imperialists to be wiser and to conduct themselves more calmly. It must be surmised that capitalism is not interested in speeding up its own collapse."

statistically as follows: We know that we can and essentially must cooperate with the West, & they with us. Our minds are already slum on this point, but we cannot make up other's minds for them. We can only wait till they come to their senses.

We're now - in Feb., 1948, waking up - a little.

This chapter is good.

8. America's Course After Roosevelt's Death.

After Roosevelt's death in April, 1945, the reactionary forces that always fought him inside and outside of the government went to work to destroy his policies which had guided America to victory. The reactionaries dominated the U.S. delegation at the initial assembly of the United Nations, and nearly wrecked that organization before it was formed. They controlled the new Secretary of State Byrnes, and thereby doomed to frustration his prolonged negotiations on the peace treaties. Anti-Sovietism became the keynote of American foreign policy, growing day by day more shrill. When President Truman, after announcing in advance his approval of Henry Wallace's speech in September, 1946, a speech that appealed for a return to friendship with the Soviet Union, soon thereafter collapsed under reactionary pressure and dismissed Wallace from the Cabinet on the demand of Byrnes, that dismissal marked the liquidation of the Roosevelt foreign policy.

"The Truman Doctrine" followed in March, 1947, with large-scale military measures in Greece and Turkey, openly directed against the Soviet Union. Then came the "Marshall Plan", the offer of dollars to Europe in return for supporting Hoover's project of a rejuvenated Germany as the center of Europe — the plan for organizing Europe as an anti-Soviet and anti-socialist fortress. The alternative to Roosevelt's policy had now emerged in its full outlines, and its full ugliness and stupidity. Even the *London Times* commented on this plan, when Byrnes revealed it in his book "Speaking Frankly", that it is a blue-print for war, and wondered if it was criminal or merely stupid.

The last glimmer of Roosevelt's intelligence is gone from official Washington. Reaction reigns supreme without effective challenge. American imperialism has become synonymous with a

mobilization of all the darkest forces of reaction throughout the world. And as always, domestic reaction accompanies reactionary foreign policy like Siamese twins. The democratic gains of the New Deal period and the war are rapidly being whittled away. The air of America again has the odor of the days of Palmer and Herbert Hoover.

The new policy of Washington is obviously merely an *American edition of Hitler's foreign program*. It represents a grandiose scheme to turn the course of history, which is in the direction of socialism, back to capitalism — but now a capitalism guided and controlled by America.

The most important question to be answered regarding the neo-Hitlerian Truman-Marshall plan is, what are the elements of strength and weakness contained within it, what are the consequent perspectives of its success or failure?

Any Marxist analysis of the world situation points to a relatively quick and obvious failure of the Truman-Marshall policy. But it does not require Marxist theory to perceive this fundamental fact. The reactionary-conservative Walter Lippmann, analyzing the world situation from an anti-Marxist, anti-Soviet point of view in his recent book "The Cold War", comes to the same conclusion. Lippmann's conclusion that the Truman-Marshall plan is headed for inevitable bankruptcy is soundly based upon a perception of reality, and has a double value as it cannot fall under suspicion as "wishful thinking", it is an unwilling judgment forced by facts and logic against the influence of interest and desire.

Lippmann sees that the present policy of Washington is a "strategic monstrosity". He says that "the Americans would themselves probably be frustrated by this policy long before the Russians were." He points out that American dollars cannot purchase reliable allies, that "we must not deceive ourselves that we stand at the head of a world wide coalition of democratic states in our conflict with the Soviet Union." He exposes how this policy is turning governments into "clients of the U.S.", puppets, stooges, "in whose affairs we intervene", and that nationally self-respecting peoples "do not wish to become such . . . clients." "They are alienated" from America, he says, "above all by the prospect of war . . . total war which would merge into a general civil war", as the outcome of Washington's present

Berlin has moved to Washington!

course. He warns America: "We have been preparing the grounds for a gigantic diplomatic disaster." "The policy of containment is a booby-trap", he says, for America. It is "suicidal . . . to treat the western portion of Germany as a prospective ally in the operation of the Truman Doctrine." He points out that it will "compel" the peoples of Europe "to choose sides for a Third World War" and "the enormous civil war it would surely precipitate." He shows that "The Truman Doctrine would take us to the destruction of the United Nations", and says that American delegates to U.N. "treat the United Nations as expendable". He concludes this devastating attack with the judgment that America is heading toward "gigantic disaster" because our Government "does not have as its objective a settlement with . . . Russia."

Lippmann's indictment of the Truman Doctrine, and of the whole anti-Soviet policy it expresses, is unanswered — and unanswerable. It is all the stronger because Lippmann is himself avowedly anti-Soviet in all his basic attitudes. He is against the Truman Doctrine only because he sees its inevitable failure.

Marxist analysis must go deeper than merely to support a judgment to which even a Lippmann can come. It must define not only the immediate facts and the basic historical trends which will defeat the Truman-Marshall plan, but it must also, which is more important, define the forms of the historical process by which it will be defeated and what will be the result, what will follow the Truman-Marshall plan.

American imperialism operates under the contradiction of being an expanding power, both relatively and absolutely, within a capitalist sector of the world which is drastically shrinking. It is producing goods at a rate far higher than in any previous peace time, it is planting bases of power over the world with unprecedented speed. From this condition it draws confidence and aggressiveness, and the assumption that this is a sufficient credential for world leadership and domination. When it collides with the fact, nevertheless, that the capitalist sector of the world continues to shrink, that the world trend toward socialism grows stronger, not weaker, it is filled with doubt, frustration, and fear. Some factor "contrary to nature" must be operating to cancel the most "natural" expectation of America's naive reactionaries that the dollar must march triumphantly anywhere it "damn well pleases" — just as the American Navy boasts it can sail the world's waters.

*
hate
this
well,
for it
explains
a lot
of your
baffle
at the stock market's "confusion".

This "unnatural" stubbornness of the trend of world events, which insists on going contrary to the expressed wishes of American imperialism, can only be caused by the "Red spectre", the "Bolshevik plot". This primitive animistic explanation of the course of history, "reasonable" only in the sense that insane obsessions have an inner consistency when their premises are granted, gives rise as do all superstitions to waves of unreasoning fear.

Thus it can happen that America, rich and powerful beyond the dreams of Midas and Caesar, suffers from an acute attack of hysterical fear, the "Red Scare", at which the whole world gapes wondering whether it dares laugh! Thus the nervous fumbling of the President, from endorsement of Wallace's call to restore the Roosevelt policy, to the raw aggression of the "Truman Doctrine" within six months, and to the more sophisticated but equally unreal Marshall plan in another half-year. Thus the "loyalty purge", and the ludicrous "Hollywood investigation", the intellectual terror which has effectively put a stop to serious thinking in the U.S.A. or has driven it underground.

America, by far the strongest country in the world economically and in sheer military might, may be compared intellectually today with any blubbing village idiot if it is to be judged by the tone and direction of its public life. Irrational fear has done its work. It was not for nothing that Franklin Roosevelt in his last message warned America that the country had nothing to fear but fear itself. This fear that eats away the brains of the nation is the direct outgrowth of the contradiction between expanding American power and a shrinking capitalist world.

Roosevelt had given America the only answer, consistent with the continued existence of "the American way of life", of how to reconcile this contradiction. That answer is the acceptance of the co-existence of the two systems, socialism and capitalism, and cooperation between them on a long-term basis.

The Roosevelt answer carries with it abandonment of the Hoover scheme of rebuilding Germany as the center of an anti-Soviet Europe. It requires freedom for each European country to realize its aspiration to socialism in its own way, without economic or political obstruction from America. It gains for America a long time peace and a vast expansion of markets for her surplus production, without which a catastrophic economic crisis cannot be

amphibious

long avoided, and the coming of which is warningly noted even by the United Nations organization.

There is no logical end to the Truman-Marshall plan, which has replaced the Roosevelt plan, except a new war to resolve this contradiction by military means, to re-expand world capitalism by force, since this cannot be achieved by consent.

One cannot say that such a war is impossible, even though it is clearly suicidal for American imperialism. It is hardly necessary for a Marxist analysis to emphasize that America could not win a Third World War, since even a Walter Lippmann has taken pains to demonstrate this fact. But there are powerful forces in American ruling circles, sufficiently stupid, blind, reckless and adventurous to embark upon just such a suicidal course unless they are restrained by power greater than their own.

The major task in America is to unmask and restrain the war-makers, and to restore Roosevelt's foreign policy. Only this can restore the perspective of peace, and of world progress without major upheavals. This is a realistic task because Roosevelt's policy demands no revolutionary change in America, but only tolerance of and accommodation to the revolutionary changes occurring elsewhere in the world.

9. The New Communist Information Bureau.

The nine most important Communist Parties of Europe held a meeting in Poland during September, 1947, and established a common Information Bureau with headquarters in Belgrade. The purpose of this new center is to coordinate the work of the constituent Parties in opposing the Truman-Marshall offensive in Europe and protecting the independence of these countries, their freedom to restore themselves on a new, not an American, pattern.

American newspapers have almost uniformly misrepresented the significance of the new Information Bureau, calling it a restoration of the dissolved Communist International and the Communist strategy and tactics of the former post-war period. This interpretation is quite false.

Unfortunately, even the American Communists are not fully informed that Joseph Stalin, without doubt the most authoritative Marxist voice in the world, has said that any idea of reviving the Communist International would be "Utopian and quixotic."

In sharp contrast to the old Communist International, dissolved in 1943, the Information Bureau has adopted no general program and no centralized organization. It has set itself the most immediate limited task of securing the freedom of the countries involved to decide their own policies, and to resist the pressure of the Truman-Marshall plan that would destroy that freedom. Its function is to secure consultations that would prevent the nine Parties from working at cross purposes in this common task.

This is clearly an emergency function, one that would have been quite unnecessary if America had continued to follow in the path of Roosevelt. It represents a change in Communist strategy

and tactics only to the degree that this has been rendered necessary by the new hostile pressure from America. It was not the choice of European Communists that made this change. It was the choice of America in abandoning Roosevelt's course.

The declaration of the new Information Bureau, and the speech of Zhdanov, Soviet delegate, at its formation, clearly upholds and continues the main line of Communist strategy and tactics that has been effective during and after the war. It modifies this line only to recognize and counter the new threat from America of the Truman-Marshall offensive. The goals remain as they were, freedom for the liberated countries to reconstruct themselves in a form transitional to socialism, the overwhelmingly registered desire of the populations of these countries.

With regard to America, the most characteristic and indicative words of the Information Bureau were the reiteration of the goal of securing long term peace and collaboration between the major countries of the two systems.

Long term collaboration between the two systems, the goal of world Marxist thought and action, certainly does not signify an expectation of speedily eliminating capitalism from the world. If there is to be long term collaboration between the two systems, this means that both systems are expected to exist for a long time. And it must be admitted that America, the stronghold of capitalism, has at least as much prospect of continued existence as any capitalism in the world. The world concept of long term collaboration of systems, if it is to have any significance, obviously means, first and foremost, collaboration between capitalist America and socialist Soviet Union.

Jittery capitalists in America, who place so much importance on the words of the Communist Information Bureau, should therefore really not fall into panic. The "Cominform", as they call the new organization, has really not threatened a socialist revolution in America. On the contrary, it has assured the nervous American bourgeoisie that the dominant thought of world Marxism confirms their prospects for a long life, in the course of which they will be able to work out that long term collaboration of systems.

Of course, Marxists or reasonable men of any ideology whatever, would not undertake to assure a long life to any man or system that fell victim to a suicidal mania. The assurance is only

that in Marxist opinion it is possible, given sane and reasonable policies on *both* sides, to ensure long term collaboration and thereby long life. The final decision is in the hands of America's rulers.

Marxists do not expect an early socialist revolution in America. While they are keenly aware that in material progress America is, of all countries, most ripe for socialism, they know equally well that politically, intellectually, and emotionally, this country is least prepared for the transition to socialism. They know that an early, quick change of the American attitude toward socialism can be expected only as a result of a deep and prolonged crisis of American capitalism which would demonstrate the incapacity of our present rulers to keep our economy in running order.

A lot of ideological nonsense is spread by American newspapers to the effect that Communists everywhere *desire* that America shall plunge into an economic crisis, and are working to bring it about. If any so-called Communist has such an idea he is a fool, but not a Marxist. Communists fight to overcome crises, not to create them.

Roosevelt was the leader who did most to raise America from the economic crisis which hit the country under Hoover's presidency. Communists everywhere swung to the support of Roosevelt precisely because of his ability to lead the country out of the crisis. Communists demand the restoration of Roosevelt's program for post-war reconstruction of the world precisely because it offers the only hope of cushioning the inevitable cycles of capitalism, and prevent the gap between American production and available markets from being so great as to produce a catastrophe.

Marxists know, better than anyone else, that American capitalism is terrifically strong, and its overthrow will be made possible only by the stupidities and incompetencies of the dominant capitalists themselves. The working-class can make an effective decision for a new socialist system only when the capitalists have demonstrated their incapacity to maintain the national economy as a going concern. Marxists, always and everywhere, educate and organize the workingclass for socialism *in their own countries*, but they know that the time for the change to socialism is fixed for each country by the moment of capitalist failure and not by their own desires.

If American capitalists were wise enough to recognize their impotence to overthrow the socialism of the Soviet Union, or to stop the progress toward socialism in Europe, this country and the world would be able to avoid the pains that must necessarily accompany the collapse of the Truman-Marshall plan.

It is not true, as American newspapers falsely state, that European Communists and the Information Bureau wish to deny American aid to Europe or to limit the markets for American products and trade.

Andrei Zhdanov, speaking to the nine-party conference in Poland in September, said:

"The Soviet Government has never objected to utilizing foreign, and particularly American, credits as a means of speeding up the process of economic restoration. However, the Soviet Union always insisted that the conditions of the credit should not be of an enslaving nature and should not lead to the economic and political subjugation of the debtor to the creditor states. Soviet foreign policy proceeds from the fact of the co-existence over a lengthy period of two systems — capitalism and socialism. From this flows the possibility of cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the other systems, given the observance of the principle of reciprocity in the fulfillment of pledges made."*

The Communists resist only American plans that demand control of the European countries as the price of their aid and trade. The Communists, and with them the great majority of Europe's peoples, will not and cannot agree that American aid can be allowed to drag them back to a bankrupt and discredited social

* The magazine *Political Affairs* (New York), issue of December 1947, published a version of Zhdanov's report, which it says is "a translation of the text which appeared in *Pravda*, October 22, 1947", giving a different version of the first sentence above quoted. Its translation says: "The Soviet Government has never objected to taking advantage of foreign, and even American credits, as a means of speeding up the process of economic restoration." Reference to the original text, however, will show that the Russian word there translated as "taking advantage of", is *ispolzovanie* which is more correctly translated as "utilizing"; and the words *v chastnosti* there translated as "even" really mean "in particular" or "particularly". These mis-translations give a tone and direction to Zhdanov's words quite different from the original. It is possible that the editors of *Political Affairs* did not make their own translation from *Pravda*, but merely copied the version published in *World News and Views* (London) which contained the same errors.

order. They insist on carrying out their firm decision that, while not immediately establishing socialist systems, while preserving a large degree of private capitalism and a main structure of state capitalism, they are on the whole *in transition to socialism* and will not permit America to erect any obstacles in that path.

Whenever America's leaders bring themselves to accept this basic condition, then American economic collaboration and trade with Europe (as well as the rest of the world) will be welcomed by the Communists as well as by the rest of the people in all lands. They *want* American aid and collaboration. But they will not trade their independence for it.

There CAN be generations of peace and resulting economic progress and well-being for the world. *What a perspective!*

The necessary condition for this, on the part of America, is to restore Roosevelt's plan for long term friendship, alliance and cooperation between this country and the Soviet Union, between the two rival systems of capitalism and socialism, — a plan which is shared fully by Marxists everywhere.

At present, under the Truman-Marshall plan, the billions being poured out under the name of "aid to Europe" are not helping either Europe or America. As in Greece, this aid is enriching a few greedy Greek capitalists who, as even Truman tells us, refuse to invest their own money in their own country. In Turkey, it is sustaining a corrupt military machine which helped the German Nazis, blackmailed the allies, and is maintaining a corrupt oppressive oligarchy. In France and Italy it is splitting national unity, restoring speculators and black-marketeers to power, and plunging the nations into crisis. Throughout Europe it rallies reactionary forces, in order to split the continent, which will make any recovery of Western Europe impossible. Truly, this type of "aid to Europe" may properly be called "Operation Rathole", it is feeding the rats of Europe and causing them to multiply, but it is ruining, not feeding, the peoples. The more billions that are dumped into Europe on the Truman-Marshall plan, the deeper grows the economic and social crisis of Europe.

The Truman-Marshall plan is senseless and disastrous in an economic as well as a political sense, for America as well as for Europe. Instead of adjusting American economy to the post-war world, it is steadily and systematically deepening the already

Note the word "economic"

existing maladjustment. The only sane and orderly economic goal for America, corresponding to the long term needs of the American economy as well as to those of the outside world, is to promote American exports of machinery and capital goods. Instead of this, the Truman-Marshall plan promotes and makes necessary American exports of food and raw materials primarily, at the expense of our natural exports. The only possible result of this senseless course is to pile up new elements of crisis for both industry and agriculture in America. Industry is being cut off from its natural European markets, and does not feel it immediately only because of the very temporary post-war domestic boom in capital goods, while agriculture is being swollen by expansion for a purely artificial, politically manufactured, European market which must inevitably be returned sooner or later to its natural source of supply in Eastern Europe. The longer this distortion of world economy is continued, the more painful and disastrous will be the crisis of accounting — and primarily painful and disastrous to Western Europe and America.

The Truman-Marshall plan has placed America in the unfortunate position in which every ally it gains is a source of additional weakness, — a new burden. Because American policy is directed toward preserving the exploiters and parasites who feed on the body of the European peoples, these allies have become parasites on the body of America — especially since the Truman-Marshall plan systematically *cultivates this parasitism.* Since American dollars furnish rich nourishment for these profiteers, and the volume is greatest to those points where the “red menace” is sharpest (which means where least is being done to solve the problems of reconstruction), these American proteges find their maximum profit in perpetuating disorder and chaos, and doing everything possible to obstruct any rapprochement between America and the Soviet Union. The Greek capitalists who bank their accumulations in America, refusing to invest them in Greek economic reconstruction, are the perfect fruits of the Truman-Marshall plan. The Chinese capitalists, who have accumulated an admitted billion dollars (much more in fact) in bank accounts in America (their source in the first place being American loans to the Kuomintang government) are another typical example of this rapidly growing parasitism. There is no longer a serious pretense of controlling this parasitism in any of the

countries drawing American anti-Soviet bribes, with the possible exception of Britain where the parasitism takes on a less vulgar and more state-organized form.

The new Communist Information Bureau can be a “danger” for America only in the sense that it exposes the unsound and harmful character of the Truman-Marshall plan, and forces its withdrawal. There is a real danger in this situation, but the danger lies in the inevitable consequences of the Truman-Marshall plan, and not in its exposure. The defeat of this plan is inevitable, as even Walter Lippmann has irrefutably demonstrated, and the sooner this is recognized and America returns to the Roosevelt plan, the less painful and costly it will be for America.

10. CONCLUSION.

Since the end of the war America has suffered under a reactionary administration, primarily because the progressive coalition which was the base of Roosevelt's policy has broken up and disintegrated. There has not been any reactionary swing among the masses, but they have lost their unity, their orientation, their *elan*, their sense of moving forward to a common goal. The reactionary camp has seized power and taken the initiative; it has not been resisted by a common movement of the people with a clear program and inspiring leadership. The process of disintegration, of breaking up the progressive movement into feuding factions which waste their energy fighting one another instead of the common enemy, has penetrated seriously even into the most progressive sections of the labor movement. The progressive majority of Americans is losing to the reactionary camp by default, from lack of leadership, from confusion in its own ranks.

There exists no easy formula for remedying this situation. But one thing is clear. The experience of all progressive persons and groups and organizations during the years of Roosevelt's presidency has given them all one thing in common — the knowledge that it is possible to enforce a progressive program in the government of America, and a knowledge of what minimum program can ensure progress. That program with which the millions of progressives and their leaders are already quite familiar, around which they had already been victoriously united — Roosevelt's program — is the necessary starting point for any serious effort to unseat from power the reactionary camp now riding the country toward catastrophe.

In order to fight effectively for the Roosevelt program it is necessary to understand its whole place in the world scene, its

role before and during the war. It is necessary to understand that while Europe has already entered the path of transition to socialism, the same is not true of America; in this country the war has not placed the transition to socialism on the order of the day. It is necessary to understand that the Roosevelt program starts from the premise of working out a long-term cooperation between two systems on the world stage, of capitalism in the U.S.A. and socialism in the U.S.S.R., with the European countries free to find each its own way to socialism in accordance with the democratic decisions of its people.

In order to fight effectively for Roosevelt's program *it is necessary to believe that such a program is possible of realization*. It is necessary to understand that America still contains the potentiality of playing a progressive historical role *before it arrives at the immediate transition to socialism*.

Without this understanding and faith, all protestations of support to the restoration of the Roosevelt program are but cheap, boastful, and empty phrases. They are but demagoguery in the worst sense of that word. They are futile, without force, and carry no conviction.

It is the purpose of this little pamphlet to make some contribution to restoring power and conviction, morale and enthusiasm, to the fight for restoration of the Roosevelt program as the guide for America in the post-war world. It is its purpose to help the fight against phrasemongering, the most deadly enemy of Marxism and of progress everywhere, and the cause of most mistakes now creating disunity and confusion in the progressive camp.

America can be brought back into service of the promise made at Teheran, of a progressive and peaceful world for several generations. But this can be only if all progressives fight for it — *unitedly and intelligently*.

them to do so — an obvious implication that he realized compromise on the basis of mutual self-interest is in order.

When will this shift occur?
We can only predict direction, not

speed. But I suggest two signs pointing to a fairly early shift:

- 1) French monetary devaluation & consequent repercussions on Britain's weakened economy;
- 2) the weakening of the U.S. Commodity markets.

Please note that Lippmann knows that no U.S. govt., regardless of party label, would dare let a new deflation run its course, as Hoover did after 1929 to 1933. No U.S. govt. could if it wanted to; govt. debt & govt. costs are too high.

I suggest we watch for these developments:

- 1) a more conciliatory attitude toward the Soviets by British statesmen.
- 2) a proposal - from either London

Other Works of Earl Browder.

BOOKS:

- COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES, 1935
- WHAT IS COMMUNISM? 1936
- THE PEOPLES' FRONT 1938
- FIGHTING FOR PEACE 1939
- THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR 1940
- THE WAY OUT 1941
- VICTORY-AND AFTER 1942
- TEHERAN 1944
- AMERICAN MARXISTS AND THE WAR 1945
- WAR OR PEACE WITH RUSSIA 1947

PAMPHLETS:

- Unemployment, 1924
- Class Struggle vs. Class Collaboration, 1925
- Trade Unions in America, 1925
- Civil War in Nationalist China, 1927
- China & American Imperialist Policy, 1927
- Out of a Job, 1930
- War Against Workers' Russia, 1931
- Secret Hoover-Laval War Pacts, 1931
- The Fight for Bread, 1932
- Technocracy & Marxism, 1933
- Is Planning Possible Under Capitalism, 1933
- What Is the New Deal? 1933
- The Meaning of Social-Fascism, 1933
- What Every Worker Should Know About N.R.A. 1933
- Communist Position on the Negro Question, 1933
- Report to the Eighth Convention, 1934
- The Question of a Labor Party, 1935
- Unemployment Insurance, 1935
- Religion & Communism, 1935
- New Steps in the United Front, 1935
- Debate With Norman Thomas, 1935
- Build the United Peoples' Front, 1936
- Lincoln & the Communists, 1936

Communist Position in 1936,
Democracy Or Fascism? 1936
Zionism, 1936
Who Are the Americans, 1936
Hearst's "Secret Documents", 1936
Peoples' Front in America, 1936
Results of the Elections, 1936
Revolutionary Background of the U. S. Constitution, 1937
Trotskyism Against World Peace, 1937
Talks to America, 1937
Lenin & Spain, 1937
Communists in the Peoples' Front, 1937
China & the U.S.A., 1937
North America & the Soviet Union, 1937
Next Steps in Spain, 1937
Traitors in American History, 1938
Concerted Action or Isolation? 1938
A Message to Catholics, 1938
The Democratic Front, 1938
Social & National Security, 1938
Theory as a Guide to Action, 1939
The Economics of Communism, 1939
Religion & Communism, 1939
The 1940 Elections, 1939
Unity for Peace & Democracy, 1939
America & Second Imperialist War, 1939
Whose War Is It? 1939
Socialism, War & America, 1939
Stop the War, 1939
Two Speeches, 1940
The People Against the War Makers, 1940
Jewish People & the War, 1940
The Peoples' Road to Peace, 1940
Testimony Before Senate Judiciary Com. 1940
An American Foreign Policy for Peace, 1940
Internationalism: Results of Elections, 1940
The Most Peculiar Election, 1940
Way Out of the War, 1941
Communist Party of U.S.A., 1941
Communism & Culture, 1941
The Road to Victory, 1941
The Soviet Union, 1942
Victory Must be Won, 1942

Production For Victory, 1942
Wage Policy In War Production, 1943
Is Communism a Menace, Debate, 1943
Policy For Victory, 1943
The Heritage of Jefferson, 1943
Talks About the Communist Party, 1943
Moscow-Cairo-Teheran, 1944
Teheran and America, 1944
Communists & National Unity, 1944
The Road Ahead, 1944
Economic Problems of War & Peace, 1944
Meaning of the Elections, 1944
America's Decisive Battle, 1945

in Washington - for another
conference with Russia &
probably France, with the
emphasis on political
settlement.

3) Resignation of King
Berch & American appointive
officials most closely
identified with the anti-
Soviet policy.