

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND THE WAR DANGER*

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE CHIEF WORLD political characteristic at present is a growing tension within the various capitalist countries and among the great Powers on a world scale, that is, between the forces of reaction and the forces of democracy. Underlying this general situation and giving urgency to it everywhere, is the effort of the United States, controlled as it is by the big trusts and corporations, to secure world domination. Wall Street is attempting to force an American-dictated imperialist peace upon a world determined to bring to reality the democratic objectives for which the peoples fought and defeated the fascist Axis powers. The tension caused by this drive of American imperialism for world control has now become so intense as to generate fears among the masses, in this and other countries, of another world war, a war that will be fought with atomic, bacteriological, and other super-dreadful weapons. Let us see what there is to this war fear. To place the question

clearly of whether or not there is a war danger will be the central purpose of my report.

* * *

After the Battle of Stalingrad, when a perspective of ultimate victory was opened up before the democratic countries, the big capitalists of the United States, banking upon the huge industrial and military strength of this country and the war-weakness of other lands, had already determined that in the postwar period they would establish a peace that would be formulated in the interests of Wall Street and not of the democratic peoples.

Today, American foreign policy is being dictated by the Republican Party, the main party of imperialist finance capital. Just what the policy of this party is, was indicated even during the war, when I stated the following in the *Daily Worker* of July 25, 1944, in commenting on the Presidential campaign:

Make no mistake about it, a Dewey Government would follow actively imperialist policies and would be an enemy of democracy and progress throughout the world. Its path, if unchecked by democratic resistance, would lead towards economic crisis, the regrowth of fascist reaction and a World War III.

To this end, even before the war was concluded, the great trusts of this country launched a big economic, political, and diplomatic offensive designed to cripple the U.S.S.R. and other democratic forces, and to make Washington (that is,

*The text of a report delivered at the June 30-31 meeting of the National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.

Wall Street) the capital of the world. Ever since then, this American imperialist offensive has been prosecuted vigorously and relentlessly. It is being conducted under hypocritical slogans about defending world democracy and about the necessity for the United States to exercise moral world leadership. This hypocrisy is equalled only by that of the Vatican which, while speaking in the name of preserving world peace, constantly throws its support to the Truman Doctrine, to the worst reactionaries and warmongers.

Among the specific objectives set by American imperialism in this drive for world conquest may be listed the following:

1. To reduce the Soviet Union to the status of a second-class power.
2. To force Great Britain into the position of Wall Street's junior partner.
3. To develop a reactionary, American-dominated, anti-Soviet Europe.
4. To transform the defeated countries—Germany, Japan, and Italy—into satellites of the United States.
5. To establish American economic and political hegemony over the colonial countries that are loosening their bonds with the British, Dutch, and Belgian Empires.
6. To strengthen the grip of American monopoly all over Latin America.

Together with these grandiose projects of conquest, the moguls of Wall Street also planned to run the

United Nations as they saw fit; to secure a stranglehold on the markets of the world by means of this country's vast, high-powered industries; and to establish American air and naval bases all over the world. In the United States proper, as the base of all their imperialist plottings, they proposed to set up an ultra-reactionary, militarized regime, if not outright fascism.

Such is the kind of imperialist peace that the trust-controlled Truman Government and the Republican Party, with their so-called bipartisan policies, are trying to fasten upon the world, with the help of the Vatican, Right-wing Social-Democrats, and assorted fascists and capitalist reactionaries in various countries. The United States has indeed become the organizer and leader of reaction all over the world.

No other nation in history, not even Nazi Germany or militarist Japan, ever set for itself such all-inclusive imperialist goals. The whole program is fantastically impossible. Moreover, Wall Street's imperialist leaders made it all the more impossible in that they hoped to establish this American world domination, not after a long period of years, but immediately upon the close of the war. Their atom-bomb diplomacy and their general truculence in the United Nations and throughout the four corners of the earth were based on this blitz conception of taking charge of the world at once.

But this Wall Street imperialist drive against world democracy has

not succeeded. And for two major reasons: First, the forces of monopoly capital on a world scale have been greatly weakened in the war—the German, Japanese, and Italian empires have been shattered; the British, French, and Dutch empires have also been seriously undermined; while all over Europe, as well as in other parts of the world, the strength of the big monopolists, financiers, and landlords has been seriously reduced. Only in the United States and Canada has monopoly capitalism been able to strengthen itself, and here, too, it suffers from serious economic and political weaknesses.

Secondly, American imperialism has not achieved its goal because the world's democratic forces have been greatly strengthened as a result of the war. The U.S.S.R. has become a top-rank world power, the colonial peoples are almost everywhere in upsurge, Europe is alive with a new and militant democracy, and the trade unions and Communist Parties have a greatly enhanced power all over the world. These democratic forces are making real resistance to American imperialism on an international scale. The relations of the forces of democracy and reaction are radically different after this war than they were after World War I. The general result is that the United Nations has by no means been transformed into the convenient tool for the United States that Wall Street hoped it would be. In consequence, the imperialists have had to rely

more and more upon unilateral action by the United States, as in the case of Greece and Turkey. This course of action is greatly weakening the United Nations. By the same token, the American world slogans of free trade and free enterprise are meeting effective opposition in the various world conferences and world markets. In short, the postwar situation of a weakened world reaction and a strengthened world democracy is working out to stymie Wall Street's imperialist plans of global conquest.

American imperialism has unquestionably won numerous important victories since the end of the war, but it has also suffered many checks and defeats. Great Britain, although it has been forced into a position secondary to that of this country, is by no means a docile prisoner of American imperialism. British interests conflict basically with Wall Street interests in many parts of the world and this contradiction is full of dynamic dangers to the position of American big capital. In Europe, too, American imperialism has won some victories, such as the exclusion (which will turn out to be temporary) of the Communists from the governments in France and Italy. Democracy in Europe, however, is more than holding its own in its struggle against native and American reaction. Japan has been reduced virtually to a colony of Wall Street, but Germany and Italy have by no means been captured by American imperialism. In Latin America, de-

spite a new-formed "friendship" with Argentina, the United States is also confronting serious difficulties. In the colonial world especially, the future looms up as a dismal one for the imperialists, with India, Indonesia, Indo-China, Burma, Madagascar, and other large colonies moving irresistably, in spite of temporary setbacks, toward a larger independence. China, particularly, registers a big loss for the Wall Street imperialists, what with the Chiang Kai-shek government, spoon-fed by the United States, now fighting with its back to the wall against the rising tide of the Chinese people's democratic strength. And most important of all, the U.S.S.R., the spearhead of the world's democratic forces, remains quite unintimidated by Wall Street's atom-bomb diplomacy; its influence is now greater than ever before and is rapidly increasing. Then there is the strong and growing resistance of the American people to Wall Street imperialism. Nonetheless, the most significant victory American imperialism has scored since the end of the war was right here in this country when, last November, the Republican Party, the main party of American imperialism, captured both houses of Congress. This, as we now see, is raising the danger of fascism in the United States.

• • •

Despite these domestic successes, however, the world situation looms up as very unsatisfactory and alarm-

ing to Wall Street. It shows that American imperialism, with all its war threats, is not able to force its imperialist peace upon the world. International politics presents a picture of world democracy marching forward in spite of all that American imperialism and its reactionary allies can do to prevent it. Hence, American Big Business chiefs are becoming afflicted with nightmares of an advancing radical democracy and Socialism that they believe will write finis to capitalism and its "free enterprise." They are convinced that American imperialism must at all costs become dominant or the world capitalist system is lost. Never in the history of the United States was the American capitalist class so frightened, confused, and pessimistic as it is at the present time. In consequence, it is attempting to apply ever more drastic measures to achieve its own imperialist domination of the world. This added imperialist drive is sharply expressed through the so-called Truman Doctrine of military intervention in various countries to defeat the forces of democracy.

Previously, the armory of weapons of American imperialism consisted principally of atom-bomb threats and warmongering, of the political use of food reserves among famished peoples, and of the political coercion of war-ravaged countries by the granting or withholding of financial loans. These are very powerful weapons, but obviously they are not powerful enough. So to

them has been added the policy of open military intervention by the United States on the side of reaction in various crucial situations in other countries. This Truman Doctrine is being carried out openly in Greece and Turkey for the express purpose of combatting the new European democracy and Socialism, conveniently dubbed Communism. President Truman's new doctrine is the 1947 edition of Hitler's anti-Comintern pact.

The Truman Doctrine, pushed to its logical conclusion, would go as far as initiating civil wars in given countries in order to keep reactionary minorities in governmental power or to give them such power. Actually, in several countries the United States is already practically waging war against democratic forces. This encouragement of civil war is not exactly a new policy, however, for American imperialists. Latin-American history has many examples of governments instituted by *coup d'état* organized by American adventurers. In China, too, the result of our policy is the present civil war. And in Poland the attempts of British and American imperialists, continued over several years, to force reactionary governments upon the unwilling Polish people, were climaxed in armed attempts to overthrow the present democratic government. Now what is proposed is the widespread use of this civil war technique in Europe. The consequence is that all the reactionary and fascist adventurers in

Europe, from de Gaulle in France to Petkov in Bulgaria and Nagy of Hungary, will proceed on the assumption that they can count on President Truman's backing, even to the point of civil war.

The Truman Doctrine, however, has had very serious negative consequences for American imperialism. The bald support of the reactionary Greek and Turkish regimes, and the threat to follow a similar line in other countries, greatly shocked and alienated democratic forces all over the world. Here in the United States large masses see that the Truman Doctrine conflicts directly with our national interests. For the policy stripped away the pretences of democracy in Wall Street's foreign program and exposed its reactionary heart. Even many American reactionaries doubted the wisdom of the Truman Doctrine, explaining, with truth, that it was antagonizing liberal and democratic forces in every country.

Now we have the so-called Marshall plan. The purpose of this plan is to attempt further to implement the Truman Doctrine and, if possible, to make it more palatable to the democratic masses by initiating a super-loan plan for all Europe. According to this plan, billions of dollars would be placed by the United States Government at the disposal of various European governments. This plan, it is clear, if Wall Street has its way, would turn out to be only another way for reaction more effectively to fight democracy. The

very fact that such a grandiose financial plan should be projected and supported by powerful political leaders, indicates a deep conviction in capitalist ranks that present American imperialist policies in Europe are not succeeding and that they must be greatly strengthened. Behind it is also a great fear for the stability of capitalism in Europe.

The Marshall plan is a scheme to place all of Europe in economic and political bondage to the United States. This has already been made clear by statements of its supporters. Behind this plan also lurks the reactionary Churchill proposal to establish an anti-Soviet bloc of West-European powers, the so-called United States of Europe. It is an attempt to split the world into two armed, hostile camps. Of course, our Party supports financial loans, as large as possible, to the impoverished democratic countries of Europe. Perhaps our Party needs to formulate a general program of American aid for Europe. A major part of such a program must be to fight against the dictation by Wall Street imperialists of reactionary political conditions for loans, and to insist that these loans be formulated in the common interests of the people of Europe and the United States. We must clearly understand that the Marshall plan is not a substitute for the reactionary Truman Doctrine, but an extension and reinforcement of it. What comes out of the Marshall plan will depend upon the resistance of the European peoples

to the political conditions laid down by Wall Street for financial help.

American imperialist foreign policies of war threats and sabre-rattling serve several major purposes. First, they are a weapon for blackjacking economic and political concessions out of weaker nations and for reducing them to the status of puppet states of the United States. Secondly, they are a means of stiffening the reactionary forces in Europe, of giving them hope for their expected war between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Thirdly, such warmongering, by setting up an ideological terrorism in this country, is a convenient smokescreen behind which to put across the Big Business program of political reaction and fascist forms in the United States. Fourthly, the deliberately cultivated war-scare offers a plausible excuse for maintaining and extending the present unprecedented 16 billion-dollar yearly peace-time military establishment in the United States.

Behind these immediate purposes of American warmongering there lies a real war danger. Obviously, the Truman Doctrine, by promoting civil war in support of reactionary minorities, is thereby a menace to world peace. A civil war in France or Italy, for example—and there is actual danger of this because of American imperialist intervention and plotting—might possibly cause a far-spreading international war tragedy. There is also real danger when the most powerful capitalist country in the world is feverishly

arming, as the United States is now doing, and when it is carrying on a veritable diplomatic, economic, and propaganda offensive against the U.S.S.R., accompanied by military threats which are becoming less and less veiled. In view of all this, it would be folly for us to ignore the existence of a potential war danger. This would be an ostrich policy that could lead to disaster. The only tenable conclusions we can draw from the whole situation is that the Truman foreign policy, if unchecked, will lead to war; and that, therefore, we must combat it as essentially a war policy.

* * *

In determining the degree of war danger that exists we should not reduce the war danger to a theoretical abstraction, nor should we paint a picture that would make it appear war was just around the corner. We must particularly oppose all ideas that a war is inevitable. We must make a sober Marxian analysis of the situation, dialectically weighing the factors that are making for and against war. A major element in this analysis, and one we have rather neglected so far, is to analyze the groupings in the American capitalist class regarding foreign policy, and the social forces at work upon these groups. This is fundamentally necessary; for, since the capitalists constitute the ruling class, their moods and policies are of decisive importance in the great questions of war and peace.

At this point let me remark that

a basic element in Browder's revisionism was his grossly false estimate of the capitalist groupings in this country. He saw the extreme Right elements and he also saw the Roosevelt group, but he did not see the main body of capitalists lying between these two extremes. He made the ridiculous error of trying to classify the decisive sections of finance capital as part of the Roosevelt group. This absurdity completely wrecked all his calculations. We must make no such error, neither to the Right nor to the Left, in analyzing the trends among the capitalists.

On the question of foreign policy there are roughly three groupings among the capitalists. The first, a lesser section of the capitalists, constitutes the definite war party. Among them are Democrats as well as Republicans. This pro-war group is made up of the most consciously fascist elements in our country. The essence of their position is that they believe an American imperialist peace can be fastened on the world only after the U.S.S.R. is crushed militarily. Typical voices among these war jingoes are the Hearsts, Pattersons, McCormicks, Bullitts, Earles, MacArthurs, and the like. They consider a war with the U.S.S.R. as inevitable, and the sooner it comes the better. They fill our press and radio with flamboyant war-mongering. They are more or less open advocates of a "preventive" war against the U.S.S.R. They want to use the atom-bomb against that country while, as they assume, the

United States still has a monopoly of it. They are ultra-militarists and insolent advocates of the get-tough-with-Russia policy. They are now demanding a showdown on Russian policy. Numerous labor leaders, such as Matthew Woll and David Dubinsky, must be classed in this definite war group, as well as many Right-wing Social-Democrats and renegade Communists. Numbers of prominent Catholic clericals are also in this strong pro-war group.

The second, the most powerful, group of the capitalist class has largely contradictory conceptions of what American foreign policy should be, especially with regard to the question of war. In the main, with some reservations, they believe that a war with the U.S.S.R. is perhaps inevitable, they support the get-tough-with-Russia general line, and they back the Truman Doctrine of direct intervention against the democratic forces in various countries. They are likewise champions of the present so-called bipartisan foreign policy of manipulating food reserves, and of making reactionary, politically conditioned financial loans to war-ravaged countries. They support the huge anti-Soviet propaganda and military program of the Administration, including the three great anti-Soviet air salients the government is building over the North Pole, through the Japanese Islands, and via the Mediterranean and the Middle East, as well as the establishment of war bases all over the world.

This largest and most decisive sec-

tion of the capitalist class, although it mainly has an eventual war perspective, equivocates on the actual question of war. Having an inkling of the fact that the forces on a world scale are definitely against the initiation of another war, these capitalists are plagued with many doubts and fears. Many of them waver as to the wisdom of the Truman Doctrine, and many others will hesitate on furnishing the huge funds needed by the Marshall plan, and will lay down reactionary political conditions for such aid. They also doubt efficacy of the atom-bomb as a decisive military weapon. They fear that Great Britain will not go along in an anti-Soviet war. They view with alarm the war-weariness of the European peoples and especially the strong anti-war spirit of the American people. They dread the strength of the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies. They are skeptical that they could win an anti-Soviet war, and they fear that such a war might bring about the end of capitalism and the world victory of Socialism. Hence they waver on policies actually making for war. These contradictions and waverings in this broad group of capitalists are intensified by the partisan rivalries between the two big parties.

Sometimes this broadest of the capitalist groups, leaning toward the open advocates of war, sharpens up dangerously its anti-Soviet, anti-democratic policies, as seen, for example, in Hoover's proposal for a separate United States treaty with

Germany. But, on the other hand, they still have lingering hopes that, short of war, they can impose, by negotiations, their imperialist peace on the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. Their governmental leaders even occasionally come to agreement with the U.S.S.R. on some major points, although with much travail and anguish of spirit. This even makes possible a certain amount of agreement at the coming November conference of foreign ministers.

Chief spokesmen of this decisive capitalist group are the Hoovers, Vandenberg, Trumans, Marshalls, Dulleses, Deweys, Connallys, etc. It is the most decisive capitalist group, the one that is at present shaping American foreign relations. Most of the labor top leadership now tails along after this capitalist group in international policy.

The third capitalist group, decidedly a lesser faction, has, as its outstanding spokesmen, Henry A. Wallace and Senator Pepper. This is the residue of the old Roosevelt section of the capitalists. It represents mostly small capitalists. Among it there are very few, if any, big finance capitalists. This group follows a line of international peace; it is for friendly collaboration with the U.S.S.R. and for Big Three unity. This group's support among the capitalist press is minimum, but it has a very large following among the lower category of trade union officials and among the broad masses of the people.

As for the democratic masses of the American people — workers, farmers, Negro people, intellectuals, small businessmen, etc.—they are heavily anti-war, and this is the most decisive factor of all in our calculation. A recent Gallup poll showed that 62% of the people believed that American cooperation with the Soviet Union is possible. And in a poll by the Town Meeting of the Air, specifically on the question of giving financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey, 75% of the replies stated that the so-called Truman Doctrine is a policy that leads to war. The American people are stubbornly non-militaristic. They fought to have the troops returned from overseas and demobilized immediately the war ended. They are very generally against universal military training, military control of atomic energy, huge military budgets, and various other militaristic projects dear to the hearts of the warmongers and imperialists.

While recognizing this basic anti-militarism of the mass of the American people, our Party, however, would be dangerously deceived if it did not at the same time note certain dangerous moods among some sections of the masses. It is a fact that, due to the incessant Red-baiting in the press and on the radio, large numbers of democratic elements, including many workers, have been deeply poisoned against the U.S.S.R. and against the new European democracies. A dangerous

example of this was seen at the Red-baiting, Soviet-baiting convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. Many generally progressive labor leaders have been also affected by the current anti-Communist hysteria. Such prejudices not only cripple the workers in their general struggle against the domestic program of Wall Street reaction; they especially confuse them regarding foreign policy. There is the gravest danger that, in the event of a real international crisis, these contaminated elements would be an easy prey to the fascist-minded warmongers. All of this leads to the conclusion that there is the keenest need to awaken the workers and their progressive allies to the serious danger represented by Red-baiting, imperialist jingoism and anti-Soviet warmongering to the establishment of a democratic world peace.

The three capitalist groupings that I have briefly analyzed earlier are not, of course, static. Their size and influence vary under different pressures and conditions. The war danger could be sharpened materially by forces that would increase the strength and prestige of the first, or most definitely warlike group. And, vice versa, the war danger would be lessened by a weakening of these extreme right forces.

An increase of the war danger might occur under at least three conditions:

1. The group of warmongers could become really dangerous in the event of a serious weakening of

the democratic forces in this country through the loss of major strikes, through the enactment of reactionary legislation in Congress, such as the Taft-Hartley slave labor law, or especially through a big Republican victory in the Presidential elections of 1948.

2. The warmongers could also become a menace with the onset of a severe economic crisis, one in which many capitalists would turn toward a government program of munition-making in order to keep their factories going.

3. It might also become menacing should moods of desperation be generated among the imperialists by a sharp sense of the failure of their international policies, that is, by the creation of a situation where they might try to solve, by military means, the control problems which they are unable to solve by diplomacy, money, and food.

Any one of these three conditions, or all of them together, might render the war danger acute by putting more power into the hands of the worst and most jingoistic capitalist imperialists and warmongers in this powerful country.

On the other hand, a victory by the democratic forces in this country, especially in the 1948 elections, would cut the ground from beneath the rabid warmongers and render them powerless. There are many signs that such a victory is now in the making.

• • •

The foregoing analysis provides

sufficient reason why we should be on the alert to fight the war danger. This country is the center of that danger, and we American Communists have special responsibilities in combating it. We must ruthlessly expose and fight against every move of the warmongers, whether in the shape of jingoistic propaganda or of actual military preparations. With the passage of the Taft-Hartley Law there is now a fascist danger in the United States, which means that there is also a war danger. We must carefully analyze the origins, character, and urgency of this incipient fascist danger. In the developing national 1948 elections, too, we must raise both anti-fascist and anti-war slogans. The American people are correct in their war fears, in the eagerness with which so many thousands are now rallying around the peace program of Henry Wallace. They sense the danger of another world war and they want to take precautions against it. We must support and help them in carrying out this determination.

In our struggle for a democratic peace, against the warmongering imperialists, there are several major factors that we should always bear in mind.

The first and most basic of these is to show the workers and other progressive forces that the foreign policies of the Government are highly detrimental to the national interests. A most dangerous menace is the attempt of the reactionaries to make it appear that their so-called

bi-partisan foreign policy is a national policy, initiated in the interests of all the people. This is akin to the nonsensical but widely believed idea that class politics stops at the ocean's edge. At all costs, we must make it clear to the masses that the foreign policy of our Government is the foreign policy of Big Business, and as such it is injurious to the masses. We must make them understand that the big capitalists, in order to rob all the people that they can get into their clutches, both here and abroad, formulate both foreign and domestic policies, which are but two phases of the one policy. Thus, the fight against imperialism must be linked up with all the immediate interests and daily struggles of the workers, with the fight against fascist trends in the United States.

Secondly, we must aim to make the masses understand that American foreign policy is reactionary, imperialist, and aggressively expansionist in character. In Great Britain, which every Britisher understands is the heart of a great empire, it is a relatively easy matter to give the people at least an indication of the imperialist content of the government's policy—even the Labor government. But as our country has only a few minor colonies, it is much more difficult to make the masses understand that the United States is nonetheless an empire and that the government is carrying on an imperialist policy. This requires endless A-B-C educational work on our part to uncover the imperialist nature of Wall Street's

ruthless drive to establish its dominating control in the many parts of the world. We must teach the masses that such a war as the warmongers are now propagating would be reactionary; it would be directed against democracy and would be aimed to establish world fascism.

Thirdly, we must convince the masses that the war the jingoes are agitating and preparing for would be a needless war. We must show them tirelessly that there is no conflict between the interests of the American and Soviet peoples, and demonstrate that, on the contrary, with correct policies, mutually highly profitable trade and cultural relations can be established between these two great nations. We must pin the responsibility for the present international tension squarely where it belongs—on the Wall Street imperialists, who want to conquer the world for their profits' sake even if they have to provoke a most frightful world war to do so. Day in and day out, we must champion the Roosevelt policy of collaboration among the Big Three powers. This we must do concretely on the basis of the long and friendly relations that have prevailed between the American and Russian peoples.

Fourthly, we must show the masses, too, that the war the Hearsts and their likes are preparing for would be not only a needless war, but a lost one as well. In the two world wars the American people escaped lightly because other peo-

ples did most of the fighting and suffering and dying. In our country the workers actually enjoyed steadier employment and higher living standards than ever before. Consequently, they have never really felt in their hearts the iron terror of real war. The warmongers try to play upon the easy wartime experiences of Americans by making it appear that the anti-Soviet war would be a sort of picnic. We must completely deflate this deceptive notion. We must show the masses that a war directed against the world democratic forces would be a two-sided atomic war, overwhelming in its horrors and destruction: that the United States would have to fight the war virtually alone, and that the war could not possibly be won by us. We must make it clear that a third world war would result in the utter devastation of our country, as well as of other parts of the world.

Fifthly, we must systematically demonstrate to the masses the immediately harmful effects of the hysterical warmongering that is now going on in this country. That is, we must make clear to them that when the reactionaries shout from the housetops about an imminent danger of war, and when this warmongering goes unchallenged, then they can more readily frighten the people into adopting their dangerous program of militarism, they can easily force through anti-labor union legislation and, generally, they can make headway toward their goal of

ultra-reaction or fascism. We must clearly show the masses that the fight for a people's peace presupposes an energetic fight against the Red-baiters, imperialists, and warmongers. One of the major reasons why the reactionaries were able to drive the Taft-Hartley anti-labor bill through Congress was precisely because of the wild orgy of Red-baiting and warmongering now going on in the United States.

Sixthly, we must resolutely combat every suggestion that an American-Soviet war is inevitable. Here we can learn much from Communists in other countries. In many lands the reactionaries are banking everything on their hopes for an early U.S.-Soviet war, as such a war would give them a new lease on life. But the Communist Parties in these countries are firm in their position that no such war can or will be allowed by the peoples to take place. Although as Marxists they know that imperialism breeds wars, they do not give aid and comfort to their enemies by accepting a war perspective for the measurable future. Most resolute of all in this respect are the Soviet people. Imagine what a profound shock it would give the world, and how joyful the warmongers would be, if Stalin were to state that in his opinion the present international tension was leading to war. In the recent official Soviet statement on the abolition of capital punishment, it was asserted that it may now be considered that peace has been secured for a long period of time.

Such a categorical declaration of the certainty of peace has behind it a firm conviction that the democratic forces of the world are now strong enough to prevent another world war from occurring. But if this optimistic prediction of the long period of peace is to come true, the militarist warmongers in the United States will have to be decisively beaten by the American people.

• • •

Peace does not develop automatically; it must be fought for. So long as capitalism lasts, the struggle against war and for peace must go on. In the United States we Communists have an especially urgent task in this respect at the present time in combating the warmongers, for American big capital is on a world rampage for power and is recklessly seeking to force its type of imperialist peace on the world. We must frankly recognize the war danger involved in such interventionist policies as the Truman Doctrine and we must warn the people to be on guard against them. As I remarked earlier, we must be careful not to overestimate the war danger, but we should also not reduce this danger to merely a theoretical abstraction. It is for us to consider the situation dialectically as Marxists, to weigh the war danger for what it is, and to fight the warmongers clear-headedly and without letup. In this crucial struggle, the Communist Party must stand in the front line.