



RS
H700

Earl Browder

on the

Soviet Union

5¢



NOTE

This pamphlet was compiled from the writings and speeches of Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, dealing with the Soviet Union and the need for an American foreign policy based on the closest friendship and collaboration with that country for the mutual interest and joint defense of both nations against fascist aggression.

The books from which this compilation was made were published between the years 1935 and 1941. For the reader who wishes to study more extensively the writings of Earl Browder, a full list of his books follows:

The Way Out (1941)

The Second Imperialist War (1940)

Fighting for Peace (1939)

The People's Front (1938)

What Is Communism? (1936)

Communism in the United States (1935)

Published by

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS, INC.

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

February, 1942



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

CONTENTS

I. Twenty Years of Soviet Power	5
II. Trotskyism—Fascist Fifth Column	13
III. The Biggest News Story in History	21
IV. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.—Good Neighbors	25
V. The Economics of Communism	30
VI. The Finnish Episode	43
VII. A Foreign Policy for Peace	45

OTHER PAMPHLETS IN THIS SERIES

The Road to Victory, 5¢

Communism and Culture, 5¢

The Communist Party of the U.S.A.: Its History,

Role and Organization, 5¢

I. Twenty Years of Soviet Power

The Triumph of Democracy Through Socialism

THE territory known until 1917 as the Empire of the Tsar of Russia closely approximates in extent, in climatic conditions and in richness of natural resources, our own North American continent. Its population is about 20 to 25 per cent greater. With such close similarity of the basic natural factors, however, these two areas have gone through sharply different historical developments. Both came under the impact of the rising capitalist system of Western Europe during approximately the same period, but with different results, due to a different inheritance from the pre-capitalist era.

Russia came into the world community and world market, that was brought into being by capitalism, with the heavy inheritance of a feudal system of economy and society rooted in centuries of slow development, a system with a highly developed superstructure of government, of state power. In contrast, North America was only beginning to be conquered by an immigration from Europe composed, in its great majority, of people in rebellion against the oppressions of the combined decaying-feudalist and early-capitalist influences of their homelands. The political superstructure imported with them had scanty roots on this continent, was maintained only by force from abroad, and was consequently soon shattered by the forces of democracy that grew rapidly under the influence of a capitalist economy at work on almost virgin soil.

In the years 1776 to 1787, the United States won its independence as a nation, and fashioned a stable state power, within which the only serious obstacle to unfettered capitalist development was the compromise with slavery. The bourgeois-democratic revolution was completed, in its most essential aspects, by the Civil War of 1861-65, and the consequent abolition of slavery. Canada won essentially the same level of historical development in the struggles of 1837.

In the tsarist empire, however, the enemy was much more stubborn and powerful. Although the same democratic forces were at work there, they could not break through; they were defeated again and again. The development of capitalism sapped and undermined the foundations of the old order; but at each period of crisis the feudal autocracy emerged triumphant through a combination of extreme repression, concessions and foreign alliances. The result for Russia was an extremely backward and distorted economic development, and the almost complete postponement of the democratic revolution until the twentieth century, when it merged with the socialist revolution.

Thus it was, in brief, that these two great sections of humanity, Russia and North America, so similarly equipped in natural resources and population, came to the world crisis of 1914-1918 at the opposite poles of economic and political development. Russia was the most backward in every important respect; North America was the most advanced. Russia emerged from the World War with an economy shattered and prostrate, racked by famine, its old political superstructure broken and scattered to the four winds, its new infant system, Soviet power, fighting against a hostile world with its back to the wall, and spoken of deprecatingly even by its friends as an "experiment." North America emerged from the World War with an enormously strengthened economy, the world's banker, holding the debts of the other powers, and with, at least for a time, predominant prestige and influence in world politics.

What a contrast this was! Every philistine, every shallow thinker and vulgarian, could and did tell the world that North America was the promised land, that it had found the way to "permanent prosperity," that with the "American system" poverty was being abolished and the millennium ushered in. Henry Ford and the belt-line system of mass production were the new God. And with God in his heaven, all was right with the capitalist world. As for that curious and disreputable "experiment," Soviet Russia, everyone knew that it was prostrate and starving. Lenin was announcing the New Economic Policy and offering concessions to foreign capitalists; soon

Russia would be safely back in the capitalist family, as the poor relation, tending the kitchen and doing the dirty work. Herbert Hoover contemptuously sent over the American Relief Administration, with some superfluous war-stores of wheat, expecting the 140,000,000 Russians to follow this wisp of straw obediently back into the capitalist harness. For all sensible people, the issue was settled. North America owned and led the world! Soviet Russia was a starving beggar at the doorstep! Such was the appearance in the early 1920's.

What Has Been Done With the Inheritance?

Today we call for an accounting of what has been done with this inheritance by North America, which inherited half the world's wealth and its leadership, and by Soviet Russia, which inherited ruin and starvation. The day of reckoning is here. To deal with the results of this reckoning, we are tempted to turn to some of the old Hebrew prophets, who celebrated the humiliation of the mighty and exaltation of the humble. Only the passionate words of an Isaiah could celebrate worthily the emergence of that "hungry beggar" of the 1920's as the "proud builder," who not only restored completely his ruined inheritance, but multiplied it five times over in the past ten years; or find scorn bitter enough to describe how the proud and mighty have squandered their inheritance and cast their people into the desolation of unemployment, labor camps, a declining standard of living and the threat of fascist destruction of civilization.

We are not of the line of Isaiah, however, who saw only the wrath of God in the humiliation of the proud and powerful. We find material causes for this confusion of the mighty, and turn to science for our explanations. If we cannot equal the brilliant imagery of the Prophets, perhaps we can compensate the loss by a deeper understanding of the dialectical paradoxes of our history.

Until the World War, North America had stood in the vanguard of world progress, politically and economically. Politically, it was the "purest" example of bourgeois democracy.

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY

that is, it had the least carry-over of feudal and semi-feudal remnants, and the broadest distribution of democratic rights. This is what removed the fetters from production, gave full sweep to the development of capitalism. But it was the full development of capitalism which undermined the economic basis of democracy, and at the same time set a sharp limit to economic expansion and brought on the crisis.

American democracy arose upon the basis of the widespread distribution among the population of the productive economy of the country, privately owned and individually operated, chiefly the individual farm and the craftsman's tools. This economic basis of democracy for a long time reproduced itself, through the expansion of the original sparse settlements on the Atlantic seaboard over the continent to the Pacific, on the basis of free or cheap lands. With the disappearance of the frontier, this process was halted. At the same time, approximately, North America together with the capitalist nations of Europe entered the era of modern imperialism, of the predominance of finance capital, of monopoly, in its economic life. This was the period of rapid concentration and centralization of capital, the pyramiding of great trusts, the feverish search for new markets, for fields of capital investment and for sources of raw materials. It was the period of the division of the entire world among the great Powers—and the consequent rivalries and antagonisms that resulted in the imperialist World War.

American democracy, based upon individual private property, had made possible this unexampled expansion, which projected the United States as the chief world Power. But this expansion had simultaneously wiped out the economic foundation of the democracy which gave it birth. Individual private property in the nation's economy became more and more concentrated and centralized in the hands of a constantly smaller group of families, constituting the privileged class, the upper and decisive strata of the ruling class. Agriculture, which felt this process least sharply in terms of production, was completely overshadowed by the growth of industry and the cities, but even the individual farm producer fell into the clutches of finance capital through mortgages, usury and mar-

ket monopolies. Individual craftsmen almost disappeared, replaced by the great armies of propertyless wage-workers in mass production, in which thousands and even tens of thousands became cogs in a single big productive mechanism under a single impersonal corporate direction. Production was socialized—while ownership remained private but confined to a smaller and smaller group which, through economic power, became the decisive rulers behind the mask of a popular democracy. Political democracy was reduced largely to what Anatole France described as “the equal right of rich and poor alike to sleep under bridges.”

The World War, which brought America to full realization of this process, thus gave it the illusion of grandeur and power precisely at the time when it had prepared the general breakdown of the whole capitalist system. The tremendous productive economy could not, under the laws of capitalism, operate except under the stimulus of a constantly increasing mass of profits. These accumulated in the hands of a small class which, already exhausted in the search for new forms of wasteful consumption, could use these enormous funds only for further capital investment for further profits, or for war to conquer new fields of investment. Economic paralysis or war became the Hobson's choice facing a society not prepared to break the bounds of capitalism and pass over to a socialist system.

Thus it was that in 1929 and since, the old Hebrew Prophet's curse against the proud and mighty was visited upon North America in the hour of her apparent triumph. America's “sin,” which brought this vengeance upon her, was not, however, that of blasphemy against the ancient Prophet's Yahveh; it was the “sin” of having permitted the fruits of bourgeois democracy to destroy its foundation, of allowing control of the people's economy to pass out of the hands of the people.

During this same period of the humiliation of once proud America, the starving beggar, as our arrogant American capitalists considered Soviet Russia, emerged as the most rapidly progressing land in all fields—economically, politically, culturally—ever recorded in the history of mankind. Surrounded

by a hostile world, with nothing other than its natural resources and its superior system of social organization, the Soviet Union restored its wrecked economy, proceeded to multiply its wealth production to thirteen times that of the early 1920's, and more than four times that of 1929, advanced from last place in Europe to the first, and is now engaged in a race to catch up with and surpass the United States. The rate of growth of Soviet economy is five or six times that of the United States in its period of most rapid expansion.

In the period when the American standard of living fell on the average by 50 per cent, the standard of living in the Soviet Union was raised by 400 per cent. While America was throwing 13,000,000 workers onto the streets, unemployed, of whom seven or eight million are still dependent upon the relief dole, the Soviet Union was not only abolishing all unemployment, but doubling the size of the industrial working class by absorbing peasants into the factories. While American agriculture was saved from destruction only by gigantic subsidies, paying for the curtailment and destruction of crops and cattle, Soviet agriculture had been reorganized on a collective, socialist, basis and doubled its production, with an increase of living standards on the countryside of immeasurable proportions—bringing a life of culture and security to the agrarian population for the first time in human history.

Above all, at a moment when democracy and culture are destroyed in half of Europe by the barbarian hordes of fascism; when they fight for their life in the rest of Europe; when China, the greatest country of Asia, fights against odds for its very existence; when democracy is under fire and threatened even in North America—at this moment Russia, so recently the synonym of backwardness, steps forward with its new Constitution, shaped under the guiding hand of Stalin, a Constitution which is a new high mark in the achievement of democracy, such as in the past only a few great spirits could dream of, but which now comes to life in the everyday activities of 170,000,000 people.

The Constitution of the United States was for generations the most democratic in the world. But compare it with that of the Soviet Union.

The United States Constitution tolerated for generations the disfranchisement of the great majority of the population; for eighty years it confirmed slavery for one-tenth of the population; its grant of suffrage to the Negroes is still largely unrealized today; for over 130 years it excluded half the population, the women, from suffrage; citizenship rights begin only at the age of twenty-one years.

The Soviet Constitution provides universal adult suffrage, the only exception being those adjudged by a court as insane or guilty of a major crime against the state; the right to vote begins at eighteen years.

The United States Constitution provides unproportional representation; in the Senate, without which no law can be adopted, the four or five million voters of the twenty-four smallest states have equal power with the 35,000,000 voters of the twenty-four largest states. Within the states, unproportional representation is so common that it is reduced to a system with a special name, "gerrymandering."

The Soviet Constitution provides for absolutely proportional representation, with one representative in the highest Council for each 300,000 voters, and for the lower, Provincial, Councils one for each smaller bloc of voters in proportion. The equal representation in the Council of Nationalities, regardless of population, guards the special interests of the different nationalities in the Union, without the possibility of a minority veto over the majority.

The United States Constitution establishes a judiciary which in practice has become the supreme power, which is appointed for life, which is irremovable, and which is responsible at no time to the people or to their representatives.

The Soviet Constitution provides for the direct election, by the people, of all government officials, without exception and including the judiciary, for a limited number of years and with the right of recall.

The United States Constitution, in the Amendments constituting the Bill of Rights, denies to the national government the power to pass any laws limiting the civil rights of the people, the most important being the rights of free speech, press and assembly. But it does not prohibit the states from

making such limitations, and the struggle for civil rights is thus merely transferred to the states, where in fact they are in many cases limited; while in general, the realization of the Bill of Rights, insofar as this involves economic factors, is left entirely at the mercy of the capitalist ownership of the economy. The livelihood of the citizens, without which no rights have any meaning whatever, does not come within the scope of the United States Constitution at all.

The Soviet Constitution has as its very heart the specific guarantee of work at a living wage for every citizen, vacations with pay, free education and adequate leisure. The working day is limited to seven hours, with six hours for dangerous occupations. The rights of free speech, press and assembly are guaranteed by putting at the disposal of the Soviet citizens, through their organizations, all the meeting halls, public buildings, the radio, printing presses and paper, the supply of which is constantly being increased. The foundation for all these guarantees is the possession of the entire national economy by the people, and its operation for their common benefit, which is made permanent in the Constitution. . . .

The Soviet Union has been able, in a world where elsewhere democracy is on the defensive or destroyed, to make a great new democratic advance, precisely because it has taken both economic and political power out of the hands of the enemies of the people, precisely because it has given to democracy a full and complete economic foundation, one which will endure, which will not be undermined and disappear as did the individual private property. Every advance of science in the Soviet Union, every increase in production and productivity, strengthens Soviet democracy and strengthens its economic foundation.

The Soviet Union has shown the way to the final and complete guarantee of democracy, and its fullest development. And such a democracy is unconquerable.

October, 1937.

II. Trotskyism—Fascist Fifth Column

THE world was shocked by the revelations of the trial in Moscow of Piatakov, Radek and their fifteen co-defendants. Most people are beginning to understand its profound lessons, its historic significance, only as the result of sustained thought, of ever-deeper analysis, of accumulation of tens of thousands of corroborative details which reveal the tentacles of the world-wide plot of fascism and Trotskyism to plunge the whole world into war in 1937. . . .

Perhaps that question which disturbs the broadest number of people who are without detailed information about the historical background of the Russian labor movement is the Trotskyist charge that the defendants convicted of treason comprised all "Lenin's strongest colleagues and co-workers" in the 1917 Revolution. From this is drawn the theory that the trials are simply the elimination of the "natural leaders" of the revolution by some upstarts who have seized power in the Soviet Union. This vile slander depends for its effect upon lack of information on the part of the American general public, reinforced by the capitalist newspapers' creation of those "reputations." A simple recital of historically established facts is sufficient to shatter this slanderous legend. Every prominent name identified with the treason trials is connected with a long history of struggle against Lenin during his lifetime and against Lenin's Party since his death. Their treason was not something which suddenly descended upon them. It was the carrying to its logical conclusion of their long and stubborn struggle against the building of socialism in the Soviet Union.

Lenin's struggle against Trotsky, from 1903 to 1917, was sharp and bitter, and went to the foundation principles of the Bolshevik Party. When Trotsky joined that Party, in August, 1917, he did not abandon his principles, which Lenin had fought against and defeated; again and again he tried to overthrow Lenin's leadership, outstandingly in the turning points of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty and at the inauguration of the New Economic Policy. After Lenin's death his entire course was one of embittered struggle against the Party policy,

always going to greater lengths, until, after years of debate and the overwhelming repudiation of Trotsky by the masses, the renegade was finally exiled.

Zinoviev and Kamenev began a stubborn career of opposition to Lenin in 1917, when they betrayed the October Revolution, with Lenin calling for their expulsion. In 1927, after fighting Trotsky, they suddenly went over to his side, joining him on the issue of opposing the building of socialism in the Soviet Union.

Radek and Piatakov fought against Lenin before the revolution, resisting his policy of self-determination of nations, and were defeated by him. Piatakov was associated with almost every opposition that developed after the revolution either in an open or concealed form. Radek was removed from any official posts since 1923 when, under Lenin, he was found responsible for disastrous mistakes made in relation to the German events. He was in opposition, and recanted and was re-admitted several times, but never again allowed to hold anything but an appointive post.

The same sort of history attaches to each and every name, not only of those already tried, but of those of the so-called "Right" oppositions who have been implicated by the confessions.

What nonsense, therefore, to assume that because the repeated oppositions of these people brought their names constantly into the capitalist newspapers, they were therefore the "natural leaders" of the Russian peoples. Exactly the contrary. Their connections with the masses had long been broken, and it was precisely because of this that they took the path of treason when they decided not to submit to the unanimous will of the 170,000,000 people united under the Soviets. That in spite of their repeated and crushing defeats they were still permitted to return to positions of trust and responsibility is proof of one thing only—namely, that the Communist Party and the Soviet Union made their errors on the side of mercy, clemency and forgiveness which have ended only when confronted with the final proof and confession of the blackest treachery known to history.

Now let us examine the question, . . . whether Trotsky was

really the directing head of the conspiracy or whether he only had "guilty knowledge" of it. Given a successful outcome of the plot, I imagine there is not a single person in the world who can imagine any figure emerging at its head other than Trotsky—least of all the Trotskyites themselves. It is only the miserable fiasco to which their plot has come that has caused them to raise this hypocritical denial. But the proof is not alone in the confessions in Moscow of every outstanding former associate of Trotsky. It is to be found in Trotsky's writing and activity over many years, which show one ascending line of reason.

The clear starting point of treasonable conspiracy was expressed from the beginning in a clearly formulated theory—Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Piatakov, and their associates, united in the theory of the impossibility of building socialism in the Soviet Union—a theory which was the breeding ground of all oppositions and all treachery, and which was the connecting link to unite with the Right opposition of Bukharin and Rykov. Trotsky already in 1926, over ten years ago, pointed to its logical conclusion by his notorious "Clemenceau thesis." This was the theory that, just as Clemenceau had seized the moment when German armies were less than 60 miles from Paris to seize the government of France in 1914, so would Trotsky and his associates be able to come to power only when the invading armies of capitalism had invaded the Soviet Union and were within similar striking distance of Moscow.

To come to power through the might of foreign armies, however, demanded from the Trotskyists an inner program acceptable to the capitalist powers. Trotsky formulated such a program in April, 1930, printed in his *Opposition Bulletin* No. 10. This called for the restoration of capitalism in Russian economy. I quote:

"Retreat is, nevertheless, inevitable. It is necessary to bring it about at the earliest possible time. . . . To discontinue mass collectivization . . . discontinue jumps in industrialization . . . to revise the question of tempo of industrialization in the light of experience . . . to abandon 'deals' of a self-contained economy . . . to work out a new, alternative plan cal-

culated on the widest possible interaction with the world market. . . . It is impossible to emerge from the present contradictions without crisis and struggle."

That last-quoted thought of Trotsky was further concretized by him in his book *The Soviet Union and the Fourth International*, published in the United States in February, 1934, in these words:

"No normal 'constitutional' ways remain to remove the ruling clique. The bureaucracy [the Soviet Power] can be compelled to yield power into the hands of the proletarian vanguard [the Trotskyites] only by force."

And from Mexico, on January 25 of this year, Trotsky sent a signed statement to the Hearst newspapers, printed in the New York *American* of January 26, in which he said: "Inside the Party, Stalin has put himself above all criticism, and above the state. It is impossible to displace him except by assassination."

That there can still be no mistake on the part of his followers, Trotsky for years has been tying up all his activities under the slogan "Remove Stalin."

In the face of these instructions of Trotsky, of his well-established character as a so-called man of action who immediately translates his counter-revolutionary thoughts into corresponding deeds, who prides himself upon being the most reliable representative of every current hostile to the Soviet Union and its leadership which has successfully built a socialist society, in the face of the confession, full and complete, of every former associate in the Soviet Union who alone could possibly execute his plans for a return to power under any circumstances—what person is still so innocent of the world as to believe Trotsky's unsupported and hysterical denials of the mountain of evidence of his guilt? . . .

It is on the war question, above all, that the horrible nature of the Trotskyist-fascist alliance stands out most clearly. We have seen from the confessions of Piatakov and Radek, how Trotsky entered into an agreement with Hitler's lieutenant Hess and with the Japanese General Staff, on the partition of

Soviet territory and the ceding of economic privileges to these two fascist powers for war purposes. One point in this agreement was the provision of Japanese imperialism with oil and other supplies needed for a prospective war against the United States. . . .

Thus we find that even the most convinced adherent of American isolation, if he is not to shut his eyes and refuse to look at facts, must also become directly interested in disclosing and defeating the world conspiracy of Trotsky with fascism, which is threatening the peace of the whole world. Trotsky moves now, as always, with the grand sweep of the would-be world-leader, but now there is revealed in its full nakedness that the force of his world-ideas is borrowed from German and Japanese fascism. . . .

The Soviet Union, by hunting out and exterminating the agents of fascism and war lurking within its own borders, has performed a signal service to the cause of progressive humanity all over the world. . . .

[February 5, 1937]

* * *

It took the United States government thirty-eight years before it finally suppressed the treasonable circles that had arisen in the first days of the revolution, and which had occupied high posts in the government established by that revolution. The Soviet Union has dug out and liquidated its treasonable sects in only about half of that time. The United States government during that thirty-eight years of fight against treason had to deal with tens of thousands of traitors in a population of three to six millions; the Soviet Union has had to deal with a few thousand traitors in a population of 180,000,000.

Altogether the relative showing of treason in the early years of American bourgeois democracy, and the early years of Soviet socialist democracy, is not unfavorable to the land of socialism. And just as every American democrat must indignantly reject the idea that our traitors were the fruits of our new democratic system, just so must we also reject, for equally valid considerations, the identical argument that the Soviet

traitors are the fruits of the socialist system of society, instead of, as the truth is, the fruits of the reactionary and fascist conspiracies against the Soviets.

Treason in the United States was not finished, however, even with the War of 1812 and the burning of the White House. When our country was face to face with the vital issue of slavery and the preservation of the Union, in the years leading up to 1860, we had traitors in control of the White House, of both houses of Congress, and of the Supreme Court, as well as in the army. These traitors in high places deliberately prepared the dismemberment of their country, dispersed its armed forces, sent its supplies to the conspiring insurrectionists, surrendered its fortresses to the enemy. During the Civil War that ensued, the government began operations with a Chief of Staff who worked in agreement with the enemy. A Confederate spy attended the meetings of the General Staff, and was subsequently arrested. When, at the conclusion of the war, Lincoln was assassinated, the deed was clearly protected and organized from within the government circles, as was the assassination of Kirov in the Soviet Union in 1934. . . .

If there are Americans still sufficiently naive to think that the days of treason ended with the Civil War, let them ponder the recent words of William E. Dodd, lately resigned as Ambassador to Berlin, who publicly declared:

“There is no doubt that the Nazi government has paid spies in America and that many of these are ranking American officials.”

It is clear that the arrest of a few lower-class Nazi spies during the past few weeks is still far away from the centers of fascist espionage and treason that infest the upper circles of American society. The open incitations to assassination of President Roosevelt that have been published in the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *New York Sun*, and the McClure Syndicate confidential dispatches are only a little whiff of the devil's brew of treason that boils in Wall Street circles. The recent column of the well known Republican commen-

tator, Mark Sullivan, in which he compares President Roosevelt with a skunk, and proposes to remove a skunk from the national premises by writing polite letters to him, was but a cowardly echo of this assassination propaganda in high places. Treason is afoot in America today. Let the Moscow trials arouse the American people to more alertness toward it! . . .

The Soviet Union and Democracy

The capitalist newspapers, Norman Thomas, and the Trotskyite-Lovestoneite groups, are working overtime now to propagate the idea that the Soviet Union is an enemy of democracy, that all Communist support of democracy is hypocritical, and that the Moscow trials furnish proof of this. Let us face this issue fundamentally and squarely, and force these gentlemen—if they are not too slippery for us—also to come down to brass tacks. Let us systematically examine their main arguments.

They say the fundamental error, the original sin, of the socialist state was that it originated in a revolutionary overthrow of the old order. We throw back into their faces the well-known fact that all democracies, including the United States of America, also originated in a revolutionary overthrow of the old order. If the Soviet Union is to be condemned on this count, then the U.S.A. is also condemned. We support the origin of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.

They say the socialist state violated democracy when it drove out and disfranchised those who took up arms to restore the old order. We throw back in their faces the well-known fact that all democracies, including the U.S.A., did the same thing, and that the U.S.A. drove out a much larger part of its population than did the Soviet Union, with at least equal violence, and that this was essential to the very establishment of democracy. We support the energetic crushing of the enemies within the republic of the United States, just as we support that of the Soviet Union, and proclaim that both were services to democracy without which democracy would have been crushed.

They say the land of socialism violates the principles of

democracy by its political set-up of a single party. We throw back in their faces that the original conception of the democracy of the United States was that of the single party, the party of all convinced adherents of the new system, that the United States operated on that system for more than twenty years, and that the system of dual parties arose only because a small exploiting class, controlling that Federalist Party, forced Jefferson and the masses of the people to organize a new party to prevent the complete crushing of democracy. Our Constitution was amended to allow for the operation of two parties only after more than a quarter-century of independence. The Soviet Union operated with many parties for years, and they were dispersed only when they took up arms against the republic. We support the idea of uniting all convinced adherents of democracy into one party at the origin of the U.S.A., even though it failed; we support the idea of a single democratic front in the U.S.A. today; and we support the successful inclusion of the overwhelming mass of the population behind the single party of socialism in the Soviet Union. In all these instances, these are examples of the struggle to realize democracy, under different conditions, which all go in the same direction.

They say the Soviet Union violated democracy by carrying through collectivization of agriculture over the opposition of a few hundred thousand kulaks, at the cost of a severe struggle and great hardships. We throw back in their faces that the democracy of the U.S.A. was forced, 86 years after its foundation, to carry through an agrarian reform much less far-reaching but against greater resistance, and only at the cost of four years of Civil War, millions of casualties, and twenty years of military rule in almost half of the country afterward. We declare that, for all its costs, the Civil War in the United States was a service to democracy all over the world, that the collectivization in the Soviet Union was a greater and more fundamental service, more successfully carried out with much less cost, and that those who attack the Soviet Union today are by that token repudiating our own American history and revolutionary heritage. Precisely because we are Americans, and value and love our American revolutionary heritage, we are

the enthusiastic supporters of the Soviet Union in its tremendous democratic achievements, including collectivization.

They say that the democratic tradition, exemplified by America, is a method of settling political problems without violent struggle, while the Soviet Union shows that its system breeds violence. We throw back in their faces the long history of armed insurrections, conspiracies, assassinations, and civil violence, which have been the constant accompaniment of every stage in the development of American democracy, and declare that the Soviet Union, a nation twenty times the size of the United States in its formative period, has shown a development a hundred times more peaceful than the early stages of bourgeois democracy anywhere in the world, whether in France, England, or in the United States.

Precisely because we love and would protect the achievements of American democracy, we love and protect that higher form of democracy which is being surely and firmly established in the Soviet Union, showing the way to the whole world of the twentieth century, just as the United States was showing the way to the whole world in the eighteenth century.

March 18, 1938.

III. The Biggest News Story in History

DURING the twenty-two years' existence of the Soviet Union, the American people have been fed with a steady newspaper diet of lies and misinformation about it. This campaign is now being raised to fantastic heights, such as we never saw before. But the truth is mighty, and the gigantic campaign of lies defeats itself. The same liars who picture the Soviet Union as in a state of economic chaos speak tremblingly of the "menace" of the Red Army, as the largest and at least among the few best trained and equipped in the world. How can both things be true, when it is known to the merest amateur that every army is strictly limited in its development by the industrial level of the country which it represents, and that this is more true of the Soviet Union than of any other land, because it draws proportionately less upon the world market than any other? . . .

Our newspapers have hidden behind these lies the greatest news story of all history. That is the story of the epoch-making successes of the new socialist economy. It is the story of mankind discovering how to conquer nature with science, machinery and technique, which in turn are conquered and harnessed to the social will of men.

To obtain the full flavor of this greatest news story of all history, let us turn our memories back to 1926, 1927 and 1928. Those were the years of a much-publicized American prosperity, which caught the imagination of the whole world. From every land, commissions were being sent to America to study the system of wealth production and distribution which had made America the envy and the model of other capitalist lands. This great prosperity reached the dizzy heights of producing in 1928 about eighty billion dollars, roughly, in national income. When the great crash of 1929 dissolved the boasted American prosperity, the world forgot the rainbow illusions of the preceding years, and American national income slipped back by 1932 into the forty billion class, and is now somewhere in the sixty billions. But let us suppose, just for the sake of the argument, that the United States, instead of dropping into a terrible crisis, had found a way to utilize its national economy so that, instead, it began to expand its production at the rate of 10 per cent each year, up to now, 1939. Then, by 1932, instead of a national income of some forty-five billions, which we had, there would have been more than one hundred forty billions, or considerably more than three times as much. And by 1939 this would have reached around two hundred thirty billions of dollars, that is, this year alone we would have produced one hundred sixty-five billions more in wealth than is really the case; and for the whole period of eleven years we would have produced almost one thousand billions of dollars more than was the case in actuality, or a little nest-egg equal to \$7,500 for every man, woman and child in the country. If we Americans had been able to make our economy perform on such a scale, can anyone doubt that the whole world would be going to school to us, trying to learn how to imitate our achievements?

Now, with this fanciful, imaginary picture of a possible

America in our minds, let us examine the record of the Soviet Union during the last eleven years. We find that they expanded their national economy at the rate, not of our fanciful 10 per cent, but of more than 22½ per cent. Instead of multiplying their national income by 300 per cent in eleven years, as we imagined the U. S. doing, the Bolsheviki multiplied it by 1,000 per cent, or ten times. If our Utopian imaginary America had kept up with the rate which the Soviet Union actually achieved in hard fact, we would this year alone have a national income of over eight hundred billion dollars, or an average of more than \$6,000 for each man, woman and child, while the additional income over the past eleven years would amount to more than \$25,000 per head of the population.

Surely, this is big news, isn't it, and good news? Men have discovered a way, and proved it in practice, to multiply national production of wealth at a rate which, if applied to the U. S., would bring our country a material prosperity beyond the wildest dreams of Dr. Townsend or California's "Ham 'n Eggs" movement.

How were the American newspapers able to hide such tremendous, world-shaking news from the American people, and palm off on them in its place the atrocity tales of the anti-Soviet propaganda?

They were able to do it because, first of all, the Soviet Union began to operate its new epoch-making socialist system at the end of the last World War, in a country which had been completely ruined and crushed by the war and the armed interventions; it had to go through years of the most terrible difficulties and privations, with almost no help from the outside world, and surrounded by hostile states. It had to start from almost nothing, and build entirely with its own resources. Thus, while in its twenty-two years of existence it has covered the ground that required over one hundred years for the United States, it still remains at about the general level our country was thirty or forty years ago; it will require about seven or eight years to cover this gap, and thus overtake and surpass the United States also, if we continue as in the past ten years. Only then can the Soviet Union begin to demonstrate that society of abundance, which is the higher stage of

socialism, called communism, which in the United States, once we took the socialist path, would be possible almost immediately, in the first years.

In the United States, our accumulated wealth and national production is still two to three times as great as that of the Soviet Union, which has a population almost half again as large. And yet, for all our greater wealth and productivity, two-thirds of our population is excluded from any secure place at the economic table of the nation, while one-third actually lives on makeshift and charity, ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed, in the very shadow of enormous stores of wealth that are unused. In the Soviet Union, in contrast, the entire population is productively employed, the general standard of life has increased about five-fold in ten years, and the whole population lives in comparative security. In our country, the educational system is progressively deteriorating, and especially higher education is more and more being denied the mass of the people. In the Soviet Union, in contrast, they have multiplied the educational and cultural budget more than twenty-fold in ten years. So that even with only a fraction of the available national resources, as compared with the U. S., the Soviet Union has brought to its population a life of hope and progress and security, which has been inexorably fading out of the American scene since 1929.

Surely there is something new, vital and important in the Soviet Union, which American workers, and the American toiling people generally, should be deeply interested in.

Is it not within the realm of possibility that we might be able to learn something from the Soviet Union that we could turn to good advantage in our own country?

November 13, 1939.

IV. The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.— Good Neighbors

THE main idea which I am defending in the field of foreign policy is that of ever closer collaboration between the United States and the Soviet Union, as the major factor in the organization of world peace, as the chief protection of the world against the flood of fascist barbarism, for the maintenance of an ordered civilization in a large part of the world.

It is impossible to dismiss this question as of secondary importance since the two countries in question are the strongest in the world, economically, militarily, and in a strategic geographical position. If the two strongest nations can work together, then the prospects for organization of world peace are bright; otherwise they are very dark.

What are the obstacles to such cooperation? Is there any conflict of interest between the United States and the Soviet Union, in any area of international relations, which shuts the door to such cooperation? It is our contention that there is no conflict of interest, that on the contrary, the interests of the two countries are parallel, with many and growing areas of complete harmony.

In the Far East, the Pacific area, those parallel interests are so obvious and fundamental that even the Harding Republican administration, in 1920, dominated as it was by a fixed and obstinate hostility to the Soviet regime that was never relaxed for twelve years under Coolidge and Hoover, was yet forced by the inexorable logic of even the narrowest conception of American national interests to put pressure upon Japan, in the Washington Conference, to evacuate the Soviet Far Eastern Maritime Provinces after the Red Army had cleared them out of the Baikal region.

How much more, then, are these common interests of emphatic importance, since Japanese militarism has run amok in China, has embarked upon such an ambitious adventure of conquest that it openly proclaims its intention of transforming all Eastern Asia into its closed preserve and reducing its hundreds of millions of population to instruments of an all-con-

quering military empire; while, through its association in the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo triangle, it has become an active force in Latin American life against the United States. The Soviet Union, by its active assistance to China, has made possible the marvelously heroic and successful resistance of the Chinese people against Japanese conquest. It is a matter worthy of deep thought on the part of all Americans that this role of the Soviet Union has been at the same time most profoundly favorable to the interests of the United States. The fundamental interests of China, the Soviet Union, and the United States are in profound harmony; the cooperative protection and advancement of these common interests furnish the only possible foundation for the stable organization of peace in the Pacific.

Turn now to Europe. Less than a year ago, Chamberlain proclaimed "peace for our time" as the fruits of the Munich pact, which excluded the Soviet Union from the "European family of nations" while surrendering Czechoslovakia and Southeastern Europe to the mercies of the Axis powers. But already the fiasco of Munich and its catastrophic consequences are openly acknowledged by the very participants in the Munich Conference. Last October it was only the Communists who were possessed of sufficient clarity and courage to openly denounce the Munich betrayal. Americans might then have been excused for their confusion on the question, since they are so largely non-communist and even anti-communist, and only the Communists told them the truth. But the awful consequences that flowed so immediately and catastrophically from Munich are so obvious that Americans can learn part of the truth from conservative, reactionary, and anti-communist sources, and therefore no longer have an excuse for refusing to see the facts. Peace in Europe is impossible without the active collaboration of the Soviet Union, which now, as always, is ready and anxious to participate in the organization of peace. Even Neville Chamberlain is forced to acknowledge this fundamental fact, though he seems to cling most stubbornly to the disastrous policy of surrender to the Axis powers.

Our American newspapers have interpreted the difficulties in negotiating the terms of the "peace front" between the

Soviet Union, France, and Great Britain as signs of Soviet reluctance to enter fully into such a front, and its wish to "drive a hard bargain" or even to come to an agreement with Hitler against the Western powers. Quite typically, even Norman Thomas has joined his voice to these stupid slanders, which are highly welcome in Berlin. Against such clouds of diplomatic poison gas, my own words would perhaps be ineffective. Allow me, therefore, to call as an expert witness the Hon. Winston Churchill, who needs no credentials from me. I select a few sentences and paragraphs from a recent article of his, syndicated among American conservative newspapers:

"It is astonishing [says Mr. Churchill] how swiftly and decisively opinion in Great Britain and France has consolidated itself upon a triple alliance with Soviet Russia. The well-known objections have simply ceased to count with enormous numbers of people with whom abhorrence of Communism is still a first principle. But it should not be supposed that this change arises out of any desperate strait or panic fear. It is due to the realization of the very real harmony of interests which unites the foreign policy of the three countries. . . . Their common interest is peace."

Mr. Churchill's words contain a profound truth. The leaders of Britain and France could not see this last October, but the people have forced them to see it in the last months. The "common interest in peace," so disastrously threatened by the Munich "appeasement" and "non-intervention" policies, is an interest that is fully and completely shared by the United States. And if the tory leaders, with whom "abhorrence of Communism" is a fundamental principle of life, have learned of that "common interest" with the Soviet Union, it should not be so hard for Americans, even the most conservative, to learn the same lesson.

What is the significance for America of the differences between London and Moscow on the terms of establishment of the peace front? . . . Again, I turn for the answer to the hard-boiled conservative Churchill, who cannot be suspected of prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union. He says:

"Personally, not having changed my views about Communism or past history in any respect, I have from the beginning preferred the Russian proposals to either the British or French alternatives. They are simple, they are logical, and they conform to the main groupings of common interest."

If Winston Churchill can prefer the Moscow proposals to those of either Chamberlain or Daladier, what then becomes of the idea that Moscow is "driving a hard bargain"? Churchill differs from Chamberlain and Daladier in having been against Munich and the appeasement policy *before* its bitter fruits were born, and in having driven to the heart of the question, without squirming about in a futile effort to eat the cake and have it too, à la Chamberlain.

Americans, even of the most conservative trend, should be more attracted to the Churchill approach than to that of Chamberlain, if they are guided in their views by American national interest and not by ideological ties with Hitler. For clearly, Moscow is taking a stand very close to that which Washington would almost certainly take if our country should, in the course of development, face a similar problem of negotiating an agreement with a Chamberlain and a Daladier. Like the Soviet Union, the United States would be faced with statesmen who are being pushed, against their own will, by the overwhelming demands of their people—statesmen who, therefore, would not be directed in their proposals by the broad all-inclusive interests of peace, which are dominant for the Soviet Union and the United States, but only by their own narrow and special interests and commitments. Like the Soviet Union, the United States would also have to appeal to the people over the heads of their governments, before it would be able to force such terms as would represent the general interests of all the peoples. Winston Churchill recognized this issue, when he said:

"There is a real and honorable basis of equal and rightful interest existing in external affairs between the Soviets and the parliamentary democracies. It is this that has invested the triple peace design with vitality. Matters have now gone so far that it is inconceivable that any of the three governments

could take the responsibility of depriving the hundreds of millions of working people involved of this joint security for their life and progress. Agreement is driven forward by irresistible forces overriding and shearing away serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws."

That this is also the view of realistic French conservatives, is shown by the words of Pertinax, prominent publicist of the "right wing," who remarked, anent Chamberlain's dilatory maneuvers:

"Last September, Chamberlain knew how to move more quickly when Hitler had to be placated. He still fails to understand . . . that the fate of the continent depends upon what they [the Soviet Union] will do or not do. . . . There is irony in the fact that Chamberlain, having started with outspoken antagonism to anything like cooperation with Russia, should now be compelled to bring it into existence undiluted and unguarded. Such is the ransom for Munich and for what followed Munich."

I quote at length from these two typical spokesmen of British and French conservatism, because it is my firm conviction that their evolution accurately forecasts, in its general nature and direction, the future of American policy in the growingly dangerous world situation. For the United States also, the realities of national interest are "irresistible forces" which before long will for us also be "overriding and shearing away serious obstacles and valid prejudices as if they were but straws," to repeat the words of Churchill.

The underlying realities will inevitably bring the same general conclusion; the United States will ultimately, despite all obstacles and prejudices, find itself in cooperation with the Soviet Union to salvage peace and civilization. The only question is whether we will march ahead consciously to that end, and thereby attain its full benefits, or whether, like Britain, we will go through the swampy bypaths of appeasement of the fascist axis, and risk the catastrophes inherent in such a policy.

July 5, 1939.

V. The Economics of Communism

The Soviet Economy in Its World Relation

SINCE the rise of the modern Communist or Socialist movement, dating from *The Communist Manifesto*, written by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in 1848, which proposes that the national economy of each country should be taken over by its people, acting through its government, abolishing private ownership in the means of production and distribution, the issues thus raised have been the very center of all economic and political thought and controversy. Until the rise and consolidation of the Soviet Union it was not possible to refer the issue to the test of practice, and to compare the *performance* of the rival schools of economics in practical life. Now that the Soviet Union has entered its twenty-second year, such a comparison is not only possible, but becomes necessary and inescapable as the final test of all disputed issues.

The final argument of all defenders of capitalist economy, that is, of all forms of economy based upon private ownership of the basic economy of each country and its operation upon the principle of search for maximum private profit, is to the effect that this capitalist system has demonstrably in the past hundred years multiplied man's productive powers, and that it alone can and does result in maximum production of wealth; while, conversely, any form of common ownership and operation would result in economic decline and eventual collapse.

The basic argument for socialism or communism is to the opposite effect, namely, that while capitalism did expand man's productive forces, it can no longer do so; that it is precisely capitalistic private ownership and operation that must result, and is resulting, in the decline of economic life and in economic crisis and collapse. Now let us proceed to a check-up of these two arguments in the light of what has actually been going on in the world for the past twenty years.

I turn first of all to statistics of world production in manufacturing and mining, as given in the *Statistical Year Book of the League of Nations* for 1937-38. Taking 1929 as an index of

100, which represents the highest point reached up to that time, we find that by 1933, the low point of the world crisis, production had declined to 77.7. From that point on there is recovery until 1938, the index reaching 109.7 for 1936, above that for 1937, with the exact figure not yet published, while 1938 showed a distinct decline.

What do these figures show? That the world, predominantly capitalist, was not able to rise above 1929 more than 10 per cent, and last year even lost that gain and went back almost, if not entirely, to the 1929 level. Capitalism has not been able to lead the world back to recovery; it still leaves the world economy in stagnation.

Perhaps it may occur to some that the reason why world economy remains in such dire straits lies in the fact that the rise of the Soviet Union has taken one-sixth of the world out of the capitalist orbit. The figures which were cited include the Soviet Union; it may be argued, therefore, that it is the influence of Soviet economy, the inability of a workers' regime properly to administer a great land, that has pulled down the world index figure so lamentably. To examine this question, we turn to another League of Nations index, namely, that of world production *excluding* the Soviet Union, which they conveniently provide us. What does that show to us?

Again taking 1929 as 100, we find that the capitalist world had declined in 1933 to the low point of 71.3, or 6.4 per cent lower than the whole world including the Soviet Union. Further, the recovery after 1933 was not nearly so favorable as the index showed for the combined capitalist and socialist worlds; taking the capitalist world alone, 1936 is no longer almost 10 per cent above 1929, but lags at 95.5; 1937 barely crawls above 1929, with a figure of 102.5, while 1938, with the exact figure unknown, is definitely below 100 again.

Facts give us the clear answer: It was not the Soviet Union which dragged down the world index but, on the contrary, it was the Soviet Union which made the world showing more favorable by far than the capitalist lands, taken separately, can show.

Partisans for the United States economy, as against the rest of the world, both capitalist and socialist, may call upon us

for the comparative figures of our own country, the stronghold of capitalism, which represents more than half the total economy of the capitalist world. If the expectation is that the U.S.A. makes a better showing, then it is doomed to disappointment. Our own country lagged behind the rest of the capitalist world, and was the chief influence dragging down the whole index. Where the combined world index in 1933 was 77.7, and the capitalist world taken separately was 71.3, that of the U.S.A. had descended to the depths of 64.3; the highest point of recovery of the U. S. in 1937 was only 93.2, while 1938 dropped to about 90 or below, exact figure not yet known. In all these comparisons, I have used the statistical tables of the League of Nations.

Let us turn now to the argument of those who say that the fascist powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, furnish an exception to the general trend of the capitalist world, that the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis has found a path to recovery which the democracies have not yet discovered. Here we are forced to compare index figures of varying bases, not directly comparable, but which reveal the basic trend and underlying facts clearly enough.

For Germany, we take the semi-official figures of the Institut für Konjunkturforschung, therefore the most favorable interpretation that can possibly be put upon the facts. With the year 1928 taken as the base of 100, German economy reached its low point in 1932 with a figure of 59; 1933 was 66, while 1937 had risen to 117. But the slightest examination of the constituent parts of German economy proves the fact, which we would know from general information, that the preponderant part of this increase is accounted for by armaments and fortifications, and therefore covers up the real condition of the general economy, which is undoubtedly not above, and is probably below, the general level of the capitalist world.

Italy's statistics demonstrate this fact even more decisively. Using the figures of the Ministero delle Corporazioni, 1928 taken as 100, Italian economy descended in 1932 to 73, and in 1937 had reached only 109, still below the general world level, and only ten points above all of Europe, notwithstanding all the influence of Italian armaments.

Japan's index is more favorable on the surface, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry claiming an index of 170 in 1937, based upon the 1931-33 average as 100; but in the case of Japan there is no dispute from any source that these figures reflect entirely the combined influences of inflation and the enormous expenditures of the Japanese aggression in China.

These official figures completely destroy all pretense that the fascist powers have discovered any secret formula for economic recovery. . . . We can use these figures as the background from which to approach more concretely our examination of the economy of the land of socialism, the Soviet Union, which is our main subject today.

First of all, let us remind ourselves of a few basic facts, economic and historical, which condition the development of the Soviet Union. Its area constitutes one-sixth of the earth's surface, and its population about one-twelfth of that of the world. It is two and a half times the area of the United States and forty times that of Germany, occupying the eastern half of Europe and the northern third of Asia. It contains unrivaled natural resources of all kinds.

But up to the World War this great area, under the tsarist empire, had remained economically the most backward among the modern nations. To the extent that its economy had been developed along modern capitalist lines, it was largely dependent upon Western European capital and technical management, and economically it was more and more becoming a colony of foreign capital. The World War, with the civil war and invasions that followed the Revolution, almost completely destroyed its industry.

The new Soviet power that undertook the building of a new economic system, therefore, had to begin almost from the bare ground. It was further denied any effective help from abroad beyond a small minimum of imports and technical assistance which it could pay for cash on delivery. These are the chief positive and negative features of the conditions under which the new socialist economy was erected.

From the World War until 1921, when the civil war and interventions were ended, the economy of Russia was continuously shrinking, until the products of its industry had de-

clined in value from a little more than 10,000,000,000 rubles in 1913 to less than 17 per cent of that volume, or 1,700,000,000 rubles in 1920. Then the Soviet Union began the reparation of its shattered economy, arriving in 1927 at a total national production equal in volume to that of 1913, the last year before the World War. This was the time, also, when the capitalist world had recuperated sufficiently to surpass once more its pre-war level of production, and is the point at which we began our examination of the trends of world economy.

Up to this time, the Russian and world economic trends had gone, on the whole, parallel, except that Russia's decline had been more precipitate and to a lower point, while its recovery had been correspondingly quicker. But with 1928-29, a sharp divergence begins between the course of economy in the capitalist world and that of the Soviet Union. The divergence is sharp and startling. While the capitalist economy went into decline, having dropped 40 per cent of its production by 1933, the Soviet economy began to rise at a rate unparalleled in history; while by 1938 the capitalist world had barely climbed back to its 1929 level and had slipped behind it again, the Soviet economy in the same period had increased its industrial production by more than one thousand per cent, had multiplied it more than ten-fold.

To bring this contrast closer home, we may recall that from 1928 to 1932 our country, under the leadership of Herbert Hoover, dropped more than 40 per cent of its national income into the abyss of economic crisis, dropping from \$80,000,000,000 to \$45,000,000,000; during that same period, the period of the First Five-Year Plan, the Soviet Union doubled its national income, which rose from 25,000,000,000 to 50,000,000,000 rubles. From 1933 to 1937 our country, under the leadership of President Roosevelt, painfully struggled out of the Hoover pit and regained most of its losses; during the same period the Soviet Union again doubled its national income, which rose from 50,000,000,000 to 100,000,000,000 rubles, through the successful execution of the Second Five-Year Plan. In 1938, the economy of our country again declined, while the national income of the Soviet Union again surged forward to 112,000,-

000,000 rubles; while the leaders of American economy can only express the *hope* that our country will climb a little above the 1929 level in the next few years, the leaders of the Soviet Union can confidently announce the *plan* whereby the national income will, in 1942, have increased by 88 per cent, or almost doubled, over 1937.

For another comparison, we may refer again to the statistical tables of the League of Nations. This shows the comparative index of industrial production of the U. S. for the years 1928, 1933, and 1936, at the figures of 111, 76 and 105, respectively. For the same years, the corresponding index for the Soviet Union stands at the figures of 100, 250, and 481. If we had the index of this series for 1937 and 1938, the gap would be greatly extended.

All the facts of the past ten years go to prove conclusively that, if we accept the test of performance, of verified deeds in actual life, the capitalist economy has failed to sustain itself on its previously achieved level, it shows no promise of any fundamental recovery, it demonstrates all the symptoms of a system which is fatally ill, which is destroying its own reserves, which is preparing the conditions of its own death and disappearance. But, in contrast to the obvious failure of capitalist economy, there is to be seen an equally obvious success of the new socialist economy, a success not only in contrast to the current failure of capitalism, but an outstanding success when compared with the achievements of capitalism in its previous days of greatest growth. For never in all its history has capitalism presented a single instance of the growth of a national economy that approaches more than 20 per cent of the growth of Soviet economy under the Five-Year Plans. . . .

Now let us examine more closely the task undertaken by the Third Five-Year Plan. . . . The general increase of 88 per cent is the average of an increase of 103 per cent in production of means of production and 70 per cent increase in production of consumption articles. Thus, while doubling its capacity for future production, the Soviet people will be enjoying an improvement in their immediate living standards by more than two-thirds. If the United States economy should perform just half of that "modest" task, on the basis of its already

existing economy, it would exceed the most wildly optimistic expectations ever expressed by its own devoted supporters. Therefore, while we can agree that the Third Five-Year Plan sets a relatively modest goal, we take note that what is a modest perspective for a socialist economy would be an obvious exaggeration for a capitalist economy. This is still more emphasized when we compare this goal with total 1928 production, and find that the *amount of increase* in the next five years will be *four times as much* as the total production of 1928; if the U.S.A. produced a total four times as much in 1942 as in 1928, our national income would then be around \$300,000,000,000 instead of its present approximate \$65,000,000,000.

It must be admitted quite frankly that the progress of the Soviet economy in overtaking the capitalist world has been greater in total than in *per capita* production; that means, while it has surpassed all European countries in amount of production, it is still in productivity per worker behind several of the technically most advanced nations. That is because it has engaged the entire population in its economy, has expanded its working class from 11,000,000 in 1928 to 26,000,000 in 1937; these new industrial recruits were raw peasants, and have had to receive prolonged and difficult training in modern industry to transform them into fully qualified workers. The rapid mechanization of all economy, the high spirit of emulation among the workers exemplified in the Stakhanov movement, the tremendous educational and cultural work, and the rapid rise in living standards, all of which are outstanding features of Soviet economy today, provide sufficient guarantee that in *per capita productivity* also the Soviet Union will rapidly overtake and surpass the capitalist countries.

Are there any visible natural limits to the expansion of the Soviet economy? It is very difficult to discern any. Its area of 5,000 billions of acres contains every requirement of the national economy for the indefinite future. To give a few examples: the already surveyed iron ore deposits exceed 10,000,000,000 tons, and if iron-bearing quartzites are included the figure is 260,000,000,000 tons. Surveyed oil reserves exceed 6,000,000,000 tons, more than half the resources of the world. Known

coal deposits contain 1,654 billion tons, second only to the U.S.A. Water-power resources exceed 280,000,000 kilowatts, much greater than any other country. The population is greater in number than any other industrial country, but there is plenty of room for expansion, as the population per square mile is the lowest; the natural growth of the population is almost five times as much as any other industrial country.

One of the most important, and least clear for the American public, among all questions of comparison between the socialist and capitalist economies, is that of the relative results upon the living standards of the working populations. If we accept the standard of weekly earnings in industry as the measure of living standards, and their movement during the past ten years, then all capitalist countries show a decline while the Soviet Union reveals a steady and sharp rise.

Again quoting the League of Nations statistics, the U.S.A. index figure of weekly earnings, taking 1929 as 100, declined to 60 in 1932, recovered to 78 in 1935, and to 95 in 1937 (the League does not yet give a figure for 1938, but it is known to have declined). The German index declined from 100 in 1929, to 67 in 1932, recovering to 75 in 1935, and to 80 in 1937. The Soviet Union rises from 100 in 1929 steadily each year to 240 in 1935, the latest figure of the League of Nations; while from Soviet sources we can conservatively estimate that the same index, when published, for 1936 will be around 300, and for 1937 around 380.

What has been the trend of the intellectual workers in the Soviet Union can be sufficiently indicated by comparative figures of their average yearly wages in 1932 and 1937, during which period the rise was from 3,636 to 6,502 rubles.

Another method of comparison is that of the volume of production of articles intended for mass consumption, which to some degree inevitably reflects the trend of living standards of the population. The United States index of consumption goods declined from 111 in 1928 (the basis being 1923-25 average), to 98 in 1933, rising then to 110 in 1937, still somewhat below 1928. For Germany, the index of 100 in 1928 dropped to 83 in 1933, and rose to 103 in 1936. For the Soviet

Union, the index rose to 201 in 1933, and to 348 in 1936. In each case I have taken the latest figures published by the League of Nations, in order to avoid any suspicion that the comparison may be considered by anyone to be unbalanced or unfair. It may be remarked, by the way, however, that the Third Five-Year Plan in the Soviet Union envisages the multiplication of consumers' goods by approximately 70 per cent in 1942 over the figure of 1937, which means that the *increase* in consumption articles per capita will be many times the *total* means produced in 1928. Nothing even remotely approaching this rapid rise in the means of livelihood is even dreamed about for any capitalist country.

With regard to the agricultural population, I have not had sufficient time at my disposal to gather adequate comparative data. It is well known, however, that in every capitalist country agriculture has been in continuous crisis ever since the war, and that the decline of income of the farm population has been especially catastrophic. In the Soviet Union, however, since 1933, when its agriculture definitely moved above the pre-war level, the income of the collective farms, comprising 98 per cent of the farm population, increased by 2.7 times up to 1937, while the amount of income distributed in money form multiplied by 4.5 times.

By this time the simple examination of comparative figures will have raised the question in the mind of any person, if he does not deliberately close his mind to such thoughts, as to why the Soviet Union, which started so far behind us in productive powers only a few years ago, is forging ahead so rapidly as already to surpass all other countries but the U.S.A., and to promise to surpass the U.S.A. itself within ten or fifteen years at the outside; while the countries of greatest resources lag behind and cannot even maintain their past achievements.

Is there anything wrong with the American people, the workers, farmers and technicians, that they could not move forward with equal speed, or at least with half the speed, as the Soviet peoples have been advancing? Clearly, there is nothing wrong with the American people as *producers*, but

on the contrary they are a hundred times better prepared for economic advance than the Soviet peoples, insofar as their individual technical capacities are concerned, and many times as well prepared insofar as already existing machinery is concerned. Neither can we say that natural resources and geographical position can account for the difference between the performance of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., for these differences favor the Soviet Union only in the long perspective of the next fifty or one hundred years but have no immediate consequence. The answer, therefore, must be found in the difference in the *economic system*, in the different relations of production as between socialism and capitalism.

Under our economic system of capitalism, the national economy is under the private ownership and operation of a relatively small section of the population, the incentive to production being entirely dominated by the search for private profit on the part of these private owners. The result is anarchy in economic life, which periodically brings crises, which grow progressively more deep and profound. The accumulated surplus production becomes more difficult of reinvestment in expanded production in proportion as it increases in volume.

It is characteristic of this fundamental contradiction of capitalism that when its economic machinery enters a crisis, and paralyzes the nation, the explanation is immediately found, not in lack of production, but in *overproduction*. Because we have produced so much, more than our capitalist economy knows how to make use of, therefore the whole nation is thrown into crisis and chaos, and large sections of the owning class itself are bankrupted and dispossessed. The emergency measures whereby our government attempts to bring some order out of this chaos inevitably take the form of governmental intervention in the economic set-up, directed toward putting idle capital and man-power back to work under governmental direction. But these emergency measures are themselves deprived of much of their effectiveness by the imperative demand on the part of capitalists that such governmental intervention shall be kept down to the minimum, and

shall be directed into channels entirely outside the normal development of economic life. We therefore have the crying anomaly that it is precisely in the period when our economic life is in crisis and depression, when the standards of living have been falling most disastrously, that we have suddenly blossomed out in a veritable orgy of public improvements of all kinds.

The present capitalist system has accumulated idle capital and idle man-power which it is no longer able to bring together in any normal way, and has no prospect of ever bringing together again in the normal processes of capitalism. Its emergency measures, typified by the New Deal, while absolutely essential to the continued existence of a large part of the population, are in themselves no cure for this condition, because they scrupulously keep within the limits of the capitalist mode of production, and avoid the slightest competition with private capital which monopolizes all fields except the narrowest margin of public works.

The unexampled economic success of the Soviet Union is made possible by its system of organization, by the economic relations established between the producers and the productive machinery. The productive wealth of the country is collectively owned and operated by the entire population acting through their government. Whatever surplus they accumulate belongs to all, and there can never be such a problem as overproduction, the bugbear of capitalism. The entire economy is brought under a national plan, which expresses not a *hope* which may or may not be realized, but a decision which experience has proved can be fulfilled, in the main, and often even overfulfilled. It makes maximum utilization of all the productive forces, men and machinery, and constantly raises the level of performance by the systematic application of scientific principles. It realizes, for the first time in history, the full capacity of humanity for the expansion and enrichment of life, first of all materially, and upon that basis culturally and spiritually.

There is an old superstition, often repeated in the textbooks of capitalist economics, that the establishment of socialism is

merely the confiscation of the wealth of capitalism which is then divided and dissipated among the masses, leaving them worse off than before because it "killed the goose that laid the golden eggs." But the original confiscation of the national economy from the hands of private owners was of supreme importance, not because of the amount of wealth involved (in the Soviet Union it was relatively small), but because it made the people master of their own destiny. The *new wealth*, directly produced by the new economy and which would not exist at all, except for the new economy, already amounts to ten and twenty times that of pre-war times. To illustrate this, we may compare the 1913 value of the fixed capital of large-scale industry, which was 7,200,000,000 rubles, with the 1937 value (measured with the same scale) of 50,400,000,000 rubles. This unprecedented rate of accumulation was entirely out of their own resources. As a matter of fact, the old capital has almost entirely disappeared, and the entire economy is practically new, the product of the socialist system.

No other country can hope or expect to expand its economy at any rate comparable to that of the Soviet Union, so long as it clings to the outmoded and self-defeating system that we know as capitalism.

It is, therefore, only a question of time and of a relatively short time in terms of history, a matter of decades at most, until the superior merit of the socialist system in the Soviet Union will have proved itself by producing a land so overwhelmingly rich, prosperous and culturally advanced, above all the rest of the world, that the peoples of all lands will inevitably be compelled by the simple dictates of common sense, to adopt the same principles as the Soviet Union, or resign themselves to permanent backwardness and decay. There is no escape from the logic of the facts of world experience in the last twenty years, and particularly of the past decade.

It is this certainty of the future which is the foundation of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, which is a policy of peace and international order, of cooperation with all forces in the world which want to maintain peace and international

order. The only thing which can threaten the Soviet economy in its triumphal march forward is war. Therefore the Soviet Union wants peace above all else, and is ready to cooperate with everyone who for any reasons also wants peace. The Soviet Union concedes to every people and nation the right to decide its own system and its own policies so long as they allow the same privilege to others. The Soviet people and government avoid every act or even utterance which could in any way be interpreted as any dictation, or desire to dictate, to any other people. It relies entirely upon the example of its own achievements, as its only influence upon other peoples, an influence entirely intellectual and moral, as was the influence of the new republic of the United States upon the world after 1776. Its armaments are entirely for the defense of its own increasingly prosperous and rich economy against the threatening attacks from without. It is supremely confident of its ability to defend itself against any enemy or collection of enemies.

Regardless of whether one may approve or disapprove of the inner regime of the Soviet Union, and of its economic system, one thing is clear beyond all doubt for every American who loves his country and wishes to preserve its independence and well-being. That is, that the Soviet Union, its government and its people, are natural friends of the United States and its people, and the two nations are naturally friends, with common aims and faced with common enemies, in the present strained and dangerous international situation, in which the new world war is already begun. There is no possible or conceivable course of events which could place the United States and the Soviet Union on opposite sides in the world alignment which is being hammered out by the aggressions of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance of war-making powers. The Soviet Union is unalterably on the side of international order and peace, against all aggressions everywhere in the world; the only way in which the United States could be on the opposite side would be for our country to enter the path of imperialistic aggression as a partner of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis, and this, I think it will be agreed, is so directly contrary to

the whole history, tradition and temper of the American people, as to be unthinkable.

It is, therefore, of supreme importance to all Americans, regardless of their economic and political convictions otherwise, to understand the Soviet Union, its growing weight in world affairs, the system out of which arises its growing strength, and its potentiality as an active friend of our country in a world full of dangers and pitfalls. Perhaps we will be able to learn something from the economic system of the Soviet Union which will help us to solve our American problems. But whether that is so or not, and on this question some of my audience may disagree, it cannot be denied that the Soviet Union is a great and growing power in the world, upon the basis of the Soviet economy; that it is a power most friendly to the United States, with no interests or policies which could change this friendship to its opposite, and therefore, and finally, that American citizens of all opinions who love their country should try to understand and utilize more effectively this great, growing and friendly power for the protection of American national interests, which are the interests of the one hundred and thirty million American people, which are the interests of world peace.

February 27, 1939.

VI. The Finnish Episode

AMERICANS would do well, in our own interests, if we would try to understand the Soviet Union in terms of American experience and American problems. Our country also feels the menace of a world at war, regardless of our differences about how to meet the dangers. How much more must the Soviet Union feel this menace, when only twenty years ago they drove the invaders from twelve nations off their soil, when only last summer they had to conduct major military operations to drive out invaders in the Far East, when leaders of the great Powers openly speak of uniting to make war in the West against the Soviet Union. The United States has no such

immediate menace hanging over it, and yet we have drawn a line around the Americas, a whole hemisphere, extending three hundred miles into the ocean, within which the U. S. declares it will not permit any force to venture which it considers even potentially hostile. The United States is feverishly strengthening and extending military and naval bases on foreign soil, thousands of miles from our borders, to guarantee this security. Let us imagine, for a moment, what the United States would do, if a hostile government had a position commanding Long Island Sound, with a heavily fortified line less than twenty miles from New York City, and notoriously conspiring with powerful enemies of the United States all over the world. There is not the slightest doubt that the United States would remove that menace immediately by whatever means it might find necessary, entirely independently of what kind of inner regime we might have in our country. No government could possibly tolerate such a situation in the present explosive and war-ridden condition of the world.

But this imaginary situation which we have described for the United States is a weak parallel to the real situation between the Soviet Union and the old Finnish Government, which stubbornly, on the advice of Britain and the United States, refused to guarantee the safety of Leningrad and the Gulf of Finland, the New York and Long Island Sound of the Soviet Union. This hostile Finnish Government had expended tens of millions of foreign capital to establish airports to accommodate 4,000 airplanes, although itself only possessing and operating a few hundred, and it refused to give any guarantees that these airports, some of them twenty minutes' flight from Leningrad, **would not be used against the Soviet Union** by some other power.

Yes, there is not the slightest doubt that Americans could well examine the whole problem of Soviet-Finnish relations in the light of our own experience and problems, and not of abstract sentimental slogans which only serve to mask the imperialist intrigues of Britain, France and Germany, and of our own war profiteers of Wall Street.

The enormous efforts that are being made to whip up moral

fervor in support of the militarist-banker government of Man-
nerheim and Ryti could be expended to much better effect
for American interests, material and sentimental, if they were
directed toward shutting off American supplies which for years
have been supporting the Japanese conquest of China. Japan
could never have conducted her war on China a single month,
not to speak of the six years it has been going on, except for
the American supply of more than half of her materials for
that war, which is an open and cynical war of aggression and
conquest, against the most vital interests of America as well
as China. Instead of this, however, our government is frankly
dickering with Japan for an agreement to continue this sup-
port, demanding only more concessions to American business
interests as the price for continuing the betrayal of China and
of America's future.

December 15, 1939.

VII. A Foreign Policy for Peace

A CLEAR-SIGHTED and long-range foreign policy for the
United States can only be developed upon the solid founda-
tion of friendship and close collaboration between our coun-
try, China and the Soviet Union. That is now blocked by our
shameful betrayal of China, through our supply to Japan, over
the years, of the materials for her war of conquest, and by
Washington's studied and artificial hostility toward the Soviet
Union. Only when these features of our present foreign policy
are wiped out can we begin to move toward a foreign policy
which can guarantee peace and security to America.

Such a constellation of powers, the United States, China and
the Soviet Union, moving along agreed-upon lines fully con-
sistent with the needs of the three great peoples, would be
very powerful indeed. It would be a stable combination, for
these countries have no rivalries or conflicting interests. It
would be strategically powerful, because it would immediately
hold the keys to three continents; a Washington-Moscow-
Chungking Axis, solidly welded with correct policies, would

be unmatched in world politics. It would be physically strong, combining seven hundred to eight hundred millions of population, and the preponderance of the world's productive forces. It would be morally invincible, attracting the enthusiastic adherence of the suffering peoples all over the globe.

Some glimmerings of the bright light such a policy would bring to America and to the world shine through the remarks made in the House of Representatives in Washington by Congressman Sabath of Illinois on October 1. The key to Mr. Sabath's remarks can be seized in the following brief quotations. He said:

"Yesterday's leading editorial in the *Washington Times-Herald* emphasizes a viewpoint concerning Russia that I have suggested and recommended on several occasions; the last time as recently as September 24. My query has been and still is today: Why should not the United States try to cultivate the good will of the Soviet Republics? It is realized now in many quarters that Great Britain made a serious if not well-nigh fatal mistake by not concluding and cementing friendly relations with Russia ahead of Germany. Should we repeat that error? . . .

"I know there are critics of Russia and its policies. Investigation will reveal, I sincerely believe, that a whole lot of the criticism of Russia is due to Nazi and fascist propaganda. That is one of the subtle tricks of the leaders of these two 'isms.' They conduct all kinds of subversive activities and then try to escape detection and blame by pointing their fingers at the Communists. . . .

"Regardless of what the Nazi, fascist, or capitalistic groups in the United States may say about Russia, I reiterate that the best interests of the United States will be served not by criticizing and assailing Russia but by taking just the opposite course and seeking her friendly cooperation. The latter course will inure to the benefit of America, and it is the welfare and safety of America that in these critical days should be our sole objective."

Those remarks contain a profound wisdom which Americans, regardless of their opinion about socialism, would do well to ponder.

We Communists have been urging such a course upon our Government for many years. But our words were dismissed as the special pleading of a small minority who were interested mainly in getting the United States to help the Soviet Union. Only now is the true situation becoming clear to large numbers that the Soviet Union is fully able to take care of herself without any outside help, that it is the United States that needs such a friend as can be found only in the Soviet Union.

A word of warning is, however, in place at this point. It will be worse than useless for the United States to approach the Soviet Union in the hopes of finding an ally in a war, the aims of which are to redistribute the colonies and subject peoples among the great powers. The Soviet Union will never participate in such a war. It will be equally futile and harmful for the United States to indulge in such tricky maneuvering as Chamberlain carried on in Moscow from June to August last year. And it will not be conducive to success of any attempt at rapprochement with the Soviet Union if it is conducted by a government which is stamping out democracy at home and establishing an American version of Hitlerism, for such a government would have no moral advantage over a Hitler Germany and would be under a great geographical handicap.

I am no spokesman for the Soviet Union, and can make no promises on her behalf. I am the spokesman for a growing body of American workers and farmers, who see friendship and collaboration with the Soviet Union and China as the prerequisite for a sound foreign policy for our country. We would wish to join our efforts with all those of like mind to lead our country along such a road as would make that not only possible but inevitable.

Only along such a road of foreign policy for America can our country win through, for itself and for the world, out of the present dangers and bloody chaos, into a new world of peace, order and well-being for all peoples in all lands.

October 6, 1940.

A magnificent guide and background to the epochal events which are reshaping the world today—

THE BROWDER LIBRARY

These books by Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, written between the years 1936 and the early part of 1941, constitute a penetrating analysis of the historical background of the present peoples' war against the Hitler axis, and of the forces which led to its outbreak.

What Is Communism?	\$2.00
The People's Front	2.25
Fighting for Peace	1.00
The Second Imperialist War	2.00
The Way Out	1.00

PAMPHLETS BY EARL BROWDER—

The Communist Party of the U.S.A.: Its History, Role and Organization	\$.05
Communism and Culture05
The Road to Victory05
Religion and Communism02

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.