

The Workers' Advocate



WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

THEORETICAL ISSUE

\$1.00

VOICE OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY OF THE USA

May 1, 1984

Volume 14, Number 6

In Defense of Marxism-Leninism

On Problems in the Orientation of the International Communist Movement in the Period from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin

IN THIS ISSUE

Resolutions of the 2nd Congress of the MLP, USA on the Post-World War II Period
and on the Classics of Marxism-Leninism

Soviet Leaders on the World Situation (1945-1954)

Notes on Zhdanov's 'Two Camps' Speech at the Founding of the Cominform

On the Pacifist Policy of the World Peace Congress (1949-1954)

On the Reformist Orientation of the French CP (1944-1956)

'The British Road to Socialism' (1951) — The Petty Bourgeois Nationalist Program
of the British CP

The CPUSA's Liberal-Labor Critique of Browder

Introduction to the April 2009 PDF edition

IN THIS ISSUE

Introduction to the April 2009 PDF edition	1
Introduction: In Defense of the Classic Teachings of Marxism-Leninism	3
From the Resolutions of the Second Congress of the MLP,USA	8
On Problems in the Orientation of the International Communist Movement in the Period From the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin	8
On the Marxist-Leninist Classics	12
Pre-Congress Discussion Material on the Post-World War II Period — The Internal Bulletin of the MLP,USA, March 17, 1983	15
Soviet Leaders on the World Situation (1945-1954)	27
Reference Material:	
Joseph Stalin — Post-War Interviews	38
From Malenkov's Report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU (1952)	49
Notes on Zhdanov's 'Two Camps' Speech to the Cominform	58
Reference Material:	
From Zhdanov's Speech to the Cominform (1947)	60
Declaration on the Founding of the Cominform (1947)	66
From the Resolutions of the 1949 Cominform Meeting	68
On the Pacifist Policy of the World Peace Congress (1949-1954)	74
Reference Material:	
From the Resolution of the 6th Congress of the Communist International on the Struggle Against Imperialist War (1928)	84
'Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibilities of Averting It,' by I.A. Seleznev	86
On the Orientation of the French CP (1944-1956)	95
Reference Material:	
Three Documents From the French CP (1947, 1950, 1951)	104
On 'The British Road to Socialism' — The Petty-Bourgeois Nationalist Program of the British CP	111
Reference Material:	
From the 'British Road to Socialism' (1951)	113
'People's Democracy as a Form of Political Organization of Society,' by A. Sobolev	115
The CPUSA's Liberal-Labor Critique of Browder	118
Reference Material:	
From the Duclos article 'On the Dissolution of the CPUSA'	121
Resolution of the Second Congress of the MLP,USA 'Against Trotskyism'	124

Introduction to the April 2009 PDF edition

The May 1, 1984 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*, which is now being made available on the Internet in a PDF edition, was a large pamphlet of 126 pages, which dealt with the line of the Soviet-led section of the international communist movement in the immediate post-world war II period. It covered the period of Stalin's leadership, up to his death in 1953, and analyzed the views of Soviet leaders, the Cominform, various European parties, and the CPUSA. It showed the revisionist nature of these views. The corrupt orientation of abandoning revolutionary work in the capitalist countries, and the other rotten practices which were at one time thought to originate in Khrushchovite revisionism, were already being championed by the Stalinist leadership of this time. The pamphlet illustrated how superficial was the supposed repudiation at that time of Browderism and other liquidationist views, views which had led not only to the temporary dissolution of the CPUSA in 1944, but to the elimination of the revolutionary content of the agitation of many parties that called themselves communist.

The pamphlet regarded these practices as major weaknesses and seriously mistaken practices in a world movement that was still genuinely communist. At the time this document was prepared, although the Marxist-Leninist Party was polemicizing against the mistaken orientations of the Stalinists, it still thought that socialism was being built in the USSR during the post-war period and right up until the Khrushchovite regime that came about soon after Stalin's death. It still thought that it was under Khrushchov that socialism was first replaced with state-capitalism. Further theoretical work and study of Soviet history by the MLP and, later, the Communist Voice Organization led to the conclusions that the historic Bolshevik revolution of 1917 had begun fading away sometime in the 1920s, and that not a socialist system, but a state-capitalist one, was built up in the USSR in the 1930s. Thus in the post-World War II period the Soviet Union was not a socialist country, but a capitalist one, albeit with a new form of capitalism. This was the economic base for Stalinism being a new form of revisionism; and it's why the Soviet regime became oppressive.

So, if this document were rewritten today, it would not just criticize various of their policies, but draw a class line against the Soviet leadership of that time, and condemn the state-capitalist tyranny practiced by revisionism. Indeed, since the May, 1984 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*, we have learned more about various of the betrayals and brutalities of the state-capitalist leadership, such as the mass deportation of the entire Chechen people and of several other small nationalities and the methods of subjugating other parties and countries. A rewriting of this document would sharply bring out the contradictions resulting from a communist movement, comprising the main forces of the class-conscious proletariat in various countries, that looked to a hostile class force, the Stalinist leadership of the state-capitalist bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union, as its standard-bearer. And it would also be enriched with a deeper discussion of communist tactics, making use of the further experience and theoretical study

since that time by the MLP, and then the Communist Voice Organization.

Nevertheless, the pamphlet gave a good picture of the general framework for political work in capitalist countries being set forward in the world communist movement at that time. It didn't just describe the MLP's *opinion* of what was going on in the post-World War II period, but provided *extensive documentation* from the writings of the CPSU and other parties. It was part of a series of documents in the 1980s with which the MLP brought into the open the issues worrying the anti-revisionist movement of which it was a part. The MLP took a steadfast stand against reformist treachery, no matter from what quarter, to the cause of building a militant and independent working class movement. Even though mistaken on the nature of the Soviet Union in the post-World War II period and about the system that was eventually built up in Albania, the MLP held back nothing in providing an historical account of the views and practices of the world revolutionary movement, as far as it was aware of them. In doing so, the MLP -- in company with a handful of other courageous anti-revisionist groups and individuals around the world -- refused to be intimidated by various of its one-time friends in certain other parties, and preferred to suffer protracted isolation than to hide the truth from the activists involved in collective struggle against capitalist exploitation and tyranny. These matters were discussed by all members and supporters of the MLP, and it was decided at MLP congresses and national conferences to bring the discussion, as far as we could, to all the working-class activists and communists of the world. The MLP's knowledge may have been partial, and its analysis of world communist history a work in progress, but its commitment was total to developing the anti-revisionist struggle as a conscious activity, not of a handful of knowledgeable people, but of the mass of communist activists and workers.

The issues raised by these documents have remained issues in the left-wing movement till this day. They concern such matters as the struggle against the threat of imperialist war, the attitude that the activists in imperialist countries should take to the national liberation movement, the assessment of social-democracy and reformist forces, the stand towards the class-collaborationist labor bureaucracy, whether to adapt one's agitation to petty-bourgeois nationalist prejudices, whether to see the class nature of the entire bourgeoisie or pretend that only a small ultra-right section was responsible for the war-drive and other bourgeois crimes, and whether communist parties should join bourgeois governments. If one wants to take part in building a revolutionary working-class movement, it isn't sufficient to simply know that the communist movement was subordinated to state-capitalist Stalinist regimes, and that this helped corrupt it. One still has to know what the correct orientation for communist activity is. If all one knows about what is wrong with the views given in the post-World War II period is that the movement was subordinated to the Soviet leadership, then one knows very little about how to build the

working-class movement. One can't simply answer the question of what to do by saying "just be sure, whatever you decide, not to be subordinated to the views and motives of this or that Stalinist regime or official". Trotskyism acts in this way and devotes so much effort to generalities about "socialism in one country" because it doesn't really have a good idea of what's wrong with Stalinism: underneath its misleading rhetorical slogans, its views have much in common with Stalinism. (See "An Outline of Trotskyism's Anti-Marxist Theories", at www.comunistvoice.org/00TrotskyOutline.html, for an updated and anti-Stalinist critique of the basic ideas of Trotskyism.)

As well, the study of the erroneous post-World War II orientation underlines the need to carry forward the anti-revisionist struggle to the end. The Stalinist-dominated movement sometimes claimed to be fighting revisionism; the Cominform often put on a "left" pose in its denunciations of imperialism; and a show was made of upholding Leninist theory. But this was pretense. It isn't sufficient to be satisfied with the milquetoast anti-revisionism of the CPUSA's reconstitution in 1945, that reversed its dissolution in 1944 by Browder, or with the Maoist assessment of the world communist movement. A careful study of world communist history shows the need to uphold the real standpoint of Marx, Engels, and Lenin against the contortions of Stalinist revision-

ism. And it is also necessary for activists today to further develop communist theory by taking account of the experience of a century of mass struggle and revolutionary organizing since Lenin's death, analyzing new developments in the economic and political situation of the world, and dealing with the new questions of our day.

This pamphlet's coverage of the communist movement of that time was, however, geographically limited. It dealt mainly with the Soviet, French, British, and American parties; the Cominform; and the World Peace Congress. Aside from some remarks about the Maoists, it did not deal with the Asian, Latin American, Australian, and African parties. This is not because the MLP regarded these other parties and movements as unimportant; on the contrary, the pamphlet discussed and sharply condemned the general lack of interest of Stalin and various parties in the national liberation movements and other revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples outside Europe. Instead this limited coverage was for the sake of bringing into sharp focus the views and practices most closely associated with Stalin and the Cominform.

Joseph Green, editor, *Communist Voice*
April 6, 2009 □

Communist Voice — a journal of revolutionary theory

The *Communist Voice* is the successor to *The Workers' Advocate*, which was the journal of a series of activist organizations, the last one being the Marxist-Leninist Party of the US. The MLP, which was founded on Jan. 1, 1980 and dissolved in November 1993, stemmed from the anti-revisionist movement of activists who wanted to push forward the mass struggles and root them in the working class, saw Marxism as an essential guide for the revolutionary struggle, and rejected the sell-out reformism of the official pro-Soviet communist parties. The MLP was opposed to both Soviet revisionism and Trotskyism. Its roots go back to the mass movements of the 1960s, such as the anti-racist, anti-war, student, women's, and workers' movements, and *The Workers' Advocate* itself was published from 1969 to 1993.

The *Communist Voice* is published by the Communist Voice Organization, and it continues, in a different form, with fewer resources, and with more emphasis on theoretical work, the struggle of *The Workers' Advocate* to contribute to the development of a mass communist party. It opposes both market capital-

ism, and the state-capitalist regimes (such as Cuba or China today or Russia and most of Eastern Europe yesterday), which falsely call themselves socialist or communist. It deals with the world crisis of revolutionary theory, analyzes what happened to the revolutionary movements of the past, and opposes Stalinism, Trotskyism, anarchism, and reformism.

The CVO calls on activists who want to fight capitalism in all its guises, and see the importance of Marxist-Leninist theory, to join with us in supporting the path of class struggle and opposing the bankrupt revisionist theories and practices of the past. It is time to lay the basis for the revolutionary communism of the future by revitalizing the communist theory and practice of today! Only when Marxist communism spreads among the millions and millions of the oppressed can the struggle against capitalism again become a force that shakes the world!

For more about anti-revisionist communism, visit the CVO website at www.comunistvoice.org.

E-mail us at mail@communistvoice.org

or write us at CV
P.O. Box 28536
Joyfield Station
Detroit, MI 48228-0536

In Defense of the Classic Teachings of Marxism-Leninism

In this issue of *The Workers' Advocate*, we complete the publication of the political resolutions from the Second Congress of the Marxist-Leninist Party of the USA. The resolutions published here are devoted to the history of the international communist movement, and they are accompanied by extensive reference material. The historical questions we raise are related to the burning questions concerning the revolutionary work of the present; they directly reflect on the controversies currently agitating Marxist-Leninists all around the world.

We Must Work Hard to Strengthen the International Marxist-Leninist Movement

The first years of the 1980's have their own specific character and have posed new tasks for the international Marxist-Leninist movement. The Marxist-Leninists face not only the class enemy, but also controversies on direction and orientation. The world capitalist-revisionist offensive of recent years, the depressing effects on world politics of China's alliance with Western imperialism, and all the difficulties facing the class struggle at present have encouraged the growth of rightist and liquidationist moods in the revolutionary movement in many countries. The Marxist-Leninist parties do not live in a vacuum, but are drawn from, and work in, the heart of the working class and revolutionary movements of their countries. The rightist moods have put pressure on the parties, and petty-bourgeois nationalist and liquidationist views have had some influence inside the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

The Second Congress of our Party called for resolute work to uphold the international Marxist-Leninist movement. It rededicated our Party to the tasks of striving hard to develop closer contacts among the Marxist-Leninist parties and of stepping up proletarian internationalist cooperation. But it also pointed out the necessity, for ensuring the health and solidarity of the international movement, of hard work to resolve the controversies and questions of orientation. This is especially important to enable the Marxist-

Leninists to make better use of the revolutionary factors that exist today and that counteract the difficulties and obstacles. A great revolt is being prepared in the midst of the working masses, and it is up to the Marxist-Leninists to know how to link up with it and to organize it. Thus the Second Congress of our Party held that upholding the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism and applying them to the burning questions of our time was one of the main tasks for strengthening world Marxism-Leninism.

From the theoretical side, the fact that petty-bourgeois nationalist and liquidationist views have been able to penetrate, to a certain extent, into the international Marxist-Leninist movement, is, in part, the result of the influence of certain traditions from the international communist movement of the post-World War II period. The years from the end of World War II in 1945 to the death of Stalin in 1953 were marked by the spread of certain mistaken views and orientations among the communist parties. And, in the early 1980's, a tendency has grown of looking to these traditions for ready-made answers to the problems of revolutionary work, rather than carrying through to the end the struggle against Maoism and "three worldism" and painstakingly bringing to life the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism by applying them to the present tasks of revolutionary work. Thus not only do the post-World War II views still affect the parties via tradition, but there has also been an increase in the direct copying of the stands of that period.

The Second Congress of our Party carefully examined the history of the post-World War II period in the international communist movement. The resolution from the Second Congress declared that the general orientation in the international communist movement on various key issues was seriously flawed. It declared that it is a serious mistake to follow these orientations for the revolutionary work of today.

The wide extent of the communist movement in the post-World War II period and the victories of socialism and revolutionary wars give this period its attractiveness for progressive people. This was a period of intense struggle between world communism and world imperialism. The

division of the world into two great opposing social forces stood out, not just as the hidden mainspring of world events which it always is, but as an obvious political reality. On one side stood the communist parties, the socialist countries, the various movements of the working masses and the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. On the other side stood the old, decaying world of capital, of imperialism, the bourgeoisie and reaction, led by U.S. imperialism. Our Party stands resolutely in defense of the communist and revolutionary movements of that time and of the then-socialist countries.

But the post-World War II period was also a time when many wrong views on fundamental questions of the revolution were widespread in the international communist movement; these wrong views amounted, in essence, to the casting aside of the Marxist-Leninist principles on various questions. These mistaken views helped cause profound setbacks, corrode various communist parties from within, and weaken the international communist movement. These mistaken views and practices helped create the conditions for the great tragedy that struck a few years later with the rise to power of the Khrushchovite revisionists in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Soviet revisionism restored capitalism in the Soviet Union and became one of the diehard enemies of true communism and the working people of all countries.

The Relation of the Post-World War II Period to the Present Weaknesses in the Stands of the Party of Labor of Albania

The danger posed by the post-World War II traditions to the international Marxist-Leninist movement is illustrated by the effect these traditions have had on the recent stands of one of the glorious parties of world communism, the Party of Labor of Albania. First let us recall that the PLA is a party with experience of both armed struggle and the construction of socialist society. Albania is today the only genuinely socialist country in the world. The PLA has for decades on end built up a record of heroic accomplishments in the fight against the class enemy. It led the Albanian people to rise up against the fascist occupiers in World War II, to resist the blandishments of the U.S. and British imperialists, to overthrow the local exploiters and pass on to a socialist revolution, to stand firm against first the Yugoslav revisionists, then the Soviet revisionists and finally against the Chinese revisionists. Today it continues to fight against capitalist-revisionist encirclement. And it has made many contributions to the international Marxist-Leninist movement, such as having boldly opened up first the period of the worldwide condemnation of the "three worlds" theory and then the period of the worldwide condemnation of Maoism.

Nevertheless, in the early 1980's weaknesses are becoming apparent in the stands of the PLA on the orientation for the international Marxist-Leninist movement. We have dis-

cussed these weaknesses in the issue of *The Workers' Advocate* of March 20, 1984 which has as its lead article "Our Differences With the Party of Labor of Albania." We hold that proletarian internationalist solidarity requires not just studying and assimilating what is correct in the stands of the PLA, but also taking a sober and critical attitude to what is weak or mistaken. We spoke out on the weaknesses in the current stands of the PLA because this is essential for dealing with the present controversies facing the international Marxist-Leninist movement, but also with the firm conviction that this is required as well by our communist responsibility to support the PLA.

In our article "Our Differences With the PLA," we pointed out that some of the weaknesses in their present stands resembled the errors of "three worldism," but in fact had a different source. We said that we would later discuss what some of the roots of these weaknesses are.

One of the main sources of the weaknesses in the present stands of the PLA is precisely its taking of the post-World War II period as a model for many of its views. Instead of carrying through to the end the struggle against "three worldism" and Maoism, it has fallen back, in part, on the traditions from the post-World War II period. Comrade Enver Hoxha has written, starting in 1979, a series of books that, in part, have taken up the defense of some of the orientations of this period. The PLA and Comrade Enver have retreated from various of their advanced stands of the past and fallen back on this period.

Take, for example, the way that the PLA is now speculating on appeals to the petty-bourgeois or bourgeois nationalism of various European capitalist countries. We analyzed this in our issue of March 20 and showed how the PLA has thus tended to separate the struggle against the superpowers from the socialist revolution in Europe and the class struggle.

This stand was typical of the post-World War II period. The Cominform (the leading international communist body of that time) and the major Western European parties took up the stance of detaching the struggle against U.S. imperialism from the socialist revolution and the class struggle. Instead everything was posed in terms of the "national independence" and "national interests" of the European countries.

Another feature of the present weaknesses in the stands of the PLA is its abandonment to a great extent of the criticism of the nature of the various regimes in the dependent countries. It has retreated from its advocacy of the revolution in these countries and the interlinking of the socialist and democratic revolutions.

This too is a characteristic feature of the post-World War II traditions. Although many parties led revolutionary wars in the dependent countries, the Cominform set the general line of looking for accommodation with existing regimes. Thus Zhdanov's famous "two camps" speech at the founding of the Cominform declared that monarchist Egypt was a sympathizer of the anti-imperialist camp and also bourgeois-landlord India, although both of these

regimes were then tightly tied to Western imperialist policy.

The Post-World War II Period Versus the Classic Teachings of Marxism-Leninism

The questions of petty-bourgeois nationalist strategies and of hiding the class struggle under democratic phrases go right back to the post-World War II traditions. Thus the present controversies inside the Marxist-Leninist movement, and the struggle against the liquidationist and rightist trends in the revolutionary movement, are linked with the question of the assessment of this period. The struggle to answer the questions of revolutionary strategy and tactics with the viewpoint of revolutionary Marxism-Leninism comes up against the fact that non-Marxist-Leninist stands are taken to carry the authority of Marxism-Leninism because they come from this period.

The fact is that the international movement, in the post-World War II period, itself believed that it was putting forward new views on revolutionary work, different from those given at various times before. It was common for the documents at that time to contrast their stands on the peace movement to the communist views at the time of World War I. Euphoric assessments were given about how much further things had advanced, about how the working people had awakened, how the forces of peace, progress and democracy had become stronger than the forces of reaction and war, and so forth; and, under the banner of these assessments, many of the former Marxist-Leninist views were step by step thrown aside.

Thus, in order to uphold the classic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, it is necessary to judge the differences between the views of the post-World War II period and the earlier views of Leninism. It is necessary to decide whether Marxism-Leninism will only be taken up insofar as it is first *defracted through the prism of the post-war period*, or whether it will actually be used as the basis for solving the problems of today.

The Second Congress of our Party took up the question of judging just what are the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. Previously, at the First Congress, our Party held that the classic works were those of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. But Stalin and the major Soviet leaders of the time took part in the post-World War II orientation. The Cominform was not rebelling against them, but carrying forward the orientations that they championed. And the same goes for the World Peace Congress.

Indeed, the resolution of the Second Congress on the Marxist-Leninist classics points out that one can either uphold the earlier stands of Stalin, who wrote many fine works expounding Leninism, or his later stands in the post-World War II period, but not both. Stalin fought in the ranks of world communism all his life. But the orientation of his activity changed at some point. Most of his works that are known in English come from the earlier period of his

activity, when he defended Leninism against its opponents, and fought the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, Zinovievites, cultural nationalists, anarchists and others. But in his later period, he himself championed replacing the Leninist orientations on various key questions with something else.

For this reason, the resolution of the Second Congress defines the classics of Marxism-Leninism to be the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the example of their revolutionary activity. It points out that the good works of Stalin should be utilized, but that his life and work does not have the necessary consistency to be described as a classic model of Marxism-Leninism. The resolution, it is clear, rejects the orientation of the post-World War II period.

Our view is that it is the teachings of Marxism-Leninism that provide the foundation for solving the present controversies concerning revolutionary work. We stand for the slogan: "*Back to the classics of Marxism-Leninism!*" Combining the classic Marxist-Leninist teachings with the analysis of today's concrete conditions and with the experience of the revolutionary struggle is the way for providing a firm theoretical base for revolutionary work.

The Post-World War II Period and the Chinese Communist Party

The reports in this issue of *The Workers' Advocate* center on Europe and the Soviet Union, because the stands of the CPSU, the Cominform and the French CP can be taken as reliable models of the post-World War II views and practices. Nevertheless, the problems in the orientation of the international communist movement were not restricted to Europe and the Soviet Union, but were world phenomena confronting each party.

The Chinese Communist Party also took up various features of the post-World War II traditions, although it modified them in accordance with its particular circumstances. *The Chinese Communist Party and various other communist and workers' parties* — such as those in Korea and Viet Nam — were faced with the situation where they either had to continue a fierce struggle or be utterly smashed. To their everlasting credit, they fought and fought well. And these heroic armed struggles during the post-World War II period shook the imperialists and gave much of the militance to this period of international communism. As well, naturally such parties could not look at matters simply through the "Eurocentric" point of view prevalent in Cominform statements.

But the heroic armed struggle of the masses does not automatically guarantee a correct orientation in the leadership of the communist parties. In this issue of *The Workers' Advocate* we spend much time on showing the corruption that ate away at the French Communist Party during this period. Yet the French CP had waged a heroic armed struggle against the Nazi occupation, a glorious mass struggle waged under the most difficult conditions. The communist-led resistance worked and fought both in the cities and the

countryside. In large parts of France, the Nazis didn't dare leave their encampments in the towns without heavily armed convoys. Nevertheless, this did not prevent the leadership of the French CP from frittering away the fruits of this heroism by taking up a wrong and reformist orientation.

Similarly, the leadership of the CP of China, despite the great struggle of the Chinese communists and working people, welcomed the new orientations of the post-World War II period. The Maoist leadership welcomed the idea of seeking accommodation with the great powers, especially American imperialism. For example, the 7th Congress of the CP of China, held in 1945 while the CP of China still faced years of fighting, welcomed the idea of great-power cooperation on world events and foreign investment in China and put forward a series of opportunist views. (See our article "*Mao, Browder and Social-Democracy*," in the pamphlet of the same title.) Indeed, the leadership of the CP of China toyed at various times with the idea of coming to accommodation with U.S. imperialism and orienting to the West; it was the intransigence of U.S. imperialism, not special virtues of Mao, that prevented this until the early 1970's.

After the death of Stalin, the leadership of the CP of China even welcomed various of Khrushchov's innovations. The 8th Congress of the CP of China in 1956 was in line with the notorious 20th Congress of the CPSU, which marked the crystallization of the Khrushchovite revisionist theses.

It is true that the Maoists are known for their criticism of Stalin. But the question is: from what angle did they appraise Stalin? Did they seek to restore the Marxist-Leninist principles that were being denigrated in the post-World War II period?

No, instead they used the criticism of Stalin to justify a cavalier attitude to the lessons of Bolshevism and the October Revolution of 1917. Take the question of the struggle against opportunism. In the 1956 article "The Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," the Chinese leaders did not oppose the denigration of the struggle against opportunism in the post-World War II period. Instead they criticized Stalin from the point of view of wanting to throw off the Marxist-Leninist principles of struggle against opportunism. And they underlined their stand by joining in the Khrushchovite rapprochement with the Titoite revisionists.

Nevertheless, the Chinese Communist Party eventually stood up in struggle against the Khrushchovite revisionists. This was a positive stand of the utmost importance. It helped preserve the militance of the CP of China, and it had an electrifying effect on the international communist movement. In the heat of this struggle, the CP of China raised many questions of Marxist-Leninist principle. Had the Chinese leaders taken a serious attitude to rectifying their own stands and taking up the classic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, they could have achieved a great deal.

But this was not to be. Even in their most militant years in the 1960's, there were grave weaknesses in the Chinese

stands. There were "three worldist" features in their views, such as denigration of the Marxist-Leninist party principle, distrust of the revolutionary role of the proletariat, only feeling comfortable with struggles that could be painted in national liberation colors, and so forth. There were also various semi-anarchist features to Maoism.

The Maoists developed their own terminology and pet formulations, and the Maoist views have their own domestic roots as well as international roots. But it is clear that various of the negative features of the post-World War II traditions form one of the elements that goes into Maoism; the Maoists, like the Soviet revisionists, welcomed various of these negative traditions and further developed them.

The Maoist theory couldn't meet the rigorous requirement of the world revolutionary struggle. The Chinese leadership fell from the opportunist "third worldism" of the 1960's to the fully developed counterrevolutionary "third worldism" of the mid-1970's. The Maoists had boasted of giving the world a Chinese form of Marxism-Leninism; they ended up giving the world a Chinese form of revisionism.

The Traditions of the Post-World War II Period Cannot Serve as the Foundation for the Struggle Against Soviet Revisionism

The fiasco of Maoism is a vivid illustration of the need to base the struggle against Soviet revisionism on the classic teachings of Marxism-Leninism, and not the post-World War II traditions or any other cavalier attitude to Marxism-Leninism.

Of course, the weaknesses in the international communist movement in the post-World War II period do not justify Chinese revisionism, nor does the recognition of these weaknesses lessen the need to carry the struggle against "three worldism" and Maoism through to the end. "Three worldism" is a flagrant anti-Marxist-Leninist ideology that has done tremendous harm to the revolutionary movement of today. Those who do not participate in rooting out thoroughly the errors of today can hardly be expected to have a sober attitude to the analysis of various of the historical roots of these errors.

But the failure to deal with the mistaken traditions of the post-World War II period would leave a roadblock to solving the problems of the revolutionary movement of today. This is illustrated by the difficulties which the heroic PLA — despite its glorious history of waging anti-fascist liberation war, fighting the various revisionist currents and carrying out socialist construction — has had in dealing with the revolutionary problems of the early 1980's. The traditions of the post-World War II period are one of the reasons the PLA has not been able to carry the struggle against "three worldism" and Maoism through to the end.

"Three worldism" and the mistaken orientations from the post-World War II period reinforce each other. The international Marxist-Leninist movement cannot return to

the orientations of the post-World War II period; instead, we must return to the classic teachings of Marxism-Leninism. We must clear away all the obstacles to the application of the Marxist-Leninist principles and judge everything in the stern but clear light of revolutionary principles.

After the outbreak of the historic polemic with Soviet revisionism, the task was set of working to build up a new international communist movement, free of opportunism. It is the split with modern revisionism that is the source of the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement of today. We must take account of the successes and the setbacks in building up this revolutionary Marxist-Leninist movement. Our Party believes that an assessment of the course of the struggle against modern revisionism proves the need to return to the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. It is by integrating the classic teachings of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete conditions of today and the experience of the world movement that international communism will advance.

The building up of the international communist movement has seen many twists and turns. Yet each step brings the proletariat closer to the day when it will seize power on a world scale and eliminate forever the exploitation of man by man. The study of the post-World War II period in the international communist movement, the subsequent revisionist betrayal, and then the long struggle that is still proceeding to build the international Marxist-Leninist movement brings to mind Marx's comments in Part I of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* on the course of proletarian revolutions:

"...proletarian revolutions...criticize themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again, more gigantic, before them, recoil ever and anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their own aims, until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out:

Hic Rhodus, hic salta!

Here is the rose, here dance!"

Materials for the Study of the Post-World War II Period in the International Communist Movement

This issue of *The Workers' Advocate* is devoted to

material for the study of the problems in the orientation of the international communist movement in the post-World War II period.

To begin with, the resolutions of the Second Congress of our Party entitled "On Problems in the Orientation of the International Movement in the Period from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin" and "On the Marxist-Leninist Classics" are printed here for the first time. The resolution "Against Trotskyism" is reprinted from the January 1, 1984 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*.

This issue also contains the bulk of the Internal Bulletin of our Party that provided the orientation for the pre-congress discussion on the post-World War II period. As well, the six reports that accompanied this bulletin have been reprinted, after having been further edited for ease of comprehension. These six reports provide extensive material on the orientation followed in the post-World War II period. Some of the reports deal with the theories that were put forward, while others show what the consequences of these theories were in practice.

All these reports are based on authoritative documents of the international communist movement of that time, especially from reports taken from the official Cominform journal *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*. The reports were originally accompanied by extensive reference material consisting of documents from the time of the post-World War II period; much of this reference material is also included, although some of it has been excerpted or omitted for the sake of space. The reports and accompanying reference materials are listed in the section of the Internal Bulletin entitled "On the Source Material for the Study of the Post-World War II Period."

It should be noted that the reference material has been selected so that it contains, in addition to various key passages which show how the Marxist-Leninist theses were denigrated in the post-World War II period, other passages which may consist, say, simply of denunciation of imperialism. Insofar as there was space to include such passages, it helps give an idea of how the wrong orientations were presented. In general, one can find militant statements denouncing imperialism in some of the literature of the post-World War II period, but when it comes to what to do about imperialism, the line goes astray.

Finally, as we pointed out, some of the reference materials have been omitted for reasons of space. Some of these omitted or excerpted materials are available elsewhere. As well, our Party will make available, at cost, any of these documents which the reader may require for the serious study of this period in the history of the international communist movement. □

From the Resolutions of the Second Congress of the MLP, USA

On Problems in the Orientation of the International Communist Movement in the Period from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin

This resolution is published here for the first time. The main body of the resolutions of the Second Congress of the MLP are available in the January 1, 1984 issue of The Workers' Advocate.

Today there are a number of controversial issues and vexed questions facing the international Marxist-Leninist movement. A number of the present difficulties and weaknesses are, in part, the result of trying to apply some of the wrong views and practices that were prevalent in the international movement during the latter 1940's and the early 1950's. This is one of the sources of the weaknesses in the stands of the Party of Labor of Albania in the early 1980's. It is also a factor in the views of a number of other parties, both indirectly from the influence of the PLA and also from the direct influence of the traditions of this period in the communist movement of various countries.

Thus an assessment of the ideas of the post-World War II period is not an issue for musty antiquarians, but has become an important issue confronting the international Marxist-Leninist movement today. It has become impossible to close one's eyes to the issue of the post-World War II period, because some of the wrong stands that are being taken today are being justified by the same or similar stands taken in this earlier period. Furthermore, the assessment of the post-World War II period affects the vital question of

what constitutes the Marxist-Leninist classics. One must judge: during this period did the international communist movement set a model in the implementation of correct strategy and tactics, or were there flaws in the ideas put forward, so that this period cannot be set as the judge of Marxist-Leninist conduct and orthodoxy but must itself be judged against the yardstick of the earlier classic writings of Marxism-Leninism.

The period in question — the (immediate) post-World War II period in the international communist movement — is the period from the end of World War II in 1945 to the death of Stalin in March 1953. It corresponds in general with the main period of activity of the Cominform (Communist Information Bureau), which was founded in 1947, embraced just under ten parties, and served as the most authoritative international body of world communism for the rest of this period.

It is easy to see what people liked about this period of the world communist movement. It was a period of upsurge after the great victory over fascism in World War II. The world communist movement reached the largest size, numerically, that it has yet achieved. The socialist camp embraced many countries. The international communist movement was relatively unified, and Stalin and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) stood at the head of the world movement.

But the post-World War II period in the international communist movement was a complex one. It was a time

of intense struggle between the communist movement and imperialism on a world scale, but it was also a time in which wrong views and practices were widespread.

There were dazzling victories, but there were also profound setbacks, and the period was closely followed by the greatest setback of all, the tragedy of the emergence of Soviet revisionism. The death of Stalin in 1953 was followed by three years of transition, after which the infamous Twentieth Congress of the CPSU of February 1956 set forth the Khrushchovite theses and marked the emergence into the open of Soviet revisionism.

Hence, the post-World War II period requires a careful and all-sided assessment.

On one hand, this period saw the existence of a powerful world communist movement. The historic victory over fascism in World War II gave a tremendous impetus all over the world to the communist parties, to the proletarian movement and to the revolutionary movement in the oppressed and dependent countries. The communist and workers' parties shouldered heavy tasks. They took over the helm of state in the devastated countries of Eastern Europe. The CPSU led the rapid post-war reconstruction of the Soviet Union. Communist parties led national liberation struggles and other revolutionary wars in China, Viet Nam, Korea, Greece, the Philippines, and elsewhere and had major influence in the liberation movement in Indonesia, India, Brazil and elsewhere. The liberation of China was a victory of immense proportions. Meanwhile the class conscious proletarians in Western Europe rallied around the communist parties. And the international communist movement maintained a definite cohesion as an international force.

During this period, the international communist movement confronted the world offensive of U.S. imperialism. U.S.-led world imperialism and capitalism was frightened at the advance of communism and threw everything it could think of against the revolutionary workers' movement. Our Party, in its assessment of the post-World War II period in the international communist movement, resolutely upholds the defense of the then-socialist Soviet Union and of the whole socialist camp against world imperialism. We uphold the struggle against the U.S. imperialist drive for world hegemony. We defend the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples and the proletarian movements. And we denounce the treachery of Tito and the Yugoslav revisionists who abandoned the socialist revolution and sold out to Western imperialism.

However, this was also a period where the general orientation on various key issues was seriously mistaken and was a departure from Marxism-Leninism. Here we refer to the views set forth by such authoritative sources as Stalin, the CPSU in general, and the Cominform. This orientation can also be studied in the work of the Communist Parties of France and Italy,

which were regarded by the Cominform as model parties, and in the activity of the World Peace Congress, the building of which was a major project of the world communist movement at that time. It turns out that the ideological weakness of the Communist Party of the USA, which rejected only the most outlandish liquidationist stands of the notorious American ultra-revisionist Browder but preserved the essence of his liberal-labor or social-democratic approach, is also, in part, a reflection of the general orientation of this period.

What were some of the errors in the general orientation of the post-World War II period in the international communist movement?

The orientation in the struggle against imperialist war was wrong. This struggle had brilliant possibilities during this period, and it could have been used effectively to strengthen the revolutionary movement and to help prepare the working masses for the struggle to overthrow imperialism. But instead the orientation was set forward of detaching the anti-war struggle from the class struggle, the socialist revolution, the national liberation movement or any other social content. There was a strong tendency to replace struggle against the warmongers with the concoction of mechanical and apolitical definitions of warmongering. There were petitions and other widescale campaigns that didn't mention who in particular was the warmonger, but instead stressed that the aggressor is he who refuses to sit down at big-power negotiations, or he who shoots first, etc. The Soviet Union even passed a law outlawing all propaganda for war, without distinguishing between wars of aggression and wars of liberation. The various abstract definitions of aggression were unscientific, and the severing of the anti-war struggle from the revolutionary struggle could only dull the political consciousness of the working masses.

This orientation found a concentrated expression in the founding and building of the World Peace Congress, which not only failed to denounce the imperialist system, but refrained, in general, from denouncing the U.S. government or any warmongering government. It prided itself on being officially neutral in the struggle between imperialism and socialism and sought to build a peace movement which wasn't directed at any concrete enemy.

There was a wrong orientation in the struggle against the U.S. imperialist drive for world hegemony. At first, there were illusions that the partial, uneasy, wartime coalition against the fascist Axis could be followed up by great-power collaboration between imperialism and the Soviet Union in the post-war world. It took until the founding of the Cominform in mid-1947 for the general call to be given against the aggressive crusade of U.S. imperialism, but even then the orientation remained that of forcing U.S. imperialism back to the path of great-power cooperation.

Furthermore, the absolutely essential struggle

against U.S. imperialism was detached from the struggle against the local imperialist bourgeoisies in Western Europe. The fact that U.S. imperialism was trying to put back on their feet all the reactionary bourgeoisies undermined by World War II — naturally, with a subordinate position to the U.S. taskmaster — was misunderstood. The theory was given that one can appeal to the "national interests" of the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe against U.S. imperialism. The statement of the Cominform meeting of November 1949 even appeals to the West European countries "for a return to the path of an independent foreign and home policy corresponding to the national interests of the peoples," failing to note that the "independent foreign and home policy" of the past was the policy of French, German, Italian, British and other imperialisms!

There was a wrong orientation with regard to social-democracy and opportunism. Instead of a consistent, principled struggle, there was incessant unity-mongering. There were repeated attempts to come to an accommodation with social-democracy, to say nothing of the middle bourgeoisie, the priesthood, etc. Social-democracy, however, had not changed its counter-revolutionary nature, and it continued its anti-communist frenzy. Thus there was, it is true, some strident and harsh rhetoric against certain social-democrats. But such denunciations of social-democracy were generally restricted to attacks on the "right-wing social-democratic" leaders, for the sake of coming to terms with social-democracy as a whole. And even the denunciations of "right-wing social-democracy" were often narrowed down to that they betrayed the all-class "national interests."

There was an astonishing lack of interest in the national liberation movement and other revolutionary struggles of the oppressed peoples in Cominform statements, Soviet statements and in the work of the World Peace Congress. Even the more militant sounding statements show this deficiency. Yet this was a time when many colonies were gaining independence or on the verge of so doing and when communist parties were leading national liberation struggles and other revolutionary wars in China, Viet Nam, Malaya, Korea, the Philippines, etc. This was a time when the imperialists, faced with the on-going collapse of old-style colonialism despite the bloody efforts of imperialist aggressor armies, began to rig up extensive neo-colonial empires.

The major Cominform statements not only display a definite "Eurocentric" attitude, but their few references to the oppressed and dependent countries usually refer not to the various popular movements fighting against oppressive regimes, but only to regimes in power. Once a revolutionary movement wins state power, it may be mentioned in the Cominform press, but rarely before. A few reports on the struggle in Viet Nam do get printed in the Cominform press, but there

is even less on the Chinese revolution until after the liberation of the country. Moreover, several of the existing bourgeois nationalist and even monarchist regimes in the oppressed countries are painted in liberation colors. Other wrong stands of this period include the astonishing support given by the Soviet Union to the founding of the state of Israel.

The typical attitude towards national liberation wars is not to support the struggle against the oppressors but to press for negotiations to end the warfare or for discussions among the great powers. Furthermore, the stand of the CP of France, which was one of the parties taken as a model during this period, is quite revealing. It had a disgraceful and shameless attitude with regard to French colonialism. It placed the defense of French "national interests" and the "French Union" (of metropolitan France and the overseas possessions and colonies) in the forefront and denigrated the national liberation movement. Nor did it regard the fight against colonial wars as an important part of the peace movement. It even supported French governments, despite the fact, apparently a minor or secondary issue in its view, that they were raining shot and shell down on the Vietnamese people and the fraternal Vietnamese communists; indeed, during the early days of the war against the Vietnamese, a member of the CP of France was, for several months, Minister of Defense and party leader Maurice Thorez was vice-premier of France!

The post-World War II period in the international communist movement was also rife with schemes of becoming part of the capitalist governments and achieving peace and prosperity without revolution. In the first year or two after World War II, there were even illusions about the post-war capitalist regimes in Western Europe. Later, the Cominform meeting of November 1949 set forth the idea of achieving power through the "setting up of governments which will rally all the patriotic forces opposed to the enslavement of their countries by American imperialism...." Thus, in effect, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism were to replace the class struggle and the revolution as the driving forces bringing socialism.

Eventually, in 1951, the British Communist Party set forth a full-scale, worked out program of a parliamentary, reformist, nationalist and altogether social-democratic sort of "socialism" in its new program, "The British Road to Socialism." This type of "socialism" was not to be achieved by class struggle or the revolution but through defense of British "national interests," arm in arm with the soldout, bourgeois "Labor" Party and trade union bureaucracy; even a reformed British empire was to be preserved. This program was reprinted in the Cominform journal and promoted inside the international communist movement.

On these and various other issues, wrong orientations were adopted to a greater or lesser extent. These orientations are different from those put forward in the

classic writings of Marxism-Leninism. **In essence, they amounted to an attempt to replace the views of the Marxist-Leninist classics on various questions with something else.** Even certain of the authoritative documents of the post-World War II period themselves point out that the general ideas being put forward for communist work in this or that field are different from earlier stands. For example, they may contrast their views with the earlier stands of the communists "in 1914." Far from being that reticent about this, the leading spokesmen of the time created an euphoric atmosphere that this change would open up wide new prospects.

The various wrong orientations undermined the work of the international communist movement. Despite the vast extent of the communist movement in this period, a dangerous disease was spreading inside.

The great tragedy struck with the rise to power of the Khrushchovites in the mid-1950's. U.S. imperialism and the other imperialisms immediately recognized the revisionist regime as something new, something that they counted on to destroy communism from within. And indeed, the Khrushchovites joined hands with the Western imperialists; destroyed the socialist economy and replaced it with a capitalist system designed to enrich the bureaucratic elite; thoroughly purged the party and the state apparatus of proletarian elements; and so forth. Meanwhile struggles broke out everywhere in the international communist movement. The great polemic against Soviet revisionism would eventually begin, and the parties that adhered to the Khrushchovites would be revealed as burned-out shells.

It is clear that the glaring and flagrant weaknesses in the stands and practices of the international communist movement during the post-World War II period weakened the movement, thus creating conditions which the Khrushchovites utilized for their own nefarious aims. This was one of the reasons why Khrushchov did not meet with an immediate rebuff to his demagoguery about unity with the social-democrats, peaceful coexistence, negotiations among the big powers, denigration of the national liberation movement, and so forth. Khrushchov took everything further, but on many key issues the basic Marxist-Leninist stands of the international movement had already been undermined before him.

Since the great polemic against Soviet revisionism began, the struggle to reestablish a powerful Marxist-Leninist communist movement without and against the

revisionists has had many twists and turns. One of the difficulties confronting the anti-revisionist movement has been the influence of some of the wrong stands from the post-World War II period in the international communist movement. The mistaken theories and orientations from this period are not just wrong theoretically. They have received a worldwide test of unprecedented scope. All possible variants of these theories have been tried over a period of several decades. And they have proved as harmful in practice as they are erroneous in theory. As Lenin says: "...we are of the opinion that the practical experience of the mass working class movement is no less important than theory and that this experience alone can serve as a serious test of our principles." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 528) This test has been made, and it is conclusive with regard to the erroneous orientations on various key issues from the post-World War II period.

In our view, the answer to the vexed questions of the present-day world Marxist-Leninist movement must be sought in orthodox Marxism-Leninism and in a careful examination of the concrete situations of today. **They must be solved according to the classic teachings of Marxism-Leninism and not according to the new orientations of the post-World War II period.** Today the international Marxist-Leninist movement has reached a turning point. **It must clear out all the mistaken traditions that have blocked its progress.** It would have been better if this had been done earlier, but it is essential today. It is essential that the course of the struggle against modern revisionism be assessed and that the roadblocks that have held up this struggle be removed. It is essential to wage a consistent and determined struggle against the liquidationist, petty-bourgeois nationalist and other opportunist deviations that are prevalent today. And this cannot be done so long as one is obliged to stay within the bounds of the orientations of the post-World War II period.

Hence the Second Congress holds that the Marxist-Leninist Party should speak publicly and clearly on the problems in the orientation of the international communist movement in the period from the end of World War II to the death of Stalin in 1953. This must be done from the standpoint of defending the revolutionary orientations given by the Marxist-Leninist classics for communist work. This public discussion is not to be opened immediately following the Second Congress, but sometime later, with the timing to be decided by the Central Committee. □

On the Marxist-Leninist Classics

This resolution is published here for the first time. The main body of the resolutions of the Second Congress of the MLP are available in the January 1, 1984 issue of The Workers' Advocate.

Theory is of tremendous importance for the working class movement. Marx held that *"Theory becomes a material force as soon as it grips the masses,"* while Lenin stressed that *"without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."* The revolutionary ideas that light up the path forward are crucial for the progress of the proletarian revolutionary movement. The struggle over theory and ideology is one of the three basic forms of the class struggle: political, economic, and theoretical.

The advanced communist ideas have a tremendous mobilizing, organizing and transforming role. Theory shows the prospects and goal of the class struggle and thus inspires devotion and heroism. Theory provides answers to the burning questions of the day and shows where the revolutionary toilers should concentrate their forces and where they should strike heavy blows.

The opportunist forces convert theory into something lifeless and inert, something detached from the concrete practice of the revolution, or they denigrate theory altogether. They constantly tend to trail spontaneity and to fall into any new fashionable blunder. And they are helpless slaves to the various prejudices and lies spread by the bourgeoisie.

The Marxist-Leninist Party has always paid close attention to theory and to the spread of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideas among the class conscious workers and activists. We have laid stress on the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the inseparable connection that should exist between revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice. And we have defended Marxism-Leninism from the attacks, vilifications and distortions by the bourgeoisie and the revisionists. Today, in the fight in the U.S. against liquidationism, it is once again the Marxist-Leninist Party that carries forward the banner of Marxist-Leninist theory.

The Marxist-Leninist classics justly occupy a special place in the body of world Marxist-Leninist literature. They provide the most consistent elaboration of the basic Marxist-Leninist principles and, along with the example of the political activity of their authors, provide a model of Marxist-Leninist work and world view. Their existence is a tremendous asset to the revolutionary working class movement.

Thus the Marxist-Leninist classics have an indispen-

sable role as authoritative expositions of the principles of communism. They help the class conscious proletarians see things clearer, penetrate to the essence of matters, and make better and wiser decisions on their revolutionary struggle. The vital importance of upholding the Marxist-Leninist theory can be seen by the tremendous struggle that each contingent of the world revolutionary movement has to go through to obtain the solid foundation of a revolutionary theory. Lenin pointed out that *"For nearly half a century — approximately from the forties to the nineties — advanced thought in Russia, oppressed by an unparalleled, savage and reactionary tsardom, eagerly sought for a correct revolutionary theory and followed with astonishing diligence and thoroughness each and every 'last word' in this realm in Europe and America. Russia achieved Marxism, the only correct revolutionary theory, through veritable suffering, through half a century of unprecedented torment and sacrifice, of unprecedented revolutionary heroism, incredible energy, devoted searching, study, practical trial, disappointment, verification and comparison with European experience."* (*"Left-Wing" Communism. An Infantile Disorder*, Ch. II) Today the revolutionary working class movement in the U.S. is going through similar torments in order to arrive at true Marxism-Leninism, purged of the filth of liberal-labor, social-democratic and revisionist distortions. In this struggle, the Marxist-Leninist classics stand out as a beacon of tremendous penetrating power.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were the very founders of scientific communism. Before them, socialism was an aspiration, a dream, and sometimes even a cry of defiance, but not a scientific doctrine of revolutionary struggle. Marx and Engels gave communism a solid theoretical basis. They combined vigorous participation in the revolutionary struggle with the most rigorous and protracted theoretical work. They created the most profound revolutionary theory the world has ever known.

Lenin further developed and elaborated the Marxist theory, thus creating Marxism-Leninism. The Great October Socialist Revolution of the Bolsheviks in 1917 ushered in a new epoch for the working class movement and signaled the victory of Leninism. All over the world, communists turned to Bolshevism, to Leninism. As Lenin pointed out, *"Bolshevism can serve as a model of tactics for all."* (*The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*)

The Marxist-Leninist classics have never failed us. Again and again, at each turning point and facing each vexed question, we have made a new study of the clas-

sics and deepened our knowledge of the revolutionary principles they expound. As our revolutionary experience has deepened, so has our understanding of the classics, which have always helped move us forward and point us in the correct direction. While the opportunists lose heart and doubt the Marxist-Leninist principles at the slightest pretext, our Party has never lost faith in the Marxist-Leninist theory and tactics. This is an important reason for our victories and advances.

Thus it is important to define just what the classics are. Previously, at the First Congress, we held that the classics consisted of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

But, since then, our Party has carried out an intensive study of the orientation in the international communist movement in the period from the end of World War II to the death of Stalin. This study shows that an attempt was made in this post-World War II period to replace the classic principles of Marxism-Leninism on various subjects with other conceptions. It shows that the post-World War II period is not a model of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy and consistency, but a period when various profoundly erroneous views and practices were prevalent. These erroneous orientations undermined the Marxist-Leninist stands of the international communist movement, thus helping create the conditions for the gigantic setback of the crystallization of Soviet revisionism with Khrushchov's takeover and the holding of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956.

This raises the question of Stalin's views and activities, since Stalin championed the new orientations of the post-World War II period. It is clear that Stalin was not unaware of the views put forward at the 19th Congress of the CPSU over which he presided or of the analysis put forward at the Cominform Meetings of 1947 and 1949. On the contrary, Stalin was the pivotal figure in developing and advocating these orientations. Although he has relatively few writings from this period — at least as far as are available to us — they show that he supported and championed the new orientations.

Thus Stalin cannot be held to be one of the classic teachers of Marxism-Leninism. His life and work do not show the necessary consistency. At some point in his political activity, he departed from his earlier adherence to Leninism and began to take a casual attitude to various of the basic Marxist-Leninist principles. This is clear from his views and activities after World War II. This does not simply mean that he made this or that mistake: everyone, without exception, makes some mistakes. It means that he began to try to replace the basic foundations of Marxism-Leninism on various subjects with something else.

Hence the Marxist-Leninist classics should be taken to be the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

This does not mean negating all Stalin's work and writings.

Stalin began his political activity as a revolutionary Marxist. He was a Bolshevik, and he defended Leninism against the economists, nationalist deviators, liquidators and so forth. After the October Socialist Revolution, he continued for years to defend Leninism in the course of struggle against Trotskyism, Bukharinism, Zinovievism, and so forth. In the course of his communist activity, he wrote many excellent works.

The example of Lenin's attitude towards the work of various Marxists who eventually strayed from Marxism or even fell headlong into the mud is useful. Plekhanov, for example, was one of the founders of the Marxist movement in Russia. Despite certain weaknesses in his views that were present right from the start, his activity was of tremendous significance for the Russian working class movement. But, at a certain point, he departed more and more from Marxism. He became first a Menshevik and later a social-chauvinist and an outright renegade. Nevertheless, Lenin stated in 1921 that "*Let me add in parenthesis for the benefit of young Party members that you cannot hope to become a real, intelligent communist without making a study — and I mean study — of all of Plekhanov's philosophical writings, because nothing better has been written on Marxism anywhere in the world.*" ("Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Current Situation and the Mistakes of Trotsky and Bukharin," *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 94)

Similarly, Lenin did not negate Kautsky's earlier services to revolutionary Marxism when Kautsky later became a renegade. Lenin, right in the midst of his biting polemical work *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, stated that: "*We know from many of Kautsky's works that he knew how to be a Marxist historian, and that such works of his will remain a permanent possession of the proletariat in spite of his subsequent apostasy.*" And he pointed out that "*...the Russian workers...formerly respected Kautsky, and quite rightly...*"

Unlike Plekhanov and Kautsky, Stalin stayed with the international communist movement till the end of his life. However his casual attitude to various of the Leninist principles, an attitude that appeared at a certain point in his life, did great damage to communism and undermined his later work. But Stalin's errors by no means prevent us from utilizing his good works, which will remain a valuable tool for the study of Leninism. Indeed, only by soberly recognizing Stalin's errors can anyone adhere to the principles laid down in Stalin's correct works.

Our criticism of Stalin's errors is the diametrical opposite of bourgeois and opportunist criticism. The bourgeoisie was profoundly shaken by the gigantic victories of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and then thrown into a frenzy by the gigantic victories of international communism in and after World War II. It raged and fumed against "Stalinism." The Trotskyites,

Soviet revisionists, Maoists and other opportunists have taken over the bourgeois criticism of Leninism, and it is from this angle that they criticize Stalin.

Take the question of the struggle against reformism. The bourgeoisie and the opportunists usually regard "Stalinism" as the most horrible example of struggle against opportunism and social-democracy. Why, they sputter, Stalin not only denounced social-democracy, he even denounced the "left" phrasemongering wing of social-democracy. They denounce "Stalinism" in order to denigrate the Leninist principles of unyielding struggle against opportunism and social-democracy.

Our Party, on the other hand, criticizes the orientation put forth in the post-World War II period of reconciling with social-democracy, clericalism, reformism and so forth. Our criticism of Stalin's errors is from the standpoint of defending the struggle against opportunism and social-democracy. Only such criticism allows the struggle against opportunism to proceed full force.

Take the question of party-building. The bourgeoisie and the opportunists usually regard "Stalinism" as the most horrible example of upholding the leading role of the party and its monolithic nature. They rage against "Stalinism" in a frenzied effort to discredit party-building and the Leninist principles that show how to build the proletarian revolutionary party of the new type.

Our Party, on the other hand, criticizes the wrong ori-

entations put forth in the post-World War II period from the standpoint of defending the task of party-building and the Leninist principles on party-building. Our Party is monolithic, that is, free from factions and united in thought and action. But we see that the wrong orientations of the post-World War II period resulted in undermining the structure of various parties and, in fact, amounted to casting aside the Leninist principles on party-building. Only by rejecting the wrong orientations set forth in this period can the struggle to build a solid communist party proceed full speed.

The same thing appears on every question, whether it be anti-fascist struggle, the question of the national liberation movement, the question of partial demands, and so forth. The bourgeois and opportunists denounce Leninism under the cover of denouncing "Stalinism." Our Party, on the contrary, criticizes Stalin's errors in order to defend the Leninist principles which Stalin himself defended earlier.

For all these reasons, the Second Congress declares that the classics of Marxism-Leninism are the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and the example of their political activities. There are many other works in the rich body of world Marxist-Leninist literature. But the Marxist-Leninist classics will always occupy a special place in the study and dissemination of Marxism-Leninism. □

Pre-Congress Discussion Material on the Post-World War II Period

The Internal Bulletin of March 17, 1983

Below we reproduce the bulk of the internal bulletin which oriented the thorough party-wide discussion on the post-World War II period which was held in preparation for the decisions taken at the Second Congress of our Party, held in fall 1983. Several explanatory notes, which are clearly marked, have been added.

An important part of the work of the upcoming Second Congress of our Party will be consideration of the situation in the international Marxist-Leninist communist movement. Our Party has always taken an active stand towards the world Marxist-Leninist movement. We have always worked and fought as a component part and loyal contingent of the international army of revolutionary communism. Today it is as vital as ever that all Marxist-Leninist parties and communist activists participate fully in building the international movement. We must pay close attention to the burning questions coming up in the international Marxist-Leninist movement and play an active role in resolving them.

This Bulletin has been written as part of our Party's preparations for the Second Congress. It discusses an issue that has come to the fore in the international movement, namely, whether the stands and activities of the post-World War II period in the international communist movement should be taken as the model for the present-day movement. It turns out that this question provides a key to understanding many of the developments in the current international movement and, as well, many of the trials and tribulations of the protracted struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism. Judging this question is essential for safeguarding and strengthening the ideological foundations of our Party and will be an important part of the work of the Second Congress. [The Second Congress of the MLP held in the fall of 1983 did judge this question. See the resolutions from the

Second Congress which are printed elsewhere in this issue of *The Workers' Advocate*. — WA]

This Bulletin was prepared by the National Executive Committee on the instructions of the 17th Plenum of the Central Committee. It is an introduction to the accompanying reports and reference material discussed in the Central Committee and further edited for study throughout the Party.

CONTENTS

Introduction	16
The Post-World War II Period in the World Communist Movement	17
The General Orientation on Various Key Issues Was Wrong	18
On the Assessment of the Post-World War II Period	20
The Legacy of the Post-World War II Period and the Problems in the Struggle Against Soviet Revisionism	21
The Evaluation of the Post-World War II Period Has Been One of the Controversies in the International Marxist- Leninist Movement	22
The Latter Part of the 1930's and Some Other Questions	24
On the Source Material for the Study of the Post-World War II Period	24
Towards the Second Congress	26

On the Security for this Bulletin [omitted]

Introduction

Our Party has been fighting hard to uphold the Marxist-Leninist theory. We have stressed that it is the Marxist-Leninist principles that provide the theoretical framework to guide us in revolutionary work. Today, in the U.S., we are up against the liquidationist renegade. The liquidators have thrown overboard the revolution and are seeking to convert the proletariat into an impotent tail of liberal-labor politicians, of liberal imperialists and of the trade union hacks. Against this treachery we have upheld the militant ideas of Marxism-Leninism on building the party, on fighting for the political independence of the working class, on the miserable nature of social-democracy, on the fight against "one's own" bourgeoisie, and so forth.

Internationally, too, a fierce struggle is going on. [In the last few years, various rightist and liquidationist currents have become fashionable in the revolutionary movement in a number of countries. This has placed pressure on the Marxist-Leninist parties, and some manifestations of the pressure of liquidationist and petty-bourgeois nationalist views have appeared inside the international Marxist-Leninist movement. We have published in *The Workers' Advocate* a number of reports on the controversies inside the international Marxist-Leninist movement, including reports from parties which have denounced liquidationism as it appears in the revolutionary movement of their country. — WA] And, in particular, we have intervened in this struggle in various ways. One important contribution of our Party is our ongoing public denunciation of the liquidationist and factionalist stands of the leadership of the Communist Party of Canada (ML) and its followers. Another notable stand of our Party has been our discussion of the controversy concerning Marxist-Leninist work in the movement against imperialist war preparations. [See, for example, the major article "Some burning questions in the struggle against imperialism/On the West European movement against U.S./NATO war preparations" in *The Workers' Advocate* for June 5, 1982. — WA] These controversies have helped to bring to the surface many important features of the present situation, from the danger of liquidationist practices to the use of semi-anarchist phrasemongering as a "left" cover for liquidationism.

In the struggle to clarify the burning issues in the international movement, just as in the struggle against liquidationism in the U.S., our Party steadfastly holds that it is the life-giving ideas of Marxism-Leninism that serve to clarify the path forward. For example, in the controversy over work in the movement against imperialist war preparations, we have brought to the fore such fundamental issues, clarified by Leninism, as the necessity to direct the struggle against "one's own" bourgeoisie, the danger of petty-bourgeois nationalism which seeks to outdo the imperialist bourgeoisie in patriotic frenzy, the necessity to fight the liquida-

tionist striving to merge with social-democracy, the role of Marxist-Leninist theory in the movement, the method of approach to the mass movement, and so forth. To continue this struggle, we have put forth the fighting slogan: "Back to the classics of Marxism-Leninism!"

[The IB goes on to point out that the rightists and liquidators outside the Marxist-Leninist parties have been openly denouncing the validity of Marxism-Leninism. Inside the international Marxist-Leninist movement, however, when there has been departure from Marxism-Leninism it has taken place mainly in the abandonment in practice of this or that Marxist-Leninist thesis, not through the open denunciation of Marxism-Leninism. For example, the petty-bourgeois nationalist theses that have gained a certain fashionableness are a flagrant departure from Leninism, and this is known to some of those who put them forward. Meanwhile, there have also, now and then, been incidents where Marxism-Leninism has been openly denigrated, such as has been done by the liquidationist leadership of the Communist Party of Canada (ML) and various of its international followers. For example, when the leadership of the Revolutionary Communist Party of Britain (ML), in the reactionary war between Britain and Argentina, denounced the slogan "the main enemy is at home," they were directly denouncing Leninism and they knew it. (See *The Workers' Advocate* of September 5, 1982 which is entitled "Lessons from the Falklands Conflict for the Struggle Against Imperialist War.") It is notable that such flagrant trampling on Marxism-Leninism has not received the rebuff from the international Marxist-Leninist movement that it should have. The IB went on to emphasize that:]

...The class conscious workers and revolutionary activists who fight in the ranks of the international Marxist-Leninist movement are fervently in favor of Leninism and the revolution. They work under difficult conditions, sacrifice their personal interests for the advance of the proletarian revolution, and when necessary lay down their lives heroically. They are inspired to do this by the interests of the working masses and by their fervent belief in the correctness of Marxism-Leninism. We are but a single national contingent among this great army of our class brothers. We know their trials and tribulations because we share them every day. When we raise the question of the controversies in the international movement and when we make our comments and write our polemics, we do so not just because the international issues affect us, but also because we feel a deep sense of responsibility to our fraternal comrades around the world and because we desire to march forward shoulder to shoulder with them.

But this raises even more sharply the question: why, in a movement composed of sincere and dedicated believers in communism, has it been possible for a negative attitude to various of the basic tenets of Marxism-Leninism to gain currency? Why, in a movement composed of those who believe in class struggle and class solidarity, have the flagrant theses of petty-bourgeois nationalism and of other deviations been able to find a crack to penetrate into?

There are a number of reasons for this. This Bulletin is dedicated to only one of them, but one that has great importance. This is that various communists are taking the views, stands and action of the international communist movement in the post-World War II period as the standard for Marxism-Leninism. This doesn't just apply to some dubious elements. As we shall see, the Party of Labor of Albania's stands on the international movement can, to a large extent, be described as trying to reconstruct the present movement on the ideological lines of the post-World War II period. Whether or not to follow the model of this period is thus, in one way or another, becoming a question facing all parties. And this period is the model for such practices as the petty-bourgeois nationalist agitation in the advanced capitalist countries, the building of a peace movement devoid of struggle against "one's own" bourgeoisie, and the denigration of the Leninist teachings on the anti-war struggle as invalidated by new conditions. In the opinion of the 17th Plenum of our Central Committee, the model posed by the post-World War II period is a dangerously flawed one.

The rank-and-file communist around the world in the main does not know that the practice of the international movement in the post-World War II period is anything other than a loyal continuation of the previous traditions of the communist movement. This applies to all who have not had the occasion to study this period carefully and to dig up its documents, as we ourselves had not done until now. And, indeed, the tremendous extent of the communist movement of this period and the great battles fought with imperialism give it an authority and a prestige.

But the guiding ideas of this period on one key question after another were different from the earlier stands of the Third International and from the previous classic writings of Marxism-Leninism. Even certain of the authoritative documents of the time point out that the general ideas concerning tactics and methods in this or that field are, for one reason or the other, different from that of earlier periods. Far from being reticent about this, the leading spokesmen of the day used the successes of the day to back up the legitimacy of the new ideas. It turns out that all this is known to those who are knowledgeable about this period. The idea of patterning the present movement after this period thus amounts in practice to the view that there was a change after World War II, new and better strategies and tactics were applied, and that therefore the earlier classics of Marxism-Leninism, to this or that extent, don't apply. Or, it amounts to reinterpreting the earlier classics in the light of the stands of the post-World War II period. Either way, the result is about the same. The post-World War II period is taken as a model, and anything that contradicts it from the earlier classics is thrown aside.

It can thus be seen that an evaluation of the post-World War II period is essential in order to truly implement the slogan "Back to the classics!" In a way, it can be said that this affects the very conception of what the Marxist-Leninist theory really is. It has become impossible to put aside the question of the post-World War II period, because the

various stands that are being taken and implemented today are often justified by the same or similar stands taken in this period. Hence one must judge: during this period did the international communist movement set a model in the implementation of correct strategy and tactics, or were there flaws in the ideas put forward, so that this period cannot be set as the judge of Marxist-Leninist conduct and orthodoxy but must itself be judged against the yardstick of the earlier classic writings of Marxism-Leninism? It is this question to which this Bulletin is devoted and which is one of the issues that will face the Second Congress. It is the opinion of the Central Committee that it is impossible to have a full understanding of why various things are happening today in the world Marxist-Leninist movement or to fully take part in the consideration of the various burning questions facing the international movement, without raising this issue. This question is vital, because it affects the question of whether Marxism-Leninism or something else will be taken as the guide and theoretical framework for all revolutionary work.

The Post-World War II Period in the World Communist Movement

By the post-World War II period in the international communist movement we mean the period from the end of World War II in 1945 to the death of Stalin in March 1953. This is the period before the rise of Khrushchovite revisionism. For the sake of placing the events we will be referring to in historical context, let us refer to another date. The notorious 20th Congress of the CPSU, which set forth the Khrushchovite theses, took place in February 1956. Thus there was a short intermediate or transition period of three years between the death of Stalin and the holding of the 20th Congress. In this Bulletin and the accompanying material we will be looking at the post-World War II period, but we will occasionally follow events into the intermediate period.

In the post-World War II period, the world communist movement was still led by Comrade Stalin and the CPSU. This was a period of gigantic struggles between world communism and U.S.-led Western imperialism. It was a period where communism made a number of giant strides as a result of the impetus given by the defeat of the fascist fiends in World War II. Just as World War I shook capitalism to its foundations and gave rise to a revolutionary crisis, so did World War II. But, at the same time, this was also a period where communism suffered setbacks in various places, although the setbacks were not, especially on the surface, as dramatic as the world advance of the proletariat and oppressed peoples that took place. The great tragedy, visible to all, would come a little later, with the rise of Soviet revisionism.

The Central Committee of our Party gradually became aware that certain difficulties existed in the work of the post-World War II period, both in the work of the CPSU and

in the work of the international movement as a whole. However, a full assessment of the world communist movement of this period is a lengthy task, because so much was happening and many questions arose: there is the question of the experience in constructing socialism in the people's democracies, because this period saw the extension of socialism to a vast area outside the Soviet Union; there is the question of the rich experience in the national liberation movement, as the Communist Parties led historic struggles in China, Viet Nam and elsewhere and suffered setbacks and difficulties in certain other struggles; there is the question of what was happening to the great CPSU, what was corroding it from within; there is the question of assessing "our own" CPUSA; and so forth. Therefore the CC decided to concentrate its study of this period on certain particular fronts of the work of the international communist movement, mainly those concerned with the peace movement.

The CC concentrated its attention on the question of the peace movement, as it was called at the time, because this is directly related to the burning issues of the present. Today there is a debate on the question of the path forward for communist work in the struggle against U.S./NATO missiles and in the anti-war struggle in general. This is where many of the hottest disagreements that have been expressed publicly in the international Marxist-Leninist movement have arisen. Furthermore, many of the questions of Leninism that in general are burning issues in the international movement are involved in the controversy over the anti-war struggle or are even central to it. This includes such issues as the question of petty-bourgeois nationalism, the question of struggle against "one's own" bourgeoisie, the question of struggle against social-democracy and revisionism, the question of united front tactics, and so forth.

Furthermore, the issue of the peace movement raises these questions in a context with which we are familiar. Since we work painstakingly in the struggle against imperialist war, we have studied attentively the Marxist-Leninist classics on this question, and we have developed definite views on this question. The question of, say, the people's democracies would probably require a much longer study and involves many difficulties, among other things, because it involves a careful assessment of concrete realities in various countries with which we have little familiarity, and because it involves a type of work, socialist construction and its preliminaries, that has not faced our Party.

From its preliminary discussions, the CC had arrived at the opinion that a detailed study of this period would most likely show that, while the orientation of the international communist movement was then generally correct, there were certain weaknesses. These weaknesses would show why this period cannot be taken as the model of communist tactics, but must be subjected always to a critical evaluation and comparison with the Marxist-Leninist classics. However, at this time the CC still had read and discussed only a fraction of the key documents of this period.

Thus the Central Committee carried out a detailed study of the peace movement in the post-World War II period.

This study was based on authoritative sources from the international communist movement, and especially on the documents in the newspaper *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, which was the official journal of the Cominform (Communist Information Bureau). The study utilized several different methods of approach, in order to get an all-sided picture:

(1) the general international orientation set at Cominform meetings and elsewhere was looked into;

(2) the activity of the World Peace Congress itself was examined;

(3) there was a detailed study of the work in the peace movement conducted by the CP of France, which was a highly regarded party in the Cominform and one of the parties set forward as a model for others; and

(4) various other important statements of Soviet leaders were collected. As well, some attention was paid to the CPUSA, but this was not taken as central to the study as, although the CPUSA appears to be a party that followed closely, in its publications, the general stands on world affairs taken by the international movement, it was not clear a priori whether the actual work and practice of the CPUSA could be taken as typical of the international movement. On the other hand, the CP of France was one of the parties strongly promoted in *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*.

As a result of this study, the Central Committee reached the unanimous conclusion that the ideological stand guiding communist work in the peace movement during this period was deeply mistaken. There was "...unanimous agreement on the general assessment of the ideological stand.... There are not simply some errors in a generally correct orientation, but a profoundly wrong ideological stand that negates the revolution." (Minutes of the 17th Plenum) It is clear that this wrong stand undermined the work that was done during this period.

This is a serious assessment that has heavy consequences. Errors of such magnitude clearly could not be restricted simply to work in the peace movement but, as we shall see, affected the general line being given in the international communist movement. This does not negate the fact that the international communist movement of this period was still the movement of the revolutionary proletariat, still the center of the struggle against imperialism, but it does mean that the ideological and practical foundations of the movement were grievously undermined.

The General Orientation on Various Key Issues Was Wrong

The various documents from the post-World War II period all agree in their basic ideological stand. There is no sign of any dissonance in general outlook between the Cominform, the CP of France, the major Soviet leaders, etc. Here we will just outline a few features of this common stand. This is merely an introduction to the ample material contained in the accompanying reports and documents.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that our present study of the post-World War II period, taken all together, still does not comprise a complete characterization of this period. It does contain more than enough insight about this period to show that it cannot be taken as a model, which is the burning issue facing the present-day movement. But this study is still only a start on a comprehensive analysis of the post-World War II period.

Let us start by looking at the situation at the end of the war and immediately after, from mid-1945 to mid-1947. At this point, there is even confusion in the statements from the international movement about the nature of U.S. imperialism and over whether wartime collaboration between U.S. imperialism and the then-socialist Soviet Union and progressive people can be maintained. On the political front, the line drawn with Browderite revisionism in 1945 is mainly that Browder believed that this and other good things will come automatically, while the communists know that it is necessary to mobilize the masses against the reactionary circles in order to achieve the implementation of the Teheran accords and the continuation of a liberal-labor policy.

It is worth recalling that at the end of World War II various parties and liberation movements welcomed U.S. and Western troops and did not understand the danger facing them. And, in the immediate post-war literature, the regimes in Eastern Europe and Western Europe are discussed in about the same light as "new democracies"; this shows remarkable illusions about the situation facing the Western European communists. It is notable that the post-war constitutions in France and Italy are described by the parties there as something that goes beyond mere bourgeois democracy.

Yet 1945 and 1946 are years of fierce struggle between U.S. imperialism and the world proletarian movement. At the end of the war, U.S. imperialism drops two atomic bombs on the all-but-defeated Japan as the beginning of nuclear blackmail against the Soviet Union and the anti-fascist movements around the world. The British and U.S. imperialists arm reaction for a civil war in Greece and generally apply pressure all through Eastern Europe. The peace treaties between the Soviet Union and Germany and Japan were delayed for year after year. The French imperialist war of aggression against Viet Nam begins (with the CP of France still in the French government — indeed, the Minister of Defense during a few months of this war was from the CPF). The U.S. imperialists were arming Chiang Kai-shek in the Chinese civil war. And so on.

Nevertheless, it is not until mid-1947 that an overall conclusion is drawn from this and a general call given to the world. The founding meeting of the Cominform in September 1947 and Zhdanov's "two camps" speech are taken by everyone — both reactionary imperialist commentators and communists — as marking a new phase. A call is given to the communist parties, to the East European governments, and to all progressive people that the U.S. capitalist government is indeed imperialist and reactionary, that it is not a

paragon of democracy, and that it is striving for world hegemony. It is astonishing that it took until mid-1947 to clarify this basic point in the line of the international communist movement.

The main part of the post-World War II period is from the founding of the Cominform in 1947 to the death of Stalin (March, 1953). It is basically the stands and theories developed in this latter period, from 1947 on, that are being put forward as the model for the present-day movement. And indeed, in this latter period, the language of the international communist movement becomes a little more militant. There is denunciation of imperialism: mainly of U.S. imperialism and, to a certain extent, of British imperialism. But the general ideological stand on the international situation remains profoundly erroneous.

Even the stand against U.S. imperialism remains weak. Yes, there are some militant-sounding statements. The Cominform meeting correctly points out that U.S. imperialism is on a brutal drive to subdue the whole world and that it is using the most underhanded means. But the general line in this whole period remains that of forcing U.S. imperialism back to the path of great-power cooperation. The orientation for the peace movement becomes that it should center its work on appeals for negotiations between the great powers. And it should be noted that references to U.S. imperialism in post-World War II statements may only be referring to part of the U.S. ruling class, only to certain ultra-reactionary or adventurist circles. There are still longing glances back to the late President Roosevelt, and still illusions in the Democratic Party.

The stand towards the West European bourgeoisie is wrong. The fact that U.S. imperialism was trying to put back on their feet all the reactionary bourgeoisies undermined by World War II — naturally, with a subordinate position to the U.S. taskmaster — was misunderstood. The theory was given that one can appeal to the "national interests" of the advanced capitalist countries of Western Europe against U.S. imperialism. The statement of the Cominform meeting of November 1949 even appeals to the West European countries "for a return to the path of an independent foreign and home policy corresponding to the national interests of the peoples." ("Resolutions of the Meeting of the Cominform, November 1949," Section I., subsection entitled "The Most Urgent Tasks," point number 6, emphasis added.) But what was this "independent foreign and home policy" of the past? It was the policy of French, German, Italian, and British imperialism!!! And this type of appeal was typical.

There is also, throughout this entire period, an astonishing lack of interest in the [revolutionary struggles in the colonial and dependent countries] in the Cominform statements, the Soviet statements, and in the work of the peace movement. Even the most militant sounding statements show this deficiency. And yet this was a time when communist parties were leading liberation struggles in China, in Viet Nam, in Malaya, etc. This makes the silence on this question positively deafening! Instead, the Cominform

statements not only display a definite "Eurocentric" attitude, but their few references to the oppressed nations are usually directed at existing regimes. Once a [revolutionary movement in an oppressed country] wins, it may be mentioned; and the existing bourgeois nationalist or even monarchist regimes are mentioned. A few reports on the struggle in Viet Nam do get printed in the Cominform press, but almost nothing on China prior to the liberation of the country, which is then hailed as a historic step. The typical attitude towards national liberation wars is not to support the struggle against the oppressors but to press for negotiations to end the warfare or for discussions among the great powers.

One of the most characteristic features of this period is its incessant unity-mongering. There is to be unity with everyone: the social-democrats, the clerics, the middle bourgeoisie, etc., etc. The line of the peace movement is repeatedly watered down in the quest to find the magic appeal that will unite everyone, even those who don't understand who it is that is responsible for the war danger.

Thus the orientation given to the peace movement is that it should be a movement without enemies. The peace movement is not to be connected to anything, whether to the class struggle, to the struggle against imperialism or even to the denunciation of particular warmongering governments. Instead there is the concoction of mechanical definitions of warmongering, independent of social content: the aggressor is he who refuses to sit down at big-power negotiations, or he who shoots first, etc. The Soviet Union even passes a law outlawing all propaganda for war, without distinguishing between wars of aggression and wars of liberation.

This period is also rife with schemes of taking over the government and achieving peace and prosperity without revolution. In the immediate post-war period, it will be recalled, there were even illusions about the West European regimes. Later, the Cominform meeting of November 1949 sets forth the idea of achieving power through the "setting up of governments which will rally all the patriotic forces opposed to the enslavement of their countries by American imperialism...." And, in 1951, the British Communist Party sets forth a full-scale program of reformist socialism in its program "The British Road to Socialism." This program is reprinted in the Cominform journal and favorably commented on.

These things give some idea of the deeply mistaken stand of the post-World War II period on a series of vital questions.

On the Assessment of the Post-World War II Period

Hence it is more than clear that the post-World War II period cannot serve as the model of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy to guide and orient the work of the present-day international Marxist-Leninist movement. What then, is the general role of the post-World War II period in the history of

the international communist movement? This question cannot be completely answered by our present study of the post-World War II period, since it has concentrated on only one aspect of the work of this period, albeit an aspect which bears on the general line given with respect to revolution and imperialism. But the two following general points should be kept in mind.

First of all, despite the profound mistakes in the ideological line, the post-World War II period was indeed a period of struggle between communism and imperialism on a world scale. In this period, the world communist movement shouldered heavy tasks. It took over the helm of state in the devastated countries of Eastern Europe. Communist parties led liberation struggles in China, Viet Nam, Korea and elsewhere and had tremendous influence in the liberation movement in Indonesia, India, Brazil, and elsewhere. The class conscious proletarians in Western Europe rallied around the communist parties. The international communist movement maintained a definite cohesion and force.

During this period world imperialism was frightened at the advance of communism and threw everything against it. Our Party resolutely upholds the defense of the socialist Soviet Union of this period against world imperialism. We uphold the struggle against the U.S. imperialist drive for world hegemony. We defend the various liberation struggles and proletarian movements led by the parties.

When Khrushchov came to power, it was recognized by everyone that a change had taken place. U.S. imperialism and the other imperialisms immediately recognized the revisionist regime as something new, something that could destroy communism from the inside. Struggles broke out everywhere in the international communist movement, a series of parties would soon break away from the Khrushchovites in various directions, and the other parties would be revealed as burned out shells. The great polemic against Soviet revisionism would soon begin.

But, **secondly**, it is clear that the glaring and flagrant weaknesses in the line and practices during the post-World War II period were a important factor corroding the international communist movement so that it could be preyed on by the Khrushchovites. Khrushchovism marked a major turning point. Yet it is not possible to point to one or two easy dividing lines and say that this formulation, at least, marked the line between the post-World War II period and the later Soviet revisionism.

Take the promotion of revolution. As we have already remarked, the post-World War II period saw the development and promotion of schemes of reformist socialism and of progress without revolution. The notorious "British Road to Socialism," with its idea of socialism as the perfecting of British bourgeois democracy, was already put forward at the end of the post-World War II period. Far from being simply the deviation of a single party, it was widely promoted without protest in the Cominform journal. Meanwhile the Cominform and the 19th Congress of the CPSU put forward the idea that the peace movement was the central task of the communist parties, and the peace movement was giv-

en the most class collaborationist and non-revolutionary interpretation.

Take the struggle against social-democracy. In both the peace movement and in the general work of the communist parties, the post-World War II period strived hard to abandon the struggle against social-democracy. The peace movement, for example, didn't decide who to unite with on the basis of who supported some definite militant program of struggle. On the contrary, the program was determined by what would appeal to the broadest possible mishmash, and periodically the program was further watered down on the plea that the new way to draw absolutely everyone in had been found. Thus the World Peace Congress tried to organize a movement without enemies in order to avoid antagonizing anyone.

True, later Khrushchov and company embraced the social-democrats even more ardently. But the basic ideological stand against social-democracy had already been undermined previous to Khrushchov. This is one of the reasons why Khrushchov could get away with his demagoguery on unity with the social-democrats without meeting an immediate rebuff. The same goes for his demagoguery on peaceful coexistence, negotiations among the big powers, denigration of the national liberation struggles, and other subjects.

The difference between the post-World War II period and the period of Soviet revisionism thus cannot be reduced to whether one upheld certain basic formulations. In a sense, Khrushchov just took everything further — but there is a point at which quantity turns into quality. The Khrushchovites joined hands with the Western imperialists, destroyed the socialist economy and replaced it with a capitalist system designed to enrich the bureaucratic elite, thoroughly purged the party and the state apparatus of proletarian elements, and so forth. This, and not certain basic formulations, is what divides the two periods. Indeed, the Brezhnevites that followed Khrushchov fixed up a few of the more outrageous of Khrushchov's formulations and tried to don a somewhat more orthodox appearance, while in fact deepening their revisionist treachery.

The Legacy of the Post-World War II Period and the Problems in the Struggle Against Soviet Revisionism

The corrosion of the Marxist-Leninist foundations of the international communist movement during the post-World War II period thus helped pave the way for the victories of Khrushchovism. This shows vividly why we cannot and must not "go back" to the stands of the post-World War II period, but must instead go back to the classics. This shows why any attempt to base the struggle against Soviet revisionism, against Khrushchovism, Brezhnevism and Andropovism, on the ideological grounds provided by the post-World War II period will lead to immediate difficulties. Indeed, this helps explain various of the difficulties that have

come up in fighting Soviet revisionism and why it has proved so difficult to reestablish a solid international Marxist-Leninist movement.

In the Soviet Union, certain attempts were made to oppose Khrushchov by the previous Soviet leaders, presumably on the basis of the post-World War II stands. This, one would guess, was the stand of the so-called (by Khrushchov) "anti-party group" of longtime eminent leaders, such as Molotov, Kaganovich, Malenkov and Voroshilov. This group, as described in Enver's book *The Khrushchevites* and in the current editions of *The History of the CPSU* by the Soviet revisionists, momentarily attained a majority in the Presidium of the CC of the CPSU in favor of deposing Khrushchov in June 1957, but was then decisively crushed and collapsed. It is notable how long it took these leaders to recognize the danger of Khrushchovism and how ineffective their opposition appears to have been. However, not much is really known about their views, presumably because their struggle was confined to certain maneuvering in the leadership of the Party.

It is also significant that the post-World War II stands have a relationship to the rise of "three worldism." Our Party has taken seriously the question of not only fighting to utterly rout the "three worlds" theory, but to investigate where it came from so as to be able to pull all its remnants up by the roots. The PLA played an important role in directing the attention of the international Marxist-Leninist movement to Mao Zedong Thought as the roots of the "three worlds" theory, and our Party has emphatically agreed with the importance of fighting Maoism.

But there is more to the study of the problem of the roots of "three worldism" than this. Important as the struggle is against Maoism and its various theses and variants — and we believe that this struggle must be carried through to the end and that various of the difficulties in the present-day international movement stem, in part, from a failure to carry through this struggle — there is yet another chapter to the story of "three worldism." There is the fact that, although Maoism has its own critique of the post-World War II period in the Soviet Union and although the particular formulations of the "three worlds" theory are distinctly Maoist, "three worldism" also shares a clear common ground with certain theses and practices from the post-World War II period.

Consider, for example, the question of the attitude to the oppressed countries. The theory of "three worlds" negates the toiling masses and banks everything on the wheeling and dealing of the bourgeoisie, the landlords and the existing governments. But it is striking that Zhdanov's "two camps" speech to the founding meeting of the Cominform in September 1947 also ignores the struggle of the toilers in the oppressed nations. He does say that "Indonesia and Viet Nam are associated with it [the democratic anti-imperialist camp — ed.]; it has the sympathy of India, Egypt and Syria." Viet Nam does at least receive a one-word mention, but the other passing references are to Egypt (this is not even Nasserite Egypt, but Egypt of the time of the monar-

chy!), the India of the national bourgeoisie and big landlords, and the ruling regimes in Syria and Indonesia. There is no direct reference to the internal forces of the toilers, and even such a gigantic liberation struggle as the civil war in China is not mentioned. "The fight for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies," however, is briefly mentioned in a list of the forces that back the anti-imperialist camp.

A similar approach can be found in Enver's writings. Consider Comrade Enver's report "On the International Situation and the Tasks of the Party" at the 3rd Plenum of the CC of the PLA in February 1957. (*Selected Works*, Volume II, pages 655-724) Although this was written one year after the 20th Congress of the CPSU, it most likely still reflects the post-World War II views since the PLA did not fall in with the Khrushchovites. In the first part of this work, Enver raises some questions concerning the oppressed nations. He supports the national liberation movement. But when it comes to the discussion of the oppressed countries whose regimes have a certain amount of independence, he only addresses himself to countries as a whole and to regimes. This is clear in the section entitled "The imperialist aggression against Egypt." There is no mention of the role of the toiling masses of Egypt or of how the Egyptian communists should act in the face of the repression directed against them by the Nasserite regime. Instead, the attention is concentrated on explaining why states "like Egypt, Syria, and others, are bourgeois, but not imperialist states; they pursue the policy of safeguarding their national independence and of fighting against imperialism and colonialism. ...but they are not socialist states.... That is why they are called independent, nonaligned states." (*Ibid.*, p. 659) Apparently Enver didn't deal with the question of the attitude of the toilers towards such regimes at any other time during the 50's either, for such questions did not appear anywhere in Volume II of his *Selected Works*.

This failure of the Cominform and other literature to discuss the independent role of the toilers towards the ruling regimes or to deal with national-reformism and this attitude towards the bourgeois-nationalist and other regimes in the oppressed countries is strikingly similar to that of "three worldism." This illustrates the fact that the weaknesses of the post-World War II period helped provide fertile ground for the growth of "three worldism," both that of the Soviet revisionists, who don't use the Maoist formulas, but who talk of the "third world" and court the reactionary regimes, and that of the Maoists.

Another way the question of the post-World War II period comes up in relation to the struggle against Soviet revisionism is with regard to the present stands of the PLA. In our Bulletin on the November 10 speech of Enver's, we pointed out that he makes use of some nationalist and "three worldist"-style rhetoric, but that "This does not mean that the PLA is really a Chinese 'three worlder,' for it has arrived at these errors from its own standpoint." The study of the post-World War II period sheds light on this question. It is clear that the post-World War period is a

major source for the nationalist and "three worldist" rhetoric of the PLA and that the PLA is presently seeking to channel the international Marxist-Leninist movement along the lines of various stands from that period. Although the PLA undoubtedly has various of its own particular formulations, it also stands fiercely by the post-World War period.

This indeed is one of the reasons why the PLA has not been able to continue the struggle against "three worldism" and Mao Zedong Thought. The PLA could not go beyond a certain point in criticizing "three worldism" without bringing into question various of the post-World War II stands. The PLA made a great contribution to this struggle with its denunciation of Mao Zedong Thought. But it did not have the fortitude to carry the struggle through to the end. Indeed, in its accounts of the history of the development of Chinese revisionism, it does its best to cover up any connection between the Maoist views and the post-World War II views on such questions as new democracy, the existence of different parties under socialism, the failure to deal with national-reformism and the attitude towards the ruling regimes in the oppressed countries.

The PLA has the knowledge and experience of the post-World War II period. In the various works of Enver, one will even find repeated criticisms of the Soviet Union in the days when it was socialist. These remarks are scattered around, but when put all together indicate that Enver and the PLA have definite grievances from this period. But the PLA raises these complaints only to immediately evade the question of what conclusion should be drawn from them. Enver and the PLA have not had the honesty to take the stand of subjecting everything, even the post-World War II period, to the test of a strict Marxist-Leninist analysis. In this way, the PLA has failed to live up to the requirements of the struggle against revisionism, for this struggle cannot be based on the post-World War II stands. This is not to deny that the PLA has made immense contributions. One cannot forget its heroic anti-fascist national liberation war, its unyielding fight against Khrushchov and his successors, its standing up to the imperialist-revisionist encirclement, its construction of socialism and its denunciation of Mao Zedong Thought. It may be "unfair," in a sense, that history placed the burden on the small but valiant PLA to do even more, to carry an even heavier load. But history is a stern taskmaster. It is the PLA that had the knowledge of the post-World War II period and that had the attention and respect of the international Marxist-Leninist movement. It was up to the PLA to give a correct and mature assessment. Its failure to do so has had serious consequences for the struggle against revisionism and for the strength and stability of the international Marxist-Leninist movement.

The Evaluation of the Post-World War II Period Has Become One of the Controversies in the International Marxist-Leninist Movement

The assessment of the post-World War II period is not

just an important key to understanding the problems in the current international movement and the history of the struggle against revisionism, but this issue is presently coming up as one of the controversies in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. It is not just a question which has attracted the attention of our Party, but it is becoming an issue around the world. Given the methods that are currently being used in the international Marxist-Leninist movement for the exchange of views and the resolving of controversies, the question of the post-World War II period is not generally being put forward openly in a straightforward manner. Yet again and again it is peeking to the surface.

A: First of all, we have already pointed out that the post-World War II views and theses are being put forward as a model to be followed in present-day work. Here we are not just referring to this model coming up indirectly when, say, the parties study various views of the PLA without knowing that they are based on the post-World War II period. But various parties are directly looking at the post-World War II analysis and applying it to the present. For example, we have become aware that certain parties are studying the experience of the people's democracies in Eastern Europe and the theories developed in the post-World War II period on the course of the revolution in order to help decide what the stage of revolution is in their own countries.

B: Enver has dealt with this question from various angles in his various books and memoirs of the last few years. First there was *With Stalin*, then *Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism*, and then *The Khrushchevites*. His recent book *The Titoites* also takes up certain questions on this theme. In these works, the PLA has fought for its views on the post-World War II period.

In these books Enver has sought to shield the general political stands taken in this period from a careful evaluation. For example, he has stated that the revisionist betrayal in the Soviet Union was preceded by a period of degeneration and sclerosis. He says that this sclerosis was particularly evident in the post-World War II period. But Enver then evades the question of the line being followed by saying that Stalin didn't know what was going on and that the general line was correct. In fact, Enver takes his analysis, without saying so, from Malenkov's Report to the 19th Congress, Part III, "The Party."

In this respect, it is notable how Enver deals with the question of the so-called "anti-party group" of Molotov, Kaganovich, Malenkov and others in the top leadership of the CPSU who opposed Khrushchov. He acknowledges glaring weaknesses in their stand and tells various stories to illustrate this. But he then reduces things to that they had degenerated, "had lost the revolutionary spirit, were no longer Marxist-Leninists, but corpses of Bolshevism." (*The Khrushchevites*, Ch. 6, p. 57, col. 2, *Proletarian Internationalism* edition; p. 187, Albanian edition) By talking of their degeneration, he evades the question of whether the difficulties this group had in recognizing the evil nature of Khrushchovism and in fighting against it had anything to

do with the views and practices that they had become accustomed to in the preceding period. When degeneration affects not one or two individuals, but the entire leadership of the most authoritative party in the international communist movement, one would think that a natural question would be to investigate whether there is a political basis for this tragedy.

Let us consider another example. The question arises of why, if the stands and practices of the post-World War II period were correct, did the French and Italian CP's, which were the pride of the Cominform and regarded as model parties, degenerate into the servile and corrupt parties they are today. Without saying so in so many words, Enver takes up this problem in *Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism*. But having raised this question, Enver promptly does his best to evade it.

Let us follow Enver's views with respect to the CP of France. He walks a tightrope: on one hand, he has to criticize the French CP in the post-World War II period because it is obvious that its later degeneration must have had some roots, while on the other hand he wants to do this in a way that doesn't reflect on the general stands of the Cominform at that time. Considering the promotion of the CP of France by the Cominform, this is some feat. This is why, on pages 28-29 (Ch. 2, p. 28, col. 2 - p. 29, col. 2 in *Proletarian Internationalism* edition; pp. 90-94, Albanian edition), he criticizes the CP of France for 1944-47, then says things were better at the end of 1947, and finally jumps to the period after Stalin's death. Although he doesn't see fit to tell the reader this, the CP of France received some criticism at the founding meeting of the Cominform in September 1947. Thus Enver follows the Cominform analysis by criticizing them for 1944-47. But Enver refuses to criticize them after 1947, until after the death of Stalin, because any such criticism would, in effect, reflect on the Cominform. Instead he prettifies them, as when he relates how the CP of France "rose against the new colonial wars of French imperialism" and "called on the working class to oppose the colonial war in Viet Nam, not merely with propaganda but also with concrete actions." (*Ibid.*) [The "Report On the Orientation of the French Communist Party in the Post-World War II Period," found elsewhere in this issue, shows that in reality the FCP had a shameless attitude towards French colonialism.]

C: The Communist Party of Japan (Left), which is part of the international Marxist-Leninist movement and has longstanding relations which continue to this day with the PLA and other Marxist-Leninist parties, has directly raised in its press the assessment of the post-World War II period. The CPJ(L) has been faced with the situation that the revisionist CP of Japan welcomed the U.S. imperialist occupation of Japan and even believed for years in the possibility of a socialist Japan under U.S. occupation. [The IB goes on to discuss the assessment the CPJ(L) makes of the post-World War II period and related stands of the CPJ(L).]

D: Raul Marco, [one of the leaders] of the CP of Spain (ML), is the author of the pamphlet "On Some Questions of

the International Movement" (October 3, 1982). This is the main document used by the CPS(ML) in its present work in the international Marxist-Leninist movement. In this document, Raul Marco raises various questions which the CPS (ML) considers of major importance and which, in their view, are not presently resolved. Among these is issue #2. "Why did modern revisionism arise? Why the degeneration of the Party of Lenin and Stalin. Until now no one has analyzed this problem with all the necessary profundity." Presumably he is raising, among other things, the need for an assessment of the post-World War II period, although, [he does not actually specify what his issue #2 is referring to. — WA]

E: This question has also been raised outside the Marxist-Leninist parties. The liquidators, among others, have raised various questions about the Soviet Union in the days it was socialist as part of their campaign to denigrate Marxism-Leninism. This type of consideration of the post-World War II period tends to bring the idea of assessing this period into disgrace among upright, militant Marxist-Leninists.

These different examples show that there is much more consideration of the post-World War II period going on than might be apparent on the surface. It has become one of the burning issues facing the international movement.

The Latter Part of the 1930's and Some Other Questions

The wrong stands of the post-World War II period naturally raises the question of how far back certain of these errors go. It is clear that certain of these weaknesses appear earlier, in the latter part of the 1930's, but not in such a flagrant form, whereas they flourished in the post-World War II period.

In this regard, it is worth noting that Enver, who does his best to say that there were no errors in line causing or contributing to the sclerosis that affected the CPSU, himself dates that sclerosis back to the late 1930's. In *The Khrushchevites* he says that "I am of the opinion that **even before the war**, but especially after the war, signs of a deplorable apathy appeared in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." (Ch. 2, p. 17, col. 2, *Proletarian Internationalism* edition; p. 43 Albanian edition, emphasis added) This strongly confirms that it is impossible to make a serious examination of the revisionist takeover in the CPSU without dealing with an entire process of corrosion extending back even into the post-World War II period. And it suggests that the problem began to appear in the late 1930's.

[The IB goes on to point out that the fight against fascism was **not** the problem in the late 1930's or during the Second World War. The IB emphasizes that, "Far from detracting from the revolution, the struggle against fascism led to tremendous victories for the world communist movement." The problem was that various mistaken views in the international communist movement weakened the struggle

against fascism and laid the basis for the seriously erroneous stands in the post-World War II period. The IB then returns to the discussion of the views in the post-World War II period. — WA]

Similarly, it must be kept in mind that we uphold that it was correct to give a call for struggle against U.S. imperialism and the U.S. imperialist drive for world hegemony. We denounce petty-bourgeois nationalism and the failure to fight "one's own" bourgeoisie for giving up the revolution and, as well, undermining the struggle against U.S. imperialism — indeed, these deviations led to the line of a movement without enemies. Of course, in our case U.S. imperialism is "our own" imperialism, and it would be unforgivable for us to slacken, however slightly, in the struggle against it. But for the movement in all countries, understanding the correct relationship between fighting U.S. imperialism and fighting the local imperialism or reactionary bourgeoisie, rather than crudely counterposing the two questions, is a crucial issue.

Thus, in particular, we still uphold our criticism of the "RCP's" national nihilism and their denunciation of the fight against U.S. imperialist domination, although if we were to redo our article on this question (Part III of *Against Mao Zedong Thought!*) we would not use the same quotation from the 19th Congress of the CPSU.

Finally, there is the question of the evaluation of Stalin's writings in this period. It is clear that Stalin wasn't ignorant of the general line being followed in the post-World War II period, but took part in it. Stalin's statements, his participation in the 19th Congress of the CPSU, the impossibility of his being unaware of the general line of the Cominform and his position at the head of the CC of the CPSU all indicate this. Our Party has maintained that Stalin's works are among the classics of Marxism-Leninism. However, his statements in the post-World War II period have some serious errors and weaknesses because they reflect the wrong ideological stand of that time on various key questions. However, Stalin upheld and continued the work of Lenin following Lenin's death, and this is reflected in his fine works until the various weaknesses appear in this last period.

On the Source Material for the Study of the Post-World War II Period

[Most, but not all, of the material listed below is reprinted in this issue of *The Workers' Advocate*. We have noted below those documents which we have not reprinted or which we have reprinted only in part. Anyone wishing to read the deleted material may acquire it for cost by writing to *The Workers' Advocate*.]

The bulk of this Bulletin consists of extensive material for the study of the post-World War II period. This material is taken from the most authoritative documents, and it provides a firm basis for the comrades to judge the line of this period. There are three basic types of materials pro-

vided.

- There are reports on different subjects. These reports were prepared by CC members to provide additional background material for the discussion at the 17th Plenum. The reports have then been further revised for inclusion in this bulletin.

- There are various documents to be read by all comrades. These often consist of excerpts in order to keep the amount of material to be examined within manageable limits.

- There are further documents, and the complete documents from which the excerpts referred to above were taken, which are available to be read by any comrade who wishes to. Because of the large amount of material involved, it is not possible to require that every comrade should read every document. By providing these extra documents, however, those comrades who wish to can examine them in order to investigate the issues more deeply, to check the context of the excerpts, to follow up some particular interest they may have, etc. We encourage comrades who are interested to examine these documents. We expect that those comrades who do read this or that additional document will, by their comments and views on what they read, help bring the benefit of these documents to the other comrades.

The various reports and documents can be grouped into six basic areas, and we recommend taking up these basic areas in the order given below.

I. There is material on the views of the leaders of the CPSU on foreign policy and the world situation. These materials corroborate that the CPSU was giving the same general line as seen at Cominform meetings and elsewhere during this period. This includes Malenkov's *Report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU* in 1952. It should be noted that Malenkov's Report is the main document of this Congress and gives the context for the short speech delivered there by Stalin.

All comrades should read the report entitled "Soviet Leaders on Foreign Policy and the World Situation" and the selected passages from Section I, "The International Situation" from Malenkov's *Report to the 19th Congress* [extracts in WA].

The additional reference material that is available is:

- the full text of Malenkov's *Report* [not reprinted in WA];
- Stalin's Speech at the 19th Congress of the CPSU [not reprinted]; and
- the pamphlet "Peaceful Coexistence — Joseph Stalin Postwar Interviews."

II. There is material from two important meetings of the Cominform in 1947 and 1949. These documents express the general line of the Cominform on the issues at stake and are among its most authoritative statements. In the case of Zhdanov's "two camps" speech, it achieved world fame both in the communist movement and among bourgeois circles, which both took it as marking a new phase in the orientation of the international communist movement.

All comrades should read the following materials:

- the "Introduction to Zhdanov's Speech" at the 1947 meeting that we have prepared;

- the selected parts of "The International Situation by A. Zhdanov" which is his famous "two camps" speech at the 1947 meeting [extracts in WA];

- the "Declaration on the Founding of the Cominform" of September 1947;

- the extract from the "Resolutions of the Meeting of the Cominform, November 1949."

III. There is material on the activities of the World Peace Congress. The World Peace Congress directly illustrates the line being given on how to organize the struggle against imperialist war and imperialist war preparations. It shows what the formulations given in the Cominform reports on the peace movement amounted to when translated into practice.

All comrades should read the "Report of the World Peace Congress."

The additional reference material that is available consists of:

- Section IV: "The Proletariat's Attitude Towards the Question of Disarmament and the Fight Against Pacifism" from the "Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, August 29, 1928" [This CI document is carried as positive material to show how these questions are approached from the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist standpoint.]; and

- the article "Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibilities of Averting It" by A. Seleznev [extracts in WA].

IV. There is a detailed report on the activities of the Communist Party of France. It is based on a study of approximately 150 documents from the CP of France in the Cominform journal *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*. The CP of France was a highly regarded party with a leftist reputation and was strongly promoted in the Cominform. Hence it provides a vivid illustration of what the general views of the post-World War II period amounted to in practice in an advanced capitalist country.

All comrades should read the "Report on the Orientation of the French Communist Party in the Post-World War II Decade."

The additional reference material includes:

- "Notes on the Post-World War II Situation in France from W.Z. Foster's Book *The New Europe* ('47)" [not reprinted];

- three documents from "The Twelfth Congress of the French Communist Party" [not reprinted];

- the article "The French Communist Party in the Struggle for the Independence of the Country, Against American Expansionism" (extracts) by Jacques Duclos;

- "Struggle of French Communists for Prohibition of Atomic Weapons (extracts)"; and

- the article "Historic Example of October Revolution and Middle Strata" (extracts) by Jacques Duclos.

V. There is the notorious revisionist document "The British Road to Socialism." It is interesting that the RCPB (ML), which has denounced this document up and down for over a decade, although without giving much content to

their denunciation of it, are now step by step taking up its petty-bourgeois nationalism. The British CP was not a strong party, but one of the weaker parties of the international movement. Therefore one would not a priori take its actions and documents as representative of the international movement. But "The British Road to Socialism" was reproduced in the Cominform journal and endorsed. Thus this document shows how far the ideological stand of the post-World War II period had disintegrated.

All comrades should read the introduction "On 'The British Road to Socialism'" and the highlighted parts of "The British Road to Socialism" itself.

For reference, the article "The Fight for British Independence" by R. Palme Dutt has been included, where Dutt twists and turns to defend the petty-bourgeois nationalism of "The British Road to Socialism" from public ridicule. [Not reprinted]

VI. There is a report on the nature of the repudiation of Browderite revisionism in the U.S. Browderite revisionism was one of the forerunners of Khrushchovism. This adds interest to the question of what type of denunciation of Browderism was accomplished in the post-World War II period, and even more so because of the role played by the celebrated letter from Jacques Duclos, a leader of the CP of France. It turns out, however, that William Z. Foster and Jacques Duclos repudiated Browder from liberal-labor positions.

All comrades should read the report "On Browderism."

The pamphlet *Marxism-Leninism Versus Revisionism* containing the Duclos letter and articles by Foster and other leaders of the CPUSA has been included as reference material. [extracts in WA]

In studying all this material on the post-World War II period, one is confronted with many issues regarding many complex events. It therefore should be borne in mind that there are certain basic issues, issues that are fundamental tenets of Leninism, that can be used as a guide. The point is not that we are expressing an opinion on every tactical complexity of this period, but that the main drift of all the material from the period confirms the departure from Leninism on a number of fundamental questions. This includes such issues as:

- the question of the revolution;
- the question of the fight against social-democracy and opportunism;
- the question of directing the struggle against "one's own" bourgeoisie;
- the question of the national liberation movement;

— the question of the struggle of the toiling masses of the oppressed countries against capitalist-landlord regimes; and

— the question of petty-bourgeois nationalism in the imperialist countries.

The study of this Bulletin and the accompanying materials should clearly demonstrate the wrong orientation followed in the post-World War II period on these fundamental issues.

Towards the Second Congress

As we have said above, this Bulletin is part of the preparations for the Second Congress. It is an essential part of a mature, serious evaluation of the questions facing the international Marxist-Leninist movement. An assessment of the post-World War II situation provides a valuable key to understanding the present situation and to grasping various of the difficulties and setbacks that have afflicted the struggle against Soviet revisionism. And this assessment is necessary to uphold our stand of relying on the Marxist-Leninist classics and to preserve and strengthen the ideological foundations of the Party. The post-World War II situation has been put forth as either a further development that supersedes various of the stands of the classics or as the concrete application of the classics, so that assessing the post-World War II situation is necessary in order to ensure that one really upholds the classics.

The assessment of the post-World War II situation is coming up internationally. All parties are being forced to deal with it. But this does not mean that our views will be popular. Should the Second Congress of the Party adopt these views and decide to fight for them, we can expect a difficult, protracted and complex struggle. But the importance of a correct assessment of this period demands that we fight to uphold the truth and not shuffle it under the rug.

The importance of this question demands that it be studied carefully and thoroughly. The necessity to stand firmly for our views in a difficult struggle demands that all our comrades be clear and prepared. For both these reasons, this question is being put forward now, well before the Congress, so that all comrades have the chance to examine this question now, in an intensive period of study. Our Party prepares well and takes its time coming to conclusions on such questions, but when we have reached our view, we stand firm as a rock. □

Soviet Leaders on the World Situation

This is a report on some features of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the analysis of the world situation by Soviet leaders in the post-World War II period. It is based on major statements by the most authoritative spokesmen of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik), namely Stalin, Molotov and Malenkov.

Stalin's remarks quoted here are from a pamphlet of his post-war interviews and statements published by the Communist Party USA (CPUSA) in 1951, entitled *For Peaceful Coexistence*, and from his work *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*. With respect to the interviews, we note that they are brief statements and do not provide much elaboration. However, the content of the remarks indicate that Stalin fully shared the views put forward by other CPSU spokesmen; indeed, quotes from these interviews are used as authoritative statements in numerous documents of the post-World War II period. Finally, it should be remembered that, besides his work on linguistics, these interviews and the book *Economic Problems* were the principal documents from Stalin that were publicly released in this period. They are as important for what they don't say as for what they say. As far as we know, there are no authoritative public statements which fill in these gaps.

We have also used statements of Molotov and Malenkov who were among the closest colleagues of Stalin. Molotov was foreign minister of the USSR from 1939-49 and again from 1953-56. Malenkov was a major party leader who delivered the main report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU in 1952. He became First Secretary of the Party and prime minister of the Soviet government after Stalin's death. Both Molotov and Malenkov were expelled by Khrushchov from the Presidium of the CPSU in 1957 for being part of the so-called "Anti-Party Group." Statements by Molotov and Malenkov are in the main taken from the Cominform journal, *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*.

This report does not deal with the details of foreign policy such as the various particular proposals advanced and fought over. Rather it concentrates on the CPSU leaders' analysis of the world situation and the general policy they advocated for dealing with that situation. From this study one can draw a few general conclusions:

1) The most striking thing about the orientation on the

world situation is the complete absence of revolutionary spirit. The questions of the class struggle, and of the revolutionary movement generally, are hardly to be found. Although in a series of countries big battles were raging between the communist-led revolutionary movements and imperialism and domestic reaction, one does not find much enthusiasm for them in the statements of the CPSU leaders. This is notable with regards to Greece, China, Indochina, and the Philippines, among others. Thus, proletarian internationalism as the fundamental basis of the international policy of the Soviet Union is nowhere to be found.

2) Instead of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet leaders lay principal stress on such questions as peaceful coexistence, peaceful cooperation, and peaceful competition among the great powers. Naturally it is necessary for any genuinely socialist country to do everything that it can to fight against the imperialists' war plans. And of course a socialist country is not aggressive, but stands for peace. But this does not mean that proletarian internationalism can be replaced as the driving force in the communists' international policy. Nor can illusions be created that the imperialists will put down their butcher knives or that all that is necessary for peace is pious words about peace. It is harmful to teach the world proletariat to place its faith in great-power negotiations and agreements. But it is precisely such harmful illusions that were sowed by the leaders of the CPSU after the Second World War.

3) There is, however, a certain evolution which takes place in the analysis of world affairs by the Soviet leaders in the post-war period. In the immediate years after the war, up to the middle of 1947, there are euphoric assessments about the prospects for the continuation of the wartime alliance between the USSR and the Anglo-American imperialists.

These illusions collapse in the face of the stepped-up offensive of the imperialists led by the U.S. government. The Soviet leaders then begin to talk in more militant terms, they begin to denounce imperialism (which was notably lacking in the earlier years), and so forth. But there is no fundamental change in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. In this period following the middle of 1947, the

period coinciding with the existence of the Cominform, the statements of the CPSU leaders continue to stress a foreign policy based on peace and cooperation. The general perspective of the CPSU leaders is to denounce the imperialists for breaking their agreements and to call on the imperialists to return to the path of great-power cooperation.

Around the time of the 19th Congress of the CPSU in 1952, it appears that there are strains developing in the U.S.-led imperialist camp and the Soviet leaders step up their appeals to those imperialists who are the junior partners in the U.S.-dominated alliance. Around this time the Soviet leaders assess that it is possible to return to the path of conferences and agreements between the Big Powers. Following the death of Stalin in 1953, such assessments bear fruition in the Korean ceasefire, the Berlin Conference and the Geneva talks on Korea and Indochina. Once again, euphoric statements abound about the glories that will come from collaboration between the Soviet Union and the imperialists. This then sets the stage for the 20th Congress of the CPSU and the flowering of Khrushchovite revisionism.

• **Speech by Stalin Delivered at a Meeting of Voters of the Stalin Electoral Area of Moscow, February 9, 1946**

We will now begin a review of the statements of the leaders of the CPSU. The first series of quotes are from the period of 1946 up to mid-1947. These statements are marked by an absence of revolutionary spirit. The question of the fight against war is detached from the class struggle and there are no appeals to build up the revolutionary movement. What is more, these statements indicate a profound confusion on the nature of U.S. imperialism and illusions that there can be the maintenance of the wartime collaboration between the American imperialists and the Soviet Union and the progressive people. Although U.S. imperialism pursued its own imperialist ambitions during the anti-fascist war, and although at the war's end the U.S. imperialists dropped two atomic bombs on the all-but-defeated Japan as the beginning of nuclear blackmail against the Soviet Union and the anti-fascist movements around the world, and although after World War II the U.S. government led an imperialist offensive against the Soviet Union and the revolutions in many countries around the globe, U.S. imperialism is not denounced. Even where contradictions are such that they cannot be brushed aside, the most that the Soviet leaders criticize is "certain circles" or "reactionaries," but not imperialism.

In Stalin's speech to the meeting of voters he provides an assessment of the character of the Second World War and how it differed from the First World War. The statement is correct in pointing out that World War II had a generally anti-fascist character. As well, there were various anti-fascist features to the war from its beginning. However, Stalin's statement fails to acknowledge that the U.S. and British imperialists pursued aims in the war which were in fact different than those pursued by the Soviet Union and the popular masses. While correctly upholding the tempo-

rary wartime alliance between the Soviet Union and these imperialist powers, Stalin's remarks give the impression that in this alliance the Soviet Union and the imperialists shared the same democratic and liberating aims.

Here is what Stalin says:

"Thus the First World War was the result of the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and the Second World War was the result of a second crisis.

"That does not mean of course that the Second World War is a copy of the first. On the contrary, the Second World War differs materially from the first in nature. It must be borne in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the principal fascist states — Germany, Japan and Italy — destroyed the last vestiges of bourgeois democratic liberties at home, established a brutal terrorist regime in their own countries, rode roughshod over the principles of sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed a policy of seizure of alien territories as their own policy and declared for all to hear that they were out for world domination and the establishment of a fascist regime throughout the world.

"Moreover, by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and of the central areas of China, the Axis states showed that they were prepared to carry out their threat of enslaving all freedom-loving nations. In view of this, unlike the First World War, the Second World War against the Axis states from the very outset assumed the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the aims of which was also the restoration of democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis states could only enhance, and indeed did enhance, the anti-fascist and liberation character of the Second World War.

"It was on this basis that the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and other freedom-loving states came into being — a coalition which subsequently played a decisive part in defeating the armed forces of the Axis states."

• **Interview with Stalin published in *Pravda* on March 13, 1946**

This interview is published a week after Churchill's infamous "iron curtain" speech. That speech marked one of the opening volleys of the anti-communist Cold War. Stalin assesses this speech as "a dangerous act; calculated to sow the seeds of discord among the Allied governments and hamper their cooperation." While denouncing Churchill as a warmonger, Stalin fails to connect his diatribe with imperialism, but only points out that Churchill "has friends not only in England but also in the USA."

These remarks are quite characteristic of Soviet foreign policy in the immediate post-war period, which appears to underestimate the offensive which U.S.-led world imperialism is launching. Instead it is marked by profound illusions about the continuation of the wartime alliance. It should be noted that by this time the U.S. and British governments had already shown repeated indications of "getting tough" with the Soviet Union. This had been marked, for example,

by forcing the anti-fascist government in Poland to accept representatives from Polish reaction which had been based in London during the war, as well as machinations to rig up an Anglo-American domination of the newly formed United Nations Organization.

There is another remark of Stalin's in this interview which is notable. One of the charges which Churchill had made was that the Soviet Union was establishing its control over Eastern Europe. He had characterized this as "the boundless expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union." Stalin's principal reply to this charge was:

"...the following circumstances should not be forgotten. The Germans made their invasion of the USSR through Finland, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. The Germans were able to make their invasion through these countries because, at the time, governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. As a result of the German invasion the Soviet Union has lost irretrievably in the fighting against the Germans, and also through the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet citizens to German servitude, a total of about seven million people. In other words, the Soviet Union's loss of life has been several times greater than that of Britain and the United States of America put together. Possibly in some quarters an inclination is felt to forget about these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people which secured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. **And so what can there be surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, anxious for its future safety, is trying to see to it that governments loyal in their attitude to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries?** How can anyone, who has not taken leave of his wits, describe these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as expansionist tendencies on the part of our state?" (emphasis added)

This is of course no real rejoinder to Churchill. Stalin glosses over the revolutionization of Eastern Europe which the Soviet Union was then assisting. Instead, Stalin talks in the language of big powers and of setting up governments loyal to your own; he talks as if he is haggling with the imperialists about carving out spheres of influence.

• **Stalin's answers to the questions of Eddy Gilmore, AP correspondent, on March 22, 1946**

On the question of the threat of war, Stalin says: "I am convinced that neither nations nor their armies seek a new war. They want peace, and seek to secure the peace. That means that the present war scare does not come from that direction. I think that the present war scare is aroused by the actions of certain political groups who are engaged in propaganda for a new war and are thus sowing the seeds of dissension and uncertainty." Thus, the source of the war danger is reduced to "certain [unnamed] political groups." There is no reference to imperialism or anything hinting at the class character of these groups.

As to what needs to be done, Stalin replies: "It is neces-

sary that **the public and the ruling circles of the states** organize widespread counter-propaganda against the propagandists for a new war, as well as propaganda for the maintenance of peace; that not a single utterance of the propagandists for a new war gets away without the rebuff it deserves on the part of public opinion and the press; that in this way the warmongers be promptly exposed and given no opportunity to misuse freedom of speech against the interests of peace."

Here two things are noteworthy. First, Stalin's appeal is a common appeal to both "the public" and "the ruling circles of states." Again, class questions are obscured. Second, there is no call to build up the revolutionary movement against imperialism. Instead, there is simply an appeal to oppose the "warmongers" through the bourgeois press.

• **Stalin's Order of the Day, May 1, 1946**

This version of Stalin's statement is taken from a pamphlet published in 1946. It was slightly altered in the 1951 version, the main change being replacement of "nations" in the original with "peoples." But irrespective of this change, it is noteworthy that there is no class differentiation, only a differentiation between "nations" and "reactionary leaders," who are said to pursue "narrow caste" aims. As for the perspective of the struggle that the nations are supposed to carry out, this is limited to democracy in general, and more particularly, to the "consolidation of peace and security." The Soviet Union is described as "in the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security." It is to be noted that this is a statement by Stalin to the Soviet people and not an interview with foreign correspondents.

Stalin describes the outcome of World War II in the following terms:

"...The Second World War, prepared by the forces of international reaction and unleashed by the chief fascist states, ended in a full victory of the freedom-loving nations. The smashup and liquidation of the main hotbeds of fascism and world aggression resulted in changes in the political life of the nations of the world, in a wide growth of the democratic movement of the nations.

"Taught by the experience of war, the popular masses realized that the destinies of states cannot be entrusted to reactionary leaders, who pursue the narrow caste and selfish anti-popular aims. It is for this reason that nations which no longer wish to live in the old way, take destinies of their states into their own hands, establish democratic order and actively fight against the forces of reaction, against instigators of a new war. The nations of the world do not wish a repetition of the calamities of war. They fight persistently for consolidation of peace and security.

"In the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security marches the Soviet Union, which played an outstanding part in smashing fascism and fulfilled its great mission of liberation. The nations liberated by the Soviet Union from the fascist yoke received an opportunity of building their state life on democratic foundations, of realizing their

historical aspirations. On this road they find fraternal assistance on the part of the Soviet Union." (J. Stalin and V.M. Molotov, *The Soviet Union and World Peace*, New Century Publishers, N.Y., 1946, pp. 30-31)

• **Statement of Molotov to the Soviet press on the results of the Paris Conference of the Council of Foreign Ministers, May 27, 1946**

The Council of Foreign Ministers (of the USSR, USA, Britain and, later, France) was set up as a body at the Moscow Conference of Three Ministers in December 1945. The Paris Conference dealt with the question of peace treaties with Italy, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland.

Molotov's statement records numerous issues of contention between the Soviet Union and the Anglo-American imperialists. He notes a series of facts about the Anglo-American imperialist offensive that is already well under way. However, it is notable in such a statement that Molotov, while showing awareness of the designs of world reaction, refuses to name their source in imperialism, but only points to "certain circles," and so forth. As for the perspective for the future, it is limited to only "peace and security."

Molotov points out, among other things, that:

"It is not for nothing that in certain countries advocates of new imperialist domination of the world by one of the strongest states have now acquired great weight, and, without feeling inconvenienced by the official position of a senator or a deputy, are trumpeting about their expansionist plans, are instigating new aggressive wars, disregarding lightmindedly the lessons of the inglorious collapse of imperialist Germany and of her plans for world domination. The future is now not with these gentlemen but with those nations which, like the Soviet Union, desire lasting peace and bind the interests of their security with the interests of the security of other peace-loving nations." (*Ibid.*, pp. 45-46)

• **Stalin's Interview with Alexander Werth, correspondent of the London Sunday Times, September 24, 1946**

This interview is another striking example of the over-optimistic view about the aims of the imperialist powers in the immediate post-war period. In this interview Stalin denies that a real danger of a new war exists. It may have been quite true that a new world war was not an immediate threat. But here Stalin goes overboard, suggesting more than that. In reply to the question of whether the U.S. and British governments are consciously placing the Soviet Union in a state of capitalist encirclement, Stalin says: "I do not think that the ruling circles of Great Britain and of the United States of America could create a 'capitalist encirclement' of the Soviet Union even if they so desired, **which, however, I do not assert.**" (emphasis added) Furthermore, on the issue of the possibility of friendly and lasting cooperation and friendly competition between the Soviet Union

and the "Western democracies," Stalin replies: "I believe in it absolutely."

• **Stalin's interview with Hugh Bailie, president, United Press, October 28, 1946**

This interview hints that there are problems between the Allies, such as on the question of the denazification of Germany, but the general assessment is quite different. In reply to a question about whether Stalin agrees with the feeling of U.S. Secretary of State Byrnes that there is growing tension between the U.S. and the USSR, Stalin replies: "No." The worst threat to world peace is described as "The instigators of a new war, in the first place Churchill and people of like mind in Britain and the USA."

This interview was made at a time when the civil war was raging in Greece and the British imperialists were massively attacking the Greek people. Meanwhile, the U.S. imperialists were stepping up their preparations to bolster Greek and Turkish reaction, which were codified in the Truman Doctrine of March 1947. On September 30, 1946, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal had announced the U.S. Navy's decision to have a permanent U.S. task force in the Mediterranean.

Stalin was asked about these questions. On the question of how the USSR regards the presence of British troops in Greece, Stalin replies: "As unnecessary." Period. There is no condemnation or anything else expressed. And asked about how the USSR regards the presence of U.S. warships in the Mediterranean, Stalin simply replies: "Indifferent."

• **Stalin's interview with Elliot Roosevelt, December 21, 1946**

This is another striking example of the illusions about the continuation of the wartime alliance. Asked whether it is possible for the U.S. to live peacefully alongside the Soviet Union, with no attempt of either to interfere in the internal affairs of the other, Stalin replies:

"Yes, of course. This is not only possible. It is wise and entirely within the bounds of realization. In the most strenuous times during the war the differences in government did not prevent our two nations from joining together and vanquishing our foes. **Even more so is it possible to continue this relationship in time of peace.**" (emphasis added)

Stalin also comes out supporting the creation by the UN Security Council of an international police force drawn from all the United Nations, which would immediately step in wherever armed warfare threatens peace. The idea that a joint socialist-capitalist armed force could police the world, that such a force could take a common stand whether the issue were to suppress reactionaries or revolutionaries, is absurd to say the least.

With respect to the conflicts that have come up between the U.S. and Soviet governments, Stalin replies: "As to the relations between the two governments, there have been

misunderstandings. A certain deterioration has taken place, and then great noise has been raised that their relations would even deteriorate still further. But I see nothing frightful about this in the sense of violation of peace or military conflict." Stalin reiterates his view that the danger of a new war is unreal. On the failure in the American and British zones of Germany to carry out denazification, Stalin replies: "No, it has not been a cause for serious alarm, but of course it is unpleasant for the Soviet Union that part of our common program is not being put into effect."

Finally, it is noteworthy that when Stalin speaks of the possibilities of U.S.-Soviet cooperation, he takes it quite far. In reply to whether the U.S. and Soviet Union should form a common policy of aid to the peoples of the Far East, Stalin replies: "I feel it will be useful if it is possible. **In any case our government is ready to pursue a common policy with the United States in Far Eastern questions.**" (emphasis added) One cannot say that by this time the aims of U.S. policy in the Far East were unclear. For example, the U.S. was backing Chiang Kai-shek in the civil war in China which was beginning at this time; in fact, China was at this very moment the arena of a widespread movement against U.S. imperialism.

• **Stalin's interview with Harold Stassen, April 9, 1947**

This interview reaffirms Stalin's views about cooperation between the U.S. and the USSR. However, this interview offers an interesting glimpse of how Stalin posed the question of coexistence. Stassen tries to promote that the U.S. (under Roosevelt) had a different economic system than Nazi Germany, disagreeing with Stalin. Stassen holds up Roosevelt's regime as an example of how Marx and Engels were wrong about how much progress the workers could make with their votes. Stalin replies by casting aside Marx and the class struggle:

"Let us not mutually criticize our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain. Which one is better will be said by history. We should respect the systems chosen by the people, and whether the system is good or bad is the business of the American people. To cooperate, one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure cooperation. **Only, if we criticize, it will lead us too far.**

"As for Marx and Engels, they were unable to foresee what would happen forty years after their death. But we should adhere to mutual respect of people. Some people call the Soviet system totalitarian. Our people call the American system monopoly capitalism. **If we start calling each other names with the words monopolist and totalitarian, it will lead to no cooperation.**

"We must start from the historical fact that there are two systems approved by the people. **Only on that basis is cooperation possible. If we distract each other with criticism, that is propaganda.**

"As to propaganda, I am not a propagandist but a businesslike man. We should not be sectarian. When the people wish to change the systems they will do so. When we met with Roosevelt to discuss the questions of war, we did not call each other names. We established cooperation and succeeded in defeating the enemy." (emphasis added)

• **Malenkov's report to the founding meeting of the Cominform, August 1947**

In the face of the full-scale imperialist offensive, the views of the Soviet leaders on the world situation made a turn in the middle of 1947. This change was marked at the founding meeting of the Cominform. After the illusions of the 1945-47 period, the U.S. government is finally denounced as imperialist and reactionary and its striving for world domination is condemned. Nevertheless, the underlying foundations and aims of Soviet foreign policy do not change. Proletarian internationalism continued to be lost sight of. There was no enthusiasm for the revolutionary struggles around the world. The anti-war struggle continued to be detached from the class struggle. And the general perspective remained that of forcing U.S. imperialism back to the path of great-power cooperation.

In another article we comment on the famous "two camps" speech of A. Zhdanov which was presented to the founding meeting of the Cominform. Here we will present a few excerpts from Malenkov's report to the Cominform which contained a major section on the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

To begin, Malenkov describes two opposite trends in foreign policy which have taken shape in the world.

"One is the policy pursued by the Soviet Union and the new democracies. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and of the democratic countries is designed to undermine imperialism, secure a stable democratic peace among the nations and generally strengthen amicable cooperation among the peace-loving nations. In following this line, our foreign policy is supported by the increased international significance of the Soviet state and the new democracies.

"The other trend in international politics is headed by the ruling clique of American imperialists. In their efforts to consolidate the position which American monopoly capital gained in Europe and Asia during the war, this clique has taken the path of outright expansion, of enthraling the weakened capitalist states of Europe and the colonial and dependent countries. It has chosen the path of hatching new war plans against the USSR and the new democracies under the banner of combating the 'communist menace.' The clearest and most specific expression of this policy pursued by American capital is provided by the Truman-Marshall plans."

This statement shows how the Soviet leaders condemned U.S. imperialism. It should be noted that Zhdanov's speech also pointed out that the Western imperialists had pursued imperialist aims during World War II. In the material that

we have, this was the first time since the war ended that such an analysis was put forward in a statement by leaders of the Soviet Union. However, it should be noted that the criticism of the "ruling clique of American imperialism" may only be referring to part of the U.S. ruling class, only to certain ultra-reactionary or adventurist circles. Zhdanov's speech, in another place, seems to long for the "old course of Roosevelt."

What is most notable about Malenkov's assessment of two opposing foreign policies is the narrowness of Soviet policy. Proletarian internationalism drops out of sight and the aims of foreign policy are limited to pious words about "democratic peace" and "cooperation" which are to be secured without revolutionary struggle.

Further on in his statement, Malenkov gives a more detailed elaboration of the "foundations" of the foreign policy of the CPSU:

"We proceed from the fact that the coexistence of two systems — capitalism and socialism — is inevitable for a long period of time and we follow the line of maintaining loyal good-neighborly relations with all states manifesting a desire for friendly cooperation on the condition that the principle of reciprocity is observed and that obligations are fulfilled. The USSR, true to its international treaties and obligations, pursues this policy with the utmost consistency and firmness.

"But at the same time we are prepared to repel any policy hostile to the Soviet Union, no matter from what quarter it comes. The Soviet Union, together with the democratic countries, invariably exposes all enemies of peace, all foes of friendship among the nations, all enemies of international cooperation on a democratic basis. It combats all attempts by hostile imperialist circles to discriminate against the USSR and the new democracies, belittle their importance or ignore them in the solution of major questions of international policy, weave intrigues against the USSR and the new democracies, and set up hostile blocs and groupings.

"The CPSU(B) clearly and distinctly sees the danger of the reorientation now being effected by certain former war allies of the USSR....

"We oppose to the plans of the American and British imperialists the friendly cooperation of the Soviet Union and democratic countries, primarily the new democracies....

"With regard to countries that have proven true friends and loyal allies of the Soviet state — the new democracies — the USSR is always prepared to come to their assistance, and actually does so by rendering them extensive aid and firmly defending their interests.

"The USSR and the new democracies pursue a policy of unswerving support with regard to colonial and dependent countries fighting for their national liberation from the yoke of imperialism.

"Such are the foundations of the foreign policy of the CPSU(B)."

Here we see that "peaceful coexistence" is proclaimed as being "inevitable for a long period of time" and is put forward as the basis of the CPSU's foreign policy. Proletarian internationalism, the basis of a Leninist line, is not even mentioned. This fact is further amplified by the complete lack of enthusiasm for the revolutionary struggles around the world. There is one sentence claiming support for the national liberation struggles, but this is the only such sentence in the entire report. And there is no discussion of how to organize towards socialist revolution in the capitalist countries. At another place in the report, Malenkov does mention that the working class movement has grown stronger and that the Soviet Union has helped it, but this is only mentioned in passing. The real center of the CPSU policy is thrust forward as being pious appeals for "peace" and "cooperation" among nations which is to be achieved without revolutionary struggle.

• Stalin's interview with *Pravda* correspondent, October 28, 1948

This interview is made during the Berlin crisis in 1948. Stalin denounces the policy of the U.S. and British governments in the UN Security Council as a "display of the aggressiveness of the policy of Anglo-American and French ruling circles." Asked to explain this phenomenon, Stalin replies:

"The thing is that those in the United States and Great Britain who inspire an aggressive policy do not consider themselves interested in an agreement and in cooperation with the USSR. What they want is not agreement and cooperation, but talk about agreement and cooperation, so as to put the blame on the USSR by preventing agreement and thus to 'prove' that cooperation with the USSR is impossible. What the war instigators who are striving to unleash a new war fear most of all is the reaching of agreements and cooperation with the USSR because a policy of concord with the USSR undermines the position of the instigators of war and deprives the aggressive policy of these gentlemen of any purpose."

This statement shows that there has been no fundamental break with the conceptions about foreign policy seen in Stalin's earlier remarks. In this period, while the aggressive acts of the imperialists are openly denounced, there are simply calls to return to the policy of cooperation and agreement, which it is claimed will undermine the warmongers. When asked about where all this will end, Stalin replies:

"It can only end in ignominious failure on the part of the instigators of a new war. Churchill, the main instigator of a new war, has already managed to deprive himself of the trust of his own nation and of democratic forces throughout the world. The same fate lies in store for all other instigators of war. The horrors of the recent war are still too fresh in the memory of the peoples; and public forces

favoring peace are too strong for Churchill's pupils in aggression to overpower them and to turn them toward a new war."

Presumably, the example of Churchill refers to his defeat in the 1945 elections. But Churchill wasn't the only warmonger. For example, the Labor government which replaced Churchill in 1945 was no less warmongering. Besides, Churchill himself would return to power in 1951. How Churchill's defeat shows that the warmongers are getting defeated is really hard to see.

*** Molotov's Report to the Moscow Soviet on the 31st anniversary of the October Revolution, November 6, 1948**

This report has a section on foreign policy entitled: "In the vanguard of struggle for a lasting, democratic peace." This report goes into the following issues:

— the status of the international agreements between the wartime allies. It describes the holdups in the fulfillment of agreements concerning Germany and Japan.

— the struggle against aggression, propaganda for a new war, etc. It goes into activity in the UNO. It discusses the Soviet disarmament proposals and so forth.

— the question of the atomic bomb. It praises Henry Wallace, a former vice-president during one of Roosevelt's presidential terms, and the Progressive Party that he ran on in the 1948 elections, for coming out against the A-bomb.

— denounces the aggressive policies of Anglo-American imperialism and the breaking of international agreements. As to where all this is likely to end, Molotov quotes Stalin's remark from the October 28 interview with *Pravda*. Then he continues to say:

"The elections in the United States on November 2 resulted in a victory for the Democratic Party and President Truman. The failure of the Republican Party and Dewey who came forward in the elections with a frankly reactionary and most aggressive program indicates that the majority of the American people reject this program."

This is truly an amazing statement when one considers that it is President Truman and the Democratic Party which launched and had been heading up the post-World War II counterrevolutionary worldwide offensive of U.S. imperialism. This statement indicates not so much the CPSU's leaders' faith in the American people as their illusions about coming to terms with the Democratic Party.

Molotov's speech then concludes its remarks on this section with a couple of paragraphs on how the democratic and anti-imperialist forces in Europe and Asia are growing stronger and stronger.

*** Stalin's greeting to the President and Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic, October 13, 1949**

In this greeting Stalin makes an exaggerated assessment, to say the least, of the significance of the establishment of the GDR.

"The formation of the peace-loving German Democratic Republic is a turning point in the history of Europe. There can be no doubt that the existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslaving of European countries by the world imperialists."

*** Malenkov's speech to the Moscow Soviet on the 32nd anniversary of the October Revolution, November 6, 1949**

This has a section on foreign policy entitled: "The Soviet Union stands for peace and defends the cause of peace." It starts as follows:

"If asked what is the main thing in our foreign policy it is, to put it briefly, that the Soviet Union stands for peace and upholds the cause of peace."

This speech discusses the world peace movement. It declares about this movement:

"History knows no such mass movement as that uniting the international supporters of peace. There is not a single country in which this movement does not possess a base nor one in which it is not growing and spreading...."

Speaking of the Paris World Peace Congress Malenkov says:

"This Congress vividly demonstrated that the international peace movement is based not on pacifist ideology, which as a rule combines denial of war in words with utter passivity in deeds, but in a firm determination actively to fight the warmongers and frustrate their perfidious schemes and designs."

This is, of course, a ridiculously wrong definition of pacifism. The problem with the pacifists is not their "utter passivity in deeds"; in fact, many pacifists are quite active. The problem with pacifism is, among other things, that it gives a wrong analysis of the source of war, that it denies the class basis of war, that it denies all use of force against the oppressors and reactionaries, and, therefore, that it opposes the revolutionary struggle against imperialism which is necessary for any real struggle against imperialist war. What this statement indicates is that the leaders of the CPSU were having a hard time drawing a distinction between the tactics followed by the World Peace Congress and the tactics of the ordinary, run-of-the-mill pacifists.

Malenkov describes the strength of the peace movement to be based on the following:

"The international peace movement owes its greatness and strength to the fact that it unites beneath its banner hundreds of millions of workers by hand and brain, irre-

spective of race or nationality, religious or political views.

"The peace movement also owes its strength to the fact that it is developing on a solid organizational foundation which is growing stronger and stronger. We know that national associations of the partisans of peace have been set up in nearly every country of the world."

Thus, Malenkov's report confirms that the World Peace Congress and its tactics had the full backing of the Soviet Union. (For more on this see the article "Report on the World Peace Congress" elsewhere in this issue of *The Workers' Advocate*.)

• **Stalin's interview with *Pravda*, February 16, 1951**

In this interview, Stalin gives his views on the prospects of war and endorses the peace movement. In discussing why he does not consider a world war inevitable at the moment, Stalin does acknowledge that in the U.S., Britain and France there are aggressive forces thirsting for a war. He even acknowledges that the billionaires, war profiteers and reactionary governments are carrying out warmongering.

But when it comes to the question of what to do about it, then it is another story. The struggle for peace is emptied of all content; it is not connected to the struggle against imperialism, or against the capitalists, or against the reactionary government, or anything. Instead there is just empty phrases about taking the cause of peace into one's own hands. This is a passage which is then quoted over and over again in the literature of the time as a statement of great significance. He says:

"Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

"That is why the wide campaign for the maintenance of peace as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers is now of first-rate importance.

"As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future as well firmly to pursue the policy of averting war and maintaining peace."

• **Law in Defense of Peace, passed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, March 12, 1951**

This law outlaws propaganda for war, regardless of the form in which it is carried out. It does not distinguish between just and unjust wars. Thus, on the face of it, it outlaws propaganda for revolutionary wars too.

• **Stalin's work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR*, published in the Soviet press during the first week of October 1952**

This book has a section entitled "Inevitability of wars between capitalist countries." This speaks to the question

of the inevitability of war under imperialism and gives an assessment on the peace movement. We had originally thought that Stalin was here simply describing the peace movement as it existed at the time. But after studying the material of the period and thinking it all over, we have concluded that this is not what Stalin is doing. He is drawing a distinction between the post-World War II peace movement and the movement during the First World War in order to imply that the established Leninist tactics of struggle against imperialist war no longer apply in the new conditions after World War II. Stalin writes:

"The object of the present-day peace movement is to rouse the masses of the people to fight for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of another world war. Consequently, the aim of this movement is not to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism — it confines itself to the democratic aim of preserving peace. In this respect, the present-day peace movement differs from the movement of the time of the First World War for the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war, since the latter movement went further and pursued socialist aims.

"It is possible that in a definite conjuncture of circumstances, the fight for peace will develop here or there into a fight for socialism. But then it will no longer be the present-day peace movement; it will be a movement for the overthrow of capitalism.

"What is most likely, is that the present-day peace movement, as a movement for the preservation of peace, will, if it succeeds, result in preventing a **particular** war, in its temporary postponement, in the temporary preservation of a **particular** peace, in the resignation of a bellicose government and its supersession by another that is temporarily prepared to keep the peace. That, of course, will be good. Even very good. But, all the same, it will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally. It will not be enough, because, for all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force — and, consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force." (emphasis as in original)

The type of distinction made between the post-World War II peace movement and the movement during World War I is erroneous; it is a distinction drawn to wipe out a revolutionary perspective for the peace movement of the day. It is well known that the movement during World War I also **by itself** was not a movement with revolutionary socialist aims. In fact, there were powerful voices in that movement which sought to limit that movement to democratic and pacifist perspectives, such as the Kautskyites. It was Lenin and the Bolsheviks and other international Marxists who had to fight for a revolutionary perspective in order to transform that movement into a revolutionary one.

Stalin in this work does not call for this revolutionary perspective. Even where he concedes that "here or there" the present-day movement may develop into a fight for

socialism, he does not show how this will take place or, most importantly, call for the kind of tactics and work that are necessary for such a transformation to take place. And as the study of the tactics of the Cominform towards the world peace movement shows, insofar as the communist parties followed these tactics, they did not fight to give the movement a revolutionary perspective; in fact, they sought to orient the movement, even where it took up particularly militant forms of struggle, into pacifist and reformist directions.

In this section, Stalin also points out that imperialism generates war and that "to eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism." But this assertion is clearly not made in order to say that the peace movement should fight for the overthrow of imperialism; it is not used to give a call to link the struggle against war with revolutionary struggle.

Throughout the 1960's and 70's, Stalin's statement on the necessity to eliminate war was often cited to show that Stalin was fighting the rightist trends of that time. We too thought that this was what Stalin was aiming at. And Stalin's statement may have been, in part, aimed against the ultra-reformist trends that gave up any criticism of imperialism at all. But Stalin's statement comes at the end of a passage that was designed to defend a pacifist and reformist orientation to the peace movement of that time. It is notable that Stalin's statement was immediately taken up by the French Communist Party to defend their reformist stand in the anti-war struggle. After all, the passage on the peace movement, taken as a whole, banishes the Leninist tactics from the ongoing work of the "present-day peace movement," while asking only that one preserve, as an icon to pray to, the idea that in the unspecified future someone may get around to fighting for the overthrow of imperialism. (See the "Report on the Orientation of the French Communist Party in the Post-World War II Decade," Section 3, "The Peace Movement," elsewhere in this issue.)

In this section, Stalin also speaks of the lesser imperialist countries finding their way again towards "independent development." In the past we took this assessment to mean that Stalin was giving a warning that these countries remained imperialist countries, that their bourgeoisie was working to strengthen their imperialisms, and thus the proletariat should remember to fight these imperialisms too. However, it turns out that this is not what Stalin means. What Stalin means is spelled out in Malenkov's *Report to the 19th Congress* which we shall examine next. It shows that this assessment of the lesser imperialist countries was being made to appeal to them on the basis of supporting their imperialist interests vis-a-vis the U.S. imperialists.

• *Malenkov's Report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B), October, 1952*

This is the first congress since the 18th Congress, which was held in 1939; thus it was the first post-war congress. Malenkov's *Report* confirms the general direction of Soviet

foreign policy in the post-war period. Thus it points out that the Soviet Party's "Main line in the sphere of foreign policy has been and remains a policy of peace between nations and of ensuring the security of our socialist Motherland." It stresses that the core of the Soviet foreign policy centers around the premises of peaceful coexistence, peaceful cooperation and peaceful competition. After denouncing the breaking up of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Western countries, the 19th Congress spells out in striking terms the utopia that lies in store if peaceful cooperation is agreed to by the capitalist states. It says:

"The bellicose circles in the USA and Britain are constantly reiterating that the armaments race alone can keep the industries in capitalist countries running. Actually, however, there is another prospect of developing and expanding commercial relations between all countries, irrespective of the difference in social systems. **This can keep the industries in the industrially developed countries running for many years to come, can ensure the sale of products of which one country has an abundance to other countries, can help to raise the economy of the underdeveloped countries, and thereby bring about lasting economic cooperation.**" (p. 45, emphasis added)

Malenkov also sheds light on the attitude of the CPSU(B) leadership towards the question of the division of one world market into two. First Malenkov says:

"The economic consequence of the formation of two opposite camps was, as Comrade Stalin has pointed out, that the single, all-embracing world market disintegrated and two parallel world markets were formed: the market of the countries in the camp of peace and democracy, and the market of the countries in the aggressive camp. The breakup of the single world market is the most important result of the Second World War and of its economic consequences.

"The two world markets are developing in two opposite directions...."

From this one would think that the Soviet leaders were in favor of the coming into being of two world markets and for the strengthening of the market of the socialist camp. But no. The *Report*, in making its call for the restoration of international cooperation, actually calls for putting an end to the existence of two separate markets. Malenkov says:

"But there is another prospect, the prospect of maintaining peace, the prospect of peace between the nations. This prospect calls for the prohibition of war propaganda, in conformity with the decision of the United Nations; it calls for the banning of atomic and germ weapons and for the steady reduction of their armed forces by the Great Powers; it calls for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace between the powers, for the expansion of trade between countries, **for the restoration of the single international market**, and for other measures of a similar nature aimed at consolidating peace.

... "The Soviet Union stands for the implementation of these measures, for the prospect of peace between the nations."

There is not much discussion about the world revolutionary movement in the *Report*, except for one brief paragraph of support for the national liberation struggle, and that lumps together armed national liberation struggles, such as in Southeast Asia, with the bourgeois-nationalist regimes in certain countries. The only movement which is enthusiastically hailed is the world peace movement. It endorses the pacifist and reformist tactics of the movement:

"In view of the growing danger of war, a popular movement in defense of peace is developing; anti-war coalitions are being formed of different classes and social strata interested in easing international tension and in averting another world war. All the efforts of the warmongers to paint this non-partisan, peaceful, democratic movement as a party movement, as a communist movement are in vain.... This peace movement does not set itself the object of abolishing capitalism, for it is not a socialist, but a democratic movement of hundreds of millions of people. The peace supporters advance demands and proposals designed to facilitate the maintenance of peace, the averting of another war. Under the present historical conditions, the achievement of this object would be a tremendous victory for the cause of democracy and peace.

"The present relation of forces between the camp of imperialism and war and the camp of democracy and peace makes this prospect quite real....

"The task now is to enhance still further the activity of the popular masses, to strengthen the organization of the peace supporters, tirelessly to expose the warmongers and to prevent them from enmeshing the people in a web of lies. **Curb and isolate the adventurers in the camp of the imperialist aggressors, who, for the sake of profits, are trying to draw the peoples into a holocaust — such is the chief task of the whole of progressive and peace-loving mankind.**" (emphasis added)

While the *Report* in its denunciation of the imperialist offensive of the U.S. repeats the general formulations of the post-war period, it also adds something which helps to shed light on Stalin's comments about inter-imperialist contradictions. In fact, it strongly indicates that what Stalin spoke of about the lesser imperialist countries setting out "on the path of independent development" is already being seen in world affairs.

Thus, the *19th Congress Report*, at first sight, appears to give the contradictory assertions that the lesser imperialists were becoming more slavish towards the U.S. government and, simultaneously, that the lesser imperialists were becoming more independent-minded. On the one hand, it is pointed out that "The once free capitalist states — Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and Norway — are now

virtually renouncing their national policy and are pursuing a policy dictated by the American imperialists.... The British political leaders... have signed up for a long time as the junior partners of the U.S., thereby pledging themselves to pursue not their national policy, but the American policy." On the other hand, the *Report* points out that there are "extremely acute contradictions" between the U.S. and both the defeated powers, such as Germany and Japan, and the allies, Britain and France. It remarks for example, "Britain and following it France and the other capitalist countries are trying to break away from their subjection to the U.S. in order to win an independent position and high profits for themselves...."

It is in fact true that sharp contradictions were already being manifested between the U.S. and its capitalist-imperialist allies. Of course, one cannot object to the utilization of inter-imperialist contradictions; the real question is, what use is made of them, to advance the revolutionary movement or to lose sight of it. The 19th Congress indicates that an appeal is being made to the lesser imperialists against the U.S. on the basis of support for their own imperialist interests. For example, the *Report* says:

"British propaganda agencies continuously assert that the British Empire is being broken up by the Communists but the ruling circles of the British Empire cannot fail to see the obvious facts which show that the British imperial possessions are being seized not by the Communists, but by the American billionaires."

It is one thing to point out that the American imperialists were penetrating the British empire, but it is quite another to deny that the Communists are out to break up the empire. And it is instructive to note that one of the major colonial wars going on right at this time was in Malaya, between the British imperialists and the revolutionary forces around the Communist Party!

Finally, in this connection, note the perspective being put forward for these countries:

"But already the more sober-minded and progressive politicians in the European and other capitalist countries, those who are not blinded by anti-Soviet enmity, distinctly see the abyss into which the reckless American adventurers are dragging them; and they are beginning to come out against war. **It is to be supposed that in the countries which are being condemned to the role of obedient pawns of the American dictators genuine democratic and peace forces will be found who will pursue an independent peace policy and find a way out of the impasse into which the American dictators have driven them. If they take this new path, European and other countries will meet with the complete understanding on the part of all the peace-loving countries.**

• **Molotov's Statements at the Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers of the USSR, France, Britain and the USA, January-February 1954**

Next we examine a statement from early 1954. In March 1953, Stalin died. Even before his death, around the time of the 19th Congress, the Soviet propaganda was indicating the prospects for a relaxation of international tension, giving stepped-up appeals for Big Power negotiations, and so forth. It turns out that, after Stalin's death, some of these things start to come to fruition: some negotiations and agreements start to take place, and within a year, outlandish illusions are being promoted about the imperialists, including the U.S.

The Four Powers have a Foreign Ministers meeting in Berlin, the first such meeting since 1949. At this time, Soviet propaganda is effusive about the easing of international tension which it asserts has been developing in the immediate period before the Conference. The Conference is hailed as one sign of this easing of tension and more such conferences are called for.

The Conference in Berlin discussed disarmament proposals, Korea and Indochina, Germany and Austria. But only statements on the last two issues — Germany and Austria — were published. On these questions the Foreign Ministers could not agree. They were able to arrive at agreements on the other questions but these discussions were held in closed sessions. The only agreement publicized was to hold the Geneva Conferences on Korea and Indochina, where the Big Four would participate plus China and the local parties involved in the Korean and Indochinese issues.

On the German question, the Soviet Union proposed unification of the two parts of Germany on the condition of non-participation in blocs. It is implied that Germany could be capitalist so long as it was neutralist. However, the Western imperialists refused this proposal. They wanted to either have unification on a basis that would link it with the Western imperialist bloc or to preserve a separate imperialist West Germany.

At the Berlin Conference, the USSR also proposed a Collective Security Treaty for the European countries. They suggested that the U.S. and China (as Big Powers) could participate in this treaty as observers. One of the interesting justifications for this Treaty and an argument as to why the U.S. should not oppose this Treaty was given by Molotov:

"On September 2, 1947, a Pan-American Treaty of Mutual Assistance was concluded in Rio de Janeiro. The parties to that treaty are the United States of America and all the Latin American Republics. That treaty was con-

cluded after the United Nations was established. **Nobody regarded it as impermissible or superfluous.**

"Why, one asks, can there be a Pan-American Treaty of Mutual Assistance, but not, say, a European Treaty on Collective Security in Europe? There are no grounds whatever for rejecting such a proposal."

Later on, in reporting on the Conference Molotov again spoke on this:

"A regional Pan-American Treaty of Mutual Assistance, to which the United States and all the Latin American Republics are party, has been in existence since 1947. Such regional arrangements, provided they are of a strictly defensive character, may be of positive value, although of course, the attempts of U.S. ruling circles to use the aforementioned treaty, under the pretext of combating communism for the furtherance of their own selfish interests cannot be regarded as legitimate."

The Rio Treaty was the one which laid the groundwork for the Organization of American States. It was a thoroughgoing reactionary U.S.-dominated pact. Molotov's remark that when it was signed in 1947, "nobody regarded it as impermissible" suggests that the Soviet Union did not put up any opposition to the Rio Treaty. In that context, to make a distinction between its ostensible "defensive" character and the "use" which the U.S. makes of it for its "selfish interests" is astounding. Considering that the U.S. knew very well what the Rio Treaty was all about, to expect them to agree by analogy to a European Collective Security agreement is ludicrous.

• **Soviet government expresses willingness to consider joining NATO, April 1954**

In a few months, Soviet propaganda on European Security extended even to a proposal to join NATO! *For a Lasting Peace. For a People's Democracy* of April 9, 1954, after denouncing NATO as a warmongering alliance, went on to say:

"It is quite obvious that NATO can, under given conditions, be divested of its aggressive nature provided all the big powers which belonged to the anti-hitlerite coalition, take part in it. In keeping with this and guided by unwavering principles of its peace-loving foreign policy, striving to relax international tension, the Soviet government has expressed its willingness to consider, jointly with the governments concerned, the question of the participation of the USSR in the North Atlantic Treaty." □

Joseph Stalin's Post-War Interviews

The following pamphlet was published by the Communist Party, USA in 1951 under the title, "For Peaceful Coexistence." The pamphlet includes a series of statements, messages and interviews by J.V. Stalin from the years of 1946 through 1951. It also includes the "law in defense of peace" which was enacted by the Soviet Union on March 12, 1951. Although the remarks are brief, they show that Stalin shared the views of the other Soviet leaders on the world situation and on the orientation for the international policy of the international communist movement. We have deleted the somewhat lengthy "Editor's Foreword" so that the reader may concentrate completely on the statements of Stalin himself. The subheadings are taken from the original pamphlet.

Joseph Stalin

For Peaceful Coexistence

POSTWAR INTERVIEWS



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK

"The government of the U.S.S.R. believes that in spite of differences in economic systems and ideologies, the coexistence of these systems and the peaceful settlement of differences between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. are not only possible, but absolutely necessary in the interest of universal peace."

—Joseph Stalin, in response to
Henry A. Wallace's Open Letter,
May 17, 1948.

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S FOREWORD
ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR
SIR CHURCHILL'S CALL TO ARMS
THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE WAR SCARE
PEOPLE DO NOT WANT WAR
GERMANY, ENGLAND, CHINA, U.S.A., WAR DANGER, COEXISTENCE, THE A-BOMB
AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE U.N., THE A-BOMB, GERMANY, POLAND, GREECE, JAPAN
COEXISTENCE, THE U.N., TRADE AND PEACE, THE A-BOMB, THE BIG THREE, AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE FAR EAST
COEXISTENCE, AMERICAN-SOVIET CO-OPERATION, ATOMIC ENERGY, EUROPE
BERLIN CRISIS, THE U.N. AND ANGLO-AMERICAN AGGRESSIVE POLICIES, CHURCHILL
BERLIN, DISARMAMENT, STALIN-TRUMAN MEETING
PEACE IN EUROPE
PEACE IN KOREA
PEACE IN THE FAR EAST
WHEN IS WAR NOT INEVITABLE?
PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS
LAW IN DEFENSE OF PEACE

ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

[From a speech to the voters of his district during the elections to the Supreme Soviet, February 9, 1946]

It would be wrong to think that the Second World War was a casual occurrence or the result of mistakes of any particular statesmen, though mistakes undoubtedly were made. Actually, the war was the inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism. Marxists have declared more than once that the capitalist system of world economy harbors elements of general crises and armed conflicts and that, hence, the development of world capitalism in our time proceeds not in the form of smooth and even progress but through crises and military catastrophe.

The fact is that the unevenness of development of the capitalist countries usually leads in time to violent disturbance of equilib-

rium in the world system of capitalism. That group of capitalist countries which considers itself worse provided than others with raw materials and markets usually makes attempts to alter the situation and to repartition the "spheres of influence" in its favor by armed force. The result is a splitting of the capitalist world into two hostile camps and war between them.

Perhaps military catastrophes might be avoided if it were possible for raw materials and markets to be periodically redistributed among the various countries in accordance with their economic importance, by agreement and peaceable settlement. But that is impossible to do under present capitalist conditions of the development of world economy.

Thus the First World War [1914-18] was the result of the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and the Second World War [1939-45] was the result of a second crisis.

That does not mean of course that the Second World War is a copy of the first. On the contrary, the Second World War differs materially from the first in character. It must be borne in mind that before attacking the Allied countries the principal fascist states—Germany, Japan, and Italy—destroyed the last vestiges of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home, established a brutal terrorist regime in their own countries, rode roughshod over the principles of sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed a policy of seizure of alien territories as their own policy, and declared for all to hear that they were out for world domination and the establishment of a fascist regime throughout the world.

Moreover, by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and of the central areas of China, the Axis states showed that they were prepared to carry out their threat of enslaving all freedom-loving nations. In view of this, unlike the First World War, the Second World War against the Axis states from the very outset assumed the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one aim of which was also the restoration of democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis states could only enhance, and indeed did enhance, the anti-fascist and liberation character of the Second World War.

It was on this basis that the anti-fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain, and other freedom-loving states came into being—a coalition which subsequently played a decisive part in defeating the armed forces of the Axis states.

That is how matters stand as regards the origin and character of the Second World War.

MR. CHURCHILL'S CALL TO ARMS

[Interview with correspondent of Pravda, March 13, 1946, on Winston Churchill's radio speech at Fulton, Missouri]

Question: How do you appraise Mr. Churchill's latest speech in the United States of America?

Answer: I appraise it as a dangerous act, calculated to sow the seeds of dissension among the Allied states and impede their collaboration.

Question: Can it be considered that Mr. Churchill's speech is prejudicial to the cause of peace and security?

Answer: Yes, unquestionably. As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill now takes the stand of the warmongers, and in this Mr. Churchill is not alone. He has friends not only in Britain but in the United States of America as well.

A point to be noted is that in this respect Mr. Churchill and his friends bear a striking resemblance to Hitler and his friends. Hitler began his work of unleashing war by proclaiming a race theory, declaring that only German-speaking people constituted a superior nation. Mr. Churchill sets out to unleash war with a race theory, asserting that only English-speaking nations are superior nations, who are called upon to decide the destinies of the entire world. The German race theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans, as the only superior nation, should rule over other nations. The English race theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the English-speaking nations, as the only superior nations, should rule over the rest of the nations of the world.

Actually, Mr. Churchill, and his friends in Britain and the United States, present to the non-English-speaking nations something in the nature of an ultimatum: "Accept our rule voluntarily, and then all will be well; otherwise war is inevitable."

But the nations shed their blood in the course of five years' fierce war for the sake of the liberty and independence of their countries, and not in order to exchange the domination of the Hitlers for the domination of the Churchills. It is quite probable, accordingly, that the non-English-speaking nations, which constitute the vast majority of the population of the world, will not agree to submit to a new slavery.

It is Mr. Churchill's tragedy that, inveterate Tory that he is, he does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Churchill's position is a war position, a call for war on the U.S.S.R. It is also clear that this position of Mr. Churchill's is incompatible with the Treaty of Alliance existing between Britain and the U.S.S.R. True, Mr. Churchill does say, in passing, in order to confuse his readers, that the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Collaboration might quite well be extended to fifty years. But how is such a statement on Mr. Churchill's part to be reconciled with his position of war on the U.S.S.R., with his preaching of war against the U.S.S.R.? Obviously, these things cannot be reconciled by any means whatever. And if Mr. Churchill, who calls for war on the Soviet Union, at the same times considers it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to fifty years, that means that he regards this treaty as a mere scrap of paper, which he only needs in order to disguise and camouflage his anti-Soviet position. For this reason, the false statements of Mr. Churchill's friends in Britain, regarding the extension of the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to fifty years or more, cannot be taken seriously. Extension of the treaty term has no point if one of the parties violates the treaty and converts it into a mere scrap of paper.

Question: How do you appraise the part of Mr. Churchill's

speech in which he attacks the democratic systems in the European states bordering upon us, and criticizes the good neighborly relations established between these states and the Soviet Union?

Answer: This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is compounded of elements of slander and elements of discourtesy and tactlessness. Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade,* Bucharest, Sofia—all these famous cities and the populations around them—lie within the Soviet sphere and are all subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence, but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow." Mr. Churchill describes all this as "unlimited expansionist tendencies" on the part of the Soviet Union.

It needs no particular effort to show that in this Mr. Churchill grossly and unceremoniously slanders both Moscow and the above-named states bordering on the U.S.S.R.

In the first place it is quite absurd to speak of exclusive control by the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils made up of the representatives of four states and where the U.S.S.R. has only one-quarter of the votes. It does happen that some people cannot help engaging in slander. But still, there is a limit to everything.

Secondly, the following circumstances should not be forgotten. The Germans made their invasion of the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. The Germans were able to make their invasion through these countries because, at the time, governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. As a result of the German invasion the Soviet Union has lost irretrievably in the fighting against the Germans, and also through the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet citizens to German servitude, a total of about seven million people. In other words, the Soviet Union's loss of life has been several times greater than that of Britain and the United States of America put together. Possibly in some quarters an inclination is felt to forget about these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people which secured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. And so what can there be surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, anxious for its future safety, is trying to see to it that governments loyal in their attitude to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries? How can anyone, who has not taken leave of his wits, describe these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as expansionist tendencies on the part of our state?

Mr. Churchill claims further that the "Russian-dominated Polish government has been encouraged to make enormous, wrongful inroads on Germany."

Every word of this is a gross and insulting calumny. Outstanding men are at the helm in present democratic Poland. They have proved by their deeds that they are capable of upholding the interests and dignity of their country as their predecessors were not. What grounds has Mr. Churchill to assert that the leaders of present-day Poland can countenance in their country the domination of representatives of any foreign state whatever? Is it not because Mr. Churchill means to sow the seeds of dissension in the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union that he slanders "the Russians" here?

Mr. Churchill is displeased that Poland has faced about in

her policy in the direction of friendship and alliance with the U.S.S.R. There was a time when elements of conflict and antagonism predominated in the relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. This circumstance enabled statesmen like Mr. Churchill to play on these antagonisms, to get control over Poland on the pretext of protecting her from the Russians, to try to scare Russia with the specter of war between herself and Poland, and retain the position of arbiter for themselves. But that time is past and gone, for the enmity between Poland and Russia has given way to friendship between them, and Poland—present-day democratic Poland—does not choose to be a football in foreign hands any longer. It seems to me that it is this fact that irritates Mr. Churchill and makes him indulge in discourteous, tactless sallies against Poland. Just imagine—he is not being allowed to play his game at the expense of others!

As to Mr. Churchill's attack upon the Soviet Union in connection with the extension of Poland's western frontier to include Polish territories which the Germans had seized in the past—here it seems to me he is plainly cheating. As is known, the decision on the western frontier of Poland was adopted at the Berlin Three-Power Conference on the basis of Poland's demands. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it considers Poland's demands to be proper and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is displeased with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, while sparing no shots against the Russian position in this matter, conceal from his readers the fact that this decision was passed at the Berlin Conference by unanimous vote—that it was not only the Russians but the British and Americans as well who voted for the decision? Why did Mr. Churchill think it necessary to mislead the public?

Further, Mr. Churchill asserts that the "Communist parties, which were previously very small in all these eastern states of Europe, have been raised to prominence and power far beyond their numbers and seek everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments prevail in nearly every case, and thus far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy."

As is known, the government of the state in Britain at the present time is in the hands of one party, the Labor Party, and the opposition parties are deprived of the right to participate in the government of Britain. That Mr. Churchill calls true democracy. Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Hungary are administered by blocs of several parties—from four to six parties—and the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is secured the right of participation in the government. That Mr. Churchill describes as totalitarianism, tyranny, and police rule. Why? On what grounds? Don't expect a reply from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill does not understand in what a ridiculous position he puts himself by his outcry about "totalitarianism, tyranny, and police rule."

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be administered by Sosnkowski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovich and Pavelich, Rumania by Prince Stirbe and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some king of the House of Hapsburg, and so on. Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the fascist backyard can ensure true democracy.

* The government of Yugoslavia has since deserted the bloc of People's Democracies and joined the camp of their enemies.—Ed.

Such is the "democracy" of Mr. Churchill.

Mr. Churchill comes somewhere near the truth when he speaks of the increasing influence of the Communist parties in eastern Europe. It must be remarked, however, that he is not quite accurate. The influence of the Communist parties has grown not only in eastern Europe, but in nearly all the countries of Europe which were previously under fascist rule—Italy, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Finland—or which experienced German, Italian, or Hungarian occupation—France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Greece, the Soviet Union and so on.

The increased influence of the Communists cannot be considered fortuitous. It is a perfectly logical thing. The influence of the Communists has grown because, in the years of the rule of fascism in Europe, the Communists showed themselves trusty, fearless, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime for the liberty of the peoples. Mr. Churchill in his speeches sometimes recalls the plain people from little homes, slapping them patronizingly on the back and parading as their friend. But these people are not so simple as may at first sight appear. These plain people have views of their own, a policy of their own, and they know how to stand up for themselves. It was they, the millions of these plain people, who defeated Mr. Churchill and his party in Britain by casting their votes for the Laborites. It was they, the millions of these plain people, who isolated the reactionaries and advocates of collaboration with fascism in Europe, and gave their preference to the Left democratic parties. It was they, the millions of these plain people, who after testing the Communists in the fires of struggle and resistance to fascism, came to the conclusion that the Communists were fully deserving of the people's confidence. That was how the influence of the Communists grew in Europe.

Of course Mr. Churchill does not like this course of development and he sounds the alarm and appeals to force. But neither did he like the birth of the Soviet regime in Russia after the First World War. At that time, too, he sounded the alarm and organized an armed campaign of fourteen states against Russia setting himself the goal of turning back the wheel of history. But history proved stronger than the Churchill intervention, and Mr. Churchill's quixotry led to his unmitigated defeat at that time. I don't know whether Mr. Churchill and his friends will succeed in organizing a new armed campaign against eastern Europe after the Second World War; but if they do succeed—which is not very probable because millions of plain people stand guard over the cause of peace—it may confidently be said that they will be thrashed, just as they were thrashed once before, twenty-six years ago.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE WAR SCARE

[Interview with Eddie Gilmore, representative of the Associated Press, March 22, 1946]

Question: What importance do you ascribe to the United

Nations Organization as a means of safeguarding world peace?

Answer: I ascribe great importance to the United Nations Organization inasmuch as it is a serious instrument for maintaining peace and international security. The strength of this international organization lies in the fact that it is based on the principle of the equality of states and not on the principle of the domination of some over others. If the United Nations Organization succeeds in the future, too, in maintaining the principle of equality, then it will undoubtedly play a great positive role in guaranteeing universal peace and security.

Question: What in your opinion is the reason for the present war scare which is felt by many people in many countries?

Answer: I am convinced that neither nations nor their armies seek a new war. They want peace, and seek to secure the peace. That means that the present war scare does not come from that direction. I think that the present war scare is aroused by the actions of certain political groups who are engaged in propaganda for a new war and are thus sowing the seeds of dissension and uncertainty.

Question: What should the governments of the freedom-loving countries do at the present time to safeguard peace and tranquility throughout the world?

Answer: It is necessary that the public and the ruling circles of the states organize widespread counter-propaganda against the propagandists for a new war, as well as propaganda for the maintenance of peace; that not a single utterance of the propagandists for a new war gets away without the rebuff it deserves on the part of public opinion and the press; that in this way the warmongers be promptly exposed and given no opportunity to misuse freedom of speech against the interests of peace.

PEOPLE DO NOT WANT WAR

[Order of the Day to the Red Army, May 1, 1945]

One year ago the Red Army hoisted the banner of victory over Berlin and completed the defeat of fascist Germany. Within four months after the victorious termination of the war against Germany, imperialist Japan downed her arms. The Second World War, prepared by the forces of international reaction and unleashed by the chief fascist states, ended in a full victory of the freedom-loving peoples. The smash-up and liquidation of the main hotbeds of fascism and world aggression resulted in deep changes in the political life of the peoples of the world, in a wide growth of the democratic movement among the peoples.

Taught by the experience of war, the popular masses realized that the destinies of states cannot be entrusted to reactionary leaders, who pursue the narrow caste and selfish anti-popular aims. It is for this reason that peoples who no longer wish to live in the old way take the destinies of their own states into their own hands, establish democratic order, and carry on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against instigators of a new war. The peoples of the world do not wish a repetition of the calamities of war. They fight persistently for the strengthening of peace and security.

In the vanguard of the struggle for peace and security marches

the Soviet Union, which played an outstanding part in smashing fascism and fulfilled its great mission of liberation. The peoples liberated by the Soviet Union from the fascist yoke received an opportunity of building their state life on democratic principles, of realizing their historical aspirations. On this road they find fraternal assistance on the part of the Soviet Union.

The entire world has had an opportunity to convince itself, not only of the power of the Soviet State, but also of the character of its policy based on the recognition of equality of all peoples, respect for their freedom and independence.

There is no reason to doubt that in the future the Soviet Union will be true to its policy—the policy of peace and security, the policy of the equality and friendship of the peoples.

Upon the termination of the war, the Soviet Union started peaceful socialist construction. The Soviet people enthusiastically set about peaceful constructive labor, which had been interrupted by the war.

GERMANY, ENGLAND, CHINA, U.S.A., WAR DANGER, COEXISTENCE, THE A-BOMB

[Interview with Alexander Werth, correspondent of the London Sunday Times, September 24, 1946]

Question: Do you believe in a real danger of a "new war" concerning which there is so much irresponsible talk throughout the world today? What steps should be taken to prevent war if such a danger exists?

Answer: I do not believe in a real danger of a "new war." Those who are now clamoring about a "new war" are chiefly military-political scouts and their few followers from among the civilian ranks. They need this clamor if only: (a) to scare certain naive politicians from among their counter-agents with the specter of war, and thus help their own governments wring as many concessions as possible from such counter-agents; (b) to obstruct for some time the reduction of war budgets in their own countries; (c) to put a brake on the demobilization of troops, and thus prevent a rapid growth of unemployment in their own countries.

One must strictly differentiate between the hue and cry about a "new war" which is now taking place, and a real danger of a "new war" which does not exist at present.

Question: Do you believe that Great Britain and the United States of America are consciously placing the Soviet Union in a state of "capitalist encirclement"?

Answer: I do not think that the ruling circles of Great Britain and of the United States of America could create a "capitalist encirclement" of the Soviet Union even if they so desired, which, however, I do not assert.

Question: To quote Mr. Wallace's recent speech, may Britain, western Europe, and the United States be certain that Soviet policy in Germany will not become an instrument of Russian designs against western Europe?

Answer: I exclude the use of Germany by the Soviet Union against western Europe and the United States of America. I

consider this out of the question, not only because the Soviet Union is bound with Great Britain and France by a Treaty of Mutual Assistance against German aggression, and with the United States of America by the decisions of the Potsdam Conference of three Great Powers, but also because a policy of making use of Germany against western Europe and the United States of America would mean the departure of the Soviet Union from its fundamental national interests.

In short, the policy of the Soviet Union in relation to the German problem reduces itself to the demilitarization and democratization of Germany. I believe that the demilitarization and democratization of Germany form one of the most important guarantees of the establishment of a stable and lasting peace.

Question: What is your view of the charges that Communist parties of western Europe are having their policy "dictated by Moscow"?

Answer: I consider these charges absurd and borrowed from the bankrupt arsenal of Hitler and Goebbels.

Question: Do you believe in the possibility of friendly and lasting co-operation between the Soviet Union and the western democracies despite the existence of ideological differences, and in the "friendly competition" between the two systems to which Mr. Wallace referred?

Answer: I believe in it absolutely.

Question: During the recent sojourn here of the Labor Party delegation you, as far as I understand, expressed certainty of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. What could help in establishing these relations so profoundly desired by the broad masses of the British people?

Answer: I am indeed convinced of the possibility of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. The strengthening of political, commercial, and cultural bonds between these countries would contribute considerably to the establishment of such relations.

Question: Do you believe the earliest withdrawal of all American forces in China to be vital for future peace?

Answer: Yes, I do.

Question: Do you believe that virtual monopoly by the U.S.A. of the atom bomb is one of the main dangers to peace?

Answer: I do not believe the atom bomb to be as serious a force as certain politicians are inclined to think. Atomic bombs are intended for intimidating the weak-nerved, but they cannot decide the outcome of war, since atom bombs are by no means sufficient for this purpose. Certainly, monopolistic possession of the secret of the atom bomb does create a threat, but at least two remedies exist against it: (a) Monopolist possession of the atom bomb cannot last long; (b) use of the atom bomb will be prohibited.

Question: Do you believe that with the further progress of the Soviet Union towards communism the possibilities of peaceful co-operation with the outside world will not decrease as far as the Soviet Union is concerned? Is "communism in one country" possible?

Answer: I do not doubt that the possibilities of peaceful co-operation, far from decreasing, may even grow. "Communism in one country" is perfectly possible, especially in a country like the Soviet Union.

AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE U.N., THE A-BOMB, GERMANY, POLAND, GREECE, JAPAN

[Interview with Hugh Baillie, president, United Press, October 28, 1946]

Question: Do you agree with Secretary Byrnes's feeling, as expressed in his radio speech last Friday (October 18), that there is growing tension between the U.S.S.R. and the United States?

Answer: No.

Question: If such an increasing tension exists, could you indicate the reason, or reasons for it, and what are the most essential bases for eliminating it?

Answer: The question does not arise in view of my answer to the preceding question.

Question: Do you foresee that the present negotiations will result in peace treaties which will establish amicable relations among the nations which were allies in the war against fascism, and remove the danger of war on the part of former fascist sources?

Answer: I hope so.

Question: If not, what are the principal obstacles to the establishment of such amicable relations among the nations which were allies in the Great War?

Answer: The question does not arise in view of the answer to the preceding question.

Question: What is Russia's attitude with regard to Yugoslavia's decision not to sign the Peace Treaty with Italy?

Answer: Yugoslavia has grounds to be dissatisfied.

Question: What, in your opinion, is today the worst threat to world peace?

Answer: The instigators of a new war, in the first place Churchill and people of like mind in Britain and the U.S.A.

Question: If such a threat should arise, what steps should be taken by the nations of the world to avoid a new war?

Answer: The instigators of a new war should be exposed and curbed.

Question: Is the United Nations Organization a guarantee of the integrity of the small nations?

Answer: It is hard to say so far.

Question: Do you think that the four zones of occupation in Germany should in the near future be thrown together, so far as economic administration is concerned, with a view to restoring Germany as a peaceful economic unit and thus lessening the burden of occupation to the four powers?

Answer: Not only the economic but also the political unity of Germany should be restored.

Question: Do you feel that it is feasible at this time to create some sort of central administration to be placed in the hands of the Germans themselves, but under Allied control, which will make it possible for the Council of Foreign Ministers to draft a peace treaty for Germany?

Answer: Yes, I do.

Question: Do you feel confident, in the light of elections which have been held in the various zones this summer and fall, that Germany is developing politically along democratic lines which

give hope for its future as a peaceful nation?

Answer: So far I am not certain of it.

Question: Do you feel that, as has been suggested in some quarters, the level of permitted industry should be increased above the agreed level, to permit Germany to pay her own way more fully?

Answer: Yes, I do.

Question: What should be done beyond the present four-power program to prevent Germany from again becoming a world military menace?

Answer: The remnants of fascism in Germany should be extirpated in fact and she should be completely democratized.

Question: Should the German people be allowed to reconstruct their industry and trade and become self-supporting?

Answer: Yes, they should.

Question: Have the provisions of Potsdam, in your opinion, been adhered to? If not, what is needed to make the Potsdam Declaration an effective instrument?

Answer: They are not always adhered to, especially in the sphere of the democratization of Germany.

Question: Do you feel the veto power has been used to excess during the discussions among the four Foreign Ministers and in meetings of the United Nations Council?

Answer: No, I do not.

Question: How far does the Kremlin feel the Allied Powers should go hunting down and trying minor war criminals in Germany? Does it feel that the Nuremberg decisions created a sufficiently strong basis for such action?

Answer: The farther they go the better.

Question: Does Russia consider the western frontiers of Poland permanent?

Answer: Yes, she does.

Question: How does the U.S.S.R. regard the presence of British troops in Greece? Does it feel that Britain should supply more arms to the present Greek government?

Answer: As unnecessary.

Question: What is the extent of Russian military contingents in Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Austria, and how long do you feel that, in the interests of securing peace, these contingents must be maintained?

Answer: In the West, that is in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Poland, the Soviet Union has at present in all 60 divisions (infantry and armor together). Most of them are below full complement. There are no Soviet troops in Yugoslavia. In two months, when the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of October 22 of this year on the last stage of demobilization is put into effect, forty Soviet divisions will remain in the above-mentioned countries.

Question: What is the attitude of the government of the U.S.S.R. towards the presence of American warships in the Mediterranean?

Answer: Indifferent.

Question: What is the present outlook for a commercial agreement between Russia and Norway?

Answer: It is hard to tell, so far.

Question: Is it possible for Finland again to become a self-sufficient nation after reparations have been paid, and is there

any idea in contemplation of revising the reparations program so far as to expedite Finland's recovery?

Answer: The question has been put in the wrong way. Finland has been and remains an entirely self-sufficient nation.

Question: What will trade agreements with Sweden and other countries mean with regard to reconstruction in the U.S.S.R.? What outside aid do you consider desirable in accomplishing this great task?

Answer: The agreement with Sweden constitutes a contribution to the cause of economic co-operation among the nations.

Question: Is Russia still interested in obtaining a loan from the United States?

Answer: She is interested.

Question: Has Russia developed its own atom bomb or any similar weapon?

Answer: No.

Question: What is your opinion of the atom bomb or similar weapon as an instrument of warfare?

Answer: I have already given my appraisal of the atom bomb in the well-known answer to Mr. Werth.

Question: How, in your opinion, can atomic power best be controlled? Should this control be created on an international basis, and to what extent should the powers sacrifice their sovereignty in the interest of making the control effective?

Answer: Strict international control is necessary.

Question: How long will it require to rebuild the devastated areas of western Russia?

Answer: Six to seven years, if not more.

Question: Will Russia permit commercial airlines to operate across the Soviet Union? Does Russia intend to extend her own airlines to other continents on a reciprocal basis?

Answer: Under certain conditions this is not excluded.

Question: How does your government view the occupation of Japan? Do you feel it has been a success on the present basis?

Answer: There are some successes, but better successes could have been obtained.

COEXISTENCE, THE U.N., TRADE AND PEACE, THE A-BOMB, THE BIG THREE, AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS, THE FAR-EAST

[Interview with Elliott Roosevelt, December 21, 1946]

Question: Do you believe it is possible for a democracy such as the United States to live peaceably side by side in this world with a communistic form of government like the Soviet Union's and with no attempt on the part of either to interfere with the internal political affairs of the other?

Answer: Yes, of course. This is not only possible. It is wise and entirely within the bounds of realization. In the most strenuous times during the war the differences in government did not prevent our two nations from joining together and vanquishing our foes. Even more so is it possible to continue this relationship in time of peace.

Question: Do you believe that the success of the United Nations depends upon agreement as to fundamental policies and aims between the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States?

Answer: Yes, I think so. In many respects the fate of the United Nations as an organization depends upon a state of harmony being reached by those three powers.

Question: Do you believe, Generalissimo Stalin, that an important step toward world peace would be the attainment of economic agreement of broader scope for the interchange of manufactured and raw materials between our two countries?

Answer: Yes, I believe that it would be an important step for the establishment of world peace. Of course, I agree. The expansion of world trade would benefit in many respects the development of good relations between our two countries.

Question: Is the Soviet Union in favor of the immediate creation by the United Nations Security Council of an international police force composed of all the United Nations, which would step in immediately wherever armed warfare threatens peace?

Answer: Of course.

Question: If you believe that the atomic bomb should be controlled by the United Nations, should not they, through inspection, control all research and manufacturing facilities for armaments of any nature and the peace-time use and development of atomic energy?

Answer: Of course. To the principle of equality no exception should be made in the case of Russia. Russia should be subject to the same rules of inspection and control as any other nation must.

Question: Do you think it would serve a useful purpose if another Big Three meeting was held for discussion of all international problems at present threatening peace in the world?

Answer: I think there should not be one meeting, but several; they would serve a useful purpose.

Question: Sir, I know you are a student of many other political and social problems existing in other countries. And so I should like to ask whether you feel that the elections in the United States last November indicate a swing away, on the part of the people, from belief in the policies of Roosevelt and towards the isolationist policies of his political adversaries?

Answer: I am not so well acquainted with the internal life of the people of the United States, but I would think the election indicated that the present government was wasting the moral and political capital created by the late President, and thus it facilitated the victory of the Republicans.*

Question: To what do you ascribe the lessening of friendly relations and understanding between our two countries since the death of Roosevelt?

Answer: I feel that if this question relates to the relations and understanding between the American and Russian peoples, no deterioration has taken place, but on the contrary relations have improved. As to the relations between the two governments, there have been misunderstandings. A certain deterioration has taken place, and then great noise has been raised that their relations would even deteriorate still further. But I see nothing frightful about this in the sense of violation of peace or military

* Reference here is to the Congressional elections of November, 1946.—Ed.

conflict.

Not a single Great Power, even if its government is anxious to do so, could at present raise a large army to fight another Allied Power, another Great Power, because at present one cannot possibly fight without one's people—and the people are unwilling to fight. They are tired of war.

Moreover, there are no understandable objectives to justify a new war. One would not know for what he had to fight, and therefore I see nothing frightful in the fact that some representatives of the United States government are talking about deterioration of relations between us.

In view of all these considerations I think the danger of a new war is unreal.

Question: Do you favor a broad exchange of cultural and scientific information between our two nations? Also, do you favor exchange of students, artists, scientists, and professors?

Answer: Of course.

Question: Should the United States and the Soviet Union form a common long-term policy of aid to the peoples of the Far East?

Answer: I feel it will be useful if it is possible. In any case our government is ready to pursue a common policy with the United States in Far Eastern questions.

Question: If a system of loans or credits is arranged between the United States and the Soviet Union, would such agreements have lasting benefit to United States economy?

Answer: A system of such credits is of course mutually advantageous both to the United States and to the Soviet Union.

Question: Does the failure in the American and British zones of occupied Germany to carry out denazification give serious cause for alarm to the Soviet government?

Answer: No, it has not been a cause for serious alarm, but of course it is unpleasant for the Soviet Union that part of our common program is not being put into effect.

COEXISTENCE, AMERICAN-SOVIET CO-OPERATION, ATOMIC ENERGY, EUROPE

(Interview with Harold Stassen, April 9, 1947)

Stassen: Generalissimo Stalin, on this European trip I am particularly interested in studying conditions of an economic nature. In this regard, of course, the relations of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are very important. I realize that we have two economic systems that are very different. The U.S.S.R. with the Communist Party and with its planned economy and socialized collective state, and the United States of America with its free economy and regulated private capitalism are very different. I would be interested to know if you think these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other?

Stalin: Of course they can. The difference between them is not important so far as co-operation is concerned. The systems in Germany and the United States are the same but war broke out between them. The U.S. and U.S.S.R. systems are different but we didn't wage war against each other and the U.S.S.R. does not

propose to. If during the war they could co-operate, why can't they today in peace, given the wish to co-operate? Of course, if there is no desire to co-operate, even with the same economic system they may fall out as was the case with Germany.

Stassen: I believe, of course, that they can co-operate if they both have the desire to, but there have been many statements about not being able to co-operate. Some of these were made by the Generalissimo himself before the war. But is it possible, now that the fascist axis has been defeated, that the situation has changed?

Stalin: It's not possible that I said that the two economic systems could not co-operate. Co-operation ideas were expressed by Lenin. I might have said that one system was reluctant to co-operate, but that concerned only one side. But as to the possibility of co-operation, I adhere to Lenin who expressed both the possibility and the desire of co-operation. As to the desire of the people to co-operate on the part of the U.S.S.R. and the Party, it is possible—and the two countries could only benefit by this co-operation.

Stassen: That last part is clear. The statements I referred to are those made by you at the Eighteenth Communist Party Congress in 1939 and the plenary session in 1937—statements about capitalist encirclement and monopoly. I assume from your statement now that the defeat of fascist Germany and Japan has not changed that situation.

Stalin: There was not a single Party congress or plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at which I said or could have said that co-operation between the two systems was impossible. I did say that there existed capitalist encirclement and danger of attack on the U.S.S.R. If one party does not wish to co-operate, then that means there exists a threat of attack. And actually Germany, not wishing to co-operate with the U.S.S.R., attacked the U.S.S.R. Could the U.S.S.R. have co-operated with Germany? Yes, the U.S.S.R. could have co-operated with Germany but the Germans did not wish to co-operate. Otherwise the U.S.S.R. could have co-operated with Germany as with any other country. As you see, this concerns the sphere of desire and not the possibility of co-operating. It is necessary to make a distinction between the possibility of co-operating and the wish to co-operate. The possibility of co-operation always exists but there is not always present the wish to co-operate. If one party does not wish to co-operate, then the result will be conflict, war.

Stassen: It must be mutual.

Stalin: Yes. I want to bear testimony to the fact that Russia wants to co-operate.

Stassen: I wish to point out with reference to your earlier statement that there was a great difference between Germany and the United States at the time Germany started the war.

Stalin: There was a difference in government but no difference in the economic systems. The government was a temporary factor.

Stassen: I do not agree. Yes, there was a difference of economic systems too. Imperialism, the development of state monopoly, and the oppression of workers are the evils of capitalism practiced by the Nazis. It seems to me we have been successful in America in preventing the monopoly of capitalism and the

imperialistic trend, and that the workers have made greater progress through use of the strength of their vote and their freedom than Karl Marx or Frederick Engels thought they could make—and this regulation of free capital and prevention of monopoly and freedom of workers in America makes the economic situation quite different from that which existed in Germany.

Stalin: Let us not mutually criticize our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain. Which one is better will be said by history. We should respect the systems chosen by the people, and whether the system is good or bad is the business of the American people. To co-operate, one does not need the same systems. One should respect the other system when approved by the people. Only on this basis can we secure co-operation. Only, if we criticize, it will lead us too far.

As for Marx and Engels, they were unable to foresee what would happen forty years after their death. But we should adhere to mutual respect of people. Some people call the Soviet system totalitarian. Our people call the American system monopoly capitalism. If we start calling each other names with the words monopolist and totalitarian, it will lead to no co-operation.

We must start from the historical fact that there are two systems approved by the people. Only on that basis is co-operation possible. If we distract each other with criticism, that is propaganda.

As to propaganda, I am not a propagandist but a business-like man. We should not be sectarian. When the people wish to change the systems they will do so. When we met with Roosevelt to discuss the questions of war, we did not call each other names. We established co-operation and succeeded in defeating the enemy.

Stassen: That sort of criticism has been a cause of misunderstanding after the war. Do you look forward in the future to a greater exchange of ideas and news, of students and teachers, of artists, of tourists, if there is co-operation?

Stalin: This will happen inevitably if co-operation is established. For an exchange of goods will lead to an exchange of people. . . .

Stassen: As I see it, then, you think it is possible that there will be co-operation provided there is a will and desire to co-operate.

Stalin: That is correct.

Stassen: In the development of the standards of living of the people, mechanization and electrification have been of major significance. The new development of atomic energy is of very great importance to all peoples of the world. I feel that the matter of international inspection, effective controls and outlawing the use for war of atomic energy is of supreme importance to all peoples of the world. Do you feel that there is a reasonable prospect of working out agreements for the long-term future for the peaceful development of atomic energy?

Stalin: I hope for this. There are big differences of views among us, but in the long run I hope we shall come to an understanding. International control and inspection will be established, in my view, and it will be of great importance. The peaceful use of atomic energy will bring great technological changes. It is a very great matter. As for the use of atomic energy for war pur-

poses, this in all probability will be prohibited. It will be a problem in the long run that will be met by the consciences of the people and it will be prohibited.

Stassen: Yes, that is one of our important problems and if solved it can be a great boon—and if not, a great curse to the people of the world.

Stalin: I think we shall succeed in establishing international inspection and control. Things are leading up to it.

Stassen: I appreciate the opportunity of talking with you.

(The interview had now lasted forty minutes and Stassen prepared to take his leave. However, Stalin indicated a willingness to continue the discussion. The remainder of the conversation dealt with prevailing economic conditions in Europe and the United States.—Ed.)

BERLIN CRISIS, THE U.N. AND ANGLO-AMERICAN AGGRESSIVE POLICIES, CHURCHILL

(Interview with correspondent of Pravda, October 28, 1948)

Question: How do you regard the results of the discussions in the Security Council on the question of the situation in Berlin and the conduct of the Anglo-American and French representatives in this matter?

Answer: I regard them as a display of the aggressiveness of the policy of Anglo-American and French ruling circles.

Question: Is it true that in August of this year agreement had already been reached among the four powers on the question of Berlin?

Answer: Yes, that is true. Agreement is known to have been reached in Moscow on August 30 last, among the representatives of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Great Britain, and France regarding the simultaneous implementation of measures for the lifting of transport restrictions, on the one hand, and for the introduction of the German mark of the Soviet zone in Berlin as the sole currency, on the other hand. That agreement does not hurt anyone's prestige. It takes into account the interests of the parties concerned and insures the possibility of further co-operation. But the governments of the U.S.A. and Great Britain disavowed their representatives in Moscow and declared the agreement to be null and void, that is, they violated the agreement, having decided to refer the question to the Security Council where the Anglo-Americans have a guaranteed majority.

Question: Is it true that, in Paris during the recent discussions on the question in the Security Council, an agreement on the situation in Berlin had again been reached in unofficial talks even before the question was voted upon in the Security Council?

Answer: Yes. That is true. Dr. Bramuglia, the representative of the Argentine and president of the Security Council, who conducted unofficial talks with Comrade Vishinsky on behalf of the other powers concerned, did have in his hands an agreed-upon draft decision on the question of the situation in Berlin. But the representatives of the U.S.A. and Great Britain once again declared that agreement to be null and void.

Question: What is the matter then? Would you explain?

Answer: The thing is that those in the United States and Great Britain who inspire an aggressive policy do not consider themselves interested in an agreement and in co-operation with the U.S.S.R. What they want is not agreement and co-operation, but talk about agreement and co-operation, so as to put the blame on the U.S.S.R. by preventing agreement and thus to "prove" that co-operation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible. What the war instigators who are striving to unleash a new war fear most of all is the reaching of agreements and co-operation with the U.S.S.R. because a policy of concord with the U.S.S.R. undermines the position of the instigators of war and deprives the aggressive policy of these gentlemen of any purpose.

It is for this reason that they disrupt agreements that have already been reached, that they disavow their representatives who have drawn up such agreements together with the U.S.S.R., and in violation of the United Nations Charter refer the question to the Security Council, where they have a guaranteed majority and where they can "prove" whatever they like. All this is done to "show" that co-operation with the U.S.S.R. is impossible and to "show" the necessity for a new war, and thus to prepare the ground for the unleashing of war. The policy of the present leaders of the U.S.A. and Great Britain is a policy of aggression, a policy of unleashing a new war.

Question: How should one regard the conduct of the representatives of the six states, members of the Security Council: of China, Canada, Belgium, Argentina, Colombia, and Syria?

Answer: Those gentlemen are obviously lending their support to the policy of aggression, to the policy of unleashing a new war.

Question: What can all this end in?

Answer: It can only end in ignominious failure on the part of the instigators of a new war. Churchill, the main instigator of a new war, has already managed to deprive himself of the trust of his own nation and of democratic forces throughout the world. The same fate lies in store for all other instigators of war. The horrors of the recent war are still too fresh in the memory of the peoples; and public forces favoring peace are too strong for Churchill's pupils in aggression to overpower them and to turn them toward a new war.

BERLIN, DISARMAMENT, STALIN-TRUMAN MEETING

[Interview with Kingsbury Smith, representative of International News Service, January 27, 1949]

Question: Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to consider the issuance of a joint declaration with the government of the United States of America, asserting that the respective governments have no intention of resorting to war against one another?

Answer: The Soviet government would be prepared to consider the issuance of such a declaration.

Question: Would the government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to join with the government of the United States of America in measures designed to implement this pact of peace, such as grad-

ual disarmament?

Answer: Naturally, the government of the U.S.S.R. could co-operate with the government of the United States of America in taking measures designed to implement this pact of peace and leading to gradual disarmament.

Question: If the governments of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and France agreed to postpone the establishment of a separate Western German state, pending a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers to consider the German problem as a whole, would the Government of the U.S.S.R. be prepared to remove the restrictions which the Soviet authorities have imposed on communications between Berlin and the Western zones of Germany?

Answer: Provided the United States of America, Great Britain, and France observe the conditions set forth in the third question, the Soviet government sees no obstacles to lifting transport restrictions, on the understanding, however, that transport and trade restrictions introduced by the three Powers should be lifted simultaneously.

Question: Would Your Excellency be prepared to confer with President Truman at a mutually suitable place to discuss the possibility of concluding such a pact of peace?

Answer: I have already stated before that there is no objection to a meeting.

Kingsbury Smith later sent the following telegram to Stalin:

The official representative of the White House, Charles Ross, stated today that President Truman would be glad to have the opportunity to confer with you in Washington. Would Your Excellency be prepared to go to Washington for this purpose?

If not, then where would you be prepared to meet the President?

The reply was as follows:

Your telegram of February 1 received. I am grateful to President Truman for the invitation to come to Washington. For a long time it has been my wish to visit Washington, and at one time I mentioned this to President Roosevelt at Yalta, and to President Truman at Potsdam.

Unfortunately, at present I am unable to realize this wish of mine, since doctors strongly object to my undertaking any prolonged journey, especially by sea or air.

The government of the Soviet Union would welcome the President's visit to the U.S.S.R. A conference could be arranged at the President's choice; in Moscow, Leningrad, Kaliningrad, Odessa, or at Yalta, provided, of course, this does not go against the President's consideration of convenience.

However, should this suggestion meet with objection, a meeting could be arranged, at the President's discretion, in Poland or Czechoslovakia.

PEACE IN EUROPE

[Greetings to the President and Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic, October 13, 1949]

Allow me to congratulate you and, in your persons, the German people, on the creation of the German Democratic Republic and the election of the former to the presidency and the latter

as Prime Minister of the German Democratic Republic.

The formation of the peace-loving German Democratic Republic is a turning point in the history of Europe. There can be no doubt that the existence of a peace-loving democratic Germany side by side with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union excludes the possibility of new wars in Europe, puts an end to bloodshed in Europe, and makes impossible the enslaving of European countries by the world imperialists.

The experience of the recent war showed that the biggest sacrifices in this war were borne by the German and Soviet peoples, and that these two peoples possess the greatest potentialities in Europe for accomplishing great actions of world importance. If these two peoples display determination to fight for peace, straining their energies to the same extent as they did to wage war, peace in Europe may then be considered as secured.

Thus laying the foundation for a unified, democratic, and peace-loving Germany, you simultaneously perform a great deed for all of Europe, guaranteeing her lasting peace.

You need not doubt that in advancing along this road and promoting the cause of peace you will find great sympathy and active support among all the peoples of the world, including the American, British, French, Polish, Czechoslovak, and Italian peoples, let alone the peace-loving Soviet people. I wish you success on this new and glorious road. May unified, independent, democratic, peace-loving Germany live and prosper!

PEACE IN KOREA

[Reply to Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in connection with his proposals for seating the representatives of the People's Government of China on the Security Council of the U.N. and the "cessation of the conflict" in Korea, July 15, 1950]

I welcome your peaceable initiative. I fully share your point of view as regards the expediency of peaceful regulation of the Korean question through the Security Council with the obligatory participation of representatives of the five great Powers, including the People's Government of China. I believe that for speedy settlement of the Korean question it would be expedient to hear in the Security Council representatives of the Korean people.

PEACE IN THE FAR EAST

[Greetings to Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central People's Government, on the anniversary of the People's Republic of China, October 1, 1951]

I am sending to the great Chinese people, to the Government of the People's Republic of China and to you personally hearty wishes for further successes in the building up of People's Democratic China.

May the great friendship of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, a friendship which is the firm guarantee of peace and security in the Far East, continue to become stronger!

WHEN IS WAR NOT INEVITABLE?

[Excerpts from an interview with correspondent of Pravda, February 16, 1951]

Question: Do you consider a new world war inevitable?

Answer: No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in Britain, as also in France, there are aggressive forces thirsting for a new war. They need war to obtain super-profits, to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires who regard war as an item of income which gives colossal profits.

They, these aggressive forces, control the reactionary governments and direct them. But at the same time they are afraid of their peoples who do not want a new war and stand for the maintenance of peace. Therefore they are trying to use the reactionary governments in order to enmesh their peoples with lies, to deceive them, and to depict the new war as defensive and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as aggressive. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a war.

Precisely for this reason they are afraid of the campaign in defense of peace, fearing that it can expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

Precisely for this reason they turned down the proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a Peace Pact, for the reduction of armaments, for banning the atomic weapon, fearing that the adoption of these proposals would undermine the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and make the armaments race unnecessary.

What will be the end of this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

That is why the wide campaign for the maintenance of peace as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers is now of first-rate importance.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future as well firmly to pursue the policy of averting war and maintaining peace.

PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS

[Interview with correspondent of Pravda, October 6, 1951]

Question: What is your opinion of the hubbub raised recently in the foreign press in connection with the test of an atom bomb in the Soviet Union?

Answer: Indeed, one of the types of atom bombs was recently tested in our country. Tests of atom bombs of different calibers will be conducted in the future as well, in accordance with the plan for the defense of our country from attack by the Anglo-American aggressive bloc.

Question: In connection with the test of the atom bomb, various personages in the United States are raising alarm and shouting about the threat to the security of the United States. Are there any grounds for such alarm?

Answer: There are no grounds whatever for such alarm. Personages in the United States cannot but know that the Soviet Union is not only opposed to the employment of the atomic weapon, but that it also stands for its prohibition and for the termination of its production. It is known that the Soviet Union has several times demanded the prohibition of the atomic weapon, but each time this has been refused by the Atlantic bloc powers. This means that, in the event of an attack by the United States on our country, the ruling circles of the United States will use the atom bomb. It is this circumstance that has compelled the Soviet Union to have the atomic weapon in order to meet the aggressors fully prepared. Of course the aggressors want the Soviet Union to be unarmed in the event of their attack upon it. The Soviet Union, however, does not agree to this, and it thinks that it should be fully prepared to meet the aggressor. Consequently, if the United States has no intention of attacking the Soviet Union, the alarm of the personages in the United States should be considered as pointless and false, because the Soviet Union does not contemplate ever attacking the United States or any other country.

Personages in the United States are vexed because the secret of the atom bomb is possessed not only by the United States but also by other countries, the Soviet Union primarily. They would like the United States to be the monopolist of the production of the atom bomb. They would like the United States to have unlimited power to intimidate and blackmail other countries. But on what grounds do they think so? By what right do the interests of preserving peace require such monopoly? Would it not be more correct to say that matters are directly the opposite, that it is the interests of preserving peace that require first of all the liquidation of such a monopoly and then the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon too? I think that the proponents of the atom bomb may agree to the prohibition of the atomic weapon only if they see that they are no longer monopolists.

Question: What is your opinion regarding international control of the atomic weapon?

Answer: The Soviet Union stands for prohibiting the atomic weapon and terminating the production of the atomic weapon. The Soviet Union stands for the establishment of international control over the fully exact and conscientious implementation of the decision to prohibit the atomic weapon, to terminate the production of the atomic weapon and utilize the already produced atom bombs solely for civilian purposes. The Soviet Union stands for precisely this kind of international control. American personages also speak of control, but their control presupposes not the termination of the production of the atomic weapon, but the continuation of such production in quantities conforming to the amounts of raw material at the disposal of different countries. Consequently, the American control presupposes not prohibiting the atomic weapon, but making it legal and lawful. Thereby the right of the warmongers to annihilate tens and hundreds of thousands of peaceful inhabitants with the help of the atomic weapon is made lawful. It is not difficult to understand that this is not control but a mockery of control and a deception of the peaceful aspirations of the peoples. It is clear that such control cannot satisfy the peace-loving peoples who demand the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the termination of its production.

LAW IN DEFENSE OF PEACE

[Enacted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., March 12, 1951]

In the preamble to the law the Supreme Soviet points to the sufferings of the peoples from "the calamities of two world wars in the course of one generation" and recognizes that the peoples "cannot reconcile themselves to the impunity with which war propaganda is being conducted by aggressive circles of some states." The following are the provisions of the law:

"1. Propaganda for war, regardless of the form in which it is carried out, undermines the cause of peace, creates a threat of a new war and because of this constitutes the gravest crime against humanity.

"2. Persons guilty of propaganda for war shall be brought to trial and tried as heinous criminals."

Malenkov's Report to the 19th Congress of the CPSU

The following are extracts from the "Report to the Nineteenth Party Congress on the Work of the Central Committee of the CPSU(B)" presented October 5, 1952 by G. Malenkov. Stalin participated in this Congress and gave a short speech endorsing the analysis of the "Report."

The full "Report" is of great interest. However, because of space limitations, we have only been able to reprint extracts from section "I. The International Position of the Soviet Union." We have taken quite extensive ex-

tracts from this section so that the reader may get a full, all-sided idea of the analysis of the world situation and the orientation advocated by the leaders of the CPSU.

The full "Report" contains the following sections:

CONTENTS

I. THE INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF THE SOVIET UNION

1. The Further Weakening of the World Capitalist System and the Economic Situation in the

Capitalist Countries

2. Aggravation of the International Situation. The American-British Aggressive Bloc Threatens to Launch a New War. The Peoples Fight for Peace
3. The Soviet Union in the Struggle for the Maintenance and Strengthening of Peace

II. THE INTERNAL SITUATION IN THE SOVIET UNION

1. Continued Economic Progress in the U.S.S.R.
 - A. Industry
 - B. Agriculture
 - C. Trade, Transport and Communications
 - D. Economy—a Key Factor in Further Economic Development.
2. Further Rise in the Material, Health and Cultural Standards of the People
3. Further Consolidation of the Soviet Social and Political System

III. THE PARTY

Any reader wishing to see the full "Report" may obtain it upon request to The Workers' Advocate for the cost of reproduction and mailing.

Passages from the "Report" that we have cited in our article "Soviet Leaders on the World Situation" have been highlighted by the WA. Passages that are in bold type were that way in the original.

I

THE INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF THE SOVIET UNION

Comrades, the period that has elapsed since the Eighteenth Party Congress has been replete with events of world-historic importance.

The Second World War shook the life of many peoples and states to its foundations and changed the face of the world. Prepared by the forces of international imperialist reaction and unleashed in the East by militarist Japan and in the West by Hitler Germany, the war upset the calculations of its inspirers and, thanks to the heroic struggle of the Soviet people, ended in a way that was unforeseen by the imperialists.

Instead of being destroyed or weakened, the Soviet Union was strengthened; its international prestige rose still higher. Instead of the weakening or crushing of democracy, the upshot was that a number of countries in Central and Southeast Europe broke away from capitalism and established the people's democratic system. Instead of the further enslavement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, the upshot was a further mighty upsurge of the struggle for national liberation in those countries, and the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism became

more acute. A severe blow was struck at the entire world imperialist system by the historic victory of the great Chinese people. Today, a third of mankind has already been delivered from the yoke of imperialism, freed from the chains of imperialist exploitation.

In the capitalist world itself, as a result of the war, three big states—Germany, Japan and Italy—ceased to be great powers, and France and Britain lost their former positions.

The postwar period has been one of further weakening of the world capitalist system and of the growth of the forces of democracy and socialism.

In the economic sphere, the postwar years have seen the maturing of new economic difficulties in the capitalist countries, stepped-up expansion by American imperialism and, as a result, intensification of the antagonisms between the capitalist countries. These antagonisms have been aggravated by the attempts of imperialist circles to find a way out of the economic difficulties through economic militarization and the preparation of a new war.

In the political sphere, the postwar period has witnessed the formation of two camps—the aggressive, antidemocratic camp headed by the U.S.A., and the camp of peace and democracy. In this period a new centre of reaction and aggression emerged in the capitalist world—the U.S.A.—and it is from this centre that the chief danger comes to the peace, freedom and national independence of the peoples. In face of this danger, the forces of peace have risen in all countries to wage a determined struggle in defence of peace and of the national independence of their countries.

The Soviet Union in the postwar period resumed its progress, interrupted by the war, along the road mapped by the Eighteenth Party Congress, along the road of peaceful development and gradual transition from socialism to communism. The postwar period has been one of impressive achievements in industry, transport, agriculture, and in all fields of science, culture and art. At the same time, it has been a period of further consolidation of the Soviet system, of further strengthening of the moral and political unity of Soviet society and of the friendship between the peoples of our country.

During the whole of this period the Soviet Union has been waging an active struggle for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace.

Let us examine the basic questions concerning the international situation.

1. THE FURTHER WEAKENING
OF THE WORLD CAPITALIST SYSTEM
AND THE ECONOMIC SITUATION
IN THE CAPITALIST COUNTRIES

...

The economic consequence of the formation of two opposite camps was, as Comrade Stalin has pointed out, that the single, all-embracing world market disintegrated and two parallel world markets were formed: the market of the countries in the camp of peace and democracy, and the market of the countries in the aggressive imperialist camp. The breakup of the single world market is the most important economic result of the Second World War and of its economic consequences.

The two world markets are developing in opposite directions. The new democratic world market knows no sales difficulties, because its capacity is growing year after year in conformity with the crisis-free growth of production in the countries of the democratic camp, because the continuous growth of production in all the countries of the democratic camp is continuously expanding the capacity of the democratic market. On the other hand, there is the other world market, the imperialist market, which is not connected with the U.S.S.R. and the other democratic countries; it is therefore restricted and encounters sales difficulties due to interruptions and crises of production, unemployment and the impoverishment of the masses and its isolation from the democratic countries. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that as a result of the breakup of the single world market the sphere for the application of the forces of the principal capitalist countries (U.S.A., Britain and France) to the world resources has shrunk considerably, and this leads to the progressive contraction of the capitalist market. Selling conditions in that market have deteriorated, and are deteriorating still further. ...

The United States made immense profits out of the war; the American billionaires strengthened their economic positions. Nevertheless, the United States failed to achieve its aim, failed to establish the domination of American capital over the world market. The United States thought that after Germany and Japan had been knocked out it would be able to increase production four or five times; but it only doubled production and is now sliding into an economic crisis. It is a fact that at the present time there are no less than three million fully unemployed in the United States and even more semi-unemployed. Mass workers' strikes are still further complicating things for the United States billionaires. And this is due to the fact that, through the fault of ruling circles of the United States, the industry

of that country has been deprived of such markets as the U.S.S.R., China and the European People's Democracies.

American imperialism is acting today not only as an international exploiter and enslaver of nations, but also as a force that is disrupting the economies of the other capitalist countries. After the war, United States monopoly capital, taking advantage of the weakness of its competitors, seized a large part of the world capitalist market. It is wrecking the historically established multilateral economic ties between the capitalist countries and replacing them by unilateral ties between these countries and the United States. Boosting their exports through the most unscrupulous dumping, while at the same time closing their home market to foreign goods, with the result that the American people are being strangled by high prices, the American monopolies are more and more dislocating the world capitalist market. American imperialism is preventing the West-European countries from receiving food products from their former markets in Eastern Europe, to which they had always exported large quantities of manufactured goods in exchange for food and raw materials.

The economic policy pursued by American imperialism was bound to aggravate the antagonisms between the United States and the other capitalist countries. The antagonisms between the United States and Britain remain the chief antagonisms, and they are taking the form of open struggle between the American and British monopolies for sources of oil, rubber, nonferrous and rare metals, sulphur, wool and for commodity markets.

To this must be added the extremely acute antagonisms between the United States and Japan, between the United States and Italy, and between the United States and Western Germany, countries which are living under the occupation yoke of the United States dictators. It would be naive to think that these vanquished countries will consent to live forever under the heel of the American occupants. It would be foolish to think that they will not try in one way or another to throw off the oppression of the United States in order to live free and independent lives.

As American capitalism, on the pretext of rendering "aid" in the shape of credits, penetrates the economies of Britain, France and Italy, seizes raw materials and markets in the British and French colonies, the antagonisms between the United States and Britain and between the United States and France become more acute, and will become still more acute in future. Britain, and following it France and the other capitalist countries, are trying to break away from their subjection to the United States in order to win an

independent position and high profits for themselves. The British capitalists are already waging a stubborn struggle against American domination in international trade.

The economic difficulties in which the capitalist countries found themselves after the war were aggravated by the fact that the imperialists themselves cut off their access to the world democratic market. The United States has reduced trade with the Soviet Union and the European People's Democracies almost to zero, and has cut off trade with China. It has virtually prohibited not only the vanquished countries (Japan, Western Germany and Italy), but also Britain, France, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium and other capitalist countries from selling and buying goods in the markets of the countries in the democratic camp. In 1951 United States trade with the countries now in the democratic camp was only one tenth of the 1937 figure; Britain's trade with these countries dropped to one sixth and that of France to less than one fourth.

The United States, and also Britain and France, subjected the U.S.S.R., China and the European People's Democracies to an economic "blockade," thinking thereby to strangle them. But the new democratic world market was not strangled; on the contrary, it grew stronger. The upshot was that the imperialists merely struck a serious blow at their own exports and still further aggravated the contradictions between the productive potentialities of their industry and the possibility of marketing its products.

All this signifies that the capitalist economy is now afflicted with still more profound contradictions, and that the world system of capitalist economy as a whole has become much narrower, weaker and still more unstable than before the war.

Aware of these economic difficulties, the United States capitalists are trying to get over them by the war in Korea, the armaments drive, and militarization of industry. ...

The increasing deterioration of the material conditions of broad strata of the population due to the armaments race is causing mounting resentment among the masses and intensifying their struggle against depression of living standards and the entire policy of engineering another war. The class antagonisms between the imperialist bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the working class and all working people, on the other, are becoming more and more acute. The strike wave is spreading more and more widely throughout the capitalist world.

The position of the world capitalist system is now becoming increasingly difficult owing to the fact that, as a result of the war and of the new upsurge of the

struggle for national liberation in the colonial and dependent countries, the colonial system of imperialism is actually disintegrating.

A direct result of the defeat of fascist Germany and of imperialist Japan was the breach of the imperialist front in China, Korea and Viet-Nam, where People's Republics have arisen in the place of semi-colonies and colonies. The victory of the Chinese people has still further revolutionized the East and has stimulated the struggle for liberation of the peoples oppressed by imperialism.

The antagonisms between the colonial powers and the colonies have become more acute in the postwar period. Britain, France, Belgium and the other colonial powers are trying to compensate themselves for the burdens thrust upon them by the militarization of their economies and United States expansion by intensifying the exploitation of their colonies. At the same time, the American imperialists are penetrating the colonies and spheres of influence of these colonial powers, winning positions there for themselves and still further increasing the exploitation of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. In the course of this struggle the American usurpers instigate plots against their British and French "allies" and their actions further aggravate the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism. The territory of many of the colonial and dependent countries (Egypt, Iran, Syria, Morocco, Tunisia and others) is being used to build war bases and their peoples are being cast in the role of "cannon fodder" in a future war.

As a result of prolonged imperialist oppression and of survivals of feudalism, the economy of the colonial and dependent countries, especially agriculture, is in a state of decline. Tens of millions of people in India, Indonesia, Iran and in Africa are living in a state of constant hunger and vast numbers of people have actually died of starvation. The rapacious exploitation of the colonial and dependent countries by the imperialist powers is retarding the development of the productive forces of these countries; the purchasing capacity of the population is extremely low, and the market for manufactured goods is shrinking. All this is a dead weight that is dragging down the economy of the capitalist world and aggravating the internal contradictions of the world capitalist system as a whole.

The people of the colonies and dependencies are offering more and more determined resistance to the imperialist enslavers. Evidence of the growing scope of the national-liberation movement is provided by the struggle of the peoples of Viet-Nam, Burma, Malaya, the Philippines and Indonesia, and by the growth of national resistance in India, Iran, Egypt and in other countries.

**2 AGGRAVATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION.
THE AMERICAN-BRITISH AGGRESSIVE BLOC
THREATENS TO LAUNCH A NEW WAR.
THE PEOPLES FIGHT FOR PEACE**

In the sphere of international relations too, preparation of another war has been the keynote of the activities of the ruling circles of the United States, Britain and France in the postwar period.

Almost immediately after the termination of the Second World War the United States abandoned the agreed course of policy the wartime allies had pursued and which had been set forth in the decisions of the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences of the Powers. By a series of aggressive actions the United States aggravated the international situation and confronted the world with the danger of another war.

The rulers of the United States have quite frankly formulated the aim of their aggressive course. As early as 1945, soon after he was installed in the post of President of the United States, Truman said: "Victory has placed upon the American people the continuing burden of responsibility for world leadership." Since then he and other American politicians have time and again repeated the United States claim to "world leadership." This aim of establishing world domination, of subjugating all other countries, is the chief motive of the entire policy of the American imperialist rulers.

The United States bosses knew, of course, that they stood no chance of imposing their domination over other nations by peaceful means. They knew from the experience of the Hitlerites, who had also tried to impose their domination upon other countries, that it was useless even dreaming of achieving world dominion without recourse to force, without unleashing a new war. And so they decided to violate the peace, to prepare another war. And since the U.S.S.R. is the chief opponent of another war and is the main bulwark of peace, the men who hold sway in the United States came to the conclusion that war must be launched against the U.S.S.R. and the other champions of peace. And so the North-Atlantic aggressive bloc was formed, without the knowledge and behind the back of the U.S.S.R. And in order to conceal the aggressive aims of this bloc from the people, and to deceive the people, they proclaimed it a "defensive" bloc against "communism," against the Soviet Union, which, they alleged, intended to attack the United States, Britain, France and the other members of the bloc.

In pursuit of the same criminal aim American war bases are being established in different countries, as

closely as possible to the Soviet frontiers.

In pursuit of the same criminal aim the ruling circles of the United States are remilitarizing Western Germany and Japan.

In remilitarizing Western Germany and Japan, the ruling circles of the United States and their supporters are, in the sight of the whole world, restoring the two hotbeds of the Second World War, for the destruction of which the people shed their blood in that war.

The American attack on the Korean People's Democratic Republic marked the transition of the U.S.-British bloc from preparation of an aggressive war to direct acts of aggression. The Korean people, who, in close cooperation with the valorous Chinese volunteers, are heroically defending the freedom and independence of their country and resisting the violators of the peace, enjoy the ardent sympathy of the whole of democratic and peace-loving mankind. (Loud applause.)

The over-all international situation today has a number of specific features and peculiarities, of which the following must be noted.

The chief aggressive power—the United States of America—is vigorously impelling the other capitalist countries towards war, primarily the countries of the North-Atlantic bloc, and also the countries vanquished in the Second World War—Western Germany, Italy and Japan. The American bosses dictate to all the members of the bloc the aims of this war, the route it will take, what forces are to participate in it; and they decide all other questions connected with the preparation of war, dictating their will to the others.

The rulers of the United States assert that they are inspired by such ideals as the creation of a "commonwealth of free nations." Every now and again they declare that the United States, Britain, France, Turkey and Greece constitute a "commonwealth of free nations," whereas the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democratic Republics, they say, are "unfree" nations. Our understanding of this is that "freedom" does exist in the United States, Britain, France, Turkey and the other capitalist countries, but not for the people; it is freedom to exploit and rob the people. As regards the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies, it is true that this kind of "freedom" does not exist there, because in these countries freedom to exploit and rob the working people was abolished long ago. (Applause.) But it is this freedom that the champions of the "American way of life" are boasting of.

Actually, America's policy towards its West-European and other capitalist "friends" is not a

democratic, but an imperialist policy. Under the flag of "anti-communism" and "defence of freedom" the United States is actually subjugating and robbing the old, long-established bourgeois states and their colonies. As was the case with Hitler in the past, the American imperialists need the smoke screen of "struggle against communism" for the purpose of diverting attention from their actual usurpatory intentions. While pursuing an imperialist policy towards Britain, France and the other capitalist countries, the United States has, to put it mildly, the immodesty to pose as the sincere friend of these countries. A nice friend to be sure! He rides on the backs of his junior partners, robs and enslaves them and, belabouring them fore and aft, keeps on saying: "let's be friends." By that the American moneybags mean: First I'll drive you and then I'll ride you. (Laughter.)

The once free capitalist states—Britain, France, Holland, Belgium and Norway—are now virtually renouncing their national policy and are pursuing a policy dictated by the American imperialists; the governments are allowing their territories to be used as place d'armes and for the purpose of building American war bases, thereby jeopardizing the safety of their own countries in the event of hostilities. In obedience to the United States they are concluding alliances and blocs, contrary to the national interests of their own states. A glaring example of this is provided by the actions of the ruling circles of France who, with their own hands, are helping to rehabilitate the age-long bitterest enemy of France—German militarism. The British political leaders, both of the Conservative and Labour persuasion, have signed up for a long time as the junior partners of the United States, thereby pledging themselves to pursue, not their own national policy, but the American policy. That policy is already inflicting great suffering upon the British people and is causing the British Empire to burst at the seams.

British propaganda agencies continuously assert that the British Empire is being broken up by the Communists; but the ruling circles of the British Empire cannot fail to see the obvious facts which show that the British imperial possessions are being seized not by the Communists, but by the American billionaires.

Is it the Communists and not the American billionaires who have seized Canada, who are seizing Australia and New Zealand, who are pushing Britain out of the Suez Canal zone and from the markets of Latin America and the Near and Middle East, and who are laying their hands on the oil regions in the possession of Britain?

The facts show that no enemy of Britain has inflicted such heavy blows upon her, no enemy has taken from her part after part of her empire as her American "friend" is doing. That "friend" is in a bloc with Britain and is using British soil as air bases, thereby putting her in a difficult, I would say, a dangerous position, and yet poses as Britain's saviour from "Soviet communism."

As regards such "free" countries as Greece, Turkey and Yugoslavia, they have already been converted into American colonies, and the rulers of Yugoslavia, all the Titos, Kardeljs, Rankovices, Djilases, Pijades and others, long ago signed up as American agents and are carrying out against the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies the espionage and sabotage tasks set them by their American "chiefs."

The ruling circles of France, Italy, Britain, Western Germany and Japan have tied themselves to the war chariot of American imperialism and are abandoning their own national, independent foreign policy. True, the ruling top crust of these countries are thereby betraying the national interests of their countries and are testifying to their own bankruptcy. But they prefer to sacrifice the national interests of their countries in the hope of receiving the assistance of their trans-Atlantic imperialist patrons against their peoples, whom they fear more than bondage to alien imperialists.

Direct responsibility for this anti-national policy of the ruling circles is borne also by the Right-wing Social-Democrats, primarily by the leaders of the British Labour Party, the French Socialist Party and the Social-Democratic Party of Western Germany. The Right-wing Socialists in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Finland, Austria and other countries are following in the footsteps of their colleagues, and during the entire period since the termination of the Second World War have been furiously fighting the popular forces of peace and democracy. In addition to their old role of servitors of their respective national bourgeoisie, the present-day Right-wing Social-Democrats have assumed the role of agents of foreign, American imperialism, and are performing its dirtiest assignments in the preparation of war and in the struggle against their own peoples.

A distinguishing feature of the strategy of American imperialism is that the U.S. policymakers build their war plans on the use of foreign territories and foreign armies, primarily West-German and Japanese, but also British, French and Italian—on the use of other peoples who, according to the designs of the American strategists, are to serve as blind tools and cannon fodder for winning world domination for the American monopolists.

But already the more sober-minded and progressive politicians in the European and other capitalist countries, those who are not blinded by anti-Soviet enmity, distinctly see the abyss into which the reckless American adventurers are dragging them; and they are beginning to come out against war. It is to be supposed that in the countries which are being condemned to the role of obedient pawns of the American dictators genuine democratic and peace forces will be found who will pursue an independent peace policy and find a way out of the impasse into which the American dictators have driven them. If they take this new path, European and other countries will meet with the complete understanding on the part of all the peace-loving countries. (Loud and prolonged applause)...

Today, American imperialism is acting not only as an aggressor, but also as the world gendarme, striving to strangle freedom wherever it can and to implant fascism.

But already this world gendarme is meeting with the mounting hatred and resistance of the oppressed peoples.

All this is evidence of weakening imperialist positions and is greatly aggravating the struggle within the imperialist camp between the forces of fascist reaction and the democratic forces of the peoples in the imperialist countries. Such a situation is fraught with very grave consequences for the warmongers.

In view of the growing danger of war a popular movement in defence of peace is developing; anti-war coalitions are being formed of different classes and social strata interested in easing international tension and in averting another world war. All the efforts of the warmongers to paint this nonpartisan, peaceful, democratic movement as a party movement, as a communist movement are in vain. The fact that 500 million people signed the Stockholm Appeal and that over 600 million signed the Appeal for a Pact of Peace between the five Great Powers is the best refutation of this assertion of the warmongers and proof of the colossal dimensions of this nonpartisan, democratic movement in defence of peace. This peace movement does not set itself the object of abolishing capitalism, for it is not a socialist, but a democratic movement of hundreds of millions of people. The peace supporters advance demands and proposals designed to facilitate the maintenance of peace, the averting of another war. Under the present historical conditions, the achievement of this object would be a tremendous victory for the cause of democracy and peace.

The present relation of forces between the camp of imperialism and war and the camp of democracy

and peace makes this prospect quite real. For the first time in history there is a mighty and united camp of peace-loving states. The working class in the capitalist countries is now more organized, and powerful democratic international organizations of workers, peasants, women and the youth have been formed. The Communist Parties, which are waging a heroic struggle for peace, have gained in scope and strength.

The peoples of all countries are vitally interested in the struggle against the danger of another war, and this applies also to the broad masses in the United States, for in the event of war they will suffer no less than the population of other countries. The war in Korea, despite the enormous preponderance of American armaments, has already cost the American people hundreds of thousands of killed and wounded. It is easy to realize what colossal sacrifice the American people will have to bear if the bloated financial tycoons in the United States hurl them into a war against the peace-loving nations.

The task now is to enhance still further the activity of the popular masses, to strengthen the organization of the peace supporters, tirelessly to expose the warmongers and to prevent them from enmeshing the people in a web of lies. Curb and isolate the adventurers in the camp of the imperialist aggressors, who, for the sake of their profits, are trying to draw the peoples into a holocaust—such is the chief task of the whole of progressive and peace-loving mankind. (Prolonged applause)

3. THE SOVIET UNION IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MAINTENANCE AND STRENGTHENING OF PEACE

The Party's main line in the sphere of foreign policy has been, and remains, a policy of peace between the nations and of ensuring the security of our socialist Motherland...

Evidence of the peaceful strivings of the Soviet Union is provided not only by the proposals it makes, but also by its deeds. On the termination of the war, the Soviet Union greatly reduced its armed forces, whose numbers today do not exceed those before the war. After the war, the Soviet Government, in the shortest possible space of time, withdrew its troops from China, Korea, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, which they had entered in the course of hostilities against the fascist aggressors. Believing that the struggle against the man-hating propaganda of a new war can help greatly to relax the tension in international relations, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., on March 12, 1951, passed the Peace Defence Law

and proclaimed war propaganda a heinous crime against humanity. In this it set an example to other states.

During the most serious complications arising on the international scene in the past few years it was the Soviet Union that made proposals which provide a basis for the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is sufficient to recall that it was the Soviet Government that made the proposals that served as a basis for the truce negotiations in Korea.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. attaches great importance to the United Nations, believing that it could be an important means for the maintenance of peace. At the present time, however, the United States is converting the United Nations from the organ of international cooperation it should have been, according to the U.N. Charter, into an organ of United States dictatorial policy in the struggle against peace, and it is using it as a screen for its aggressive actions. In spite of the enormous difficulties created by the United States voting machine in the United Nations, the Soviet Union is in that body championing the cause of peace, striving to secure the adoption of effective proposals called for by the present international situation, proposals aimed at curbing the aggressive forces, averting a new war, and putting a stop to hostilities where they are already in progress.

It would be wrong to think that war can be launched only against the Soviet state. It is common knowledge that the imperialists unleashed the First World War long before the U.S.S.R. came into existence. The Second World War began as a war between capitalist states, and it inflicted severe damage on the capitalist countries. The antagonisms which now rend the imperialist camp may lead to a war of one capitalist state against another. Taking all these circumstances into account, the Soviet Union is striving to avert all war between states, and advocates the peaceful settlement of international conflicts and disputes. ...

The U.S.S.R.'s position in relation to the U.S.A., Britain, France and other bourgeois states is clear, and this position has been repeatedly stated by us. The U.S.S.R. is still ready to cooperate with these states with the view to promoting adherence to peaceful international standards and the ensurance of lasting and durable peace. (Applause.)

In relation to the vanquished countries—Germany, Italy and Japan—the Soviet Government is pursuing a policy that differs fundamentally from the policy of the imperialist powers. The fact that the Soviet Socialist State was among the victors, created for the peoples of the vanquished states an entirely new situa-

tion and possibilities unprecedented in history. The Soviet Union's policy creates for every country that surrendered unconditionally the opportunity for peaceful democratic development, for raising its civilian industry and agriculture, selling its products in foreign markets, and creating the national armed forces necessary for defence. In conformity with the Potsdam Agreement, the Soviet Union is unswervingly pursuing a policy aimed at the speediest conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, the withdrawal of all occupation troops, and the establishment of a united, independent, peace-loving, democratic Germany, bearing in mind that the existence of such a Germany, together with the existence of the peace-loving Soviet Union, precludes the possibility of new wars in Europe and makes the enslavement of the European countries by the world imperialists impossible. (Prolonged applause.)

We may hope that the German people, who are faced with the choice of proceeding along this road, or of being transformed into landsknechts of the American and British imperialists, will choose the right road—the road of peace. (Applause.) ...

The Soviet policy of peace and security of the nations is based on the premise that the peaceful coexistence and cooperation of capitalism and communism are quite possible, provided there is a mutual desire to cooperate, readiness to carry out commitments, and adherence to the principle of equal rights and noninterference in the internal affairs of other states.

The Soviet Union has always stood for, and now advocates, the development of trade and cooperation with other countries, irrespective of the difference in social systems. The Party will continue to pursue this policy on the basis of mutual advantage.

The bellicose circles in the U.S.A. and Britain are constantly reiterating that the armaments race alone can keep the industries in capitalist countries running. Actually, however, there is another prospect, the prospect of developing and expanding commercial relations between all countries, irrespective of the difference in social systems. This can keep the industries in the industrially developed countries running for many years to come, can ensure the sale of products of which one country has an abundance to other countries, can help to raise the economy of the underdeveloped countries, and thereby bring about lasting economic cooperation.

In pursuing its peace policy, the Soviet Union is in complete unanimity with the other democratic peace-loving states: the Chinese People's Republic, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania,

the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Mongolian People's Republic. The U.S.S.R.'s relations with these countries are an example of entirely new relations between states, not met with before in history. They are based on the principles of equal rights, economic cooperation and respect for national independence. Faithful to its treaties of mutual assistance, the U.S.S.R. is rendering, and will continue to render, assistance and support in the further consolidation and development of these countries. (Loud applause.)

We are confident that, in peaceful competition with capitalism, the socialist system of economy will, year after year, more and more strikingly demonstrate its superiority over the capitalist system of economy. But we have not the least intention of forcing our ideology, or our economic system, upon anybody. "The export of revolution is nonsense. Every country will make its own revolution if it wants to, and if it does not want to there will be no revolution," says Comrade Stalin.

While unswervingly pursuing its policy of peaceful cooperation with all countries, the Soviet Union, at the same time, takes into account the threat of new aggression on the part of the arrogant warmongers. That is why it is strengthening its defence capacity and will continue to do so. (Prolonged applause.)

The Soviet Union is not afraid of the threats of the warmongers. Our people have experience in fighting aggressors and have learned well how to thrash them. They thrashed the aggressors during the Civil War, when the Soviet state was still young and relatively weak; they thrashed them during the Second World War; and they will thrash them in future if they dare attack our Motherland. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

The facts of the past must be heeded. These facts are that as a result of the First World War Russia fell away from the capitalist system, and as a result of the Second World War quite a number of countries in Europe and Asia fell away from the capitalist system. There is every reason to believe that a third world war will cause the collapse of the world capitalist system. (Prolonged applause.)

That, so to speak, is the prospect of war and its consequences if the warmongers and aggressors force

war upon the peoples.

But there is another prospect, the prospect of maintaining peace, the prospect of peace between the nations. This prospect calls for the prohibition of war propaganda, in conformity with the decision of the United Nations; it calls for the banning of atomic and germ weapons and for the steady reduction of their armed forces by the Great Powers; it calls for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace between the powers, for the expansion of trade between countries, for the restoration of the single international market, and for other measures of a similar nature aimed at consolidating peace.

The implementation of such measures will strengthen peace, will rid the peoples of fear of the menace of war, will put a stop to the unprecedented expenditure of material resources on armaments and preparation of a war of extermination and will make it possible to use these resources for the benefit of the peoples.

The Soviet Union stands for the implementation of these measures, for the prospect of peace between the nations. (Loud and prolonged applause.)



The Party's tasks in the sphere of foreign policy:

1) To continue the struggle against the preparation and unleashing of another war; to rally the mighty anti-war democratic front for the purpose of strengthening peace; strengthen the ties of friendship and solidarity with peace supporters the world over; persistently to expose all preparations for a new war and all the designs and intrigues of the warmongers;

2) To continue the policy of international cooperation and development of business relations with all countries;

3) To strengthen and develop inviolable friendly relations with the Chinese People's Republic, with the European People's Democracies—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria and Albania, with the German Democratic Republic, with the Korean People's Democratic Republic and with the Mongolian People's Republic;

4) Tirelessly to strengthen the defence power of the Soviet state and enhance our preparedness devastatingly to repel any aggressor. (Loud and long continuing applause.)

Notes on Zhdanov's Speech to the Founding of the Cominform

(September 1947)

In September 1947, a conference was held in Poland of nine communist parties from East and West Europe. This meeting founded the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform). This meeting heard reports from the various parties and issued a declaration. Among the major speeches given at this conference was that of A. Zhdanov, one of the principal leaders of the CPSU(B). This speech was famous for its analysis that the post-war world had divided into "two camps" and for denouncing the U.S. imperialist drive for world domination.

There has been a general impression that the founding of the Cominform, and especially Zhdanov's speech, was a call for revolutionary struggle against the imperialist camp. Indeed, this is the way the reactionaries and cold warriors portrayed it. As well, there is the fact that, roughly coinciding with the founding of the Cominform, there was an upswing of revolutionary and militant struggles in various parts of the world. For example, communist-led armed struggles broke out in 1948 in a series of south and south-eastern Asian countries.

However, the actual documents of the Cominform, including Zhdanov's speech, do not give evidence that it was the policy of the Cominform to call for revolutionary struggle. In this commentary, we note some of the salient features of Zhdanov's speech.

First, it is notable that Zhdanov's speech is very restricted and narrow in its scope. It appears mainly concerned with Europe, and in particular the Soviet Union and the "new democracies" of Eastern Europe. This is also related to the composition of the Cominform itself. This body was made up of nine European parties, but the rationale behind this composition is nowhere explained. It did not include all the European parties in power, since it excluded the Albanian party. And it did not include all the parties in the European countries ruled by reactionary governments, but only those of France and Italy. For example, it left out the German party as well as the Greek party, which was then fighting a fierce war against monarcho-fascist reaction and

British imperialism. Moreover, it left out parties in all other continents. This included all the Asian parties, including the Chinese, Koreans and Vietnamese who were in fact in power in various parts of those countries. Thus, the composition of the Cominform cannot be explained by the criteria that these were the "major parties" or "parties in power," which is not to say that such criteria would be correct for the creation of an international organization of the movement.

Zhdanov's speech indicates that British and American imperialism, even during the Second World War, pursued their own imperialist aims. It points out, for example, that during the war Anglo-American reaction pursued its own aims and that the U.S. made deep penetrations into those regions which had formerly been regarded as exclusive spheres of influence of British capital. The Cominform declaration is more explicit in this regard and points out that "The United States of America, and Britain in agreement with them, set themselves another aim in the war: to rid themselves of competitors on the market (Germany and Japan) and to establish their dominant position." (See the "Declaration on the Founding of the Cominform, September, 1947" elsewhere in this issue.) In our study of the post-war Soviet documents, this is the earliest acknowledgement we have found that the Second World War, besides its general anti-fascist character, also involved an inter-imperialist rivalry on the part of the U.S., British and French imperialists.

Zhdanov's speech spells out the drive of U.S. imperialism to go all out for world domination in the post-war period. He gives a series of facts showing this. This is of course quite correct and marked a very important step away from the illusions that could be observed in the immediate post-war period about the intentions of U.S. imperialism. It appears that this message was particularly directed towards Eastern Europe where there may have been the danger of falling for some of the traps held out by imperialism.

It should be noted, however, that the condemnation of

U.S. imperialism may have been directed only at a part of the U.S. imperialist ruling class, only at certain ultra-reactionary or adventurist circles. For example, later on in the speech, Zhdanov seems to indicate a different attitude towards the Rooseveltians when he says that, "Today this policy is being conducted under new conditions now that America has abandoned the old course of Roosevelt and is passing to a new policy, a policy of preparing for new military adventures."

In analyzing the imperialist offensive, Zhdanov presents the assessment that there are "two camps" in the world. However, this description of the two world camps has a serious flaw in it. It is not equivalent to how today's international Marxist-Leninist movement perceives the division of the world into the camp of Capital, which includes the imperialists, social-imperialists, the bourgeoisie and all reaction, and the camp of Labor, which includes the proletarian movement, the revolutionary movements of the oppressed peoples, and socialist countries. Instead, the two camps described by Zhdanov are camps of states. The camp of reaction, which is described as the "imperialist and anti-democratic camp," is composed of the U.S., Britain and France; it is supported by "colony-owning countries, such as Belgium and Holland, by countries with reactionary anti-democratic regimes, such as Turkey and Greece, and by countries politically and economically dependent on the United States, such as the Near Eastern and South American countries and [Kuomintang] China."

On the other hand, the anti-imperialist and democratic camp is likewise described as a camp of certain states. This camp is said to be based on the USSR and the new democracies. It is also said to include "countries that have broken with imperialism and have firmly set foot on the path of democratic development, such as Romania, Hungary and Finland." Then Zhdanov says that "Indonesia and Viet Nam are associated with it; it has the sympathy of India, Egypt and Syria." Finally it is said that this camp "is backed by the labor and democratic movement and by the fraternal communist parties in all countries, by the fighters for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies, by all progressive and democratic forces in every country."

The significance of dividing the world according to states is that it concentrates attention on the maneuvering between regimes while relegating the question of the various classes and social forces to a secondary position or even losing sight of them altogether.

The description of the democratic camp is quite strange. It is solely a camp of states. The working class movement, national liberation fighters and communists are relegated to the role of "backing" this camp. As for the states included in the camp or associated with it, there are some weird things. Romania and Hungary are differentiated from the new democracies, but then they, along with Finland, are all stated to have broken with imperialism. The camp is also said to have the sympathy of India, which had just barely received independence from Britain and was ruled by a capitalist-landlord regime, as well as the sympathy of

Egypt, which was still under the rule of the monarchy! Why such regimes are said to have sympathized at that time with the anti-imperialist and democratic camp is left unexplained. The fact of the matter is that the Indian government's foreign policy was closely tied to British and American imperialism while hiding behind empty rhetoric of neutralism and non-alignment.

Then comes the question of the description of the aims of the democratic and anti-imperialist camp. This is set forward merely in terms of a fight for peace, peaceful cooperation, and democratic tasks. Zhdanov states:

"The end of the Second World War confronted all of the freedom-loving nations with the cardinal task of securing a lasting democratic peace sealing victory over fascism...."

"All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist camp are united in the effort to secure a just and democratic peace."

It is also described in connection with this task that it is the Soviet Union and its foreign policy which are playing a leading role. And it spells out what the content of this foreign policy is:

"...the major objective of the post-war foreign policy of the democratic states has been a democratic peace, the elimination of the vestiges of fascism and the prevention of a resurgence of fascist imperialist aggression, the recognition of the principle of equality of nations and respect for their sovereignty, and general reduction of armaments and the outlawing of the most destructive weapons, those designed for the slaughter of the civilian population."

It is notable that these statements all confine the aims of the anti-imperialist camp to simply democratic and peace questions. There is nothing about revolution, socialism, or proletarian internationalism. It should be noted that the peace settlement from World War II was indeed one of the major world issues, but it is quite another kettle of fish to hold out the illusion that an overall democratic peace can be attained through diplomatic efforts. It is a well-known Leninist thesis that a democratic peace requires a series of revolutions. Indeed, it may be recalled that at the time of the October Revolution, the Soviet government issued its famous Decree of Peace which declared, among other things, that "workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, will help us to conclude peace successfully, and at the same time emancipate the laboring and exploited masses of the population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation." One finds no such appeal in Zhdanov's speech.

The next two sections of Zhdanov's speech deal with the American imperialist plans in Europe and the tasks of the communist parties. The fact that these deal only with Europe confirm the preoccupation of the Cominform with questions of Europe. While we hold that it was correct to fight U.S. imperialist attempts to enslave Europe, this does not mean we would endorse all the formulations Zhdanov uses in his speech. In particular, there is a marked tendency in his speech in discussing the question of U.S. imperialism in Europe to blot out the class questions involved. For

example, in discussing the subjugation of Europe to American capital, it is not pointed out how it particularly affects the workers and toiling masses. Zhdanov barely mentions that the U.S. wants to bolster world capitalism, and he does not show how U.S. policy was aimed at bolstering the weakened capitalist classes and regimes in Europe, albeit in a subordinate position to the U.S. bourgeoisie. Thus the class foundations of the alliance between American and European capital is obscured, and things are presented as if the U.S. imperialists were hindering the capitalist development of Europe and aiming at turning it into an old-style colony.

As well, there is a pronounced underplaying of European imperialism. While there is some denunciation of British imperialism, that too is very weak. While some of the most brutal colonial wars were then being waged by European imperialism, this is not strongly condemned. Instead, an attempt is made to appeal to these powers on the basis of support for their national interests (i.e., imperialist interests).

In Zhdanov's speech, there is a very narrow conception of the ideological struggle against U.S. imperialism. This is put forward principally as a fight against the charge of "totalitarianism" and as a fight in defense of the principle of "national sovereignty." The idea of "world government" is opposed without reference to its class content. Since nothing is said about the perspective of world socialism or proletarian internationalism, the speech lays the ideological

basis for petty-bourgeois nationalism.

The section on the tasks of the communist parties also leaves a lot to be desired. Again this is an appeal centered on Europe. There is no appeal for revolutionary struggle, and the socialist perspective is totally obliterated. Instead the tasks of the CP's are posed simply in terms of the defense of national sovereignty, democracy and peace. All class questions are obscured and the call is given to "support all the really patriotic elements who do not want their countries to be imposed upon, who want to resist the enthrallment of their countries to foreign capital and to uphold their national sovereignty." This is in effect a call to support the sections of the European bourgeoisie who reject subordination to U.S. capital.

The struggle against social-democracy is also narrowed down. There is a call against the leaders of social-democracy but solely on the grounds that they "are acting as agents of U.S. imperialist circles."

In the final analysis, there is clearly a great gulf between the reputation of Zhdanov's speech and its actual contents. It is, indeed, more left-sounding than many post-war statements, but it does not give a revolutionary orientation. It illustrates many of the principal features of the profoundly wrong line on the world situation put forward by the international movement in the post-war period. □

Speech at the Founding Meeting of the Cominform

The International Situation

—by A. Zhdanov

The following are excerpts from the speech on the international situation delivered by A. Zhdanov to the first meeting of the Cominform held in Poland at the end of September, 1947. Passages cited in the report "Notes on Zhdanov's speech" have been highlighted by the WA. Bold type is as it was in the original.

I

The Post-War World Situation

The end of the Second World War brought with it big changes in the world situation. The military defeat of the bloc of fascist states, the character of the war as a war of liberation from fascism, and the decisive role played by the Soviet Union in the vanquishing of the fascist aggressors sharply altered the alignment of forces between the two systems — the socialist and the capitalist — in favor of socialism.

What is the essential nature of these changes?

The principal outcome of World War II was the military defeat of Germany and Japan — the two most militaristic and aggressive of the capitalist countries. The reactionary

imperialist elements all over the world, notably in Britain, America and France, had reposed great hopes in Germany and Japan, and chiefly in Hitler's Germany, firstly as in a force most capable of inflicting a blow on the Soviet Union in order to, if not having it destroyed altogether, weaken it at least and undermine its influence, secondly, as in a force capable of smashing the revolutionary labor and democratic movement in Germany herself and in all countries singled out for Nazi aggression, and thereby strengthening capitalism generally. This was the chief reason for the pre-war policy of "appeasement" and encouragement of fascist aggression, the so-called Munich policy consistently pursued by the imperialist ruling circles of Britain, France and the United States.

But the hopes reposed by the British, French and American imperialists in the Hitlerites were not realized. The Hitlerites proved to be weaker and the Soviet Union and the freedom-loving nations stronger than the Munichists had anticipated. As the result of World War II the major forces of belicose international fascist reaction had been smashed and put out of commission for a long time to come.

This was accompanied by another serious loss to the world capitalist system generally. Whereas the principal re-

sult of World War I had been that the united imperialist front was breached and that Russia dropped out of the world capitalist system, and whereas, as a consequence of the triumph of the socialist system in the USSR, capitalism ceased to be an integral worldwide economic system, World War II and the defeat of fascism, the weakening of the world position of capitalism and the enhanced strength of the anti-fascist movement resulted in a number of countries in Central and Southeastern Europe dropping out of the imperialist system. In these countries new, popular, democratic regimes arose. ...

The capitalist world has also undergone a substantial change. Of the six so-called great imperialist powers (Germany, Japan, Great Britain, the USA, France and Italy), three have been eliminated by military defeat (Germany, Italy and Japan). France has also been weakened and has lost its significance as a great power. As a result, only two "great" imperialist world powers remain — the United States and Great Britain. But the position of one of them, Great Britain, has been undermined. The war revealed that militarily and politically British imperialism was not so strong as it had been. In Europe, Britain was helpless against German aggression. In Asia, Britain, one of the biggest of the imperialist powers, was unable to retain hold of her colonial possessions without outside aid. Temporarily cut off from colonies that supplied her with food and raw materials and absorbed a large part of her industrial products, Britain found herself dependent, militarily and economically, upon American supplies of food and manufactured goods. After the war, Britain became increasingly dependent, financially and economically, on the United States. Although she succeeded in recovering her colonies after the war, Britain found herself faced there with the enhanced influence of American imperialism, which during the war had invaded all the regions that before the war had been regarded as exclusive spheres of influence of British capital (the Arab East, Southeast Asia). America has also increased her influence in the British dominions and in South America, where the former role of Britain is very largely and to an ever increasing extent passing to the United States.

World War II aggravated the crisis of the colonial system, as expressed in the rise of a powerful movement for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies. This has placed the rear of the capitalist system in jeopardy. The peoples of the colonies no longer wish to live in the old way. The ruling classes of the metropolitan countries can no longer govern the colonies on the old lines. Attempts to crush the national liberation movement by military force now increasingly encounter armed resistance on the part of the colonial peoples and lead to protracted colonial wars (Holland-Indonesia, France-Viet Nam).

The war — itself a product of the unevenness of capitalist development in the different countries — still further intensified this unevenness. Of all the capitalist powers, only one — the United States — emerged from the war not only unweakened, but even considerably stronger economically and militarily. ...

... Whereas before World War II the more influential reactionary circles of American imperialism had adhered to an isolationist policy and had refrained from active interference in the affairs of Europe and Asia, in the new, post-war conditions the Wall Street bosses adopted a new policy. They advanced a program of utilizing America's military and economic might, not only to retain and consolidate the positions won abroad during the war, but to expand them to the maximum and to replace Germany, Japan and Italy in the world market. The sharp decline of the economic power of the other capitalist states makes it possible to speculate on their post-war economic difficulties, and, in particular, on the post-war economic difficulties of Great Britain, which makes it easier to bring these countries under American control. The United States proclaimed a new frankly predatory and expansionist course.

The purpose of this new, frankly expansionist course is to establish the world supremacy of American imperialism. With a view to consolidating America's monopoly position in the markets gained as a result of the disappearance of her two biggest competitors, Germany and Japan, and the weakening of her capitalist partners, Great Britain and France, the new course of United States policy envisages a broad program of military, economic and political measures, designed to establish United States political and economic domination in all countries marked out for American expansion, to reduce these countries to the status of satellites of the United States, and to set up regimes within them which would eliminate all obstacles on the part of the labor and democratic movement to the exploitation of these countries by American capital. The United States is now endeavoring to extend this new line of policy not only to its enemies in the war and to neutral countries, but in an increasing degree to its wartime allies.

Special attention is being paid to the exploitation of the economic difficulties of Great Britain, which is not only America's ally but also a longstanding capitalist rival and competitor. It is the design of America's expansionist policy not only to prevent Britain from escaping from the vise of economic dependence on the United States in which she was gripped during the war, but, on the contrary, to increase the pressure, with a view of gradually depriving her of control over her colonies, ousting her from her spheres of influence, and reducing her to the status of a vassal state.

Thus the new policy of the United States is designed to consolidate its monopoly position and to reduce its capitalist partners to a state of subordination and dependence on America.

But America's aspirations to world supremacy encounter an obstacle in the USSR, the stronghold of anti-imperialist and anti-fascist policy, and its growing international influence, in the new democracies, which have escaped from the control of British and American imperialism, and in the workers of all countries, including America itself, who do not want a new war for the supremacy of their oppressors. Accordingly, the new expansionist and reactionary policy of the United States envisages a struggle against the USSR,

against the labor movement in all countries, including the United States, and against the emancipationist, anti-imperialist forces in all countries.

Alarmed by the achievements of socialism in the USSR, by the achievements of the new democracies, and by the post-war growth of the labor and democratic movement in all countries, the American reactionaries are disposed to take upon themselves the mission of "saviors" of the capitalist system from communism.

The frank expansionist program of the United States is therefore highly reminiscent of the reckless program, which failed so ignominiously, of the fascist aggressors, who, as we know, also made a bid for world supremacy. ...

The American imperialists regard themselves as the principal force opposed to the USSR, the new democracies and the labor and democratic movement in all countries of the world, as the bulwark of the reactionary, anti-democratic forces in all parts of the globe. Accordingly, literally on the day following the conclusion of World War II, they set to work to build up a front hostile to the USSR and world democracy, and to encourage the anti-popular reactionary forces — collaborationists and former capitalist stooges — in the European countries which had been liberated from the Nazi yoke and which were beginning to arrange their affairs according to their own choice. ...

II

The New Post-War Alignment of Political Forces and the Formation of Two Camps: the Imperialist and Anti-Democratic Camp, and the Anti-Imperialist and Democratic One

The fundamental changes caused by the war on the international scene and in the position of individual countries has entirely changed the political landscape of the world. A new alignment of political forces has arisen. The more the war recedes into the past, the more distinct become two major trends in post-war international policy, corresponding to the division of the political forces operating on the international arena into two major camps: the imperialist and anti-democratic camp, on the one hand, and the anti-imperialist and democratic camp, on the other. The principal driving force of the imperialist camp is the USA. Allied with it are Great Britain and France. The existence of the Attlee-Bevin Labor Government in Britain and the Ramadier Socialist Government in France does not hinder these countries from playing the part of satellites of the United States and following the lead of its imperialist policy on all major questions. The imperialist camp is also supported by colony-owning countries, such as Belgium and Holland, by countries with reactionary, anti-democratic regimes, such as Turkey and Greece, and by countries politically and economically dependent on the United States, such as the Near Eastern and South American countries and China.

The cardinal purpose of the imperialist camp is to

strengthen imperialism, to hatch a new imperialist war, to combat socialism and democracy, and to support reactionary and anti-democratic, pro-fascist regimes and movements everywhere.

In the pursuit of these ends the imperialist camp is prepared to rely on reactionary and anti-democratic forces in all countries, and to support its former adversaries in the war against its wartime allies.

The anti-fascist forces comprise the second camp. This camp is based on the USSR and the new democracies. It also includes countries that have broken with imperialism and have firmly set foot on the path of democratic development, such as Romania, Hungary and Finland. Indonesia and Viet Nam are associated with it; it has the sympathy of India, Egypt and Syria. The anti-imperialist camp is backed by the labor and democratic movement and by the fraternal communist parties in all countries, by the fight for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies, by all progressive and democratic forces in every country. The purpose of this camp is to resist the threat of new wars and imperialist expansion, to strengthen democracy and to extirpate the vestiges of fascism.

The end of the Second World War confronted all the freedom-loving nations with the cardinal task of securing a lasting democratic peace sealing victory over fascism. In the accomplishment of this fundamental task of the post-war period the Soviet Union and its foreign policy are playing a leading role. This follows from the very nature of the Soviet socialist state, to which motives of aggression and exploitation are utterly alien, and which is interested in creating the most favorable conditions for the building of a communist society. One of these conditions is external peace. As embodiment of a new and superior social system, the Soviet Union reflects in its foreign policy the aspirations of progressive mankind, which desires lasting peace and has nothing to gain from a new war hatched by capitalism. The Soviet Union is a staunch [word missing] of the liberty and independence of all nations, and a foe of national and racial oppression and colonial exploitation in any shape or form. The change in the general alignment of forces between the capitalist world and the socialist world brought about by the war has still further enhanced the significance of the foreign policy of the Soviet state and enlarged the scope of its activity on the international arena. ...

The successes and the growing international prestige of the democratic camp were not to the liking of the imperialists. Even while World War II was still on, reactionary forces in Great Britain and the United States became increasingly active, striving to prevent concerted action by the Allied powers, to protract the war, to bleed the USSR, and to save the fascist aggressors from utter defeat. The sabotage of the Second Front by the Anglo-Saxon imperialists, headed by Churchill, was a clear reflection of this tendency, which was in point of fact a continuation of the Munich policy in the new and changed conditions. But while the war was still in progress British and American reactionary circles did not venture to come out openly against the Soviet

Union and the democratic countries, realizing that they had the undivided sympathy of the masses all over the world. But in the concluding months of the war the situation began to change. The British and American imperialists already manifested their unwillingness to respect the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries at the Potsdam tripartite conference, in July 1945.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries in these two past years has been a policy of consistently working for the observance of the democratic principles in the post-war settlement. The countries of the anti-imperialist camp have loyally and consistently striven for the implementation of these principles, without deviating from them one iota. Consequently, **the major objective of the post-war foreign policy of the democratic states has been a democratic peace, the elimination of the vestiges of fascism and the prevention of a resurgence of fascist imperialist aggression, the recognition of the principle of the equality of nations and respect for their sovereignty, and general reduction of all armaments and the outlawing of the most destructive weapons, those designed for the mass slaughter of the civilian population.** In their effort to secure these objectives Soviet diplomacy and the diplomacy of the democratic countries met with the resistance of Anglo-American diplomacy, which since the war has persistently and unswervingly striven for the rejection of the general principles of the post-war settlement proclaimed by the Allies during the war, and to replace the policy of peace and consolidation of democracy by a new policy, a policy aiming at violating general peace, protecting fascist elements, and persecuting democracy in all countries. ...

Soviet foreign policy proceeds from the fact of the coexistence for a long period of the two systems — capitalism and socialism. From this it follows that cooperation between the USSR and countries with other systems is possible, provided that the principle of reciprocity is observed and that obligations once assumed are honored. Everyone knows that the USSR has always honored the obligations it has assumed. The Soviet Union has demonstrated its will and desire for cooperation.

Britain and America are pursuing the very opposite policy in the United Nations. They are doing everything they can to renege on their commitments and to secure a free hand for the prosecution of a new policy, a policy which envisages not cooperation among the nations but the hounding of one against the other, violation of the rights and interests of democratic nations, and the isolation of the USSR.

Today this policy is being conducted under new conditions now that America has abandoned the old course of Roosevelt and is passing to a new policy, a policy of preparing for new military adventures.

III

The American Plan for the Enthralment of Europe

...

One of the lines taken by the ideological "campaign" that goes hand in hand with the plans for the enslavement of Europe is an attack on the principle of national sovereignty, an appeal for the renouncement of the sovereign rights of nations to which is opposed the idea of a "world government." The purpose of this campaign is to mask the unbridled expansion of American imperialism, which is ruthlessly violating the sovereign rights of nations, to represent the United States as a champion of universal laws, and those who resist American penetration as believers in an obsolete and "selfish" nationalism. The idea of a "world government" has been taken up by bourgeois intellectual cranks and pacifists and is being exploited not only as a means of pressure, with the purpose of ideologically disarming the nations that defend their independence against the encroachments of American imperialism, but also as a slogan specially directed against the Soviet Union, which indefatigably and consistently upholds the principle of real equality and protection of the sovereign rights of all nations, big and small. Under present conditions, imperialist countries like the USA, Great Britain and the states closely associated with them become dangerous enemies of national independence and the self-determination of nations, while the Soviet Union and the new democracies are a reliable bulwark against encroachments on the equality and self-determination of nations.

It is a noteworthy fact that American military-political intelligence agents of the Bullitt breed, yellow trade union leaders of the Green brand, the French Socialists headed by that inveterate apologist of capitalism, Blum, the German social-democrat Schumacher, and Labor leaders of the Bevin type are all united in close fellowship in carrying out the ideological plan of American imperialism.

At this present juncture the expansionist ambitions of the United States find concrete expression in the "Truman doctrine" and the "Marshall Plan." Although they differ in form of presentation, both are an expression of a single policy, they are both an embodiment of the American design to enslave Europe. ...

The "Truman doctrine," which provides for the rendering of American assistance to all reactionary regimes which actively oppose the democratic peoples, bears a frankly aggressive character. Its announcement caused some dismay even among circles of American capitalists that are accustomed to anything. Progressive public elements in the USA and other countries vigorously protested against the provocative and frankly imperialistic character of Truman's announcement.

The unfavorable reception which the "Truman doctrine" was met with accounts for the necessity of the appearance of the "Marshall Plan," which is a more carefully veiled attempt to carry through the same expansionist policy.

The vague and deliberately guarded formulations of the "Marshall Plan" amount in essence to a scheme to create a bloc of states bound by obligations to the United States, and to grant American credits to European countries as a recompense for their renunciation of economic, and then of political, independence. Moreover, the cornerstone of the "Marshall Plan" is the restoration of the industrial areas of Western Germany controlled by the American monopolies.

It is the design of the "Marshall Plan," as transpired from the subsequent talks and the statements of American leaders, to render aid in the first place, not to the impoverished victor countries, America's allies in the fight against Germany, but to the German capitalists, with the idea of bringing under American sway the major sources of coal and iron needed by Europe and by Germany, and of making the countries which are in need of coal and iron dependent on the restored economic might of Germany.

In spite of the fact that the "Marshall Plan" envisages the ultimate reduction of Britain and France to the status of second-rate powers, the Attlee Labor government in Britain and the Ramadier Socialist government in France clutched at the "Marshall Plan" as at an anchor of salvation. Britain, as we know, has already practically used up the American loan of 3,750,000,000 dollars granted to her in 1946. We also know that the terms of this loan were so onerous as to bind Britain hand and foot. Even when already caught in the noose of financial dependence on the USA, the British Labor government could conceive of no other alternative than the receipt of new loans. It therefore hailed the "Marshall Plan" as a way out of the economic impasse, as a chance of securing fresh credits. The British politicians, moreover, hoped to take advantage of the creation of a bloc of Western European debtor countries of the United States to play within this bloc the role of America's chief agent, who might perhaps profit at the expense of weaker countries. The British bourgeoisie hoped, by using the "Marshall Plan," by rendering service to the American monopolies and submitting to their control, to recover its lost positions in a number of countries, in particular in the countries of the Balkan-Danubian area.

In order to lend the American proposals a specious gloss of "impartiality," it was decided to enlist as one of the sponsors of the implementation of the "Marshall Plan" France as well which had already half sacrificed her sovereignty to the United States, inasmuch as the credit she obtained from America in May 1947 was granted on the stipulation that the Communists would be eliminated from the French government.

Acting on instructions from Washington, the British and French governments invited the Soviet Union to take part in a discussion of the Marshall proposals. This step was taken in order to mask the hostile nature of the proposals with respect to the USSR. The calculation was that, since it was well known beforehand that the USSR would refuse American assistance on the terms proposed by Marshall, it might be possible to shift the responsibility on the Soviet Union for "declining to assist the economic restoration of

Europe," and thus incite against the USSR the European countries that are in need of real assistance. If, on the other hand, the Soviet Union should consent to take part in the talks, it would be easier to lure the countries of East and South-East Europe into the trap of the "economic restoration of Europe with American assistance." Whereas the Truman plan was designed to terrorize and intimidate these countries, the "Marshall Plan" was designed to test their economic staunchness, to lure them into a trap and then shackle them in the fetters of dollar "assistance."

In that case, the "Marshall Plan" would facilitate one of the most important objectives of the general American program, namely, to restore the power of imperialism in the countries of the new democracy and to compel them to renounce close economic and political cooperation with the Soviet Union.

The representatives of the USSR, having agreed to discuss the Marshall proposals in Paris with the governments of Great Britain and France, exposed at the Paris talks the unsoundness of attempting to work out an economic program for the whole of Europe, and showed that the attempt to create a new European organization under the aegis of France and Britain was a threat to interfere in the internal affairs of the European countries and to violate their sovereignty. They showed that the "Marshall Plan" was in contradiction to the normal principles of international cooperation, that it harbored the danger of splitting Europe and the threat of subjugating a number of European countries to American capitalist interests, that it was designed to give priority of assistance to the monopolistic concerns of Germany over the Allies, and that the restoration of these concerns was obviously designated in the "Marshall Plan" to play a special role in Europe.

This clear position of the Soviet Union stripped the mask from the plan of the American imperialists and their British and French coadjutors.

The all-European conference was a resounding failure.

...

We thus see that America is endeavoring to build a "Western bloc" not on the pattern of Churchill's plan for a United States of Europe, which was conceived as an instrument of British policy, but as an American protectorate, in which sovereign European states, not excluding Britain itself, are to be assigned a role not very far removed from that of a "49th state of America." American imperialism is becoming more and more arrogant and unceremonious in its treatment of Britain and France. The bilateral, and trilateral, talks regarding the level of industrial production in Western Germany (Great Britain-USA, USA-France), apart from constituting an arbitrary violation of the Potsdam decisions, are a demonstration of the complete indifference of the United States to the vital interests of its partners in the negotiations. Britain, and especially France, are compelled to listen to America's dictates and to obey them without a murmur. The behavior of American diplomats in London and Paris has come to be highly reminiscent of their behavior in Greece, where American repre-

representatives already considering it quite unnecessary to observe the elementary decencies appoint and dismiss Greek ministers at will and conduct themselves as conquerors. Thus the new plan for the Dawesization of Europe essentially strikes at the vital interests of the peoples of Europe, and represents a plan for the enthrallment and enslavement of Europe by the United States.

The "Marshall Plan" strikes at the industrialization of the democratic countries of Europe, and hence at the foundations of their integrity and independence. And if the plan for the Dawesization of Europe was doomed to failure at a time when the forces of resistance to the Dawes Plan were much weaker...[than] today, in post-war Europe there are quite sufficient forces, even leaving aside the Soviet Union, and if they display the will and determination they can foil this plan of enslavement. All that is needed is the determination and readiness of the peoples of Europe to resist. As to the USSR, it will bend every effort in order that this plan be doomed to failure. ...

The Soviet government has never objected to using foreign, and in particular American, credits as a means capable of expediting the process of economic rehabilitation. However, the Soviet Union has always taken the stand that the terms of credits must not be extortionate, and must not result in the economic and political subjugation of the debtor country to the creditor country. From this political stand, the Soviet Union has always held that foreign credits must not be the principal means of restoring a country's economy. The chief and paramount condition of a country's economic rehabilitation must be the utilization of its own internal forces and resources and the creation of its own industry. Only in this way can its independence be guaranteed against encroachments on the part of foreign capital, which constantly displays a tendency to utilize credits as an instrument of political and economic enthrallment. Such precisely is the "Marshall Plan," which would strike at the industrialization of the European countries and is consequently designed to undermine their independence. ...

IV

The Tasks of the Communist Parties in Uniting the Democratic, Anti-Fascist, Peace-Loving Elements to Resist the New Plans of War and Aggression

The dissolution of the Comintern, which conformed to the demands of the development of the labor movement in the new historical situation, played a positive role. The dissolution of the Comintern once and for all disposed of the slanderous allegation of the enemies of communism and the labor movement that Moscow was interfering in the internal affairs of other states, and that the communist parties in the various countries were acting not in the interests of their nations, but on orders from outside.

The Comintern was founded after the First World War, when the communist parties were still weak, when practically no ties existed between the working classes of the different countries, and when the communist parties had not yet produced generally recognized leaders of the labor movement. The service performed by the Comintern was that it restored and strengthened the ties between the working people of the different countries, that it elaborated theoretical questions of the labor movement in the new post-war conditions of development, that it established general standards of propaganda of the ideas of communism, and that it facilitated the preparation of leaders of the labor movement. This created the conditions for the conversion of the young communist parties into mass-labor parties. But once the young communist parties had become mass labor parties, the direction of these parties from one center became impossible and inexpedient. As a result the Comintern, from a factor promoting the development of the communist parties began to turn into a factor hindering their development. The new stage in the development of the communist parties demanded new forms of contact among the parties. It was these considerations that made it necessary to dissolve the Comintern and to devise new forms of connection between the parties.

In the course of the four years that have elapsed since the dissolution of the Comintern the communist parties have grown considerably in strength and influence in nearly all the countries of Europe and Asia. The influence of the communist parties has increased not only in Eastern Europe, but in practically all European countries where fascism held sway, as well as in those which were occupied by the German fascists — France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Finland, etc. The influence of the communists has increased especially in the new democracies, where the communist parties are among the most influential parties in the state.

But the present position of the communist parties has its shortcomings. Some comrades understood the dissolution of the Comintern to imply the elimination of all ties, of all contact, between the fraternal communist parties. But experience has shown that such mutual isolation of the communist parties is wrong, harmful and, in point of fact, unnatural. The communist movement develops within national frameworks, but there are tasks and interests common to the parties of various countries. We get a rather curious state of affairs: the socialists, who stopped at nothing to prove that the Comintern dictated directives from Moscow to the communists of all countries, have restored their International; yet communists even refrained from meeting one another, let alone consulting with one another on questions of mutual interest to them, from fear of the slanderous talk of their enemies regarding the "hand of Moscow." Representatives of the most diverse fields of endeavor — scientists, cooperators, trade unionists, the youth, students — deem it possible to maintain international contact, to exchange experience and consult with one another on matters relating to their work, to arrange international congresses

and conferences; yet the communists, even of countries that are bound together as allies, hesitate to establish friendly ties. There can be no doubt that if the situation were to continue it would be fraught with most serious consequences to the development of the work of the fraternal parties. The need for mutual consultation and voluntary coordination of action between individual parties has become particularly urgent at the present juncture when continued isolation may lead to a slackening of mutual understanding, and at times, even to serious blunders.

In view of the fact that the majority of the leaders of the socialist parties (especially the British Laborites and the French Socialists) are acting as agents of United States imperialist circles; there has devolved upon the communists the special historical task of leading the resistance to the American plan for the enthrallment of Europe, and of boldly denouncing all coadjutors of American imperialism in their own countries. At the same time, communists must support all the really patriotic elements who do not want their countries to be imposed upon, who want to resist enthrallment of their countries to foreign capital, and to uphold their national sovereignty. The communists must be the leaders in enlisting all anti-fascist and freedom-loving elements in the struggle against the new American expansionist plans for the enslavement of Europe.

It must be borne in mind that a great gulf lies between the desire of the imperialists to unleash a new war and the possibility of engineering such a war. The peoples of the world do not want war. The forces that stand for peace are so big and influential that if they are staunch and determined in defense of peace, if they display fortitude and

firmness, the plans of the aggressors will come to grief. It should not be forgotten that all the hullabaloo of the imperialist agents about the danger of war is designed to frighten the weak-nerved and unstable and to extort concessions to the aggressor by means of intimidation.

The chief danger to the working class at this present juncture lies in underrating its own strength and overrating the strength of the enemy. Just as in the past the Munich policy untied the hands of the Nazi aggressors, so today concessions to the new course of the United States and the imperialist camp may encourage its inspirers to be even more insolent and aggressive. The communist parties must therefore head the resistance to the plans of the imperialist expansion and aggression along every line — state, economic and ideological; they must rally their ranks and unite their efforts on the basis of a common anti-imperialist and democratic platform, and gather around them all the democratic and patriotic forces of the people.

A special task devolves on the fraternal communist parties of France, Italy, Great Britain and other countries. They must take up the standard in defense of the national independence and sovereignty of their countries. If the communist parties firmly stick to their position, if they do not allow themselves to be intimidated and blackmailed, if they act as courageous sentinels of enduring peace and popular democracy, of the national sovereignty, liberty and independence of their countries, if, in their struggle against the attempts to economically and politically enthrall their countries, they are able to take the lead of all the forces prepared to uphold the national honor and independence, no plans for the enthrallment of Europe can possibly succeed.

Declaration on the Founding of the Cominform

The following is the full text of "The Declaration of the Founding of the Cominform." It is reprinted from the November 10, 1947 issue of For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy.

Declaration of the founding of the Cominform at the Conference of the Communist Parties of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Poland, the USSR, France, Czechoslovakia and Italy.

The representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists), the Communist Party of Romania, the Hungarian Communist Party, the Polish Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Communist Party of Italy, having exchanged views on the international situation, have agreed upon the following declaration.

Fundamental changes have taken place in the international situation as a result of the Second World War and in the post-war period.

These changes are characterized by a new disposition of the basic political forces operating on the world arena, by a change in the relations among the victor states in the Second World War, and their realignment.

While the war was on, the Allied States in the war against Germany and Japan went together and comprised one camp. However, already during the war there were differences in the Allied camp as regards the definition of both war aims and the tasks of the post-war peace settlement. The Soviet Union and the other democratic countries regarded as their basic war aims the restoration and consolidation of democratic order in Europe, the eradication of fascism and the prevention of the possibility of new aggression on the part of Germany, and the establishment of a lasting all-round cooperation among the nations of Europe. **The United States of America, and Britain in agreement with them, set themselves another aim in the war: to rid themselves of competitors on the market (Germany and Japan) and to establish their dominant position.** This difference in the definition of war aims and the tasks of the post-

war settlement grew more profound after the war. Two diametrically opposed political lines took shape: on the one side the policy of the USSR and the other democratic countries directed at undermining imperialism and consolidating democracy, and on the other side, the policy of the United States and Britain directed at strengthening imperialism and stifling democracy. Inasmuch as the USSR and the countries of the new democracy became obstacles to the realization of the imperialist plans of struggle for world domination and smashing of democratic movements, a crusade was proclaimed against the USSR and the countries of the new democracy, bolstered also by threats of a new war on the part of the most zealous imperialist politicians in the United States of America and Britain.

Thus two camps were formed — the imperialist and anti-democratic camp having as its basic aim the establishment of world domination of American imperialism and the smashing of democracy, and the anti-imperialist and democratic camp having as its basic aim the undermining of imperialism, the consolidation of democracy, and the eradication of the remnants of fascism.

The struggle between the two diametrically opposed camps — the imperialist camp and the anti-imperialist camp — is taking place in a situation marked by a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the weakening of the forces of capitalism and the strengthening of the forces of socialism and democracy.

Hence the imperialist camp and its leading force, the United States, are displaying particularly aggressive activity. This activity is being developed simultaneously along all lines — the lines of military strategic measures, economic expansion and ideological struggle. The Truman-Marshall plan is only a constituent part, the European subsection of the general plan for the policy of global expansion pursued by the United States in all parts of the world. The plan for the economic and political enslavement of Europe by American imperialism is being supplemented by plans for the economic and political enslavement of China, Indonesia, the South American countries. Yesterday's aggressors — the capitalist magnates of Germany and Japan — are being groomed by the United States of America for a new role, that of instruments of the imperialist policy of the United States in Europe and Asia.

The arsenal of tactical weapons used by the imperialist camp is highly diversified. It combines direct threats of violence, blackmail and extortion, every means of political and economic pressure, bribery, and utilization of internal contradictions and strife in order to strengthen its own positions, and all this is concealed behind a liberal-pacifist mask designed to deceive and trap the politically inexperienced.

A special place in the imperialists' arsenal of tactical weapons is occupied by the utilization of the treacherous policy of the right-wing Socialist like Blum in France, Attlee and Bevin in Britain, Schumacher in Germany, Renner and Scherf in Austria, Saragat in Italy, etc., who strive to cover up the true rapacious essence of imperialist policy under a mask of democracy and socialist phraseology, while actually

being in all respects faithful accomplices of the imperialists, sowing dissension in the ranks of the working class and poisoning its mind. It is not fortuitous that the foreign policy of British imperialism found its most consistent and zealous executor in Bevin.

Under these circumstances it is necessary that the anti-imperialist democratic camp should close its ranks, draw up an agreed program of actions and work out its own tactics against the main forces of the imperialist camp, against American imperialism and its British and French allies, against the right-wing Socialists, primarily in Britain and France.

To frustrate the plan of imperialist aggression the efforts of all the democratic anti-imperialist forces of Europe are necessary. The right-wing Socialists are traitors to this cause. With the exception of those countries of the new democracy where the bloc of the Communists and the Socialists with other democratic, progressive parties forms the basis of the resistance of these countries to the imperialist plans, the Socialists in the majority of other countries, and primarily the French Socialists and the British Laborites — Ramadier, Blum, Attlee and Bevin — by their servility and sycophancy are helping American capital to achieve its aims, provoking it to resort to extortion and impelling their own countries on to the path of vassal-like dependence on the United States of America.

This imposes a special task on the Communist Parties. They must take into their own hands the banner of defense of the national independence and sovereignty of their countries. If the Communist Parties stick firmly to their positions, if they do not let themselves be intimidated and blackmailed, if they courageously safeguard democracy and the national sovereignty, liberty and independence of their countries, if in their struggle against attempts to enslave their countries economically and politically they will be able to take the lead of all the forces that are ready to fight for honor and national independence, no plans for the enslavement of the countries of Europe and Asia can be carried into effect.

This is now one of the principal tasks of the Communist Parties.

It is essential to bear in mind that there is a vast difference between the desire of the imperialists to unleash a new war and the possibility of organizing such a war. The nations of the world do not want war. The forces standing for peace are so large and so strong that if these forces be staunch and firm in defending the peace, if they display stamina and resolution, the plans of the aggressors will meet with utter failure. It should not be forgotten that the war danger hullabaloo raised by the imperialist agents is intended to frighten the nervous and unstable elements and by blackmail to win concessions for the aggressor.

The principal danger for the working class today lies in underestimating their own strength and overestimating the strength of the imperialist camp. Just as the Munich policy untied the hands of Hitlerite aggression in the past, so yielding to the new line in the policy of the United States

and that of the imperialist camp is bound to make its inspirers still more arrogant and aggressive. Therefore, the Communist Parties must take the lead in resisting the plans of imperialist expansion and aggression in all spheres — state, political, economic and ideological; they must close their ranks, unite their efforts on the basis of a common anti-imperialist and democratic platform and rally around themselves all the democratic and patriotic forces of the nation.

Resolution on Interchange of Experience and Coordination of Activities of the Parties Represented at the Conference

The Conference states that the absence of contacts among the Communist Parties participating at this Conference is a serious shortcoming in the present situation. Experience has shown that such lack of contacts among the Communist Parties is wrong and harmful. The need for interchange of experience and voluntary coordination of action of the various Parties is particularly keenly felt at the present time in view of the growing complication of the post-war international situation, a situation in which the lack of connections among the Communist Parties may

prove detrimental to the working class.

In view of this, the participants in the Conference have agreed on the following:

1. To set up an Information Bureau consisting of representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists), the Communist Party of Romania, the Hungarian Communist Party, the Polish Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), the Communist Party of France, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Communist Party of Italy.

2. To charge the Information Bureau with the organization of interchange of experience, and if need be, coordination of the activities of the Communist Parties on the basis of mutual agreement.

3. The Information Bureau is to consist of two representatives from each Central Committee, the delegations of the Central Committees to be appointed and replaced by the Central Committees.

4. The Information Bureau is to have a printed organ — a fortnightly and subsequently, a weekly. The organ is to be published in French and Russian, and when possible, in other languages as well.

5. The Information Bureau is to be located in the city of Belgrade. □

From 'Resolutions of the Meeting of the Cominform' November 1949

The third meeting of the Cominform took place in November, 1949. Although the Cominform was not dissolved until 1956, this was its last general meeting. Below we reprint the complete texts of two of the resolutions from that meeting: "The Defense of Peace and the Struggle Against the Warmongers" and "Working Class Unity and the Tasks of the Communist and Workers' Parties." We have highlighted those passages in these resolutions which have been quoted in our reports, which are found elsewhere in this issue. The passages printed in bold face were that way in the original.

I.

The Defence of Peace and the Struggle Against the Warmongers

The representatives of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, the Rumanian Workers' Party, the Hungarian Working People's Party, the Polish United Workers' Party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), the French Communist Party, the Italian

Communist Party and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, after discussing the question of the defence of peace and the struggle against the warmongers, reached unanimous agreement on the following conclusions:

The events of the last two years have fully confirmed the correctness of the analysis of the international situation made by the first conference of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties in September 1947.

During this period the two lines in world policy have been still more clearly and more sharply revealed: the line of the democratic anti-imperialist camp headed by the U.S.S.R., the camp which conducts a persistent and consistent struggle for peace among the peoples and for democracy; and the line of the imperialist anti-democratic camp headed by the ruling circles of the United States, the camp which has as its main aim the forcible establishment of Anglo-American world domination, the enslavement of foreign countries and peoples, the destruction of democracy and the unleashing of a new war.

Forces of Peace Grow Stronger

Moreover, the aggressiveness of the imperialist camp continues to increase. The ruling circles of the United States and Britain are openly conducting a policy of aggression and preparation of a new war. In the

struggle against the camp of imperialism and war, the forces of peace, democracy and Socialism have grown and become strong. The further growth of the might of the Soviet Union, the political and economic strengthening of the countries of the people's democracy and their embarking upon the road of building Socialism, the historic victory of the Chinese people's Revolution over the united forces of internal reaction and American imperialism, the creation of the German Democratic Republic, the strengthening of the Communist Parties and the growth of the democratic movement in the capitalist countries, the great scope of the movement of the partisans of peace—all this signifies a great widening and strengthening of the anti-imperialist and democratic camp.

At the same time the imperialist and anti-democratic camp is becoming weaker. The successes of the forces of democracy and Socialism, the maturing economic crisis, the further sharpening of the general crisis of the capitalist system, the sharpening of the internal and external contradictions of that system, testify to the increasing weakening of imperialism.

The change in the correlation of forces in the international arena in favour of the camp of peace and democracy provokes mad fury and rage among the imperialist warmongers. The Anglo-American imperialists count upon changing the course of historical development by means of a war, to solve their internal and external contradictions and difficulties, to consolidate the position of monopoly capital, and to achieve world domination.

Imperialist War Preparations

Feeling that time works against them, the imperialists in feverish haste are knocking together various blocs and alliances of reactionary forces for the realisation of their aggressive plans. The whole policy of the Anglo-American imperialist bloc serves the preparation of a new war. It finds its expression in the frustration of a peace settlement with Germany and Japan, the completion of the dismemberment of Germany, the transformation of Germany's Western zones and of Japan, occupied by American troops, into hot-beds of fascism and *revanchism* and into jumping-off grounds for the realisation of the aggressive plans of that bloc.

The enslaving Marshall Plan, its direct extension into Western Union and the North-Atlantic military bloc, directed against all peace-loving peoples, the unrestrained armaments race in the United States and in the West-European countries, the inflated military budgets and the extension of the network of American military bases serve this policy. This policy also finds its expression in the refusal of the Anglo-American bloc to prohibit atomic weapons despite the collapse of the legend of American atomic monopoly, and in the fomenting of war hysteria by all possible means.

This policy determines the whole line of the Anglo-American bloc in the United Nations organisation, aimed at undermining U.N.O. and transforming it into a tool of American monopolies.

The imperialists' policy of unleashing a new war has also found expression in the plot exposed at the Budapest trial of Rajk and Brankov, a plot which was organised by Anglo-American circles against the countries of People's Democracy and the Soviet Union, with the assistance of the nationalist fascist Tito clique who have become a band of agents of international imperialist reaction. The policy of preparing a new war means, for the masses of the people of the capitalist

countries, a continuous growth in the unbearable burdens of taxation, an increase in the poverty of the working masses, side by side with a fabulous increase in the super-profits of the monopolies which are enriching themselves from the armaments race.

The maturing economic crisis is bringing still more poverty, unemployment, hunger and fear of the morrow to the working people of the capitalist countries. At the same time the policy of war preparations is linked with continuous encroachments by the ruling imperialist circles on the elementary and vital rights and democratic liberties of the mass of the people. Intensified reaction in all spheres of social, political and ideological life, the use of fascist methods of club law against the progressive and democratic forces of the people—these are the measures by which the imperialist bourgeoisie are trying to prepare the rear for a robber war.

Thus, like the fascist aggressors, the Anglo-American bloc is engaged in preparing a new war in all spheres: military strategic measures, political pressure and blackmail, economic expansion and the enslavement of peoples, ideological stupefaction of the masses and the strengthening of reaction.

Imperialists Overestimate Their Strength

The bosses of American imperialism are making their plans for unleashing a new world war and for the conquest of world domination without taking into account the actual relation of forces between the camp of imperialism and the camp of Socialism.

Their plans for world domination have even less foundation and are more adventurist than the plans of the Hitlerite and Japanese imperialists. The American imperialists clearly overestimate their strength and underestimate the growing strength and organisation of the anti-imperialist camp. The historical situation today differs radically from the situation in which the Second World War was prepared, and in the present international conditions it is incomparably more difficult for the warmongers to carry out their bloodthirsty plans. "The horrors of the recent war are too fresh in the minds of the people, and the social forces in favour of peace are too great for Churchill's pupils in aggression to be able to overpower and deflect them towards a new war." (Stalin.)

The peoples do not want war, and hate war. They are becoming more and more conscious of the terrible abyss into which the imperialists are trying to draw them. The continuous struggle of the Soviet Union, the countries of People's Democracy and the international working class and the democratic movement for peace, for the freedom and independence of nations and against the warmongers, is daily finding ever more powerful support from the broadest sections of the populations of all countries of the world.

Hence the development of the mighty movement of the supporters of peace. This movement includes in its ranks more than 600 million people and is broadening and growing, embracing all countries of the world and drawing into its ranks ever more fighters against the threat of war. The movement of the supporters of peace is a vivid indication of the fact that the mass of the people are taking the cause of safeguarding peace into their own hands, are demonstrating their unswerving will to defend peace and avert war.

We Must Not Underestimate the War Danger

However, it would be mistaken and harmful for the cause of peace to underestimate the danger of the new war that is being prepared by the imperialist Powers, headed by the United States of America and Britain.

The tremendous growth of the forces of the camp of democracy and Socialism should not evoke in the ranks of the true fighters for peace any kind of complacency. It would be profoundly and unpardonably misleading to consider that the threat of war has diminished.

The experience of history teaches that the more hopeless the cause of imperialist reaction, the more it rages, the greater grows the danger of military adventures. Only the most tremendous vigilance on the part of the people, their firm determination to fight actively with all their might and with every possible means for peace, will smash to atoms the criminal designs of the instigators of a new war. In the conditions of an intensifying threat of a new war, a great and historic responsibility rests with the Communist and Workers' Parties.

The struggle for a stable and lasting peace, for organising and rallying the forces standing for peace against those standing for war, must today occupy the central place in all the work of the Communist Parties and democratic organisations. For the fulfilment of the great and noble task of saving mankind from the threat of a new war, the representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties regard the following as their most important tasks:

The Most Urgent Tasks

(1) It is necessary to work still more stubbornly for the organisational consolidation and extension of the movement of the supporters of peace, drawing into that movement ever-new sections of the population and converting it into a nation-wide movement.

Particular attention should be devoted to bringing into the movement of the supporters of peace the trade unions, women's, youth, co-operative, sports, cultural and educational, religious and other organisations, as well as scientists, writers, journalists, workers in the field of culture, parliamentary leaders and other political and social leaders who are in favour of peace and are against war.

Today the tasks loom particularly imperatively of rallying all honest supporters of peace, irrespective of religious faiths, political views and party membership, on the broadest platform of the struggle for peace and against the threat of the new war which hangs over mankind.

(2) For the further development of the movement of the supporters of peace, the more active participation of the working class in this movement and the solidarity and unity of its ranks are of decisive importance. For this reason it is a primary task of the Communist and Workers' Parties to bring into the ranks of the fighters for peace the broadest sections of the working class, to create a firm unity of the working class, to organise joint action of the various sections of the proletariat on the basis of the common platform of the struggle for peace and for the national independence of their country.

(3) Unity of the working class can only be won through determined struggle against the Right-Wing Socialist splitters and disorganisers of the working-class movement. The Right-Wing Socialists of the type of Bevin, Attlee, Blum, Guy Mollet, Spaak, Schumacher,

Renner, Saragat, and the reactionary trade union leaders like Green, Carey, Deakin, conducting a splitting, anti-popular policy, are the bitterest enemies of the working class, the accomplices of the warmongers and lackeys of imperialism, who conceal their betrayal in pseudo-Socialist, cosmopolitan phraseology.

The Communist and Workers' Parties, continuously fighting for peace, must day by day expose the Right-Wing Socialist leaders as the bitterest enemies of peace. It is essential to develop and consolidate to the utmost the co-operation and unity of action among the lower organisations and the rank-and-file members of the Socialist parties, to support all truly honest elements in the ranks of these parties, explaining to them the disastrous nature of the policy of the reactionary Right-Wing leaders.

(4) The Communist and Workers' Parties must oppose the misanthropic propaganda of the aggressors who are striving to convert the countries of Europe and Asia into bloody battlefields, with the broadest propaganda for stable and lasting peace among the peoples. They must continuously expose the aggressive blocs and military-political alliances—first and foremost, Western Union and the North-Atlantic bloc. **They must widely explain that a new war would bring the peoples' most profound disaster and colossal destruction, and that the struggle against war and in defence of peace is the task of all peoples of the world.** It is necessary to ensure that war propaganda, the preaching of racial hatred and enmity among peoples, which is being conducted by the agents of Anglo-American imperialism, meets with sharp condemnation on the part of the entire democratic public in every country. It is necessary to ensure that not one single action on the part of the propagandists of a new war remains without a rebuff from the honest supporters of peace.

(5) To make wide use of the new, effective and tested forms of mass struggle for peace, such as committees in defence of peace in towns and villages, the drawing up of petitions and protests, ballots among the population, which have been widely practised in France and Italy, publication and distribution of literature exposing the war preparations, the collection of funds for the struggle for peace, the organisation of boycotts of films, newspapers, books, periodicals, broadcasting companies and of the institutions and leaders propagating the idea of a new war. All these constitute a most important task of Communist and Workers' Parties.

(6) The Communist and Workers' Parties in capitalist countries consider it their duty to join in a single whole the struggle for national independence and the struggle for peace; continuously to expose the anti-national, treacherous nature of the policy of the bourgeois Governments which have become the direct agents of aggressive American imperialism; to unite and consolidate all the democratic and patriotic forces of the country round slogans calling for abolition of the ignominious subordination to the American monopolies, and for a return to the path of an independent foreign and home policy corresponding to the national interests of the peoples.

It is necessary to rally the widest sections of the people in the capitalist countries in defence of democratic rights and liberties, continuously explaining that the defence of peace is indissolubly linked with the defence of the vital interests of the working class and the working masses, with the defence of their economic and political rights. Important tasks face the Communist Parties of France, Italy, Britain, West Germany and other countries, whose peoples the American imperialists want to use as cannon fodder in order to carry

out their aggressive plans. Their duty is to develop still further the struggle for peace and for the smashing of the criminal designs of the Anglo-American warmongers.

(7) The Communist and Workers' Parties of the countries of People's Democracy and the Soviet Union have, together with the task of exposing the imperialist warmongers and their accomplices, the task of further strengthening the camp of peace and Socialism, for the sake of defending peace and the security of nations.

(8) The Anglo-American imperialists assign a considerable role in the execution of their aggressive plans, particularly in Central and South-East Europe, to the nationalist Tito clique, which is employed in the espionage service of the imperialists. The task of defending peace and struggling against the warmongers demands the further exposure of this clique which has gone over to the camp of the bitter enemies of peace, democracy and Socialism—the camp of imperialism and fascism.

For the first time in the history of mankind there has arisen an organised peace front, headed by the Soviet Union, the bulwark and standard-bearer of peace throughout the world. The courageous call of the Communist Parties, proclaiming that the peoples will never fight against the first land of Socialism in the world, against the Soviet Union, is being spread ever more widely among the mass of the people in the capitalist countries. In the days of the war against fascism, the Communist Parties were the vanguard of the nationwide resistance to the invaders. In the post-war period the Communist and Workers' Parties are the front-rank fighters for the vital interests of their peoples, against a new war.

United together under the leadership of the working class, all the opponents of a new war—working people and men and women of science and culture—are organising a mighty peace front capable of frustrating the criminal designs of the imperialists. The outcome of the developing gigantic struggle for peace depends to a great extent on the energy and initiative of the Communist Parties. It rests primarily with the Communists, as vanguard fighters, to transform the possibility of foiling the warmongers' plans into an actual fact.

The forces of democracy, the forces of the supporters of peace considerably exceed the forces of reaction. It is a question of still further increasing the vigilance of the peoples towards the warmongers, of organising and rallying the broad mass of the people for the active defence of peace, for the sake of the basic interests of the peoples, for the sake of their life and liberty.

II.

Working-Class Unity and the Tasks of the Communist and Workers' Parties

I

The preparation of a new war which is being conducted by the Anglo-American imperialists, the campaign of bourgeois reaction against the democratic rights and economic interests of the working class and the masses of the people, demand a strengthening of the

struggle of the working class to safeguard and consolidate peace, to organise a decisive rebuff to the warmongers and to the onslaught of imperialist reaction. The guarantee of success in this struggle is unity in the ranks of the working class.

Post-war experience shows that the policy of splitting the working-class movement occupies one of the most important places in the arsenal of tactical means and methods used by the imperialists for the unleashing of a new war, for the suppression of the forces of democracy and Socialism, and for sharply lowering the standard of living of the mass of the people.

Never before in the whole history of the international working-class movement has working-class unity, both within individual countries and on a world scale, been of such decisive importance as at the present time. Unity in the ranks of the working class is necessary in order to defend peace, to thwart the criminal designs of the warmongers and to foil the imperialists' plot against democracy and Socialism, to avert the establishment of fascist methods of domination, to offer a decisive rebuff to the campaign of monopoly capital against the vital interests of the working class and to achieve an improvement in the economic position of the working masses.

These tasks can be achieved first and foremost on the basis of rallying the broad masses of the working class, irrespective of party membership, trade union organisation and religious faith. Unity from below is the most effective way of rallying all workers for the sake of the defence of peace and the national independence of their countries, for the sake of the defence of the economic interests and democratic rights of the working people.

Working-class unity is fully attainable, despite the opposition of the leading centres of all the trade unions and parties, led by splitters and enemies of unity.

The post-war period has been marked by big successes in the elimination of the split in the working class and in the rallying of the democratic forces in general, an expression of which was the formation of the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Women's International Democratic Federation, and the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and the convening of the World Congress of Partisans of Peace. The successes of unity are expressed in the strengthening of the General Confederation of Labour in France, the establishment of a united trade union association in Italy—the Italian General Confederation of Labour—and in the militant activities of the French and Italian proletariat.

In the countries of People's Democracy historic successes have been won as regards unity of the working class. United parties of the working class have been set up, as well as united trade unions, and united co-operative, youth, women's and other organisations. This working-class unity played a decisive role in the successes achieved in the economic and cultural advance in the countries of People's Democracy, ensured for the working class the leading role in the State, and ensured radical improvements in the material conditions of the working masses.

All this points to the tremendous urge of the working class towards consolidating its ranks, and points to the existence of real possibilities of creating a united front of the working class against the united forces of reaction, from the American imperialists to the Right-Wing Socialists.

The American and British imperialists and their satellites in the countries of Europe are striving to split and disorganise the forces of the proletariat and of the people in general, placing particular hopes in the Right-Wing Socialists and reactionary trade union leaders. On direct instructions from the American and British imperialists, the Right-Wing Socialist leaders and re-

actionary trade union leaders are splitting the ranks of the working-class movement from the top and trying to destroy the united organisations of the working class which have been set up in the post-war period. They have tried to smash the World Federation of Trade Union from within, have organised breakaway groupings—the *Force Ouvrière* in France, the so-called Federation of Labour in Italy—and they are preparing to set up a breakaway international trade union centre.

Splitting attempts of this kind have also been made by the leaders of the Catholic organisations in certain countries. The appraisal of the treacherous actions of the Right-Wing Socialist leaders, as the bitterest enemies of working-class unity and the accomplices of imperialism, given by the first conference of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties, has been fully confirmed.

Today the Right-Wing Socialists act not only as agents of the bourgeoisie in their own countries, but as agents of American imperialism, converting the Social-Democratic parties of the countries of Europe into American parties, direct tools of United States imperialist aggression.

In those countries where the Right-Wing Socialists are in the Government—Britain, France, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries—they act as the ardent defenders of the Marshall Plan, Western Union and North Atlantic Treaty, and all similar forms of American expansion. These pseudo-Socialists carry out the foulest role in the persecution of working-class and democratic organisations which defend the interests of the working people. Sliding farther and farther down the path of betrayal of the interests of the working class, democracy and Socialism, and having completely disowned Marxist teaching, the Right-Wing Socialists are now acting as the defenders and propagandists of the robber ideology of American imperialism.

Their theory of democratic Socialism, of the third force, their cosmopolitan ravings about the need to renounce national sovereignty, are nothing but ideological camouflage of the aggression of American and British imperialism. The wretched offspring of the Second International (which rotted alive)—the so-called Committee of International Socialist Conferences (C.O.M.I.S.C.O.)—has become the rallying ground of the vilest splitters and disorganisers of the working-class movement. This organisation has become an espionage centre in the employment of the British and American intelligence services.

Only in decisive battle against the Right-Wing Socialist splitters and disorganisers of the working-class movement can working-class unity be won.

II

The Information Bureau considers it the primary task of the Communist Parties to struggle continuously to unite and organise all the forces of the working class in order to offer powerful resistance to the insolent claims of Anglo-American imperialism, to frustrate their gamble on a new world war, to defend and consolidate the cause of peace and international security, to doom to failure the offensive of monopoly capital against the standard of living of the working masses.

In the present international situation, it is the direct duty of the Communist Parties to explain that if the working class do not secure unity in their ranks, they will deprive themselves of the most important weapon in the struggle against the growing threat of a new world war and the offensive of imperialist reaction on the standard of living of the working people.

While conducting an irreconcilable and consistent struggle in theory and practice against the Right-Wing Socialists and reactionary trade union leaders and mercilessly exposing them and isolating them from the masses, the Communists should patiently and persistently explain to the rank-and-file Social Democrat workers the full importance of working-class unity, should draw them into the active struggle for peace, bread and democratic liberties, and should pursue a policy of joint action for the achievement of these aims.

The tried method of achieving unity for the working class is unity of action on the part of its various sections. Agreed joint action in individual enterprises, in whole branches of industry, on a town, regional, national and international scale, mobilises the broadest masses for the struggle for the most immediate needs which they best understand, and serves to establish permanent unity in the proletarian ranks. The achievement of unified working-class action from below can be expressed in the formation in factories and institutions of committees in defence of peace, in the organisation of mass demonstrations against the warmongers, in joint action on the part of the workers for the purpose of defending democratic rights and improving their economic position.

In the struggle for working-class unity special attention should be given to the masses of Catholic workers and working people and their organisation, bearing in mind that religious convictions are not an obstacle to working-class unity, particularly when this unity is needed to save peace. Concrete joint action in the field of economic demands, co-ordination of the struggle of the class and Catholic trade unions, etc., can be effective means of bringing the Catholic workers into the common front of struggle for peace.

A most important task of the Communist Parties in every capitalist country is to do everything possible to secure unity of the trade union movement. Today it is of tremendous importance to draw unorganised workers into the trade unions and into active struggle. In the capitalist countries these workers comprise a considerable part of the proletariat. If the Communist Parties properly organise the work among the unorganised workers, they will be able to achieve important successes in the task of securing working-class unity.

The Information Bureau considers that it is necessary, on the basis of working-class unity, to establish national unity of all democratic forces for the purpose of mobilising the broad masses of the people for the struggle against Anglo-American imperialism and reaction at home. Of extreme importance is the day-to-day work in the various mass organisations of the working people: women's, youth, peasant, co-operative and other organisations.

Unity of the working-class movement and the rallying of all democratic forces is necessary not only for the solution of the day-to-day and current tasks of the working class and the mass of the working people, but also for the solution of the basic questions which confront the proletariat as a class which is leading the struggle for the elimination of the power of monopoly capital, for the Socialist re-construction of society.

On the basis of the successes achieved in securing unity of the working-class movement and rallying all the democratic forces, it will become possible to develop the struggle in capitalist countries for the setting up of governments which will rally all the patriotic forces opposed to the enslavement of their countries by American imperialism, will adopt the policy of stable peace among peoples, will stop the armaments race and will raise the standard of living of the working masses.

In the countries of People's Democracy, the Communist and Workers' Parties are confronted with the

task of still further consolidating the working-class unity already achieved and the united trade union, co-operative, women's, youth and other organisations already created.

* * *

The Information Bureau considers that the further success of the struggle for working-class unity and the rallying of the democratic forces depends primarily on improvements in all the organisational and ideological work of every Communist and Workers' Party. For the Communist and Workers' Parties, the ideological exposure of, and the irreconcilable struggle against, all manifestations of opportunism, sectarianism and bourgeois-nationalism, and the struggle against the penetration of enemy agents into the party milieu, are of decisive importance.

The lessons which arise from the exposure of the Tito-

Rankovic spy clique imperatively demand that the Communist and Workers' Parties should increase revolutionary vigilance to the utmost. The agents of the Tito clique are today acting as the bitterest splitters in the ranks of the working class and democratic movements and are carrying out the will of the American imperialists. A decisive struggle is necessary, therefore, against the intrigues of these agents of the imperialists, wherever they try to work in workers' and democratic organisations.

The organisational and ideological-political strengthening of the Communist and Workers' Parties on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism is a most important condition for the successful struggle of the working class for unity in their ranks, for the cause of peace, for the national independence of their countries, for democracy and Socialism. □

On the Pacifist Policy of the World Peace Congress

(1949-1954)

Within two years after the end of World War II a mass anti-war movement arose in many countries around the world. Broad sentiment emerged against the warmongering of U.S. imperialism; the vicious saber rattling against the then socialist Soviet Union was denounced; there was opposition to the rearming of Germany and Japan; struggles broke out against conscription, atomic weapons and other imperialist war preparations; enormous mass actions condemned the U.S. imperialist aggression against the Korean people; as well, in some countries the working people rose up to fight their "own" imperialists' trampling on the oppressed peoples, such as the opposition to the French imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese people.

In various countries this movement took on vast proportions and a quite militant character. In a few European countries, for example, a whole movement arose among the workers to refuse to load or unload weapons destined for the rearming of Germany and the French colonial war in Viet Nam. In France, hundreds of thousands took to the streets in demonstrations where there were pitched battles with the police.

It is fairly clear that if the anti-war movement had been properly organized and led it could have been used to strengthen the revolutionary movement and to help mobilize the working masses into the struggle for the socialist revolution.

How did the Cominform and the international communist movement deal with the anti-war movement? A good idea of this can be gotten from a study of the World Peace Congress (WPC). The international communist movement took the building of the World Peace Congress as one of the central points of their policy.

The World Peace Congress was founded in April 1949. It appears to have been organized along pacifist lines. In every case it failed to link the struggle against war to the fight against imperialism and for revolution. But what is more, in its official resolutions, manifestos and proclamations it was a movement with no enemy. It not only failed to denounce imperialism in general, but it would not say a word against

the United States government or, for that matter, any government.

The problem in the orientation of the WPC was not that it used the word "peace," but that it smothered all its agitation in pious phrases about "peace" and "humanity" in order to hide the class issues involved in the problems of war and peace.

The struggle against the evils of militarism and reactionary wars is part of the struggle of the exploited and oppressed classes against the reactionary and exploiting classes which are the source of these evils. But in the orientation of the WPC, this basic Marxist-Leninist concept of the struggle for peace was thrown overboard. Instead an attempt was made to stay as far away as possible from the class issues, arguing that all that was required for the struggle for peace was to rally one and all who are willing to say in words that they favor peace, irrespective of their political stand and role in the class struggle.

At the time world capitalism, headed by U.S. imperialism, was waging a brutal warmongering crusade. It was striving to strangle socialism in the Soviet Union and to prevent its consolidation in the people's democracies; to bolster capitalist rule over the proletariat of Western Europe; and to crush the revolutionary storm that was gripping the toiling and oppressed masses all over the globe — Greece, China, Viet Nam, the Philippines, etc. But the proclamations of the WPC repeatedly denied that the struggle against war and for peace had anything to do with this worldwide class struggle. In fact, among other things, it prided itself on being neutral in the struggle between imperialism and socialism, repeating over and over again that it did not favor one social system over another.

This class and nonrevolutionary approach of the WPC appears to be connected to a never-ending quest for broader numbers and for the magic "appeal" which would bring the greatest numbers of "all sections" of the population into the peace movement. It went from the idea of a petition campaign against the atom bomb, to a petition campaign for a five-power peace pact, to a world campaign for

"negotiations" in general and "easing international tensions" — each time claiming to have found the ultimate appeal that would bring all classes into motion against war. As well, it stressed the lowest and most non-militant forms of activity such as petition campaigns, postcards for peace, and so forth. It even got to the point where you did not have to affiliate to the WPC to attend conferences and congresses.

Although all of this was done in the name of reaching the broadest sections of the people, it is stated in a number of places that the WPC was aiming most of all to recruit the petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie. Thus the quest for the broadest appeal was not aimed at bringing the widest numbers of the working class into active struggle and around them the other oppressed strata and any other progressive elements, but at denying the working class character of the struggle. The WPC watered down the line to the utmost in order to appeal to the petty bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie and subordinated the anti-war struggle to these classes.

The Cominform backed the WPC to the hilt. The communist parties were called on to make the fight for a "lasting peace" their "central task"; and in practice the building of the WPC was put in the center. The journal of the Cominform, *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy (FLP, FPD)*, is filled with euphoric praise for the WPC and advice for how to build it more broadly. Every new broader appeal issued by the WPC is praised in extravagant terms. As well, *FLP, FPD* makes outlandish claims for WPC's successes, such as the euphoric assessment that the WPC's petition campaign for the abolition of atomic weapons prevented the use of the atom bomb in Korea, Viet Nam and China. Thus it can be seen that the WPC was not simply an organization that the communists worked in and tried to push in a revolutionary direction. Rather, the policy followed by the WPC was precisely the policy advocated by the Cominform.

It should be noted that while the WPC was officially neutral towards the Soviet Union, many of its concrete proposals, such as for disarmament and the abolition of atomic weapons, were first advanced by the Soviet Union in the UN and elsewhere. Diplomatic proposals of this nature are not necessarily wrong. For example, in the 1920's the Soviet Union made disarmament proposals before certain international bodies with the aim of exposing the warmongering nature of imperialism and of taking advantage of the cracks among the capitalist states. But in this earlier period such proposals were not the foundation of the Soviet Union's international orientation, much less the basic orientation for the world communist movement. The Soviet Union carried out an active policy of proletarian internationalism, putting in the center the efforts to advance the socialist revolutions of the working class and the revolutionary liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples. That is why even when such disarmament proposals were made by the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik leaders gave constant warnings that the communists in the capitalist countries should not also make such proposals. Rather they urged the communists to

exert every effort to expose pacifism and organize the workers for revolutionary struggle. (See excerpt from the 6th Congress of the Comintern in this issue.) The problem that arose after World War II is that the disarmament and other proposals were thrust into the foreground, all the communists were urged to make these appeals the center of their policy, and class struggle and revolutionary agitation were denounced as sectarian impediments to the real business of appealing for the adoption of these proposals. The Marxist-Leninist teachings on the relations of war to capitalism and imperialism were discarded under the pretext of denouncing "the fatalist view that 'war is inevitable.'"

Below is a chronology on the development of the WPC and the Cominform's approach to it. This report is based on the documents, statements and articles carried in *FLP, FPD*. The emphasis in the quotations is our emphasis unless otherwise indicated.

1. September, 1947. The founding meeting of the Cominform is held. The documents of this meeting, including the founding declaration and the speech "On the International Situation" by A. Zhdanov, reveal the nonrevolutionary approach that is being advocated. Quite correctly an appeal is made for struggle against the U.S. imperialist drive for world hegemony; but a nonrevolutionary perspective is put forward for this struggle. It does not call for the development of the class struggle of the proletariat and the revolutionary movements of the oppressed as the way to combat imperialism and aggression. Instead the founding meeting of the Cominform emphasized the all-class and petty-bourgeois nationalist appeal for the communist parties to rally "all the really patriotic elements" for the "defense of the national independence and sovereignty of their countries." It is declared that this "principal" and "special task devolves on the fraternal communist parties of France, Italy, Great Britain and other countries."

2. February, 1949. The call for a World Peace Congress is advanced in February. The *FLP, FPD* announces, in its April 15 issue, that "the International Liaison Committee of the Cultural Workers in Defense of Peace, the World Federation of Democratic Women and a number of people well known in the cultural world addressed a Manifesto to democratic organizations and progressives with the call for a World Peace Congress to be held in April of this year. The underlying purpose of the proposed Congress was to rally all the active forces of the people of the world in defense of peace."

The article continues by describing a series of peace actions. But instead of drawing out and stressing the quite mammoth and militant demonstrations which were taking place at that time it barely mentions them. Instead it dwells on less militant activities such as a British union calling for Anglo-Soviet friendship, and even flabby activities such as a nationwide campaign for signatures to a protest letter of the National Committee of the "Fighters for Peace and Freedom" of France to Truman against the French govern-

ment, through the Atlantic Pact, trying to involve the French people in war against the USSR.

3. April, 1949. First World Peace Congress held in Paris. It is attended by representatives from 72 countries. It sets up a Permanent Committee. The only document we have from the Congress is the "Manifesto." This document says, "We know who has violated the agreement reached between the Great Powers which confirmed the possibilities of the coexistence of different social systems. We know quite well who is violating the United Nations Charter. We also know those who regard the agreements designed to preserve peace as scraps of paper, those who reject all proposals for negotiations and disarmament, those who are arming to the teeth and who reveal themselves in the role of aggressors."

But it never says who. The document never names an enemy. Rather it espouses "good" things. It is for the United Nations, disarmament, national independence and peaceful coexistence, the right of nations to self-determination, and it is against the atom bomb, military alliances (in general), colonialism, rearming Germany and Japan, and disruption of economic trade between countries. It calls itself a "united front in defense of truth and reason," and claims to represent 600 million people.

4. November, 1949. The third meeting of the Cominform is held. One of the major documents of this meeting is entitled "The Defense of Peace and the Struggle Against the Warmongers." This lays out an entire program for the peace movement. Although it does not explicitly name the WPC, it is clear from the program it gives and "new forms" of struggle it advocates, that it is describing the WPC.

The document declares, "**For the first time in the history of mankind there has arisen an organized peace front, headed by the Soviet Union, the bulwark and standard-bearer of peace throughout the world.**"

This statement about the first organized peace front in history is repeated over and over in other documents and articles. While it may be true that nothing quite like the WPC ever existed before, the real significance of this claim is to deny the revolutionary anti-war movement that arose during and following World War I. By stressing "the first time" repeatedly, the Cominform is hiding away the old, traditional Leninist tactics for the fight against imperialist war preparations in order to advance new tactics.

The document continues with the following two paragraphs, that conclude it:

"United together under the leadership of the working class, all the opponents of a new war — working people and men and women of science and culture — are organizing a **mighty peace front capable of frustrating the criminal designs of the imperialists.** The outcome of the developing gigantic struggle for peace depends to a great extent on the energy and initiative of the communist parties. It rests primarily with the communists, as vanguard fighters, to transform the possibility of foiling the warmongers' plans into an

actual fact.

"The forces of democracy, the forces of the supporters of peace considerably exceed the forces of reaction. It is a question of still further increasing the vigilance of the peoples towards the warmongers, of organizing and rallying the broad mass of the people for the active defense of peace, for the sake of the basic interests of the peoples, for the sake of their life and liberty." (pp. 13-14)

Here and elsewhere, there is a tendency to create a false, euphoric atmosphere about the prospects of a "stable and lasting peace" under imperialism. This euphoria was one of the main arguments for how the present situation and tactics were so much better than the previous situation under which Leninist, revolutionary tactics were followed. Meanwhile, there has not been a single year since the end of World War II in which one or more wars was not being waged by the imperialists in their aggression all around the world.

The guiding idea was that imperialist war can now be successfully combatted without waging the class struggle, without the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and the oppressed. In fact nowhere does this Cominform document speak of building the revolutionary working class movement or promote the national liberation struggles. (With the exception of the people's victory in China, which had taken place the month before, the revolutionary struggles breaking out against imperialism and reaction are simply overlooked.) Instead the idea is that, unlike at the time of the First World War, the people's desire for peace, combined with the declarations of governments and important personages in favor of "peace," can stop war. The idea is promoted that now things have changed. Now the "peace forces" are so strong that pious words of peace that cover over the class struggle — the same type of pious phrases that Lenin combatted so vigorously during and after the First World War — have become the guarantee of "lasting peace."

Moreover, the struggle for peace along these lines is declared to be the primary task of the world's communists. As the Cominform document stresses: "**The struggle for a stable and lasting peace, for organizing and rallying the forces standing for peace against those standing for war, must today occupy the central place in all the work of the communist parties and democratic organizations.**" (p. 9)

It then explains "The Most Urgent Tasks." Point 1 is: "Today the tasks loom particularly imperatively of rallying all honest supporters of peace, **irrespective of religious faiths, political views and party membership, on the broadest platform of the struggle for peace** and against the threat of the new war which hangs over mankind." (p. 10) While elsewhere in the document it analyzes U.S. imperialism as the enemy, and while in "Tasks" it calls for propaganda exposing the aggressive military blocs, its call as to what the parties should explain is simply, "They must widely explain that a new war would bring the peoples most profound disaster and colossal destruction, and that the struggle against war and in defense of peace is the task of all peoples

of the world." (pp. 11 and 12)

Of course the communist parties work to lead the masses of all religious faiths into the class struggle. Furthermore, they must make use of various sharp fronts of struggle that can break the working masses away from bourgeois political affiliations. But this is clearly not what the WPC document is getting at. It is saying that the issue of war and peace is above mere political differences, mere politics; it is denying that "war is the continuation of politics by other, i.e., violent, means." It is not an appeal for struggle; it is an appeal for pious declarations of peace without respect to the class struggle. Surely even the biggest and most reactionary capitalists and their lackeys can swear to the skies that they are for peace, and that they too are against destruction and other wicked things. Indeed most of them are well-practiced in such declarations which are made to hoodwink the masses, blunt their class consciousness and weaken the revolutionary struggle against reactionary war.

A further indication of what is meant by the "broadest platform of the struggle for peace" is the forms of struggle called for. **"To make wide use of the new, effective and tested forms of mass struggle for peace,** such as committees in defense of peace in towns and villages, the drawing up of petitions and protests, ballots among the population, which have been widely practiced in France and Italy, publication and distribution of literature exposing the war preparations, the collection of funds for the struggle for peace, the organization of boycotts of films, newspapers, books, periodicals, broadcasting companies and of the institutions and leaders propagating the idea of a new war. All these constitute a most important task of communist and workers' parties." (p. 12) These "new forms" of struggle are obviously not new at all. Again the point of stressing "new" is to hide away the tactics advocated by Lenin, to cover up the need for revolutionary mass struggle, and to replace this with nonmilitant and low level forms of activity.

5. March 15-19, 1950. The 3rd Session of the Permanent Committee of the WPC is held in Stockholm. It has 150 delegates representing affiliated national peace councils in 52 countries and representatives from 29 other countries.

The chairman is Frederic Joliot-Curie. Although Joliot-Curie was a declared communist and a member of the French anti-fascist underground in World War II, the WPC documents describe him only as a "physicist, Nobel Prize winner, Professor, College de France, member, Academy of Science and Medical Academy; High Commissioner on Atomic Energy, France." He opens the session with a speech demanding the prohibition of atomic weapons and mentioning no enemies.

The general secretary, Jean Laffitte, a French writer, speaks on the work since the last session. He points "to the feverish preparations for a new war now being made by the Anglo-American imperialists." But this is the only mention of imperialism in the material from the Stockholm meeting. Laffitte mentions the relatively more militant actions of the transport and factory workers in a number of West Euro-

pean countries against the transport and production of arms. However the main thing that Laffitte promotes is that a delegation of the WPC traveled around the world calling on parliaments to adopt the WPC's peace proposals.

The main action of this meeting was to launch a petition campaign for the prohibition of atomic weapons, which became known as the Stockholm Appeal. This appeal reads, in its entirety: "We demand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon as an instrument of aggression and mass extermination of people, and the establishment of strict international control over the fulfillment of this decision."

"We will regard as a war criminal that government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country."

"We call upon all people of good will all over the world to sign this call."

It is characteristic of the WPC that the Stockholm Appeal doesn't say who is the war criminal that was threatening atomic war. Nor does it condemn that government which already had made first use of the atomic bomb against an all-but-defeated enemy, namely the U.S. government which had dropped two atomic bombs on Japan in the closing days of World War II.

The same issue of *FLP, FPD* carried an article by Jorge Amado, a member of the Permanent Committee, which states, among other things: "But in order that the movement might become a power capable of upholding peace, the Permanent Committee must free itself from narrowness and from all forms of sectarianism. Its activities should not substitute those of other organizations also waging the struggle for peace — but on their own scale — such as those of the political parties, trade unions, women's, youth and other organizations. The field of action of the Permanent Committee is far wider; it unites people in various walks of life, and of all kinds of philosophic, political and religious convictions. Any narrowness in exposition and application of slogans may diminish substantially the scope of the movement and create the danger of a breakaway by certain groups of peace supporters.

"At the first Stockholm session the Permanent Committee placed in the hands of the respective national committees and the entire great peace movement **the broadest and most useful means in the struggle — namely the call for the prohibition of the atomic weapon.** The peoples will regard as a war criminal that government which first uses the atomic weapon. This call, signed by people in all countries, will prove the most effective means to extend the movement of the partisans of peace; to show the broad masses the real countenance of the warmongers." (emphasis as in original)

Thus the emphasis of the Stockholm meeting is to give an orientation without any enemy and to promote the least militant forms of struggle. The crowning point of the meeting is the call for gathering signatures for the Stockholm Appeal.

This orientation is backed to the hilt by the Cominform. *FLP, FPD* proclaims that gathering signatures for the Stockholm Appeal is the "central task" and the "main thing" in

the "struggle for peace." An article in one issue states: "The unfolding of a mass, all peoples movement for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, the **collection of millions of signatures** to the appeal of the Permanent Committee is now the **central task** of the struggle for peace. People who think that no amount of signatures can avert war and protect the peaceful population from destruction by atomic bombs are profoundly mistaken." It continues in this vein and states later on, "**The collection of signatures must now become the main thing in the struggle of all democratic organizations for peace.** Every meeting, every demonstration, all means of mass work must be brought into play in order to intensify the campaign for signatures." (emphasis as in original)

6. June, 1950. The Korean war begins.

7. September, 1950. Lead article in *FLP,FPD* entitled "Peace Movement in a New Phase." The article hails the Stockholm Appeal for having gotten 400 million signatures so far and it lists the signatures per country: "The entire adult population in the USSR and in the people's democracies (Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania), over a hundred million in the Chinese People's Republic and twenty million in Germany.... In Italy, sixteen million have signed, in France fourteen million...in fascist Tito Yugoslavia tens of thousands have signed this appeal illegally. Tens and hundreds of thousands of signatures have been collected in Greece, Brazil, Cuba and Uruguay, in Turkey and Iran. The first million signatures have been collected in Britain. In Japan...more than five million have signed...in Burma over two million...more than two million U.S. citizens...."

The article points out that U.S. imperialism has gone over from preparing acts of aggression to carrying out aggression in Korea and says peace activists are demanding the "**extension of the program of the movement against war, against any kind of aggression, against propaganda for a new war.**" (emphasis as in original) The article then goes on to discuss such things as the adoption of laws against war propaganda and the evasion of military service. So even now when U.S. imperialism is carrying out aggression in Korea, the appeal is not to vigorously agitate against this barbaric aggression, but to agitate on pacifist lines against the use of force in general. No clear distinction is drawn between the reactionary use of force by the enslaving imperialists and exploiters and the liberating use of force by the proletariat and oppressed masses.

8. November, 1950. Second World Peace Congress held in Warsaw. Originally planned for Italy, then moved to Britain where it was also barred, and at the last minute moved to Warsaw. Two thousand delegates representing 81 countries.

This congress, in its proceedings, seems somewhat more militant with verbal support for the liberation struggles of the oppressed people, particularly the struggle in Korea.

But again, its documents point to no enemy, have flabby formulations on the Korean struggle, and appeal mainly to the United Nations to reform itself. Further, this congress starts the process of emphasizing the call for a pact between the five great powers (USSR, China, U.S., Britain and France). It also calls for work to bring into the activities of the WPC the avowed pacifists and other trends which are to the right of the WPC itself.

The first day of the proceedings begins with a speech by Joliot-Curie. He again does not point to an enemy and stresses, "This Manifesto (from the 1st Congress — ed.) was, and remains proof of the fact that our **sole aim is to consolidate peace** and that in doing so, **we are not acting as champions of this or that political and economic regime.**" He argues that "We cannot leave unexposed and unpunished those who are driving the world to catastrophe," but he does not name who this is. The closest he comes is to say, "The distinguishing feature of our activity is explained by the profound conviction of every partisan of peace that war is not inevitable; that the forces of peace already united and the potential peace forces, are enormous; that a peaceful settlement of all differences is possible, that peaceful co-existence of different political and economic systems is possible; and finally, that only a handful of businessmen who, for the sake of preserving their domination, for the sake of enormous private profit, still deceive many honest people and force them to go to war." Otherwise, his report is for disarmament, for banning atomic weapons, and for a five-power pact, and it contains a lot on the failure of the UN.

Joliot-Curie's speech is followed by a report by Petro Nenni, the general secretary of the Italian Socialist Party. Interestingly the words of this social-democratic leader are a shade more militant in that he denounces the Atlantic Pact as warmongering whereas many others name no enemies at all. At the same time his basic orientation is in line with the others — that there must be peaceful coexistence, etc.

On the second day, the Chinese delegation apparently gives a fiery denunciation of U.S. imperialist aggression in Korea. As well the Korean delegation gives a similar denunciation, details the savagery of imperialism and the resistance of the people. A standing ovation is given this delegation. Also notable is the fact that J. Rogge (a former assistant U.S. attorney general and a vice-chairman of the Permanent Committee of the WPC) apparently speaks in defense of the U.S. and Tito and is denounced for this. The Vietnamese delegation also speaks denouncing U.S. and French imperialism.

But the documents mainly do not reflect this somewhat more militant sentiment. There are two main resolutions, a manifesto and an "Address to the United Nations Organization." Speaking of the failure of the UNO the manifesto states: "The peoples of the world hope that the United Nations Organization will resolutely return to the principles that inspired its foundation after World War Two, in order to ensure freedom, peace and respect between people."

This is said at a time when it is under the UN flag that the imperialists are waging aggression against Korea.

The manifesto goes on to declare: "Peace does not wait on us, it must be won. Let us unite our efforts and demand that the war now devastating Korea, a war that tomorrow may set the world ablaze, cease now." It does not say who is to blame in Korea, and, in the context of U.S. imperialist claims that the communists are trying to start a world war, this could be misunderstood by others as a denunciation of the Korean liberation struggle. This is the danger of such aclass appeals against war.

It is true that the U.S. aggression in Korea created the real danger of a wider war. But by failing to say that it is the imperialists who are to blame for the war in the first place and who are hatching dangerous warmongering plans, the door is left open for viewing the heroic resistance war of the Korean and Chinese peoples as equally to blame for the danger of "setting the world ablaze." In fact, while the imperialists will always hold the danger of aggressive war over the toiling masses, liberating wars, such as the peoples' resistance to the U.S. invasion of Korea or the national liberation wars against U.S. aggression in Indochina, play a vital role in undermining imperialism and its plans for wider aggression.

The manifesto goes on to call for all manner of good things, especially for a five-power peace pact.

The main resolution is the address to the UNO which decries the failure of the UNO, demands that the UNO call a meeting of the five great powers, and gives ten specific proposals for the UNO to carry out to bring about peace. This mentions in passing the intervention of American armed forces in Taiwan. As well, it calls for investigation of General MacArthur's role in Korea, but not the role of U.S. imperialism in Korea. Again the WPC can find no enemy. On Korea it demands that the full Security Council deal with it. The resolution states: "Disquieted by the fact that the war now raging in Korea is not only bringing incalculable disaster upon the people of Korea but also threatens to develop into a new world war, we demand the immediate cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal from Korea of foreign armies and the peaceful settlement of the internal conflict between the two parts of Korea, with the participation of representatives of the Korean people." It also demands the "cessation of hostilities against the Republic of Viet Nam, operations which ... contain the danger of world war." Thus, with the exception of Taiwan, the naming of the enemies is avoided and the Korean liberation struggle is not supported even in hints.

The resolution attempts to define aggression as "a criminal act of that state which first employs armed force against another state under any pretext whatever." This definition tries to avoid the issues of the political and class content of war in favor of some mechanical criteria, a quest that is typical of the WPC literature. According to this definition the sole criteria in judging an aggressor is who fired the first shot. This is diametrically opposed to the well-known principles put forward by Lenin. Lenin upheld the

concept that "war is the continuation of politics by other, i.e., violent means." Therefore, Lenin stresses, one can not necessarily judge a war by which army fired the first shot or which army crossed which frontier. Rather it is necessary to determine in which class interests the armies are fighting — is an army fighting for strengthening slavery and reaction or for liberation from slavery and reaction. The WPC departed from this class standpoint which is essential for any serious struggle against reactionary war.

It should also be noted that the resolution argues in favor of Big Power cooperation by, among other things, painting a euphoric picture of the economic benefits that disarmament and normal trade relations will allegedly bring the working masses of the capitalist countries. We will touch on this point again further on.

Finally, it should be noted that the report on the Congress gives a detailed account of its composition which emphasizes parliamentarians and petty-bourgeois professionals. It reads: "taking part in the work of the Congress were 2,065 people from 81 countries, including 1,756 delegates. The remaining 309 were guests and observers. Women delegates numbered 446.

"The professional composition of the Congress was as follows: statesmen and members of parliaments — 59, scientists — 49, writers and poets — 116, professors — 124, clergymen — 72, leaders of international organizations — 13, leaders of national organizations — 151, film workers — 3, architects — 13, composers and musicians — 7, engineers and technicians — 73, journalists — 67, actors — 68, military men — 12, industrial workers — 341, peasants — 57, doctors — 61, lawyers — 83, businessmen — 47, students — 121, office workers — 222, municipal councilors and mayors — 20, teachers — 72, others — 234."

The Congress set up a World Peace Council, apparently a replacement for the Permanent Committee. From this time on the literature no longer speaks of the World Peace Congress but only of the World Peace Council. Further use of the initials WPC in this report refers to the World Peace Council.

9. February, 1951. First session of the World Peace Council is held in Berlin.

The proceedings of this meeting show some enthusiasm for the national liberation struggles, defining them as part of the peace movement. But again, the documents are another story.

The main resolution of the meeting is a call for a pact of peace among the five great powers. There is talk that the 500 million signatures to the Stockholm Appeal was good, but now they've found the **really** broad appeal that nobody can refuse and which will ensure peace. The appeal reads in its entirety:

"To fulfill the hopes cherished by millions of people throughout the world, irrespective of their views as to the reasons giving rise to the danger of world war: —

"To strengthen peace and safeguard international security: —

"We demand the conclusion of a pact of peace among the five great powers — United States of America, Soviet Union, Chinese People's Republic, Great Britain and France.

"We shall regard refusal by the government of any great power to meet for the purpose of concluding a pact of peace as evidence of aggressive designs on the part of the given government.

"We call upon all peace-loving nations to support this demand for the conclusion of a pact of peace, which should be open to all countries.

"We append our names to this appeal and we call upon all men and women of good will, all organizations seeking to strengthen peace, to sign it."

There are a number of other resolutions continuing the WPC policy on Korea, Germany, Japan, etc. Of particular interest is a resolution denouncing the UN for its condemnation of China as "aggressor" in Korea. This is done based on the 2nd Congress of the WPC definition of the aggressor being the first state to attack.

Also of special interest is the resolution "Concerning Struggle for Peace in Colonial and Dependent Countries." This supports the UN Charter on the right of the people to self-determination and decries the UN for having "disappointed the hopes placed in it." It continues with this most curious statement:

"The World Peace Council denounces the false propaganda which seeks to depict another world war as the path leading to self-determination for the colonial and dependent peoples. It declares that solidarity **struggle of all people for peace is the decisive factor** in the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for the right to self-determination."

Whatever the intention of this statement, it ends up providing a rationale for counterposing peace petitions to the path of liberation wars, which supposedly carry with them the danger of another world war. What this orientation meant in practice can be seen in the shameful example of the stand of the French Communist Party on the French African colonies. In these colonies the allies of the FCP advocated that gathering peace signatures was the central task of the enslaved African masses.

10. June 22, 1951. *FLP.FPD* carries an unsigned article entitled "Lessons of History."

This article repeats the refrain that: "The more than 500 million signatures collected to the Stockholm Appeal prevented the imperialists from using the atom bomb in Korea." This assessment of the power of gathering signatures against atomic weapons is more than a little exaggerated. The truth is that the U.S. imperialists feared the wrath of the great revolutionary storm sweeping the workers and peasants of Asia and of the working people all over the world who would have risen to their feet against atomic war crimes; these were social forces many times the power of the signatures on the Stockholm Appeal.

11. Summer, 1952. A theoretical article, entitled "Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It,"

appears in a Soviet philosophical magazine. Written by I.A. Seleznev, it is the only article we have found which attempts to give a theoretical explanation of the policy adopted for building the peace movement after World War II. The article sums up the anti-war movement both before and after World War II; it outlines the proposals of the Soviet Union to the UN; it sums up the building of the WPC; etc.

Seleznev creates a euphoric picture of the power of the peace movement of that time and puts forward a number of absurd arguments. For example, he argues at length that the people are more conscious; that they "are beginning to grasp the laws of social development"; and that "Under present conditions it is difficult for the ruling classes to conceal preparations for war from the masses of the people." Apparently Seleznev forgot about the First World War, where the European proletariat was highly class conscious and was repeatedly warned of the danger of capitalist war but nevertheless was dragged into the imperialist slaughter.

The main significance of the euphoric picture is to declare that the revolutionary Leninist principles and the tried and tested Bolshevik tactics for combating imperialist war are no longer needed and no longer valid. As Seleznev puts it: "But at the present the people fight against an unjust, aggressive war in a different way than in the past for today the possibilities have matured for averting a new world war." In this way the aura is created that "in the past" (i.e., in the days of Lenin and the Bolshevik Revolution) the communists acted like fatalists, sitting on their hands pontificating the inevitability of imperialist wars. But this is a mockery of the truth.

Basing their revolutionary tactics on a scientific analysis of the aggressive and warmongering nature of imperialism, Lenin and the Bolsheviks gave the clarion call to the proletariat and oppressed peoples of the world to rise up in mass revolutionary struggle against the imperialist and reactionary powers. They called on the class conscious workers to link the struggle against reactionary war with their revolutionary struggles for the overthrow of the imperialists and exploiters and to push forward the socialist revolution as the only way to put an end to imperialist warmongering and aggression.

However, it is precisely this proletarian revolutionary perspective that Seleznev wants to cast aside when he calls for fighting the war danger "in a different way than in the past." The kernel of his entire argument on the war danger is that the old Leninist tactics for fighting the war danger no longer apply and should be replaced with explicitly nonproletarian and nonrevolutionary tactics.

The Seleznev article also discusses the type of "broad unity" across all political and class boundaries that the WPC was striving for. Although the "right socialists" are criticized, in fact the WPC bent over backward to accommodate the liberal, social-democratic, pacifist and other bourgeois trends. In its concluding section the article states: "While the Paris congress was composed predominantly of communists and workers in the sciences, arts, and literature, at the Warsaw congress there were present, along

with communists, liberals and conservatives, Laborites and Catholics, social-democrats and Radicals, as well as farmers and even industrialists. ...

"The congress also adopted a decision in favor of establishing contact with the many associations and groups which, though not affiliated with the international organization of the partisans of peace, in some measure act in opposition to war, whether consistent or not. Accordingly, the World Council of Peace decided to take steps for negotiations and conferences with supporters of the 'One World' movement, with the Quakers, church organizations, the 'neutralist' movement and other pacifist groups, for the purpose of working out conditions for joint actions in the struggle for the preservation of peace."

In passing, it should be noted that Seleznev presents an absurd argument justifying why the WPC focused its attention on the nonproletarian classes and the small and middle bourgeoisie. Explaining the necessity of founding the WPC he writes:

"But it (the anti-war movement) had also a weak side; it did not yet have organizational forms and clearly outlined programmatic principles. Some detachments of the fighters for peace were headed by powerful organizations, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Federation of Democratic Women, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and others. But a vast part of the peasantry, intelligentsia, the small and middle bourgeoisie, who were interested in the preservation of peace and were fighting against a new war, were without a leading organization."

Here Seleznev mentions the peasants among the other middle strata; but he did so knowing full well that the WPC focused its attention on the liberal bourgeois and the bourgeois intelligentsia. Seleznev reasons that the working masses already have trade unions and other mass organizations; but the professionals and bourgeoisie are without organization and therefore it was necessary to form the WPC. Seleznev is so preoccupied with the middle strata that he forgets that professionals and businessmen are also organized in their professional and business organizations and associations. His argument is a typical example of how the WPC was geared to catering to the liberal bourgeoisie rather than organizing the toiling masses.

12. October, 1952. Sometime in the summer or fall the WPC makes a call for a People's Congress for Peace. This call is based on the "successes" of the campaign for a five-power peace pact and aims to bring in still broader forces. Of course the bringing in of broader forces necessitates further watering down and making even vaguer the policy of the WPC. WPC now speaks of the fight against "international tension." It also stresses that anyone can come to the congress even if they don't affiliate.

In October a communique of the Bureau of the WPC deals with a call for a People's Congress for Peace to bring together all trends. The communique stresses that the issue is how to break the international "tension" caused by the

use of "force in the relations between nations"; it stresses that one does not have to join the world peace movement to come to the People's Congress; and emphasizes that "Agreement even on a single question, will facilitate solution of other questions and help clear the international atmosphere."

13. October 5, 1952. 19th Congress of the CPSU.

14. October 31, 1952. Lead article of *FLP.FPD* entitled "All Progressive Mankind Prepare for People's Congress for Peace." This article analyzes "new conditions" which it claims makes the situation favorable for holding a peace congress. Chief among these new conditions is that statesmen from France, Italy, Britain, Germany and Japan are making statements against U.S. imperialism in defense of their own imperialisms. The article draws from this situation the conclusion that the peace congress should bring in "all trends."

The article denounces "growing tension in the world situation caused by the aggressive action of the U.S.-British imperialist bloc." It analyzes that "there is taking place virtual subordination to and plunder by the U.S. of old, long-established bourgeois states and their colonies." It claims:

"However, in pursuing their aggressive, predatory policy, the U.S. imperialists come up against serious difficulties. Of late the imperialist camp has witnessed an acute sharpening of the fight for raw materials and markets. Antagonisms between the U.S. and other capitalist countries have sharpened as a result of the **growing striving of these countries to break loose from the American yoke and to take the path of independent development.**

"In France and Italy a number of prominent political figures who until recently maintained silence, now openly reject the brazen demands of the U.S. monopolists and the U.S. military. There is taking place a **growing national awakening of the British people** who are becoming aware of the need to put an end to the difficult and dangerous situation in which they have been placed, with the compliance of Britain's rulers by their unscrupulous American 'friends.' A strong protest movement against the crude military dictate of the U.S. occupationists is growing among all social strata in West Germany and Japan."

The article goes on to discuss the peace movement.

"**In these conditions** the People's Congress for Peace will aim at uniting people of all trends, groupings and associations of all kinds anxious to ensure disarmament, security and national independence, free choice of their way of life and easing of the tension in international relations. ...

"The popular movement in defense of peace is a non-party, democratic movement. It does not pursue the aim of abolishing capitalism and does not set itself socialist tasks. Hence, the opportunity arises of extending to the maximum the mass base of the peace movement, of drawing people into it irrespective of social status, political convictions, religious and philosophical views.

"The communique of the Bureau of the World Peace Council concerning preparation for the Peoples' Congress reads: 'Participation in the congress in the capacity of delegates, guests and observers will not signify obligatory affiliation to the peace movement.... An agreement reached on any single issue will help to solve other problems and to ease the international tension.' **This means that there is nothing to prevent any section or group of the population from participating in the congress.** ..."

"Experience shows that in those places where all sections of the organized peace movement, from national committees to rank-and-file activists, have gone ahead vigorously with their preparations and have improved their work among all sections of the population, and **particularly among the urban middle strata, among peasants, women and youth, the preparations for the congress are most successful....**"

15. December, 1952. People's Congress for Peace is held in Vienna. There are 2,000 delegates said to represent nearly all the countries of the world. It discovers the "broadest" appeal — the struggle for the "spirit of negotiations."

The congress passes an appeal. It stresses, "We hold that **there are no differences between states that cannot be settled by negotiation....**

"We call on governments of the five great powers...on whom the peace of the world so largely depends; we call on them at once to begin negotiations for a pact of peace." It goes on to claim that "The peoples will do their utmost to make the spirit of negotiation prevail."

All in the context of "the spirit of negotiations," the appeal calls for bringing an end to the hostilities in Korea, Indochina and Malaya; supports the demand of Tunisia and Morocco for independence; and calls for China to be allowed to take its rightful place in the UN. The appeal concludes:

"We urge, finally, that the United Nations become once more a place for reaching agreement between the governments and should no longer disappoint the hopes reposed in it by all the peoples of the world. ..."

"We call on the **people of the world to struggle for the spirit of negotiation and agreement, for the right of man for peace.**"

16. March, 1953. Stalin dies.

17. May, 1953. A lead article in *FLP,FPD* hails the Peace Congress. It argues that the situation has become even more favorable for peace and is enthusiastic that an even broader appeal, the appeal for negotiations, has been found which, it indicated, even Churchill and Eisenhower can agree to.

This article creates the illusion that "easing of the international tension...will be a source of prosperity" for the masses. This theme had been touched on several times before in the literature, but it becomes more prominent at the

time of the "worldwide campaign for negotiations." This theme is borrowed from the classical pacifist and social-democratic theories that capitalism can be made to work. It is the illusion that the terrible suffering and horrors that the capitalist system imposes on the masses can be eradicated through some slight adjustments and reforms — which in this case are to be realized through a campaign for big power negotiations.

A few quotes from the *FLP,FPD* article follow.

"The Appeal of the People's Congress for Peace to the governments of the five great powers met with a wide response among public opinion in all countries. The communique issued by the Stockholm meeting of the Bureau of the World Peace Council reads: 'As a result of recent events the **idea of negotiations** has won millions of new supporters. These events show to the peoples that they can, by their activity, secure an **easing of the international tension which will benefit everybody and will be a source of prosperity.**' The Bureau resolved to convene a session of the World Peace Council in Budapest on June 15, which will 'call special attention to the need to ensure in all circumstances the triumph of decisions achieved by means of negotiation...."

"All progressive mankind stresses the need for rejecting the policy of force in favor of the policy of negotiations. The mighty voice of the peoples cannot be ignored. Public opinion in all countries **responded sympathetically to the words about peace** contained in the recent statements made **by the heads of the governments of the USA, Britain and several other countries.** It justly saw in this fact the force of the influence of the peoples' movement for peace."

"However, the peoples cannot be satisfied with mere statements about peace. These statements must be followed by concrete steps that would contribute to easing the international tension." The article goes on to denounce warmongering stands of U.S. imperialism on different questions.

Later the article states, "there is a **new and more favorable situation today in the world for preserving peace** than was the case before. And this situation developed **because the world peace movement has grown and become consolidated**, because the main bulwark of and the main factor for maintaining and consolidating world peace — the Soviet Union — has consistently and invariably conducted, and is conducting now, a peace-loving foreign policy based on mutual trust, an effective policy based on facts and confirmed by facts."

"...Today those participating in the peace movement are faced with a **new task**: they must redouble their efforts in the struggle for cooperation and friendship among the peoples, **must strive for negotiations** conducted in the spirit of peaceful settlement of international problems and controversial issues in the relations between states, for signing a **Pact of Peace.**"

Another article in *FLP,FPD*, reprinted from *Pravda* under the title "Concerning Present International Situation," hails Eisenhower's statements for peace, but says the peaceful gesture was taken back. It then goes on to praise at

length statements by Churchill for peace. It says it has criticism of some of his statements, but by and large leaves this criticism unsaid, preferring to praise his "positive" statements.

18. June, 1953. The World Peace Council meets in Budapest. It calls for a "world campaign for negotiations." Its statement reads, in part:

"The events of recent months have convinced the peoples that settlement of all international difference by peaceful means is possible of attainment. ...

"The gradual achievement of security will make it possible to halt the arms race, to begin arms reduction by way of negotiation, and to devote the resources, hitherto used for means of death and destruction, to raising the standard of living of all. ...

"Negotiations will change the course of events. The United Nations can become the instrument of this change by keeping faithfully to the spirit of its Charter. ...

"It is on these grounds that the World Peace Council has decided to launch a worldwide campaign for negotiations. In this campaign the peoples will express, in a variety of organized ways, their demand that all disputes and differences between states shall be settled by peaceful means."

19. July, 1953. A lead article in *FLP,FPD* entitled "Negotiations — Way to Peaceful Settlement of International Problems" hails the call of the WPC for a campaign for negotiations, and calls on the communist parties to go all out for this campaign. Among other things, the article states:

"The World Peace Council, which adheres to the principle of not discussing the merits or demerits of one or another system, of one or another way of life, gave a splendid example of extending cooperation in this common struggle for peace by people of most diverse views and opinions. This example shows the tremendous possibilities for broadening the peace movement in the worldwide campaign for negotiations. ...

"The communist and workers' parties, closely linked with the broad masses and drawing their strength from these masses, regard the struggle for peace as their main task and link all their work with the struggle for preserving peace.... [The policy for negotiations] is the basis for broad unity....

"The duty of the communist and workers' parties is to act as initiators in building this unity in town and countryside, in factory and office, in houses and city blocks. The duty of party propagandists and agitators, of the communist and democratic press, is to give the maximum support to

the international campaign for negotiations."

20. November, 1953. Lead article in *FLP,FPD*, entitled "Main Problem of Our Day," states: "No question is more important and urgent today than that of easing international tension. This is the main problem of our day the solution of which is a matter of total concern to the overwhelming majority of the world population." The article continues in this vein.

21. November-December, 1953. The World Peace Council meets in Vienna. It passes a "Message" calling for a meeting of all who are interested in easing international tension. It also passes a "General Resolution" which demands negotiations on Korea, Viet Nam, Germany, etc.; denounces plans for a "European army," the "European Defense Community" and American atomic bases in Spain as plots to create "war psychosis"; and states that a five-power meeting is the best way to obtain peace.

22. January-February, 1954. A conference of the foreign ministers of the U.S., France, Britain and the USSR is held in Berlin. It agrees to hold the Geneva peace conference in April. A lead article in *FLP,FPD* hails this agreement and calls it "proof of the significant success gained by the peace-loving forces."

23. April, 1954. The Geneva conference is held.

24. November, 1954. Meeting of the World Peace Council is held. It passes nine resolutions. In these resolutions the claim is repeated that the Stockholm Appeal had prevented the use of atomic weapons in Korea and Viet Nam; likewise it is claimed that the peace movement had stopped the wars in Korea and Viet Nam. It calls the Geneva conference decisions on Indochina a victory of the peace-loving people. Otherwise, it can be noted, the resolutions oppose the Paris and London agreements to rearm West Germany, to include it in a military pact, and to legalize the division of Germany between East and West.

A resolution on Asia is adopted hailing the joint declaration between the prime ministers of China and India on the five principles of peaceful coexistence. "The five principles have not only laid the foundations for peace and collective security in Asia," the resolution declares, "but their acceptance would provide the basis for peaceful coexistence and friendly relations among all countries."

This is an exaggerated view of the significance of this government accord. Indeed it did not even prevent India from instigating a bloody border war with China not so long after the "five principles" were declared. □

From the 6th World Congress of the Communist International — 1928

The Proletariat's Attitude Towards the Question of Disarmament and the Fight Against Pacifism

The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, held in August 1928, adopted a resolution entitled "The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communists." Below we reprint from this resolution section IV: "The Proletariat's Attitude Towards the Question of Disarmament and the Fight Against Pacifism."

This is a positive example of the Marxist-Leninist attitude towards disarmament and pacifism. Among other things this resolution provides an example of how during this period the Communist International made a sharp distinction between the then-socialist Soviet Union's use of disarmament proposals aimed at exposing the imperialist powers, and the tasks of the communists in the capitalist countries. The resolution calls on the communists to fight against pacifist illusions about disarmament as "one of the fundamental tasks in the struggle against imperialist war."

58. Imperialism at the present time encounters serious obstacles in its ideological and organizational preparations for new imperialist counterrevolutionary wars, viz., the instinctive hostility to war aroused among the broad masses of the population, particularly among the workers, the peasants and the working women, since the last world war. For that reason, imperialism is compelled to make its preparations for war under the cloak of pacifism. At the same time, pacifism is acquiring a new objective significance as the ideology and the instrument in world imperialism's struggle against the progressing world revolution and its stronghold, the USSR. Herein lie the objective significance and the fundamental aim of the disarmament proposals and conferences initiated by the imperialist states, and particularly of the "work" of the League of Nations in this sphere: the discussions on "security"; the proposal to establish arbitration courts; the pacts for the "outlawry of war," etc. The purpose of all these pacifist schemes, treaties, and conferences are: (a) to camouflage imperialist armaments; (b) to enable certain great powers to maneuver against each other for the purpose of securing, by treaties, a reduction in their rivals' armaments, while at the same time to increase their own military power; (c) to enable the great powers to reach temporary agreements guaranteeing their domination over the weak and oppressed countries; (d) to carry out ideological and political mobilization against the Soviet Union under the cloak of pacifist slogans, or direct preparation for war.

For this reason, to fight against disarmament swindle

and pacifism is one of the fundamental tasks in the struggle against imperialist war at the present time.

A. The Social-Democratic Disarmament Program and Leninism

59. The principal instrument in the imperialist disarmament farce is social-democracy, which sows among the masses illusions about the possibility of disarmament and abolishing war without overthrowing imperialism. Among the social-democrats there are two tendencies on the question of disarmament, both of which, however, are tendencies of bourgeois pacifism.

One of these tendencies, the herald of which Kautsky became already in 1911, "discovers" nonexistent objective forces of capitalism, which are alleged to be operating in the direction of disarmament and the abolition of war. This tendency represents the policy of cooperating with the "left" bourgeoisie for the purpose of limiting armaments, concluding international agreements between the imperialists for preventing, or altogether "outlawing" war, etc. Already, in 1916, Lenin described this tendency as "absolutely bourgeois pacifism." In 1914-1918, these views comprised the ideology of the "center"; but when the world war came to an end and the imperialist governments began to resort to pacifist maneuvers, it became the policy of the leaders of the Second International. This policy is supported by the right wing as well as by the majority of the "left" social-democrats. It is presented as the policy of "realist" pacifism, but it in no way differs from the policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

With this policy is associated the "organized capitalism" theory, according to which, capitalism, in the present imperialist stage, itself develops the objective factors for abolishing war from the realm of the "civilized world," etc. It is also associated with the theory of "ultra-imperialism," of imperialist "alliances," "pacts," and international cartels as a means for removing imperialist antagonisms. As a matter of fact, imperialism reveals no tendency whatever toward the abolition of war. On the contrary, all the facts which the "realist" pacifists enumerate for the purpose of lulling the masses, are symptoms of the preparations of imperialist war on the largest possible scale, of wars in which, not individual states, but whole groups of allied states, will be involved against each other.

A United States of Europe, or a United States of the World is a utopian dream under the capitalist system. But even if such could be established they would inevitably be reactionary, because they would represent an alliance for the suppression of the proletarian revolution and of the national liberation movements of colonial peoples. All the tendencies within this main tendency (for example the Pan-European movement) are out and out reactionary.

60. The adherents to the second tendency come out as "radical," or "revolutionary" pacifists, and demand complete disarmament, not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of the proletariat, i.e., they reject the slogan of arming the proletariat. At the time of the imperialist war, this slogan was adopted by a number of revolutionary internationalists, who found no other way of expressing their honest desire to abolish militarism. It was not a revolutionary slogan, however, for it failed to take into account, or completely rejected, the necessity for arming the proletariat and for civil war; objectively, it was an expression of the desperation of the petty bourgeoisie. Lenin's criticism of this slogan expressed itself in 1916, holds good to this day, and must be employed even more sharply today, notwithstanding the fact that the number of those who support this slogan is now extremely insignificant. The October Revolution has proved to every honest revolutionary the absolute necessity for arming the proletariat. To substitute the slogan of disarming the proletariat for the slogan of, arm the proletariat, can serve at the present time only as a counterrevolutionary slogan. For that reason the communists must take great pains to explain the true position to those workers who sympathize with the slogan of disarming, particularly in the smaller countries, and to fight as strenuously as possible against the "left" leaders, who advocate it. This applies also to the theory that international guarantees and "arbitration courts" can abolish war. Such institutions are merely soap bubbles, which burst at the very first serious conflict, or else serve as instruments in the hands of the more powerful imperialist robbers.

There is only one point on which both social-democratic tendencies can agree on questions of disarmament and pacifism, and that is, that the principal obstacle to disarmament are the countries where "there is no democracy," i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR.

B. The Soviet Disarmament Proposals

61. Already in the theses of the VIII Plenum of the ECCI, emphasis was laid on the point, that the international proletariat must take up an altogether different position in principle towards the Soviet Union's point of view on the question of disarmament from the position it must take up towards the hypocritical proposals for disarmament advanced by the capitalist states. In view of the exceptional importance of this question in the fight against pacifism, it must be very clearly presented and explained to the masses.

The proposals for general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet government to the Preparatory Commission on Disarmament called by the League of Nations in November, 1927, differ radically in aim, sincerity and objective significance from the phrases and schemes submitted by the imperialists and their social-democratic flunkies.

The aim of the Soviet proposals is not to spread pacifist illusions, but to destroy them; not to support capitalism by ignoring or toning down its shady sides, but to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulate, that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism.

The Soviet government called upon the imperialists who talk cynically about disarming, actually to disarm; it tore down the pacifist masks from their faces. It goes without saying, that not a single Communist thought for a moment that the imperialists would accept the Soviet disarmament proposals. Nevertheless, the Soviet government's proposals were not hypocritical, they were made in all sincerity, because they in no way contradict the domestic and foreign policy of the workers' government, whereas, imperialist "disarmament" phrasemongering contradicts the policy of bourgeois states — the policy of plunder and oppression. The Soviet government represents the dictatorship of the proletariat in the interests of the majority of the population, who had been exploited for centuries. The Soviet government does not conduct a policy of plunder and oppression; its policy is a peace policy, in the interests of the international proletariat.

The Soviet Union's proposals differ from the bourgeois and social-democratic proposals also in their **objective significance**. They do not serve as a screen to conceal a policy of aggression; they do not express the desperation of the petty bourgeoisie; they express one of the aims of socialism, which the revolutionary proletariat will achieve after it has achieved victory all over the world.

62. In their opposition to the Soviet disarmament proposals, the social-democrats resorted to the most venomous means and utilized the slogans supplied to them by Trotskyism. They tried to discredit the disarmament proposals of the Soviet government in the eyes of the masses by declaring them to be a "revision of Leninism," a transition to "Thermidor," etc. Enough has been stated above to prove that this is despicable slander. After the Soviet proposals for complete disarmament were rejected, the Soviet delegation, in March 1928, submitted a second scheme, which provided for partial disarmament and for a gradual reduction of land and naval forces. This was not a concession to pacifism. On the contrary, it served to expose more completely the attitude of the great powers towards the small and oppressed nations. The Soviet government's position on the question of disarmament is a continuation of Lenin's policy, and a consistent application of his precepts.

C. The Proletariat's Fight Against Pacifism

63. The workers in the Soviet Union, having defeated the bourgeoisie in civil war and having established the dictatorship of the proletariat in their country, may adopt a new method in their fight against pacifism — that venomous tool of imperialism — namely, to propose general disarmament to the imperialists. But the proletariat which is still fighting for power in capitalist states, cannot employ such a method. It would not be a revolutionary act for the proletariat in these countries to propose to, or demand disarmament from their bourgeoisie and their flunkies; it would merely mean the substitution of the slogan of disarm the proletariat for the slogan of arm the proletariat; it would mean the rejection of civil war and of socialism. Hence, communists must strenuously combat the wrong conclusions drawn from the Soviet government's disarmament proposals — conclusions which contradict the revolutionary sense of this program — and must ruthlessly condemn such a deviation in their own ranks.

64. The difference between the methods of combating

pacifism employed by the proletariat in the Soviet Union and those adopted by the working class in capitalist countries does not mean that there is a contradiction between the two; or does it follow that communists in capitalist countries must not make use of the Soviet government's declaration on disarmament in carrying on agitation among the masses. On the contrary, the disarmament policy of the Soviet government must be utilized for purposes of agitation much more energetically and to a wider extent than has been done hitherto. However, they must not be utilized for as a pretext for advancing similar demands in the capitalist countries, but as a means: (1) for recruiting sympathizers for the Soviet Union — the champion of peace and socialism; (2) for utilizing the **results** of the Soviet disarmament policy and its exposure of the imperialists in the effort to eradicate all pacifist illusions and to carry on propaganda among the masses in support of the only way towards disarmament and abolition of war, viz., arming of the proletariat, overthrowing the bourgeoisie and establishing the proletarian dictatorship. □

Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It

— by I. A. Seleznev

The following article by Soviet author I. A. Seleznev first appeared in the Soviet philosophical magazine Voprosi Filosofii (No. 4, 1951). A condensed translation was carried in the CPUSA journal Political Affairs. This text has been taken from the Political Affairs translation. It is not said whether the introductory note from the editors was provided by the Soviet magazine or Political Affairs. Passages cited in the report on the World Peace Congress have been highlighted by WA.

(We publish the following article on the occasion of the 72nd birthday of J. V. Stalin, who, as the greatest living master of the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, is the foremost scientist, advocate, and champion of the principles and the path for peace among nations, and for achieving peaceful coexistence among states of heterogeneous social structures — ed.)

The hysteria fanned by the American imperialist war incendiaries, the A-bomb psychosis and the open, adventurist military actions against freedom-loving peoples in Asia and elsewhere cause apprehension among the common people everywhere for the fate of the world. Will the handful of billionaires once again succeed in plunging mankind into a whirlpool of bloody slaughter or will the peoples of the world be able to check the bloody hand of atomic warfare suspended over the world? This question is at present agitating all those who have at heart the interests of peace,

freedom and progress.

Two tendencies reflect the present state of international relations. On the one hand, the undisguised efforts of the American imperialists to enmesh the peoples of the world in lies and draw them into a new destructive war; on the other hand, the mighty counteracting will of hundreds of millions of plain people, resolutely fighting against the aggressive schemes of the monopolists and their puppet governments. What is the real content of these tendencies? Are there in existence objective and subjective conditions to render impossible the unleashing of a new world war and to transform the possibility of averting this war into actuality?

In the interview with a *Pravda* correspondent last February Comrade Stalin indicated, on the basis of a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of contemporary international relations, that the struggle between the aggressive and the peace-loving forces is becoming ever sharper. Said Stalin:

"What will be the outcome of this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces?"

"Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples will take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in enmeshing the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war." ("Interview of J.V. Stalin," in *Political Affairs*, April, 1951, p. 14)

• • •

We are living in the epoch of the collapse of the old, capitalist world and the victory of the new world, of communism. As we know, the old does not voluntarily retire from the historical stage. It clings to the slightest opportunity to delay the day of its demise. Thus, the capitalist world, disintegrating before our eyes, resorts to every possible effort in order to prolong its existence. Included among such efforts is the unleashing of war, in which the imperialists see a possibility of resolving the crisis now holding in its grip the whole system of capitalism (although such a war may bring grievous consequences for them).

Besides, for the shameless clique of monopolists, war is a very profitable business. The American monopolies reaped during the first world war net profits of \$38 billion; in World War II they netted \$53 billion; and in the first three months of the intervention in Korea the profits of the American monopolies increased by 54 percent as against the corresponding period in 1949.

And for the sake of the fabulous profits of a tiny handful of monopolists tens of millions of plain people are forced to sacrifice their lives. War means death to millions of people and the destruction of vast material resources. War means enormous destruction of productive forces, devastation of cities and countryside, and bestial annihilation of the peaceful population. Everybody knows by what inhuman methods the German fascist invaders carried on the war against the Soviet Union. And now even more perfected and brutal violence and destruction is perpetrated by the American imperialists against the Korean population.

When World War II was approaching its end, when the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and the victory of the freedom-loving peoples was already in sight, the leader of the Soviet people, Comrade Stalin, posed before the peoples of the world the task of making new aggression and a new war impossible. "To win the war against Germany," Stalin said, "is to accomplish a great historical task. But winning the war is not in itself synonymous with insuring for the nations lasting peace and guaranteed security in the future. The thing is not only to win the war but also to render new aggression and new war impossible, if not forever then at least for a long time to come." (J.V. Stalin, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, International Publishers, 1945, p. 140.)

At first glance it may seem that to assert the possibility of averting a new world war is to contradict the known Marxist position that war is an inevitable concomitant of imperialism. Actually, there is no contradiction.

Dialectical materialism teaches that a correct interpretation of the contradictions in the sociohistorical process requires an objective analysis of the whole complex of the social relations, an exact evaluation of the interrelations between the classes. Moreover, in the present international situation it is also necessary to take account of the interrelations between the two different systems existing in the world, between the two camps on the international scene. He who fails to take account of the changes in the conditions of society's development is likely, by clinging to certain

positions of Marxism related to a definite historical epoch, to fall into a gross error.

Marxism, Comrade Stalin tells us, cannot be viewed as a collection of dogmas, a catechism, the conclusions and formulas of which are suitable for all epochs and periods. "In the course of its development Marxism cannot but be enriched by new experience, by new knowledge; consequently, its separate formulas and deductions cannot but change in the course of time, cannot but be replaced by new formulas and deductions corresponding to the new historical tasks." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Linguistics*, International Publishers, 1951, p. 47)

In the course of the social development in the post-war period, in connection with the victory of democracy in World War II, new governing laws have arisen in the relations between countries. A whole system of states has come into existence, for which peaceful development is an historical necessity, an historical law. By virtue of the struggle between these two historical laws, the operation of the former is undergoing a substantial change. To this should be added the growing role of the subjective factor in history....

War is a sociohistorical phenomenon effected by men. War is planned and unleashed, not by the whole people of this or that country, but by definite groups of men who have an interest in the war. But war is carried on by the people, they are involved in it directly, on the battlefields, as well as by working to produce for the requirements of the war. But the people have no interest in waging war if the war is of an unjust, predatory character. Hence, in wars of this kind, as in any other social phenomenon in class society, we witness the operation of opposing forces: on the one hand, the efforts of the exploiting classes to unleash and carry on war; on the other hand, resistance to this on the part of the popular masses. In past history such resistance manifested itself in elemental riots and uprisings, which occurred either during the war itself or after it had come to an end.

Of course, wars were not the main and determining cause of the popular uprisings. Underlying them were deep causes of an economic and sociopolitical character. But unjust wars hastened their advent. History knows numerous cases when anti-popular wars, arousing profound discontent among the masses, hastened the outbreak of revolutions. It will suffice to recall the Napoleonic wars in the beginning of the 19th century, which brought about resolute actions by the peoples of Europe against Napoleon's France; the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, which hastened the revolutionary battles of the Parisian proletariat; the Russo-Japanese war, which hastened the Russian revolution of 1905-07; and the first world imperialist war, which hastened the historic victory of the Russian proletariat in 1917.

From the foregoing it can be seen that as soon as the reactionary classes began to mobilize their resources for the purpose of unleashing an anti-people's, aggressive war, there began to mature among the people the possibility of counteraction to the war. But this counteraction to

the war by the masses of the people manifested itself in most cases and in the strongest form after the war.

Quite different is the situation in the contemporary conditions. The conscious activity of men holds an ever firmer position in the history of mankind. Today, one-third of mankind, freed from the fetters of capitalist slavery, is building a new life consciously, in conformity with a single plan for each country. In these countries there are no classes who have an interest in waging predatory wars aimed at subjecting alien peoples. The peoples of the democratic countries are sometimes forced to take up arms, but only in order to defend their liberty and independence against the encroachments of foreign imperialists. In the capitalist world, which still holds in subjection about two-thirds of mankind, there have also occurred shifts in the direction of the conscious activity of men. The broad masses of the people now understand who plans, and who stands to gain from, an aggressive war; they are beginning to grasp the laws of social development.

Under present-day conditions it is difficult for the ruling classes to conceal preparations for war from the masses of the people. The broad laboring masses, led by the working class and its vanguard, the communist party, day by day intensify the struggle against the new world war that is being prepared by the imperialists of the United States. But at present the people fight against an unjust, aggressive war in a different way than in the past; for today the possibilities have matured for averting a new world war.

In present-day conditions it is incorrect to speak merely of the inevitability of war in the epoch of imperialism and stop with this. Should we limit ourselves to this position, we would distort the actual, objective course of the development of history and bring great harm to the mighty movement of contemporary times, the movement of the partisans of peace....

Why War Is Not Inevitable

The victory over German fascism and Japanese imperialism led to a new alignment of the world's economic and political forces. The system of capitalism, the basic source of aggressive wars, suffered a severe defeat as a result of World War II. The principal shock forces of international imperialist reaction — Germany, Italy and Japan — were routed and their armies disbanded. France was very much weakened by the war, and Britain's positions as a world colonial power were considerably undermined. Only one great imperialist nation, the United States, not only suffered no impairment in World War II, but enhanced its economic power at the expense of other nations.

The Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace, democracy and socialism, emerged from the war more vigorous, solid and strong, and in the post-war years has not only healed the wounds inflicted by the war, but has made progress in reinforcing its power in every way. The successful realization of the post-war Five-Year Plan for the reconstruction and

development of the national economy is a considerable forward step towards the realization of the gradual transition from socialism to communism in the USSR. The achievements of the Soviet Union, the growth of its economic power, are a decisive condition for the securing of peace and curbing the incendiaries of a new war.

As a result of World War II, owing to the historic victory of the Soviet Union which played the decisive role in the victorious outcome of the war of liberation, the imperialist system lost a number of states in central and southeastern Europe, namely, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania. More than 70 million people were freed from capitalism, have erected people's democracies, and are now successfully building socialism.

Analyzing the post-war international situation, Comrade Stalin declared:

"The defeat and liquidation of the principal centers of fascism and world aggression have led to profound changes in the political life of the world's peoples, to a wide upsurge of the democratic movement among the peoples. Taught by the experience of the war, the masses of the people have understood that the fate of the nations must not be entrusted to reactionary governments, which pursue narrow caste and selfish, anti-people aims. Because of this, the peoples, unwilling to live any longer in the old way, are taking the fate of their states into their own hands, are establishing democratic regimes and are carrying on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against the incendiaries of a new war. The peoples of the world do not want a repetition of the afflictions of war. They are fighting in earnest for the enforcement of peace and security." ("Order of the Minister of the Armed Forces of the USSR," of May 1, 1946, published in *Pravda*, May 1, 1946)

One of the most important results of World War II was the historic victory of the Chinese people, 475 million strong, which smashed the Kuomintang reactionaries and overthrew forever the domination of imperialism in China. In 1949, China was proclaimed a people's republic. The great victory of the Chinese people dealt a new severe blow to international imperialism. It had an exceedingly favorable influence on the development of a mass national liberation movement in the countries of the colonial East. The victory of the Chinese revolution brings nearer the time of the national and political emancipation of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries. The Chinese people have firmly linked its destiny with the peace-loving peoples of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies.

The camp of democratic, peace-loving states comprises also the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Germany, the Viet Nam Democratic Republic, and the People's Republic of Korea. Numerically, the camp of the democratic countries, headed by the Soviet Union, comprises a population of over 800 million, or more than a third of the population of the globe. Possessing inexhaustible material and human resources, and resting on the planned development of their economy, the nations of the anti-imperialist camp constitute a great bastion, firmly

standing guard for peace.

Following the Second World War, a new and higher stage was attained by the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. The struggle now aims, not at bourgeois democracy, but at people's democracy, and it is led, not by bourgeois-nationalist parties, but by working class parties (communists). The national liberation movement has assumed forms of armed struggle by the people against the foreign imperialists and the native feudal gentry.

After World War II the overwhelming majority of the popular masses lost confidence in the bourgeois and right socialist parties and turned their eyes towards the communist parties. In the course of the war the communist parties acted as the most consistent and courageous fighters in organizing resistance to the fascist invaders. In the post-war years the communists have shown themselves as the reliable defenders of the national sovereignty of their countries and of the freedom and independence of their peoples from the encroachments of the American imperialists. The communist parties are the most active fighters for a durable democratic peace and against the imperialist warmongers. A clear indication of the enhanced prestige of the communist parties is the rapid increase of their membership. Suffice it to mention that during World War II and five post-war years the membership of the communist parties in all countries (exclusive of the Soviet Union) has reached almost 20 million. The mounting influence of the communist parties is also evidenced by the fact that they have by now been entrusted with the task of piloting the state power by the peoples of 12 countries, and in some of the capitalist countries the communists have powerful fractions in the parliaments.

The victory of the freedom-loving peoples over German fascism and Japanese imperialism imparted a strong stimulus for the unprecedented development of a worldwide democratic movement, expressed in the movement for the complete eradication of fascism, the establishment of democratic liberties, and for a democratic peace.

The peoples of the world have become convinced through their own experience that monopoly capital and its parties betray the national interests of their countries. The working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia have lost confidence in "their" big bourgeoisie, and the bourgeois and right socialist parties. The peoples of the world are now beginning to understand that American imperialism, driven by the mad ambition to attain world dominion, is prepared, in order to achieve this aim, to plunge mankind into a new world war. In some parts of the world American imperialism has already established new centers of war. The American aggressive venture in Korea is today a direct threat to world peace.

That is why all men of good will, regardless of their political and religious views, irrespective of party affiliation, have decided to unite their efforts and to take the cause of peace into their own hands. The worldwide movement in defense of peace, the first of its kind in history, has united

in its ranks hundreds of millions of men and women. The working class plays a decisive role in the movement of the defenders of peace. Participating in the movement in defense of peace are broad sections of the peasantry, millions of people in intellectual professions, and the flower of world culture.

A mighty, organized peace front has crystallized, and its forces are growing and getting stronger day by day.

The warmongers, vainly seeking to split the movement of the defenders of peace, denounce it as a communist plot. The communists can but take pride in the fact that their active, self-sacrificing struggle for peace is causing new fits of rage among the warmongers. The role of the communists in the movement of the defenders of peace is additional evidence of the fact that the communists have no more honorable task than to fight for the vital interests of the people, and at the present stage the most vital interest of the people is the struggle for peace.

The struggle for communism and the struggle for peace organically complement each other. The broad laboring masses and all progressive, democratic forces see that capitalism carries within it the danger of war and that socialism means peace, they see that all the bourgeois parties act against the defenders of peace and carry on unbridled propaganda and preparations for a new world war, while the communist parties are the most active fighters for peace.

With every new year of post-war development a further change is taking place in the correlation of forces between the camp of the defenders of peace and the camp of the war incendiaries, in favor of the peace camp. That is why, under the present historical conditions, it is incorrect to assert categorically that the coming of a new world war is inevitable. The Marxist-Leninist position of the inevitability of wars in the epoch of imperialism, which was correct for certain historical conditions, cannot be applied without reservations to the new historical conditions.

In the interview with the *Pravda* correspondent Comrade Stalin also defined the conditions under which the possibility of preventing a new world war may develop into and become a reality. To assure this, the peoples must take into their hands the cause of safeguarding peace and defend it to the end.

A possibility, Stalin teaches, can never automatically become an actuality; we must bear in mind that there exist several possibilities of a contradictory character; the decisive role in transforming the possibility of averting the war into an actuality belongs to the party of the working class, which must lead the struggle of the masses for the preservation of peace.

The first period of struggle to prevent a new world war commenced already in the course of World War II. In his address on the 27th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution Stalin referred to the means and measures with the aid of which it would be possible to prevent aggression. "There is only one means to this end," he said, "in addition to the complete disarmament of the

aggressor nations: that is, to establish a special organization made up of representatives of the peace-loving nations to uphold peace and safeguard security...." (J.V. Stalin, *The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 142)

After the conclusion of World War II the aggressor nations were disarmed. To be sure, the American-British bloc did everything possible to sabotage the complete disarmament of the aggressor nations, both with regard to the liquidation of their industrial war potential and with regard to the dissolution of their military formations.

But in place of the defeated Germany and Japan, new aspirants to world domination appeared, the imperialists of the United States. The center of world reaction moved to the USA. In the course of the entire post-war period the United States has pursued a policy of rejecting international democratic collaboration, of creating a tense international situation, of fanning a war psychosis, increasingly subjecting to its influence the ruling circles of Britain and France as well as the *revanche* forces of West Germany and Japan, the United States is striving to forge powerful armies under its command within the framework of the aggressive North Atlantic Organization and other aggressive blocs with the view of unleashing war against the camp of peace, democracy and socialism.

The UN and the Peace Struggle

A special body had been created to safeguard peace and security, the United Nations Organization. The UNO was given great powers to prevent aggression and, in the event that it should occur, to liquidate it at its inception and to punish the perpetrators of aggression. The basic condition to assure proper functioning and effective action by the UNO was the principle of the unanimity of the great powers which carried the main burden of the war with Hitlerite Germany.

But from the very first days of the work of the UNO the ruling circles of the United States began to pursue a policy aimed at undermining this basic principle. Under the leadership of the United States, an aggressor core was formed in the UNO comprising the countries participating in the North Atlantic Organization, and 25 Latin American countries. As Stalin pointed out in the previously quoted interview, "It is the representatives of these countries that now decide the fate of war and peace in the United Nations."

The United Nations has not only failed to take decisive steps to curb the aggressive actions of the United States and other imperialist powers which have taken place since the end of World War II. It has helped the American and British interventionists to stifle the freedom-loving people of Greece, it helped to strangle the Indonesian republic, and in 1950 adopted the shameful resolution which sanctioned the American intervention against the Korean people and named as an aggressor the peace-loving Chinese People's Republic.

All of this is evidence of the fact that, again quoting

Stalin: "The United Nations Organization, created as the bulwark for preserving peace, is being turned into an instrument of war, into a means for unleashing a new world war."

The Soviet Union and the UN

Only the Soviet Union and the people's democracies have carried on from the first day of the creation of the UNO and are still carrying on a consistent and self-sacrificing struggle for peace.

In the first post-war year, when some imperialist nations continued to maintain vast armies, when "atomic diplomacy" was initiated, the Soviet Union, in the interests of preserving world peace and of easing the burdens of the people resulting from the large military expenditures, made a proposal at the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations calling for a general reduction of armaments and a ban on the production and use of atomic energy for military purposes.

These proposals met with stubborn opposition on the part of the aggressor bloc headed by the United States. They could not, however, unceremoniously reject these peace-loving proposals of the Soviet Union. The General Assembly therefore decided to establish a commission to examine the problems which have arisen as a result of the discovery of atomic energy, and it also recommended that the Security Council should formulate measures for armaments reduction. But these decisions have remained only on paper. In 1946-47 the reactionary circles in the United States and other countries began to carry on propaganda in favor of a new world war. With the view of curbing the propaganda for war, the Soviet Union offered at the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, held in September 1947, a resolution which called for: condemnation of the propaganda for a new war carried on in a number of countries, particularly in the United States, Greece and Turkey; declaring propaganda in favor of war incompatible with membership in the United Nations; and outlawing of war propaganda as a criminal offense. The United States and its subservient majority opposed the proposals of the Soviet Union for the condemnation of the war instigators. However, under pressure of public opinion the General Assembly was compelled to adopt this proposal. This was a great political victory for the Soviet Union.

But even after the adoption of these proposals the imperialists of the United States continued to carry on preparations for war, they began to increase the armed forces and gradually to shift the economy to war production. With a view to removing the threat of a new war, the Soviet Union, at the third session of the General Assembly, in September, 1948, made the following proposals:

- 1) To recommend to the permanent members of the Security Council to reduce their armaments and armed forces by one-third within one year;
- 2) To outlaw atomic weapons as weapons of aggression;

3) To establish within the framework of the Security Council an organ of international control to check the effectuation of these proposals.

But the Anglo-American imperialist bloc, using its obedient majority, rejected the Soviet proposals.

In 1949, faced with the threat of an imminent economic crisis, the American imperialists passed from war propaganda to direct preparations for a third world war. They launched an intense armaments drive in the United States and Great Britain. With a view to preserving peace and security, the Soviet Union, at the fourth session of the General Assembly, in September, 1949, made the following proposals:

1) To condemn the preparations for a new war which are carried on in a number of countries, particularly in the United States and Great Britain;

2) To outlaw the use of atomic weapons and other means of mass slaughter;

3) To recommend that the five great powers — the United States, Britain, France, the USSR and China — join efforts to come to an understanding with a view to eliminating the threat of a new war and that they conclude a five-power pact implementing peace.

But again the peace-seeking proposals of the Soviet Union were rejected. The peoples of the world saw additional evidence of the fact that the United Nations is not fulfilling its function as an international organization for preserving peace and security, and is becoming an instrument of the instigators of a war of aggression.

In 1950 the American imperialists passed to open acts of aggression against the peoples of southeastern Asia and above all against the peoples of Korea and China. At the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Soviet Union presented for adoption a "Declaration for the Removal of the Threat of a New War and Strengthening of Peace and Security of Nations," which contained demands for the outlawing of atomic weapons, for the reduction of the armaments and armed forces of the five great powers by one-third, discontinuance of the propaganda for a new war, and the conclusion of a peace pact by the five powers. The Soviet Union also made a proposal calling for a definition of aggression. But despite the evident need for the adoption of these proposals they were rejected by the same aggressor core of the UNO. By a majority vote of the delegations, which did not at all represent a majority of the world's population, the fifth session of the General Assembly adopted a most shameful resolution, approving the aggression of the United States in Korea and naming as aggressor the Chinese People's Republic.

Appraising the activity of the United Nations, Stalin pointed out that "being turned into a tool of aggressive war, the United Nations Organization is at the same time ceasing to be a world organization of nations with equal rights. As a matter of fact, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, an organization acting in the interests of the American aggressors.... The United Nations Organiza-

tion is therefore taking the inglorious road of the League of Nations. In this way it is burying its moral prestige and dooming itself to disintegration." (*Political Affairs*, April, 1951, p. 13)

The peoples of the world have understood that they cannot expect peace to be secured by the United Nations. They have decided to take the fate of world peace into their own hands. A new stage has commenced in the great battle of the peoples against the danger of a new world war.

At present the struggle for peace which is being waged by the states of the democratic and anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union is supported in all countries by hundreds of millions of common people, who have joined hands in a common effort to prevent the handful of billionaires from plunging humanity into a new bloody slaughter.

The Worldwide Peace Movement

The worldwide movement for peace has arisen as the inevitable result of the historical development of society, as the reaction of the masses of the people to the aggressive schemes of the imperialists of the American-British bloc. Essentially, the instigators of a new war themselves, by their actions which go counter to the interests of the people, have brought into life this unprecedented movement of hundreds of millions.

In 1946 and 1947 an intensified campaign of war propaganda was launched by the warmongers, headed by Churchill and Truman. The United States in its foreign policy turned to an open expansionist line, the clearest expressions of which were the "Truman Doctrine" and the "Marshall Plan" enunciated in 1947. Essentially, the aim of these measures was, by tying the European countries to the United States through economic obligations, to force them to surrender their economic and political independence, and thus hammer together a bloc of states as a means for attaining world domination. This created a threat to the national independence of the European peoples and doomed them to the role of cannon fodder for the American imperialists. The Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan aroused a strong wave of protest by the masses of the people. The protests grew particularly intense in connection with the formation of the aggressive Western and North Atlantic Alliances.

From the very beginning, the movement of the European peoples against the American plans to unleash a new war assumed militant forms: mass protest demonstrations, strikes, collection of signatures on petitions in defense of peace, and so on. The movement for peace was growing, embracing broad laboring masses and began to reach out beyond Europe. But it had also a weak side; it did not yet have organizational forms and clearly outlined programmatic principles. Some detachments of the fighters for peace were headed by powerful organizations, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Federation of Democratic Women, the World Federation of Democratic

Youth, and others. But a vast part of the peasantry, intelligentsia, the small and middle bourgeoisie, who were interested in the preservation of peace and were fighting against a new war, were without a leading organization.

Through the initiative of the international democratic organizations, particularly the World Federation of Trade Unions, the first world congress of the partisans of peace was convened in Paris in April, 1949, under the slogan "the defense of peace is the concern of all the peoples of the world." The congress elected a "Permanent Committee of the World Congress of the Partisans of Peace," which has played a great role in strengthening the movement for peace. During 1949 and 1950 national congresses of partisans of peace were held in all countries of the world, and national committees were elected to carry on the struggle for peace. In order to strengthen the movement of the partisans of peace organizationally, local peace committees were organized in cities and villages, in factories, etc.

The movement of the partisans of peace has united people of the most diverse views and convictions, and of different classes and groups, vitally interested in the preservation of peace and security.

In the first stage of the movement of the partisans of peace it was necessary to work out a platform, the struggle for the realization of which could unite all peoples, all sections of the laboring masses, regardless of ethnic origin and nationality, of political views and religious convictions. Such a common platform for the struggle for peace was formulated in the Appeal adopted at the Stockholm meeting of the Permanent Committee, which called for the outlawing of atomic weapons and condemning as a war criminal the government which would first resort to such weapons. To carry this measure into effect, it was decided to organize a worldwide petition campaign. This roused all sections of the population throughout the world. Within a short time the Stockholm appeal was signed by more than 500 million people. The campaign for the collection of signatures to the Stockholm resolution resulted, among other things, in an expanded base for the movement of the partisans of peace.

At its meeting held in Prague in August, 1950, the Permanent Committee adopted a new, more comprehensive decision, calling for a struggle for a general reduction of armaments, condemnation of aggression and military intervention in the internal affairs of other nations, an end to the war in Korea, and prohibition of all forms of war propaganda. These decisions were the basis for the preparation of the Second World Peace Congress, and showed the greater maturity of the movement of the partisans of peace. The Prague meeting of the Permanent Committee ushered in a new, higher stage of the movement of the partisans of peace.

The Second World Peace Congress, held in November, 1950 at Warsaw, worked under the slogan "We cannot wait for peace — peace must be won!" The Congress voiced the demand for peace in behalf of all humanity, and adopted a number of very important decisions of a programmatic and organizational character.

The program for the further struggle for peace now took the direction of fighting for an end to the war in Korea, against rearming West Germany and Japan, for general disarmament and a ban on atomic weapons. The Congress called upon the peoples of the world to demand that their governments and parliaments pass laws to safeguard peace and to insist that the five great powers conclude a peace pact.

To direct the struggle for these demands, the Congress elected a World Council of Peace. At its first meeting, at the end of February, 1951, the World Council of Peace adopted a number of practical decisions aimed at carrying into effect the program for the preservation of peace. Taking into account that the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security rests with the five great powers, and that the fate of the world depends largely on the settlement of their differences, the World Council of Peace adopted an appeal which calls upon the five great powers — the United States, the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, Great Britain and France — to conclude a pact of peace. The refusal by the government of any of these great powers to confer with the others for the purpose of concluding a peace pact, the appeal states, is to be considered as evidence of aggressive designs on the part of this government. The World Council of Peace called upon all men of good will to add their signatures to the appeal.

As is known, the broad masses of the people have responded wholeheartedly to this appeal of the World Council of Peace. At this writing the appeal has already been signed by hundreds of millions of men and women of good will.

The World Council of Peace further decided to convene a conference of the peoples of the European countries to consider the question of a struggle against the remilitarization of Germany and of a peaceful settlement of the German problem; to convene a conference of the countries of Asia and the Pacific to consider the question of fighting against the rearming of Japan, the peaceful settlement of the conflicts taking place in the Far East and the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan this year, and also to organize a number of regional conferences. It also decided to convene an international economic conference to be held in the Soviet Union, to consider questions relating to the establishment of economic ties between various countries and raising the standard of living of the masses, to convene a conference of physicians, and also an international conference of writers, artists, scientists, film industry workers, teachers, journalists, sportsmen, etc.

Of exceptional importance is the recently held conference of the European peoples on the question of fighting against the remilitarization of Germany. The overwhelming mass of the people of Europe is definitely opposed to the restoration of Germany's war potential, to the revival of the German armed forces and their utilization for aggressive purposes.

As Stalin said, in order to transform a possibility into an actuality, it is necessary that the broad laboring masses understand the correct policy and actively support it. We know that the aggressor forces, while they carry on feverish

preparations for a new world war, are at the same time apprehensive of their own peoples, who do not want war and stand for the preservation of peace. Hence, the aggressors, before they plunge the people into the whirlpool of a sanguinary war, are trying "to depict the new war as of a defensive character and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as an aggressive policy. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a new war."

Conclusion

It is therefore necessary to open the eyes of all the common people to the threat of a new war, to explain to them the meaning and significance of the struggle, now being carried on the world over, to prevent the war and to preserve peace. The World Council of Peace adopted at its first meeting a number of resolutions aimed at enabling the broad masses to understand the essence and significance of the decisions of the Second World Peace Congress and actively to support them.

A very important condition for transforming the possibility into an actuality is the unity of action both within the guiding organization and among the broad masses of the people. The Second World Peace Congress marked great progress in this respect. While the Paris congress was composed predominantly of communists and workers in the sciences, arts, and literature, at the Warsaw congress there were present, along with communists, liberals and conservatives, Laborites and Catholics, social-democrats and radicals, as well as farmers and even industrialists. At the Warsaw congress there was broad representation from the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries.

Of great significance from the point of view of extending the base of the peace movement is the decision of the Second World Peace Congress concerning the defense of the peoples fighting for their national liberation. The congress declared that the movement of the peoples in the colonial and dependent countries for their liberation is inseparably connected with the movement for peace. Therefore, any forcible attempts by the imperialists to keep these peoples in a state of dependence and colonial subjection is a threat to the cause of peace.

The congress also adopted a decision in favor of establishing contact with the many associations and groups which, though not affiliated with the international organization of the partisans of peace, in some measure act in opposition to war, whether consistently or not. Accordingly, the World Council of Peace decided to take steps for negotiations and conferences with supporters of "One World" movement, with the Quakers, church organizations, the "neutralist" movement and other pacifist groups, for the purpose of working out conditions for joint actions in the struggle for the preservation of peace.

A decisive condition for the preservation of peace is unity of action by the leading force in the peace movement, the

working class.

It is no secret that the imperialists cannot wage war without the working class. Hence, they resort to every measure in order to force the working class to work for the war and to serve as cannon fodder for the sake of carrying out the aggressive plans of the American imperialists. To this end they try to enmesh the working class in lies, and resort to intimidation and provocation, slander and open terrorist acts against the working class and the communist parties. In their efforts to win the support of the working class the imperialists make use of its worst enemies, the right socialists. Under the present conditions, the right socialists are not only (and not even so much) henchmen of the bourgeoisie of their country as the henchmen of American imperialism. These traitors see their main task as justifying the expansionist policy of the American billionaires, and they resort for this purpose to the most dishonest and vile methods of struggle. But under the present conditions it is not so easy to justify the overtly aggressive policy of American imperialism. The peoples are organizing to fight this policy. The right socialists therefore strive by all possible means to split the united front of the peoples that are fighting for peace, and first of all to break the unity of the working class. They split the trade unions, enter into agreements with the reactionary parties to fight against the democratic forces, and once again as they did prior to World War II they clear the path for fascism. This vile, frenzied campaign of the right socialist splitters meets with resistance on the part of the working class, solidifying it still more and rousing it to fortify the unity of its ranks. The proponents of peace must take full account of the fact that without unity in the ranks of the working class there can be no unity of all the laboring masses in the fight for peace and democracy, and against the danger of a new world war.

The movement of the partisans of peace, especially at its inception suffered from two incorrect points of view on the question of the danger of a new war. Some were of the opinion that a new war was absolutely inevitable, that nothing could prevent it. They proposed to discontinue all resistance to the aggressors, to submit to fate and thus to doom millions of people to annihilation. Others believed that the contemporary international situation had changed so much that there was no basis for a new war. This would have meant inaction on the part of the masses of the people, creating favorable conditions for the aggressor forces in their criminal drive for a new war. Both of these viewpoints are unscientific and therefore harmful.

In order to transform the possibility of averting a new war into an actuality and preserve peace it is vital to strengthen and expand the movement of the partisans of peace.

In the final analysis, the fate of the world depends on the activity of the masses of the people. "...a widespread campaign for the maintenance of peace, as a means of exposing the machinations of the warmongers," Stalin points out, "is now of primary importance."

One of the most important conditions for the prevention of a new world war and securing the preservation of peace

is enhancement of the power of the Soviet Union which heads the mighty front of the fighters for peace, the multiplication of its economic successes and the strengthening of its defensive capacity. In World War II the Soviet people, displaying miracles of heroism, courage and steadfastness in the struggle against fascist Germany and imperialist Japan, smashed with its armed forces the shock forces of international imperialism and aggression, thereby saving mankind from fascist enslavement. In the present condi-

tions, when over mankind is again suspended the danger of a new world war and aggression by the imperialists of the United States, the eyes of all peace-loving people are turned towards the Soviet Union, the bulwark of peace and security for all peoples.

The peoples fighting for peace may rest assured, as Stalin stated, that the Soviet Union "will continue in the future, as well, unswervingly to pursue a policy of averting war and preserving peace." □

On the Orientation of the French Communist Party from 1944-1956

Introduction

An examination of the general line and practice of the French Communist Party in the post-World War II period is quite useful for our study of the orientation of the world communist movement for the struggle against imperialist war at that time. The FCP along with the CP of Italy was one of the two parties from the capitalist countries represented in the Cominform, and these two big parties had a great deal of prestige and authority within the world communist movement. Today it is well known that in the period after the war, Togliatti's CPI proved very rotten and adopted ultra-revisionist and polycentrist stands from early on. Deservedly or not, the FCP has been given a different reputation. It has a reputation that after the war it led the French working class into militant struggle, ardently defended the Soviet Union and condemned the revisionism of Browder and Tito. What's more the FCP is also known to have resisted in the beginning the open revisionism of Khrushchov and Togliatti. (See, for example, Enver Hoxha's *Eurocommunism Is Anti-Communism*, p. 29, *Proletarian Internationalism* edition; pp. 94-95, Albanian edition) Seeing as the FCP was regarded as one of the best parties and was closely linked with the CPSU(B) and the Cominform, it can be said that in a sense it provides a model test for the orientation for the communist parties in the capitalist countries pursued by the world communist movement in the post-war decade.

The following report is based on a survey of some 150 articles taken from the Cominform journal *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*. All references are to *FLP, FPD*. Many of these articles are the reports and documents of Central Committee plenums and congresses of the FCP. Almost all of the others were signed articles from the authoritative leaders of the Party. In other words, this report is based on only the most sympathetic and polished reference material. The very condemning materials on the stands taken by the leaders of the FCP compiled by unsympathetic sources have not been used.

1. The General Line

In the post-war period the general line of the FCP was for the building of a democratic, nationally independent France in a peaceful world. This was its consistent program over the decade covered. At great intervals reference was made to revolutionary struggle, the revolutionary perspective, the struggle for socialism, the class struggle for power against the bourgeois state, the overthrow of bourgeois democracy, and fighting for the dictatorship of the proletariat. At one point they frankly admitted that "mistakes of economism" and failure to put forward the perspective of "the destruction of capitalism" had hurt their influence in the factories because "This is precisely what the workers expect of us." (August Lecoer, organizational secretary of the CC, June 23, 1950. Also 12th Congress of the FCP, April 1950) But under this thin sprinkling of revolutionary phrases, the entire practical program is kept strictly within the capitalist framework — defending the bourgeois constitution, defending the republic, defending the French national interests and defending peace. The statements of the FCP leaders stress that their basic program hadn't changed since the time of the liberation war against the Nazi occupation and that, now as then, they would unite with anyone and everyone, without regard to class or political distinctions, for the cause of democracy, independence and peace. While the FCP leaders adhered to this basic program for the whole post-war period, they adapted their rhetoric to the powerful waves of the mass upsurge, to the sharp pressure of the bourgeoisie, etc.

Immediately after liberation in August of 1944, the FCP leaders adopted the line of merging the Party and the partisan forces under its leadership into the newly reconstituted bourgeois regime. The FCP held important posts in de Gaulle's Provisional Government of 1944-45. In '45 and '46 they scored big election victories. Along with the Socialist Party, the FCP coauthored the Constitution of the 4th Republic of France. And from 1946 to the spring of 1947 the FCP held major cabinet posts in the coalition

governments along with the SP and the Christian Democrats.

During its period in government the FCP leadership did not raise the independent demands of the working class. Instead, raising industrial output to regenerate the French economy was put forward as the principal task of the communists and workers. This was spelled out by FCP General Secretary Maurice Thorez at the 10th Congress of the Party in June, 1945. In these days the FCP acted like a typical governmental party of capitalist slave drivers.

In the spring of 1947 the FCP was unceremoniously dumped from the government. (As part of a concerted push demanded by U.S. imperialism, the bourgeoisie tossed the communist parties out of a series of European governments at this time: France, Italy, Belgium and others.) The FCP leaders responded like typical capitalists.

Jacques Duclos gave a major report on the situation in France after the expulsion of the FCP ministers to the founding meeting of the Cominform in September, 1947. Duclos claimed that the employers were alarmed by what consequences the removal of the FCP from the government would have on production. He bitterly complained that this had had an ill effect on output, deficits, gold reserves, etc., and that only a government with the FCP in it could convince the workers to work hard so as to rebuild French industry and safeguard independence.

Meanwhile the FCP leaders went out of their way to put the bourgeoisie at ease that they would not take action in revenge for being robbed of the cabinet posts which the FCP had rightfully won in the elections. For example, in his report Duclos explained that it was only de Gaulle who wanted disorder, but that the FCP was "to an ever increasing extent, being recognized by the masses as **the party which upholds order.**" (Duclos, Secretary of the CC, "The FCP in the Struggle for the Independence of the Country, Against American Expansion," December 1, 1947, emphasis added)

(Note that by this time de Gaulle had become a leader of the ultra-right-wing opposition outside of the "moderate" governments being formed by the Socialists, Radicals, Christian-Democrats and other "moderate" bourgeois groupings. De Gaulle surrounded himself with ex-officers and chieftains of the pro-Nazi Vichy government and de Gaulle's "Rally of the French People" (RFP) Party frequently hinted at a fascist coup d'etat to bring order to the parliamentary chaos of the "moderate" big bourgeois parties and to crush the working masses under an iron heel.)

In the fall of '47 a very powerful and militant strike movement broke out involving over three million strikers at one time. The strike wave continued for over two years. Industrial output had been raised to 95% of the pre-war level, but the French workers starved with wages at less than half the pre-war rate. The main demand of the strike movement was for the indexing of wages to the cost of living, but it also took up demands against fascization, militarism, the U.S. plans for Europe, etc. These strikes were

ruthlessly suppressed with troops occupying the coal fields, mass arrests, heavy fines and long prison sentences, and the enacting of "super-foul" laws for the persecution of militant workers. Under the blows of this strike wave, governments were collapsing and being replaced every few months. This period also marks the beginning tremors of a powerful wave of mass struggles against imperialist war.

The FCP had to adapt to the new situation. It was the party of the majority of the French working class and it faced a debacle if it failed to adapt to the fighting stand of the workers. For example, the principal trade union center, the FCP-led CGT, was the main organization of the strike movement. The General Secretary of the CGT makes a telling comment about how in those "misguided" organizations where the union representatives in the production committees advocated class compromise the workers were leaving their unions in protest ("Sharpening Class Struggle in France," April 1, 1949) During this period the FCP itself was not only frozen out of the government, it was also hounded by the police regime. In this situation of intense class struggle the FCP was compelled to switch from acting like a capitalist party of government to acting like a typical workers' party of reformist opposition.

It should be noted that throughout the post-war period the FCP was generally the strongest single electoral party, garnering somewhere between 22% and 26% of the vote. In the first days after being tossed out of the government, the FCP leaders were still in the euphoric mood of being a government party and they declared that their big bloc of votes was a mandate for Thorez to get the premiership. They ridiculed the allegedly "Trotskyite" idea of nonparticipation in the capitalist government.

However, soon it became clear that no posts were going to be offered to the FCP and large numbers of their seats in the National Assembly were robbed by flagrantly anti-communist manipulation of the election laws. But still the FCP did not abandon its parliamentary cretinist approach; it simply added some loud rhetoric to it. On the one hand, FCP leaders cried sour grapes; Thorez and company declared that it was now inconceivable that they would want to join a government with the strikebreakers and American puppets of the Socialist Party. On the other hand, their idea was that if the FCP couldn't achieve a utopia under capitalism through participation in a bourgeois coalition government, then the same goal could also be achieved by the mass struggle exerting influence from the outside on the social-democratic and capitalist deputies, thus changing the "relation of forces" in parliament. (Thorez's report to CC plenum, October 1949) This idea of achieving a capitalist utopia through pressuring the government was central to the reformist orientation the FCP gave to the mass struggle. (Later on, after the mass upsurge had subsided, the FCP leaders again begged to enter the government with the Socialists and Radicals, but they were turned down.)

During this period of sharp class struggle, the agitation of the FCP against the ruling parties became sharper in tone. But still the revolutionary spirit of the class struggle

and the concept of the proletariat as an independent force did not make its way into the declarations and statements of the FCP. For example, even when the ruling parties were denounced for their regime of "police dictatorship," the appeal against the regime was for unity of "patriots of all political convictions" to "fight for peace [which] means to fight for France, for freedom, for the restoration of national independence, for the happiness of French men and women." The desired governmental change was proclaimed to be a "Government of National Salvation." The Manifesto of the 12th Congress of the FCP appealed to the French people to:

"Unite to achieve the formation of the government you want in your country; an honest government, a government of freedom and peace, a government of the people, created by the people and for the people; a government of democratic unity, the genuine government of France." (April 15, 1950)

2. National Independence

The slogan of "national independence" was central to the line for the entire post-war period. It was posed as key to satisfying the economic and social requirements of the workers and peasants. And it was especially key to the question of peace. There was a great deal of propaganda about the betrayal of the nation by the bourgeoisie to Marshall Plan and Atlantic Pact (NATO) slavery. Indeed, it really was important to fight U.S. imperialism, and some of the condemnations by the FCP of the U.S. imperialist designs on Europe seem quite reasonable. But the program of the FCP leaders went way beyond reason; it was a nationalist program that amounted to shameless defense of the national interests of the French monopoly bourgeoisie.

This is made graphically clear, for example, in Duclos' report to the 1947 Cominform meeting. Duclos attacked the government's action of raising prices as a U.S.-inspired plot to provoke the workers to sabotage industry and thus bring on the encroachment of U.S. manufactures. Duclos claimed that the capitalists themselves were also alarmed at the high prices the government allowed them because they too were concerned that this may damage worker productivity. He went on to explain:

"There undoubtedly are employers who fear for their capitalist interests. They are greatly alarmed by the fact that France is being prepared to play the role of a third-rate power.

"We are closely following these developments and are making every effort...to defend the independence of France."

This same theme about the capitalists, even the big bourgeoisie, being concerned about the world status of France (i.e., French imperialism) and their interests (i.e., profits) being infringed upon by the U.S. appears in several of Duclos' speeches over the years on the struggle for national independence.

After the FCP was kicked out of the government and became an opposition party, its reformist critique of the capitalist government was also cast in a nationalist framework. During the class confrontations from late '47 to '51-'52, the FCP's agitation against the right-wing Socialist leaders, against the de Gaulle fascists, against the police, etc., were all posed in the nationalist rhetoric of opposition to the "American Party," the "lackeys of the American warmongers," etc. A central theme of the propaganda was that the ruling capitalist circles were an evil to contend with, not because they were capitalist exploiters in their own right, but because they had "betrayed the nation for the sake of their class interests." This line of agitation, along with their other reformist schemes, only served to blunt the class consciousness of the workers by promoting among them an all-class nationalist spirit.

However, when the fierce intensity of the situation started to relax, in '52 and '53 and particularly by '54, the fire directed against the internal enemies was dampened down considerably. The FCP leaders openly stretched out their hands for unity with the big bourgeoisie and the worst enemies of the workers among the Socialist and Radical leaders to defend the French interests. They even started to praise de Gaulle, replacing the word "fascist" before his name with a respectful "General." It did not even matter that these new-found champions of the nation were in the main ardently pro-U.S. imperialist and pro-NATO; even a little French nationalist rhetoric against Germany would make them worthy of a hand of support. When the FCP leaders made this turn to the bourgeoisie they explained that they had never excluded anyone from the national cause during the liberation war or after, so therefore it was only natural that the Communists would welcome the growing rifts between the French capitalists and their American or German counterparts. After all, they argued, the FCP has always been loyal to its proud slogan "We continue the cause of France!"

Here it should be noted that the FCP leaders found a theoretical justification for this turn in the theses of Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* and the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B). In *Economic Problems* Stalin speaks of the strivings of the imperialist rulers of Britain, France, etc., for independent development as representing "profound forces" beneath the "outward phenomenon." It is true that underneath the outward show of unity the inter-imperialist rifts were deepening. But how the FCP leaders interpreted this analysis helps shed light on what conclusions Stalin and the 19th Congress sought to draw from such an assessment. Citing this passage from Stalin, Thorez declared: "And now in France the 'profound forces' of the nation are beginning to rise, forces which determine the new course of developments, which will achieve the triumph in our country of the policy of peace and national independence." (Speech to CC plenum, June 19, 1953) This was how Thorez and company argued for their policy of trailing in the wake of the Socialist and Radical leaders and the other chiefs of the "profound

forces" of French imperialism's independent development.

While much of the propaganda for French independence was directed at U.S. imperialism, there was also a great emphasis on the French national struggle against Germany. It seems quite just that the French working class would join the worldwide condemnations of the plans of the U.S., British and French imperialists for the rehabilitation of the Nazi chieftains and the rebuilding of the German imperialist war machine as a gendarme against the Soviet Union, etc. But they went overboard on the question of reparations and openly demanded the plunder on a huge scale of the German workers by the French billionaires: in '47 the FCP leaders were arguing that French industry, and therefore also French national independence, could only be built upon the foundations of German war reparations and in particular upon the coal from the German Ruhr to supply the French iron and steel industry.

During this post-war decade the idea was repeated over and over again that the key to European peace was loyalty to the wartime Allied agreements to block the German danger. In particular the demand was for loyalty to the Franco-Soviet Treaty that was signed between de Gaulle and the Soviet Union at the end of the war against any renewed German aggression. This was said to be the only firm guarantee of French national security.

In 1951 the FCP leaders put forward that "In the general struggle for peace and national independence the struggle against rearming West Germany has now become the basic task of the French people." (Francois Billoux, Politbureau member, citing statement by J. Duclos, January 12, 1951) Billoux's logic for this absurdity was that this issue was "The broadest basis for uniting the peace forces in France." In other words, presumably unlike such divisive problems as the French war raging against Viet Nam at that very time, "representatives of all trends, Communists, Socialists, members of the [Gaullist and Christian Democratic] RPF and MRP, Radicals, etc. — are against rearming Germany." This idea about the "broadness" of the German question, and hence its central role, was repeated from this time on. It is no mystery why the FCP leaders were so excited by the "broadness" of the German question. It was a question to unite with the French bourgeoisie upon; indeed anti-German nationalism has long been one of the cardinal tenets of French bourgeois ideology.

3. The Peace Movement

From approximately late '47 to '52 a very powerful mass upsurge against imperialist war swept France. The masses were aroused and brought into action against the U.S. imperialist war preparations against the Soviet Union, the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact, the rearming of Germany, and against the colonial wars, especially Viet Nam and to a degree the war in Korea which France also took part in. (Even though the Viet Nam war caused an acute crisis in France and there was an important struggle

against it by the French people, the FCP did not consider this question to be at the center of what it viewed to be "the fight for peace." Therefore Viet Nam and the other colonial wars will be dealt with in the next section.)

The movement against imperialist war was not just some impotent moral outcry by some pacifist do-gooders, as much of the FCP literature of the time might lead one to believe. Rather it was a profound movement of struggle which gripped the toiling masses. It ran deep among the factory workers and the working people and it frequently erupted into powerful and militant mass forms. Now and then, even in the FCP's press, there are descriptions of illegal "monster" demonstrations of tens and even hundreds of thousands which clashed with the police and were condemned by the capitalist press as attempts at communist insurrection. There is discussion of a broad strike movement (apparently of short protest strikes) against war measures, and of a widescale movement among transport and armament workers against handling war supplies. There are also reports of rebellious ferment among the soldiers and sailors.

It seems that some of the more militant mass actions — strikes, protests against handling arms to Viet Nam, etc. — took the FCP leaders by surprise. Nevertheless they associated themselves with even the more militant forms of mass struggle, led the big illegal demonstrations, etc. At the same time their consistent orientation was to turn the movement down narrow pacifist and petty-bourgeois nationalist channels. For example, strikes and job actions against war measures or handling supplies for war were directed towards ideas of the peaceful conversion to civilian industry and the "regeneration of France."

The main emphasis in the peace movement was inevitably the pacifist scheme of the day being advocated by the World Peace Council. For the FCP leaders the militant actions taking place in the streets and work places were something of a subsidiary to gathering signatures for the Stockholm Appeal, for the Appeal for a Five-Power Peace Pact for distributing "Postcards for Peace," and so forth. Indeed, periodically the "basic task," the "mainspring" work, of not only the peace movement but of the entire communist press in France and of all the organizations of the Party from top to bottom is declared to be getting out signatures for the WPC appeals. (See, for example, Fajon's report to the CC plenum, May 4, 1950.) It should be noted the Cominform journal *FLP.FPD* was given by the FCP as the model example for this orientation. As a result, tens of thousands of dedicated activists absorbed themselves with the task of knocking on doors to gather the maximum number of signatures. The general arguments for this orientation were threefold:

a. "Postcards for Peace" and similar forms could involve far greater numbers than other more militant forms of activity, i.e., even the social-democratic and bourgeois chieftains could be brought in.

b. The signature campaigns, lobbying, etc., were directly linked with the building of parliamentary combinations

capable of forming a "government of peace." Thorez refers to the Cominform resolution of 1949 to argue that the Cominform sees the possibility of the peace movement creating a "wider range" of governments than even the FCP envisioned in its calls for a government of peace and "democratic unity." (Speech to CC plenum, December 16, 1949)

c. Petitions for negotiated agreements among the big powers were given heavenly qualities. They had much loftier objectives than merely combating colonial wars and other burning fronts of struggle. After all, if the Great Powers could not realize world peace it was impossible to speak of social progress in any other sphere. In this way gathering signatures for the Stockholm Appeal was hailed to the skies. "Fighting for peace [i.e., collecting signatures for Stockholm] we are fighting for socialism, for communism, for the most wonderful and just cause." (Thorez's report to the 12th Congress)

In words, the working class was the mainstay of the peace movement; but, in practice, despite the strong base of the FCP in the working class and the ferment and activity among the workers; the intelligentsia and "important personages" took central stage. Again, the Cominform was cited as the authority for this orientation by the FCP leaders. All that was required for a diehard bourgeois to be described as an important man of peace was for him to put his signature to some empty pacifist appeal.

It must be noted that, particularly at the earlier stages of the movement, the FCP leaders made a number of veiled and open threats of insurrection if the capitalists launched war; they declared that they wanted to, as they put it, give the warmongers something to think about. Interestingly, in 1949 Thorez cited a 1907 resolution from the French Socialist Party threatening revolutionary action and insurrection against war as the historical tradition which the FCP would adhere to if the government launched war. What Thorez failed to mention was that this SP resolution turned out to be a mere fig leaf for the worst betrayal by the social-democrats, much like the FCP leaders' own pompous declarations. (Thorez's report to CC plenum, March 1, 1949)

At this same CC meeting Thorez also made his famous statement that:

"...if under such conditions the Soviet Army — defending the cause of the peoples, the cause of socialism — in its battle against the aggressor were forced to enter our territory, could the working people and the entire people of France conduct themselves any differently in relation to the Soviet Army than the working people and the peoples of Poland, Romania, Yugoslavia had done?" (March 1, 1949)

The FCP claimed that this statement played a major role in its successful election campaign of that year. In this period the FCP leaders also spoke of upholding the lessons of the 1919 Black Sea Rebellion of French soldiers and sailors who rose against the French imperialist intervention against Soviet Russia. Indeed the FCP leaders were quite "bold" about making declarations against a war versus the Soviet Union, and the slogan "the people of France will

never go to war against the Soviet Union" was one of its main themes. Among other things, this seems to confirm that there was in fact a great revolutionary sentiment in favor of the then socialist Soviet Union among the working masses at that time. With their "bold" and "militant" statements, Thorez and company draped themselves with the internationalist sentiments of the workers, but their actual stand did not amount to much; their statements were just a showy cover over their miserable pacifism.

The FCP leaders also make pompous statements declaring that the French people "will never give their sons for an imperialist war against any people." (January 1, 1949) Thorez backs up such slogans by declaring that this is the stand of "French Republicans true to the letter and spirit of the Constitution which states: 'The [French] Republic will never wage a war of conquest and will never use its forces against the freedom of other peoples.'" Thorez obviously "forgot" that both before and after the signing of that hypocritical bourgeois constitution, the French imperialist hangmen were waging nonstop war against the freedom of the people of Indochina, Africa, etc.

By 1953-54 the mass upsurge had started to die down. And with it, the fiery rhetoric of the FCP also cooled down. In 1950 the 12th Congress of the FCP had spoken of peace "hanging on a thread." But now the FCP leaders were giving the assessment that the war danger was fading and new openings for the peaceful resolution of all international conflicts were emerging. There is an interesting article by Laurent Casanova, Politbureau member, entitled "Five Years of Peace Movement." (April 23, 1954) In this article he credits the successes of the peace movement and the peace policy of the Soviet Union with ending the war in Korea and Viet Nam and bringing together the Great Powers in negotiations at the Berlin Conference, Geneva, etc., he explains that on the peace question the British and French governments "are now forced to take into account the views of their peoples," and goes on to praise "General de Gaulle" and other chieftains of French imperialism. From this time on the peace struggle is reduced to "easing international tension," to "advancing detente," and to negotiations for disarmament. The internal enemy in the struggle drops out of the picture and even the fiery rhetoric against American imperialism is replaced by polite criticisms of "a certain power," of "certain of our Atlantic Allies," etc., etc., ad nauseum.

A final ideological point on the peace movement. It seems that throughout this period there was unclarity on what this peace movement was all about. Among other things there are a number of what seem to be awkward and roundabout attempts to reconcile the "old" Leninist concepts of struggle against war with the explicitly nonrevolutionary nature of the FCP's orientation for the post-World War II peace movement. The FCP's leaders paid tribute to Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* for clarifying the question: "The broad democratic movement for peace" can accomplish a number of good things like a temporary peace, a "government of peace" and so forth, they argued. "But

to eliminate the inevitability of wars it is necessary to abolish imperialism. The abolition of imperialism is the task of the independent communist movement." (Report to CC plenum, December 1952) Thus, in theory the FCP leaders kept the Leninist analysis of imperialism and war, but in practice, they threw it away and in fact felt that revolutionary work was downright harmful to the anti-war movement. This is the eclectic reasoning that the FCP leaders used to legitimize their nonrevolutionary peace movement. Later, when Khrushchov at the 20th Congress debunked the idea of the inevitability of imperialism's drive to war and proclaimed the peacefulness of imperialism, Thorez, in effect, thanked Khrushchov for eliminating the eclecticism in their previous reasoning.

4. The Colonial Wars

Now we take up the attitude of the FCP towards the colonial wars of French imperialism. It may be recalled that the FCP did not consider the fight against colonial oppression and wars to be at the center of "the fight for peace" in France. This was a shameless imperialist stand on their part since it divorced "the fight for peace" from opposition to those wars that French imperialism was directly engaged in during the post-war period, namely the French colonial wars.

The FCP leaders spoke of their glorious loyalty to the Lenin-Stalin principles of proletarian internationalism in regard to the national question. But they failed to give the necessary support to the liberation struggles of the oppressed nations for independence from the French colonial yoke. They argued that the oppressed peoples must not leave the French Union, and they instead gave lukewarm support to equality within the French Union. They drew the parallel that just as the formerly oppressed nations thrived in the Soviet Union (where the working class was in power) and had true equality, so too the peoples of the overseas French possessions could thrive in the French Union (where the colonialists and imperialists were in power).

In 1946 the FCP had coauthored with the socialists the Constitution of the 4th Republic which had pious words in it about equality of the people of the colonies within the newly created French Union. Negotiations to ensure such equality within the French Union and to ensure that both the interests of France and the colonial peoples were safeguarded was the guiding principle of the FCP in dealing with the colonial problem throughout this decade. The FCP spoke of ending the colonial wars, and now and then even spoke of the national liberation movements for self-determination and independence. But this was always formal and unenthusiastic. What's more, even when the goal of independence was verbally supported this "independence" was frequently interpreted to mean some kind of autonomy within the French Union. Also, the strengthening of the economic and financial links with the colonies which were to continue to serve as a market for goods and as a source of

raw materials is repeatedly included in the FCP's program for the "regeneration of France." This sometimes went under the charitable signboard of "helping the overseas territories overcome backwardness." (December 29, 1950)

Marring all of the statements of the FCP on the colonial wars was that these wars were never attributed to the imperialist ambitions of the French imperialists and the French government that was conducting them, but they were inevitably attributed to U.S. plots to seize bases from France and to weaken and enslave the French Union. The appeals more and more openly demand safeguarding the French colonial territories from U.S. penetration. For example, in his report to the 13th Congress of the FCP in June 1954, Duclos protests that the French war in Indochina is being used by the U.S. imperialists to weaken French resistance to the American penetration of the French colonies in North Africa. Similar protests are voiced over the years.

It seems that a turn for the worse in this regard comes after Stalin's *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* and the 19th Congress of the CPSU(B) which discuss the contradictions between France and other countries with U.S. imperialism. Now the French leaders begin to speak openly of securing French interests outside of the sterling and dollar areas (British and U.S. spheres of influence). For example, CC member Florimon Bonte quotes the passage in Stalin's *Economic Problems* about the capitalists of Britain and France striving "to secure an independent position and, of course high profits." Bonte takes this passage as confirmation of his enthusiastic pronouncement that:

"The new and characteristic feature is the protests voiced by certain capitalist circles, deprived of the opportunity of satisfying their requirements for cheap raw materials and profitable markets as a result of U.S. interference. The dollar magnates are...seizing raw materials and markets in the French colonies and in this way threatening the profits of part of the French capitalistic bourgeoisie." Bonte then declares that the FCP is "raising high the banner of...national independence, thrown overboard by the bourgeoisie," and goes on to promise that a FCP government will "ensure regeneration of economic life by means of...equal economic agreements with Viet Nam, Tunisia, Morocco and with other countries not included in the dollar area...[and will] prepare and carry out a plan for development of industry and agriculture taking into account the possibilities of the home and foreign market of a rehabilitated France." (January 9, 1953)

a. Viet Nam

The stand adopted by the FCP leaders towards the war in Indochina was shameless from beginning to end. The war was launched against the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam in September of '45 and steadily escalated during the years of the Communist, Socialist and Christian Democrat coalition governments. During this period Thorez was the vice-president of the cabinet, and for several months an FCP member was the Minister of Defense, i.e., the minister in

charge of directing the French colonial massacres against Viet Nam, Madagascar, Lebanon, etc., etc. In '46 Ho Chi Minh was invited by this government to Paris where some agreements were signed apparently for eventual negotiations for some type of improved autonomous status for Viet Nam within the French Union. At least this is the interpretation that Thorez gave to these agreements when he referred to them four years later, at the 12th Congress of the FCP, as the key to ending the war.

In '47 Duclos complained that when the FCP was expelled from the government, the issue raised by the bourgeoisie of the FCP's criticism of the Viet Nam war was merely a "pretext." Duclos makes a self-criticism that the Party focused too much attention on this pretext" (the supposedly minor matter of the war in Viet Nam) and should have focused more attention on the U.S. interference in the affairs of France as being the cause of the FCP's expulsion from the cabinet. (Report to founding meeting of the Cominform, September, 1947)

It is true that the U.S. imperialists exerted pressure to have the communists out of the government. At the same time, one of the reasons the French bourgeoisie threw out the FCP was to remove the danger of potential opponents of its war in Viet Nam from its cabinet. And it is simply amazing that the FCP leaders would deliberately pooh-poo this issue as a mere "pretext." Indeed it was the elementary duty of the French communists to make the Viet Nam issue a banner of their irreconcilable struggle against the class enemy.

And again when the FCP's paper *L'Humanite* was prosecuted for exposing atrocities in Viet Nam it was argued that this prosecution was really due to the FCP's exposure of "the American invasion of France." (June 1, 1949)

The FCP leaders spoke frequently about the need to end the "dirty war" in Viet Nam and to negotiate in the best interests of the French and Vietnamese peoples. But for years they took no action. Clearly their big threats of revolutionary action and insurrection against capitalist war did not apply to capitalist wars to crush the communist-led government of the DRVN and the liberation war of the Vietnamese people for freedom from the "glorious" French Union.

According to the FCP's own accounts, the first mass actions organized against the war in Viet Nam took place in the latter part of 1949, four years after the war began! What's more, these actions were not initiated by the FCP but by Algerian and North African dock workers who refused to handle war cargo for the war in Indochina and by revolts of North African troops. Soon similar actions of dock workers, railway men and others spread through France. Besides the actions of the transport workers a broad upsurge against the war emerged with student and youth protests against the draft and the war, workers' protest strikes, demonstrations of the mothers of the war dead, and resistance among the soldiers and sailors. The masses stood up to the brutal repression of the French regime which was exceptionally sensitive about the need to

suppress any outcry against the war in Viet Nam. In fact there is every indication that the war in Viet Nam was the Achilles heel of the French bourgeoisie; it was a very costly war that the imperialists were doomed to lose, and it was a most unpopular war which the working masses hated and were prepared to fight against.

But the FCP trailed behind events. The CC plenum of December 1949 did self-criticism for failing to develop the mass struggle against the war and said that the call for withdrawal of the expeditionary corps was one of its main slogans. But it remained notably unenthusiastic. While petition campaigns and "Postcards for Peace," etc., remained its top priority, the FCP leaders showed even less enthusiasm for the movement to block arms to Viet Nam than for the efforts to block arms shipments to Germany or even to Tito's Yugoslavia.

In 1952 the first article appears which actually hails Ho Chi Minh's forces and the liberation wars in Indochina (March 14, 1952) It was written by Leo Figueres, Secretary of the Republican Youth Union (the FCP's youth organization) and member of the FCP CC, who visited the liberated zones. This article would almost be reasonable if not for certain absurdities. For example, speaking of protests within the French army against the slaughter of French soldiers, the article claimed that these protests were taking place because the U.S. imperialists were using the deaths of French soldiers as an argument for "abolishing the national character of the French army" and for "rearming revanchist West Germany"! There is also the repetition of the theme that the war is simply "an American war." (Figueres was also overly excited that 7.5 million people in the jungles of Viet Nam had signed the appeal for negotiations for a Fivé-Power Peace Pact.)

This slight turn towards demagogic support for the liberation war looks like just another case of tailing the French bourgeoisie. Twenty-one thousand French soldiers were killed in the first six months of '52 alone. In 1953 everyone could read the writing on the wall. As the FCP leadership pointed out, among all political trends there was now support for the slogan "Stop the war in Viet Nam — Negotiate with Ho Chi Minh." Negotiation was the only way to save anything for French imperialism in the rapidly deteriorating situation.

At that time Mendes-France, a leader of the "moderate" bourgeois Radicals and a man reportedly admired by George McGovern,* was campaigning to become premier on the ticket of stopping the war in Viet Nam. The FCP deputies gave him their blessings despite the sticky problem that Mendes-France was also a supporter of the

*George McGovern is a liberal Democratic Party politician. In 1972 he ran for U.S. president on the Democratic ticket on a platform promising to end the war in Viet Nam. He also unsuccessfully sought the Democratic Party's nomination this year for the November elections against Reagan. McGovern criticized the war in Viet Nam, and today criticizes U.S. intervention in Central America, not from the angle of opposing imperialism but from the angle of advocating a more crafty imperialist policy.

European Defense Community plan which called for the further rearming of Germany. This was indeed a sticky problem as the struggle against the "European Defense plan" had been declared "the central task of the FCP." (Duclos, report to CC meeting, March 19, 1954)

The FCP leaders made no bones about their neo-colonialist motives towards Viet Nam. In a report to a CC plenum in September, 1951, Duclos declared that support for the puppet emperor Bao Dai is only good for the Americans, but a peace with Ho Chi Minh would be good for France. At the 13th Congress of the FCP in June 1954, Duclos showed no shame in his imperialism:

"Bao Dai, becoming more and more Americanized, is striving to make Indochina fully dependent on his bosses, which would lead to France being squeezed out of that part of the world. In contrast, the Ho Chi Minh government in its peaceful proposals, recognizes the economic and cultural interests of France in the countries of Indochina and favors the establishment of economic and cultural relations between these countries and France on the basis of equality and mutual interests. In addition it expresses its intention to consider the question of the DRVN joining the French Union on a voluntary basis; similar statements must be made by the democratic governments of other countries in Indochina." (Duclos, June 11, 1954)

(It should be noted that Ho Chi Minh's *Selected Writings* indicate that Duclos was not simply lying; but faithful to positions then fashionable in the international communist movement, the Vietnamese communists adopted a soft stand towards French imperialism at that time. Even after the victory of Dien Bien Phu, pointing to the fact that now the main struggle was to be directed at U.S. imperialism Ho Chi Minh speaks of protecting French investments and so forth. (See "Report to the 6th Plenum of the Viet Nam Workers' Party Central Committee," July 15, 1954, in Ho Chi Minh's *Selected Writings 1920-1969*, p. 172 in the 1973 edition.)

The FCP organized delegations to go to Geneva and back up Mendes-France at the bargaining table in the name of protesting U.S. obstruction of the negotiations. The FCP expressed pleasure at the contributions of the British government in breaking the deadlock. Afterwards they hailed the Geneva agreements to the skies. They drew two conclusions from the Geneva agreements: 1) They acclaimed the Geneva accords as proof positive that all international conflicts can be settled equitably through peaceful negotiations! Presumably the death of millions of heroic Vietnamese workers and peasants and 100,000 French troops was just a failure to negotiate! Indeed these negotiations were so successful that they set the stage for two more decades of brutal warfare. And 2) Geneva showed that "No one can prevent France from playing an outstanding role in the world"!!! (July 30, 1954)

b. West Africa, Equatorial Africa and Madagascar

After the Second World War France held onto its vast colonial holdings in black Africa, carrying out a string of

brutal wars to suppress the people. In '47 it put down a revolt in Madagascar, slaughtering 90,000 and providing another fine example of France's "outstanding role in the world." But the FCP had little or nothing to say about the African colonies. Once in a while it spoke in a reformist voice about upholding the Constitution and ending the repression of the colonial peoples, but even on this basis the FCP did not wage campaigns against colonialist atrocities. And of course the FCP did not fail to argue that a "radical change" from the harsh treatment of the colonies was needed in order to defend French interests and block U.S. penetration.

The main discussion of black Africa was in an article by the leader of the African Democratic Alliance. (June 9, 1950) The ADA was formed in '46, sending deputies from the black colonies to the French National Assembly where they worked closely with the deputies of the FCP. The ADA's program was strictly national reformist, if that, centering on "equal rights in all spheres" within the French Union and, of course, according to the rights laid down by the French Constitution. Defense of peace and the prohibition of the A-bomb were described as "the center of activities" of the ADA and as the "best contribution to the liberation struggles of the Negro peoples in Africa."

This same basic line is confirmed by an article by Raymond Barbe, a FCP CC member. Barbe holds that one of the "important tasks of the Communists" of French colonial Africa is to fight "opportunist and nationalist deviations" and he rails against "autonomist and nationalist phraseology" within the African liberation movement. For Barbe and company there was nothing "nationalist" about the FCP's ultra-patriotic crusade for the independence, sovereignty and glory of France. But for the French colonial subjects in Africa it was an entirely different story, they were supposed to be vigilant against "autonomist and nationalist phraseology" and to bow their heads "within the framework of the French Union." (Barbe, "In French Colonial Africa," January 15, 1949)

c. North Africa

There is little discussion by the FCP of the French colonies of North Africa and the Middle East. The FCP leaders make reference to their opposition to the bloody suppression by French troops of the revolt in Tunisia and Morocco. They also repeatedly complain about U.S. penetration of these countries. It seems that the FCP came to endorse the idea of negotiating independence for these countries not long before the French government was actually forced to do so.

Algeria was a different story. Unlike the others Algeria was considered by the French bourgeoisie to be not a separate nation but an integral province of France.

In one article from 1952 by Leo Figueres there is talk of supporting the Algerian national liberation struggle along with those of Tunisia and Morocco. But from the rest of the materials it appears that the FCP leaders may have gone

along with the standpoint of the bourgeoisie on Algeria being part of France, at least up until the full brunt of the liberation war in the mid-50's made them reconsider. Then the FCP leaders granted that Algeria must now be recognized as a nation. But they continued to argue that France must hold onto it at all costs. Their argument was that the French colonial settlers in Algiers wanted to secede and create a puppet state of the U.S. Therefore, instead of supporting the national liberation war of the Algerian people, the FCP leaders advocated reformist schemes to sabotage the liberation war under the hoax of the need to block the U.S.-inspired secessionist plots by keeping Algeria within the French Union.

In a report to the CC in January '56, Duclos attacked the Socialist leaders for their failure to recognize Algeria as a nation and to negotiate with its qualified representatives. Whoever these representatives may have been he doesn't say. But the fact that these documents do not refer to the FLN* is indicative of the FCP leaders' hostility to the national war that the FLN was conducting. Duclos argues:

"The national interests of France demand satisfaction of the aspirations of the people of Algeria and all French overseas territories for freedom and independence. This is the only way to make these peoples 'the friends, the allies' of France. This is the only way to frustrate the separatist intrigues of French colonialists, which play into the hands of certain foreign powers."

(Note that "certain foreign powers" is French revisionese for U.S. imperialism.)

A month later Duclos added:

"The course to be followed in this question is that of admitting the fact of the existence of the Algerian nation. This is the only way leading to immediate negotiations with qualified representatives of the Algerian people, with the object of making this people the friend and ally of France in a genuine French Union, based on the equality of all the peoples within it.

"In this way, and only in this way, it is possible to frustrate the plans of certain Atlantic allies [more revisionese for the same "certain powers"] who dream of imposing their domination on North Africa with the help of French colonialists who certainly do not recoil at the prospect of separation from France as long as they can hold on to their privileges." (February 16, 1956)

5. The French Army

At the time of France's liberation from the Nazis the FCP leaders ordered the partisan forces under their command to merge into the bourgeois army of de Gaulle. But that was not the last or the least of such treachery. Throughout this decade, strengthening the French Army (or at least its "na-

tional character'') was part of the FCP's platform.

In the fall of '48, FCP Politbureau member Charles Tillon wrote bitterly about the liquidation of France's national defense as a result of the Marshall Plan and the Atlantic Pact. He decried that the army lost its French character; that it didn't have sufficient arms; that the national defense industries were weakened; and that the officers and men "suffer(ed) the humiliation of no longer being able to bear the name of the French Army." Tillon referred approvingly to a French general (who just happened to be directing operations against Morocco at the time) who declared that he did not want to be "Montgomery's (a British Field Marshall) adjutant." (December 1, 1948) Now there's a proud French patriot for you!

In his report to a CC plenum in September '51, Duclos protests that the French Army is not playing its proper role, that "The French Army is not told about the interests and security of our country." But Duclos had the solution. He proposed that with national independence restored and with the necessary military credits from abroad the French Army could also be restored "to serving exclusively the interests of the security of the homeland and preserving peace."

In Billoux's report to the CC meeting of December '52, there is a fiery condemnation of the "enemies of the nation" who "have the audacity to contend that the activity of the communists allegedly undermines the morale of the army and nation, allegedly harms the territorial integrity of France." Undoubtedly it was pure slander to charge the FCP leaders with wanting to damage the French Army of imperialist slavery or the territorial integrity of France's far-flung colonial empire.

6. Opposition Within the FCP

There is very little discussion in FCP statements of inner-party debate. In fact it is said that the general line of the Party is not a permissible topic of discussion within the ranks of the Party. Under the pretext of defending the concept that the party must have a single monolithic line, it appears that the necessary inner-party life that determines that line and the discussion of major problems facing the movement was quashed.

Furthermore it seems like they felt that they had no obligation or responsibility to explain the whys and wherefores of the line that was put forward. Rather it looks like there was a real cult of Maurice Thorez, who was described always in the most exalted terms as "the great disciple of Stalin," the "glorious internationalist," the "farseeing patriot," etc. The line of Thorez and the top leadership was presented as infallible, supported by the Cominform, the Soviet Union, etc. At the same time things seem to be written as if the leadership was somewhat nervous about opposition to their rightist stands. There is also mention of such things as Thorez's exposure of unnamed "sectarians" who criticized the peace movement, without any hint of what the

*The FLN (Front de Liberation National) was the main organization which organized the national liberation war of the Algerian people in the 1950's. It formed the Algerian government after independence from France in 1962.

issues at stake were.

In the resolutions of the CC meeting of December 5-7, 1952, it was announced that Andre Marty and Charles Tillon had been removed as factionalists. Marty was a renowned leader of the FCP, a secretary of the CC, a principal leader of the "Black Sea Rebels" of 1919, and the commander of the International Brigades in the Spanish Civil War. Charles Tillon had been a main leader of the anti-Nazi resistance movement and he was a member of the Politbureau.

The FCP leadership charged Marty and Tillon with opposing the FCP's policies from the left. However we do not have the necessary materials to judge what Marty and Tillon stood for in this controversy. The articles in the Comin-

form press by Marty and Tillon do not have any outward signs of disagreement with the general line of the FCP leadership. While Tillon remained in the FCP, Marty was expelled.

In '54, it appears that ultra-right-wing opportunism emerged within the FCP leadership. The Organizational Secretary, Lecoeur, was denounced as a right opportunist for wanting to eliminate the class character and political independence of the FCP. Among other things, it was said that Lecoeur wanted to strike point number two from the party rules which required participation in a party branch for all party members. □

The French Communist Party in the Struggle for the Independence of the Country, Against American Expansionism

— by Jacques Duclos

The following article is excerpted from the report published in the December 1, 1947 issue of the Cominform journal For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy.

First of all, allow me on behalf of the Communist Party of France to express our joy and deep emotion at meeting with the representatives of the fraternal Communist Parties. We are particularly happy to salute here the outstanding leaders of the Bolshevik Party, the great Party of Lenin and Stalin, to which we owe so much. Before passing over to an analysis of the situation in which we have to work in France I want, in the name of the French Communist Party, to express our gratitude and boundless affection for Comrade Stalin.

The situation in France has changed during the last few months. Reaction has intensified its offensive against the working class and democracy. This is born out by the following facts: the Communists have been removed from the government; the conditions of life of the working people have deteriorated; the rehabilitation of France is being sabotaged in order to help the American imperialists gain control of our economy; the government is pursuing a policy of colonial war; in its foreign policy France has actually joined the Western bloc and is showing a growing tendency of becoming a satellite of the Anglo-Saxons; considerable unrest and profound dissatisfaction prevail in the country, which is leading to a mass movement among the working class.

Such are the conditions in which preparations for the municipal elections, to be held on October 19, are taking place.

I The Economic Situation in the Country

America's interference in the political life of France is becoming ever more obvious and will, unquestionably, extend with the forthcoming elections.

Having outlined the main questions I shall now dwell in detail on the development of industry since the liberation of France.

Our Party, which was one of the leading forces in the resistance movement during the occupation and hence has won great authority among the masses of France, launched a nationwide campaign at the beginning of 1945 to increase industrial output. This campaign was the underlying theme of the 10th Congress of our Party, held in June 1945.

Maurice Thorez appealed to the miners, and the results were soon apparent. On the whole France's industrial production has made giant strides compared with 1945 as can be seen from the following table. ...

Thus France's industry has practically reached 95% of the pre-war level. We could have topped the figure had we received more coal from the Ruhr.

In the nationalized industries, which are forging ahead, we have the following index compared with the pre-war level. ...

The index for the first half of 1947 was extremely promising, thanks to the high productivity of labor for the first quarter of the year. However, the policy pursued by the government, has dealt a blow to the production drive of the working class. The removal of the Communists from the government has heightened the dissatisfaction of the masses. Latest reports show that the reactionary policy of

the government is responsible for the decline in production, a fact which is causing alarm even among certain employers. ...

The reduced bread ration has been the cause of strikes and demonstrations and generally speaking has evoked bitter discontent among the population. ...

The government should have undertaken a drive to obtain five million hectares sown to wheat but it has failed to do it effectively. Actually our Party is leading the battle for five million hectares and we have made it one of the main slogans in our election campaign. We claim that the independence of our country is closely linked with the solution of this problem.

The extension of the wheat area is obviously being sabotaged, which is in keeping with the pro-American policy. In 1944 Andre Philip saw to the decrease of the sown area in Algiers, while the Minister of Agriculture, Tanguy-Prigent was informed in September 1946 in Copenhagen by the American representatives that conditions in France favored the cultivation of flowers rather than the production of grain.

Thus, the present food policy meets the interests of the big wheat producing countries such as the USA and Canada, but does not in the least promote the interests of France, with the result that she is now dependent, to a certain extent, on the USA for bread supplies. ...

As for our dollar expenditures for the purchase of coal, here it should be pointed out that these expenditures are due to the inadequate coal deliveries from the Ruhr, as illustrated by the following figures. ...

What's more, American coal does not meet the demands of our industry: we need Ruhr coke for our blast furnaces. ...

And so, France has been placed at the mercy of the United States for everything that concerns bread for our people and bread for our industry. ...

Thus we have a deficit in our trade balance whereas our gold reserves are almost completely exhausted.

In 1939 the gold reserves of the French Bank totaled 2,159 tons; in 1947, before the removal of the Communists from the government the gold reserves reached 618 tons. Today the figure is only 394 tons.

Thus, since the removal of the Communists from the government the leakage of gold abroad has amounted to 224 tons, i.e., 30,000,000,000 francs. ...

The state's expenditures are great. Military expenditures amount approximately to 280,000 million francs; the war in Indochina is costing 100 million francs a day. ...

The policy of raising prices has been carried out systematically since the removal of the Communists from the government. The decision to raise prices is sometimes taken without any demand for this on the part of the employers and occasionally even contrary to their wishes. Such was the case in August of this year when the rise in prices nullified the 11% increase in wages introduced at the beginning of the month. The price index has risen from 965 to 1068.

What are the conditions of the working class in France to-

day? The living standard of the French worker has dropped by 50% compared with the pre-war level. His share in the national income has steadily decreased, despite the fact that the biggest contribution to production has been made by the worker. The living standard of the worker has not risen parallel with the increase in production. ...

A certain section of the employers realize the full gravity of the situation to the future of industry and the rehabilitation of the country. With this in mind the Employers' National Federation signed an agreement with the General Confederation of Labor (CGT) on August 1, to increase wages by 11% without a general corresponding rise in prices. The agreement simply aimed to readjust prices by bringing some of them down and slightly raising others.

The government opposed this agreement. It raised the wages of the workers in the lowest brackets by 11% regardless of the wage scale and issued a decree raising prices by approximately 11%.

Thus, the theoreticians of the vicious circle whom we combated adopted measures to show the futility of raising wages, to provoke the working people (Ramadier's speech in Limoges), to sabotage the development of industry, and to pave the way for the domination of American monopolies in France.

There undoubtedly are employers who fear for their capitalist interests. They are greatly alarmed by the fact that France is being prepared to play the role of a third-rate power.

We are closely following these developments and are making every effort not to neglect any and every assistance to frustrate the plans of the American imperialists, and to defend the independence of France.

Such is the situation in France today, which is characterized by the following four factors: the sharpening of the class struggle; the resurgence of reaction; the open interference of American imperialists in the policy of France.

In order to understand the reason for this state of affairs it is necessary to recall the march of events in France since its liberation.

II

The Ramadier Government in the Halter of the American Imperialists

During the war the bourgeoisie made doubly sure of their position. Part of them followed Petain, the other part de Gaulle. At the time of the occupation de Gaulle did not for a minute lose sight of the struggle against the Communists. He feared the action of the popular masses, for he realized that the Communists were the only party capable of leading a mass movement.

He therefore proclaimed the policy of wait and see. He did his utmost to deprive the Communists of arms. He took measures to turn the advance of the Allied troops not so much into effective operations against the invaders as into a means of safeguarding "order."

The question may be asked why was it not possible at the time of liberation to develop the offensive against the Petain traitors on a wider scale. Here it should not be forgotten that in August 1944 the war was being fought on French soil together with the Allied armies, and the war against Hitler got priority. It was impossible to remove de Gaulle at the time. The fact that he headed the government was an obstacle to continuing the active struggle against German fascism, as was proved by the dissolution of the French Home Forces (FFI) at the end of August 1944.

Immediately on his return to France de Gaulle, basing himself on an alliance of Socialists and Catholics attempted to isolate the Communists and remove them from the government. The Socialist Party facilitated the implementation of this policy. After some timid efforts to establish unity of action with us they entered the municipal elections of 1945 in alliance with the MRP (the Catholic party) and tried, in vain, to defeat the French Communist Party. ...

However, despite the MRP's successes, the Communist and Socialist Parties held the majority in the Constituent Assembly. Nonetheless when de Gaulle resigned in January 1946, the Socialist Party refused to form a government of Socialists and Communists and insisted on the inclusion of the MRP in the government, which became the arbiter in government policy.

This policy could have been obstructed, firstly, by vigorous and consistent measures to nationalize the key industries in more favorable conditions than those permitting their partial realization, and, secondly, by carrying out a real purge, which would have made it possible to reorganize the state apparatus fundamentally and ensure against a new offensive by the forces of reaction. ...

The Socialist Party lost ground at the elections of June 2, 1946. In view of the fact that in many departments no candidate of the extreme right parties ran for election the MRP was able to increase its vote. The Communist Party came second, leaving the Socialists far behind.

The MRP did not consider it possible at the time to form a government without the Communists. From the viewpoint of the internal political situation such action would have caused too much unrest among the masses, including the rank and file of the Socialist Party, as well as among all democrats. In the sphere of foreign policy the MRP was not so subservient to the U.S. as it is today.

At the elections of November 10, 1946 the Socialist Party suffered a fresh defeat. The MRP lost some votes whereas the Communist Party emerged the victor. Under the circumstances the Communist Party claimed the premiership.

...
Reaction's plan at the time was not only to prevent us from heading the government, but to remove us altogether from it. As a result the one-party government of Blum was formed whose task was to introduce the period of governments without Communists.

In the sphere of foreign policy Leon Blum prepared the Franco-English agreement, the inclusion of our country in the Western bloc, and the war in Indochina.

After the elections of the president of the Republic, the Blum government could not continue its existence. Ramadier formed a new government, which included also representatives of the Communist Party. On the home front the government proclaimed a policy of increasing the purchasing capacity of the masses. The foreign policy announced was most vague, but did not change the general trend pursued by France in this sphere.

As a means of increasing the purchasing capacity of the people Ramadier announced his intention to continue the policy of cutting down prices, earlier introduced by the Blum government for demagogic purposes. This policy could have been successfully put into effect only by mobilizing the masses, and particularly housewives' committees and industrial committees at the enterprises, to fight high prices.

The French Communist Party mobilized the masses to combat high prices. But the government, sabotaging the measures of the Communist ministers, gained the upper hand and was able to shake the confidence of the masses in the effectiveness of these measures.

In view of the failure of Blum's experiment to lower prices, the General Confederation of Labor, supporting the demands of many big trade unions, favored the introduction of bonuses in all branches of industry, which would have led to an increase in wages. Ramadier opposed this demand and in the beginning of May of this year raised the question of a vote of confidence. He utilized the question of bonuses as a pretext to remove Communists from the government.

It was a pretext similar to the one used on the occasion of the debate on the war against Viet Nam. It was obvious however that as far as Ramadier was concerned it was actually a question of carrying out the orders of the Americans, who demanded the removal of Communists from the government.

We should have from thence onwards brought main emphasis to bear not on the pretexts used to remove the Communists from the government, but on the essential factors determining this policy, namely, on the interference of the American imperialists in the political life of France.

Here it should be recognized that this was not done by us vigorously enough hence the somewhat uncertain position taken by our Party towards the Ramadier government after the May events.

The recent plenum of the Central Committee of our Party realizing the danger inherent if we were to continue this unclear position emphasized the need to intensify the struggle against the anti-labor, pro-American policy of the Ramadier government.

A firmer stand by the French Communist Party toward the Ramadier government was all the more imperative since France's foreign policy, after the removal of Communists from the government, underwent profound changes.

The role played by Bidault in convening the conference of 16 countries to put into effect the so-called Marshall Plan, facilitated the transformation of our country, to our great regret and deep shame, into a mere instrument of American

imperialist policy, which is directed simultaneously against the sovereignty and independence of nations and against the peace.

Despite the fact that our enemies try to impress upon us that France can not manage without American aid, there is a deep undercurrent of hostility in the country toward the U.S. expansionism. Speculating with this aid our enemies are trying to compel us to agree to France being subordinated to the USA which by taking advantage of our economic difficulties, wants to turn France into a bridgehead of reaction in Europe. We are fighting against this policy, but unquestionably the struggle will have to be intensified.

Without doubt the European countries could by their own efforts, reciprocal agreements and trade exchange, secure their rehabilitation without American aid. A demonstration of this would make a profound impression.

III

For a Free, Independent France!

I shall now speak of the conditions in which our Party is beginning the new election campaign.

During the last few months our influence in the working class, in the peasant masses and among the urban middle classes has increased. That is why our enemies adopted an electoral law aimed at the Communists. By introducing proportional representation in the communes with a population exceeding 9,000 and the majority system in communes with a population below 9,000 they want to deprive us of the mayoralty even if we receive the majority of votes, and to effect on a local scale what was done on a state scale, namely, to remove the strongest party from leadership in the city councils.

We will have to wage a bitter struggle, all the more so that American imperialism, backing the French government, is dictating to it an anti-Communist policy which, by the force of events, is becoming an anti-French policy.

But our Party is strong. It enjoys great influence among different strata of the working people; if we intensify our struggle against the government's reactionary policy this can only further enhance our influence.

Strong discontent prevails in France, which has spread even to the government where Ramadier received only a narrow majority; the thing that saved him was that the extreme right parties abstained from voting in the vote of confidence. Ramadier is clinging to power by pretending to favor a middle-of-the-road policy in relation to de Gaulle and the Communists. We are exposing this maneuver, by showing that Ramadier is in fact pursuing a policy in the interests of de Gaulle.

De Gaulle is rallying former Vichy elements in his organization the "Union of French People" and is using the people at his disposal in the different parties, that is, of course, except the Communist Party. De Gaulle has decided to run in the municipal elections, a fact which may cause serious damage to some of the parties. For our part this may afford

us new possibilities to hamper the formation of an anti-Communist bloc, which is the dream of all, including Ramadier and de Gaulle, and to bring about the unification of worker and democratic forces.

De Gaulle is calculating on disorders in the country, and is sanctioning assassinations, the use of bombs, arson, the destruction of the crop to meet his ends. He is being assisted in this by former members of the LVF (volunteers of the German army), by fascists released from prison, by Vichy's former Gestapo police, by spies from BCRA (de Gaulle's intelligence service), all of whom have joined forces with him. The object of all these elements is to start disorders in the country and then to evoke a general desire for peace and order, which could be restored only by a "strong man."

We are fighting this policy and are, to an ever increasing extent, being recognized by the masses as the party which upholds order, while Ramadier is being recognized as the man who is clearing the path for de Gaulle to power.

Attempts are being made to distort the essence of the forthcoming political struggle. Ramadier is doing this by declaring "de Gaulle or the Communists." Our reply to this is "Democracy or Reaction."

There can be no democracy without the Communists. Our tactic is to unite all the democratic forces who defend the national interests, to rally all elements who feel disturbed by the activities of de Gaulle.

However, France's domestic policy today is determined by its foreign policy. Every act of the government reflects the pressure of the American imperialists, who insisted on the Communists being removed from the government so as to strengthen their domination over our country.

We have not denounced this policy of constant interference by American imperialism in the affairs of France vigorously enough. From the moment our Party was removed from the government on the insistence of the American imperialists, we should have taken the policy of a strong opposition to the Ramadier government. This would have made it possible to draw the attention of the masses to the critical situation in our country and to the intolerable pressure being brought to bear upon it from the outside.

Had we done so at the beginning of May we would have overcome the vacillation and indecision, which later expressed itself in the leadership of the mass movement.

Our Central Committee pointed out to these weaknesses and defined the line of our Party, calling upon it resolutely to head the movement of the masses and to spare no effort to make the movement a politically conscious one.

We are faced with the serious problem of uniting the broad masses in order to check the policy pursued by domestic reaction, a policy which aims at doing away with national independence, and which is being put into effect under the leadership of the Socialist Ramadier. Ramadier's policy was the target of innumerable critical remarks at the recent congress of the Socialists in Lyons. However, it should be emphasized here that this criticism did not affect such cardinal problems as the defense of the sovereignty and independence of France. There is not the slightest

desire among the leaders of the Socialist Party to protect the national interests of the country; on the other hand the policy of subservience to American imperialism is represented as an expression of progressive "internationalism."

In the struggle to save the country from enslavement by American monopolies we hope to find allies among the rank-and-file members of the Socialist Party, as well as among its functionaries. We shall find also other allies, for there is no doubt whatsoever that the French people, and the same holds true for the peoples of other nations, will never agree to be shackled in the chains of slavery.

The forces of our Party are growing following a period of certain stagnation; its great influence among the masses can be denied by none. Our Party recognizes the full responsibility that falls upon its shoulders in view of the role France must play in international relations.

At its recent plenum the Central Committee decided to

intensify the struggle on the ideological front. Measures have been taken to improve the work of the party organizations and to raise the political level of the Party's membership, particularly by developing criticism and self-criticism.

Measures have also been taken to improve the contents of our newspapers and magazines, to increase its circulation. Plans have been drawn up for the systematic political education of our leading cadres, first and foremost of all the members of the Central Committee.

Thus, the Communist Party of France, rallying around its leadership, headed by Maurice Thorez, will spare no efforts to keep in step with the tasks facing the Party.

We support the proposal to establish contact between the communist parties, and I can assure you that the French Communists, conscious of their role as vigilant defenders of the sovereignty and independence of France, will, under the banner of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin, rise to the occasion. □

Struggle of French Communists for Prohibition of Atomic Weapon

— by Etienne Fajon, Member, Politbureau

The following article is excerpted from the May 12, 1950 issue of *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*.

The Basic Task

The primary condition for the more speedy elimination of the lag in carrying out the campaign for the collection of signatures is that the entire Party, from the Central Committee down to the most remote branch, should realize that this is its task, its basic task with which, naturally, everything else is linked up.

Among Communists and certain Party organizations, a point of view prevails that the campaign for signatures is in the main the job of the *Fighters for Peace and Freedom* organization and not of the Communists. How can there be such an inconsistent and harmful point of view in our ranks? It is true that the campaign for signatures is the job for the *Fighters for Peace and Freedom*. That precisely is why it is our job, the job of the Communists for we, above all, both as individuals and as a party are fighters for peace and freedom. We, of course, are not the only ones conducting the campaign for signatures. This campaign is carried out by Communists jointly with the partisans of peace — non-Communists. But we must always strive in the course of this campaign to carry out our role of vanguard of the working class and of the people.

In order that millions of people in France who had hither-

to remained outside the peace movement should sign the appeal, it is necessary to talk with them, to explain, if need be, the danger threatening them, and the significance of their signatures to the appeal. Their objections, often molded by the press they read and the government's radio broadcasts, should not remain unanswered.

As is known, such outwardly contradictory, erroneous tendencies as underestimation of the war danger or acknowledgement of the total inevitability of war are, both one and the other, designed to secure the ideological confusion of peace supporters and are spread by imperialist agents.

Thus, the fascist Tito clique in particular was assigned, among other tasks, the job of spreading the idea that there is no real danger of war at the present time. Other agents of imperialism are, to the contrary, zealously spreading the anti-Leninist thesis about the impossibility of the peaceful coexistence of the capitalist and the socialist systems. Therefore every Communist, every fighter for peace, is faced with the task of constantly engaging in ideological and political work. Each must thoroughly prepare himself for this work, utilizing the Communist and democratic press. And this means that our newspapers, beginning with *L'Humanite*, must concentrate the main attention on the campaign for signatures to the Stockholm appeal, following in this respect the example set by the newspaper *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy*, the highly significant organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and

Workers' Parties.

The campaign for signatures requires much organizational work. It is necessary to promote the maximum development of the initiative of the masses and in the most varied forms, utilizing all available possibilities. However, house-to-house visits are the most effective method. In large cities, petition forms should be circulated to all families without exception. Particular attention should be devoted to the circulation of petition forms in the countryside where the work as a whole is on a lower level. Petition forms should reach the most remote villages.

Systematically calling upon every French family is an immense task unprecedented in scale and one which requires unusual efforts in organization, coordination and control at all levels. The fact that the Stockholm appeal has been signed by deputies of the National Assembly — the Radical Badié, and Boulet, former member of the MRP (Catholic party)...as well as by Gilbert Jules, Radical member of the Council of the Republic — gives us the right to speak of the desirability of submitting this appeal for their signatures to all members of Parliament.

To secure a successful development of the campaign for signatures, it is essential immediately to secure the participation of all Party members, all sections and branches in this campaign. It is essential that all activists, all Party members should not lose sight of this task for a moment; each evening every Communist should ask himself: "How many Frenchmen have I persuaded today to sign the appeal? What have I done today to draw other comrades, other partisans of peace into the work? What should I do tomorrow to ensure that my work is ever more fruitful?"

For the fighters for peace and freedom, one campaign for signatures must serve as a basis for a considerable strengthening of the movement organizationally. It is necessary immediately to get the work going and to strengthen existing peace committees and above all, to form thousands of new committees in the enterprises and in the villages, the streets and in the schools. Communists must vigorously help to carry out this task.

In a few months' time the Second World Peace Congress will be held in Italy. It is desirable that in addition to prominent public and political personalities and cultural

workers, representatives from the broadest sections of the population and in particular from among the peasantry, should attend this Congress from France.

Concrete Actions Against War

Far from hampering the political and practical actions of dockers, seamen, railwaymen and other categories of workers against the importation, transportation and production of war materials, the broad campaign for signatures to the Permanent Committee appeal and the development of the movement of the fighters for peace and freedom around thousands of peace committees help to develop these actions; securing for them the support and solidarity of ever broader sections of the population. It is essential that these concrete actions should not show a decline but, on the contrary, should daily become more frequent and reach a higher level. Most important in this remains the struggle against the unloading of American armaments — a struggle which cannot be separated from the struggle against the loading and transportation of war materials for Viet Nam. During recent months, the actions of dockers, seamen, railwaymen and other working people against war had considerable backing from the broad masses of the people. However, this support must become even more resolute and be forthcoming everywhere.

All the conditions are present to enable our country to play an increasingly significant role in the worldwide struggle for peace. On May Day, the French people demonstrated their desire for peace with extraordinary power. The idea of peace has become a great material force which is gripping the masses. The struggle for peace which, in itself, is of decisive significance, opens the way for the solution of all problems, including the problem of the restoration of the national sovereignty of France by the formation of a government of democratic unity which would be guided by the clear 11 point program adopted by the Twelfth Congress of the French Communist Party, and which would be created and supported by all French people united on the basis of the common demand — peace and national independence. □

Historic Example of October Revolution and Middle Strata

— by Jacques Duclos

The following article is excerpted from the November 2, 1951 issue of For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy.

Celebrating the 34th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, the world proletariat looks with gratitude and confidence to the land of socialism — the country of Lenin and Stalin.

The prestige of the Soviet Union is growing, despite the vile slander of enemies. The influence of its example is gaining momentum in all countries, embracing even those sections of the population which hitherto displayed restraint and at times even hostility. ...

The working people of all countries know that the Soviet

Union stands for a Five-Power Peace Pact (between the U.S., the USSR, the Chinese People's Republic, Great Britain and France) which would be open to all states and which would pave the way for normal economic relations between all countries.

They also know that the land of socialism respects the national independence and right of the peoples to self-determination whereas Washington's rulers laud cosmopolitanism and seek to destroy national sentiment in order to facilitate their domination over the enslaved nations. But if this policy of the imperialists is favorably received by the ruling circles who, allegedly, speak on behalf of the nation, but who are more and more breaking loose from it, the attitude of the people is quite different, and they, more and more frequently, manifest their national feelings and more and more actively oppose the policy of the new American occupationists and their lackeys.

Middle Strata and Peace Policy of USSR

In these conditions the historic example of the October Revolution exercises an increasingly greater influence not on the proletariat alone but also on the middle strata of the population in the capitalist countries who, encountering present-day difficulties, are trying to figure out what the future has in store for it.

Many things which the middle sections used to regard as being unquestionable are now being appraised differently in view of the convincing nature of the simple facts.

People who for a long time past, influenced by enemy propaganda, used to think that Communists want war in order to carry out revolution, see the following: first, the USSR clearly and definitely stands for signing a Pact of Peace; second, that in collecting signatures to the Appeal for a Pact of Peace, the communists in all countries head the ranks of peace champions of different political trends and beliefs. On the other hand, these very same people see that the American imperialists and their satellites sometimes speak about peace, seeking to deceive public opinion, while in practice they are actively preparing for war and are stepping up an all-out production of arms and munitions which leads to a deterioration in the standard of living of the working masses.

Those who used to regard their rulers as unbending, at least in words, are now learning that on all questions concerning defense of national independence, the ministers act as lackeys of the U.S. imperialists. They see that these rulers are cynically betraying the interests of the national economy (industry, trade, agriculture), shamelessly agreeing to the liquidation of the national character of the army — and all on orders from their American masters.

Meanwhile, all honest people are beginning to see that the communists, being internationalists, are fighting for the

restoration of national independence and, on all issues, at the head of all patriots, are defending the interests of their country, which, naturally, does not exclude, on the basis of equality, cooperation with all other nations and a policy of international solidarity.

Many honest people, misled by anti-communist propaganda, believed that the advent to power of the working class would mean some kind of liquidation of the homeland and of all national values and traditions. But the example of the great country of socialism, like the People's Democracies, shows that the victory of the working class leads to national regeneration of the homeland and enables every country to make the maximum contribution to the common treasury of civilization.

For Alliance of Working Class and Middle Strata

Increasingly broader sections of the population are pinning their hopes on the working class. Precisely for this reason it is necessary to reinforce the militant alliance between the working class and the middle strata. Pursuing the old tradition, the common enemies of the working class and of the middle strata seek to disunite them whereas their interests insistently demand unification.

The October Socialist Revolution of 1917 was victorious because the Bolsheviks succeeded in effecting an alliance between the working class and the middle strata, above all, with the peasant masses. ...

Even certain representatives of the big bourgeoisie, whose interests have also been infringed by the policy of the American imperialists, are far from being happy at the loss of national independence. They have been forced to assert that the working class stands in the van of the struggle for the restoration of this independence under the banner of the unification of all the forces of the nation. To unite these forces, an alliance between the working class — fighting for its own unity — and the middle strata is necessary, as always emphasized by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. ... [emphasis added]

The source of the opposition to the anti-national policy which shackles the satellite countries to the chariot of American imperialism is not only the indignant national feelings evoked by foreign domination but also the striving to defend most concrete material interests against the policy of subordination that is being imposed by the American; this opposition also expresses the striving to uphold the traditions of national culture against the intolerable American spiritual and cultural life.

This explains the mood of intellectual circles who with increasing resolution are condemning the American policy pursued by ignorant and illiterate businessmen who know nothing about the ancient culture of our country.... □

'The British Road to Socialism' (1951)

The Petty-Bourgeois Nationalist Program of the British CP

The "British Road to Socialism" was adopted as the program of the British Communist Party by its Executive Committee on January 13, 1951. This program shows how far astray it was possible to go under the general orientation that was being promoted within the international communist movement at that time. This is a program of reformist and petty-bourgeois nationalist "socialism." While it has been updated since, this thoroughly revisionist program is still the basic line of the ultra-revisionist Communist Party of Britain.

The "British Road" argues that the fight for the national independence and sovereignty of Britain is the path leading to socialism. Of course it was correct for the British workers and communists to take part in the worldwide struggle against the U.S. imperialist drive for global hegemony. But this program shows the disastrous consequences of hiding the class struggle under petty-bourgeois nationalist phrases. Under the banner of the fight for national independence, the British Communist Party forgot the class struggle and the revolution, downplayed the fight against their "own" imperialist bourgeoisie, and ended up in the position of defending British imperialism and its world empire from the encroachments of U.S. imperialism.

The "British Road" actually calls for the preservation of the British empire, albeit with rights for the colonies. It argues that trade with the colonies is essential for the British economy. It concludes, therefore, that the colonies should be given independence, but kept connected to Britain. These arguments are, in fact, the classical social-democratic justifications for neo-colonialism.

In speaking of the path to socialism the "British Road" does not call for revolution or the class struggle. Indeed what they discuss is not even a peaceful revolution. There is not even a hint in the program of destroying the bourgeois state and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. Rather it calls for winning a majority in Parliament and, essentially, preserving everything intact. There are to be slight adjustments, yes, but the door is even left open for the preservation of the monarchy.

On the whole, the program glorifies everything that is already in existence and then suggests making it a little bit better. Yet all of this is called a fight for socialism.

While the general orientation in the world communist movement during this period was to hide the issue of socialism under petty-bourgeois nationalist and democratic rhetoric, the "British Road" is filled with talk of socialism. But this changes nothing. It should be remembered that in Britain the Labor Party also had lavish rhetoric about socialism. The British Communist Party could hardly expect to maintain any credibility if it did not also couch its reformism in promises of the socialist future. But there is nothing socialist in the "British Road." Rather it is a program for patching up capitalism and preserving the British empire.

The "British Road" is, in fact, a model of the "peaceful parliamentary road" to socialism which was later condemned in the struggle against Khrushchovite revisionism. But what should also be noted here is that in 1951-52, before the crystallization of Khrushchovite revisionism, the "British Road" was promoted favorably in the journals of the Cominform and of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The program itself was reprinted, without criticism, in the Cominform journal, *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy (FLP,FPD)*.

As well, *FLP,FPD* carried an article in February, 1951 by R. Palme Dutt, then vice-chairman of the British CP, which defended the "British Road." This article, entitled "The Fight for British Independence," directly admitted that, at that time, Britain still had the largest world colonial empire of any country. As well, it states that the whole savage history of British imperialism made the British CP's slogan of fighting for "patriotism" extremely suspect in the British left. From this, however, the article does not conclude that the British communists had to emphasize the struggle against British imperialism, against their "own" imperialism, if they wished to wage any genuine fight against U.S. imperialism. No, instead it concludes that the

problem is that the British workers could not "see" American imperialist domination of Britain and therefore the communists must work to convince them by exposing the "most obvious" manifestations of American domination such as the showing of Hollywood films in Britain.

Besides this article, the "British Road" is extravagantly praised in a theoretical article by A. Sobolev which was published in the Soviet magazine the *Bolshevik* in October, 1951. (The *Bolshevik* was the theoretical organ of the Central Committee of the CPSU. In 1952 its name was changed to the *Communist*.) The article was reprinted in the May 1952 issue of *Political Affairs*, the CPUSA's theoretical journal, which says of it, "Since its first appearance in the *Bolshevik*, October, 1951, this important article has been reprinted and widely discussed in a number of countries." Entitled "People's Democracy as a Form of Political Organization of Society," this article is a theoretical discussion of the development of the people's democracies in Eastern Europe.

The article devotes two pages to the "British Road" and sets it forward as the model for how people's democracy and socialism should be built in the capitalist countries of Western Europe. Speaking of the tasks of the communists in the capitalist countries, the *Bolshevik* article states:

"The tasks of winning independence, securing a democratic development and preserving peace are general national, general democratic tasks. For their successful solution, the communist parties in the capitalist countries intensify the struggle for the masses, they strive to unite the broadest strata of the people in the fight for peace and national independence."

It then goes on to point out:

"In contemporary conditions one of the political forms for rallying and uniting all democratic forces is the regime of people's democracy, which assures a progressive solution for all urgent questions and opens the road to socialism."

"The significance of people's democracy for the solution of basic questions for the development of Britain is disclosed in the program of the British Communist Party, 'The British Road to Socialism.'" (*Political Affairs*, May 1952, p. 23)

The article actually stresses that this means to reject the road of Soviet power. It states:

"Taking account of the experience of the working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe in the struggle for socialism, the British Communist Party draws the conclusion that in the present conditions the establishment of Soviet power is not obligatory for the building of socialism, that there is a different road to socialism, the road of people's democracy, which accords more with the historical conditions of Britain. The program declares outright that Britain's road to socialism is by way of people's democracy."

"The British communists declare," the program reads, "that the people of Britain can transform capitalist democracy into a real people's democracy, transforming Parliament, the product of Britain's historic struggle for democracy, into the democratic instrument of the will of the vast majority of the people...." (*Ibid.*, pp. 23-24)

The article emphasizes that what is being spoken of is not a revolution but the going over to socialism through parliamentary means. The article gives its approval to the thesis in the "British Road" that "in the struggle against the arbitrary power of the capitalists the working class can win a parliamentary majority and on this basis establish a people's government." (*Ibid.*, p. 24)

Besides these explicit endorsements of the "British Road" in the Cominform and Soviet literature, it should also be noted that the key elements underlying this program were spelled out earlier by the Cominform in its 1949 meeting. At this meeting the setting up of patriotic governments of national independence and peace was put forward as the goal of the communist parties in the western capitalist countries. The Cominform resolution stressed:

"Unity of the working class movement and the rallying of all democratic forces is necessary not only for the solution of the day-to-day and current tasks of the working class and the mass of the working people, but also for the solution of the basic questions which confront the proletariat as a class which is leading the struggle for the elimination of the power of monopoly capital, for the socialist reconstruction of society."

"On the basis of the successes achieved in securing unity of the working class movement and rallying all the democratic forces, it will become possible to develop the struggle in capitalist countries for the setting up of governments which will rally all the patriotic forces opposed to the enslavement of their countries by American imperialism, will adopt the policy of stable peace among peoples, will stop the armaments race and will raise the standard of living of the working masses." ("II. Working Class Unity and the Tasks of the Communist and Workers' Parties," p. 21)

Without mentioning revolutionary struggle, the Cominform statement suggests that the unity of the working class movement and the democratic forces will make it possible to set up governments "which will rally all the patriotic forces opposed to the enslavement of their countries by American imperialism," and that this presumably is the path toward "the elimination of the power of monopoly capital, for the socialist reconstruction of society." But what does this mean? The "British Road" is one of the concrete applications of this policy and shows the fruits of its nonrevolutionary approach. The fact that similar "roads to socialism" were followed in France, Italy and other countries only brings this truth home more forcefully. □

The British Road to Socialism (1951)

Below we reprint extracts from "The British Road to Socialism" which was adopted as the program of the British Communist Party by its Executive Committee on January 13, 1951. The text has been taken from the February 2, 1951 issue of the Cominform's journal For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy.

Peace and Friendship With All Peoples

The Communist Party fights for lasting peace as the vital need of the British people. ...

A lasting peace is the vital need for all peoples and a main aim of communist policy.

It is an aim which can and should unite the people of Britain, whatever religious or political views they hold. Their united action can be decisive for the preservation of peace. That is why all organizations and individuals who really want peace are working to develop a mass movement for peace. ...

A free, strong and independent Britain is essential for the preservation of the peace of the world. The national interests of Britain, as well as the very future of the British people, demand that Britain break, once and for all, with the American policy of aggression and world conquest. To follow that policy can only end in national disaster for Britain.

Britain should associate its efforts with the socialist Soviet Union, People's China, India and all peace-loving countries to promote peace and international cooperation, restore cooperation between the Great Powers, strengthen the United Nations as the bastion of peace, and prevent it from being used as an instrument of war. ...

National Independence of the British People and of All Peoples of the British Empire

The Communist Party fights for the national independence and the true national interests of the British people and of all the peoples of the British Empire.

The subjection of Britain to American imperialism is a betrayal of the British people in the interests of big business and of those who are planning a new world war. In the economic sphere, Britain has been turned into a satellite of America, with an American monopolist placed in supreme command of Britain's industry, and American economic controllers and supervisors established in London

and reporting to Washington. American big business controls our financial policy, imposes trade restrictions and bans, openly dictates policy, as in the case of devaluation, and is extending the network of American financial penetration and control over British industry. In the military sphere, Britain has been turned into an American base, and the American army of occupation is growing. The new arms program was decided on American instructions, and under the Atlantic Pact, Britain's armed forces have been placed under an American Supreme Commander. The British Empire, similarly, has been subjected to increasing American financial and military penetration.

For the first time in its history, our country has lost its independence and freedom of action in its foreign, economic and military policy to a foreign power — the United States of America.

The Labor Government and its advisers dare take no major step without American permission, and the leaders of the Tory and Labor Parties compete with one another in servility to the Americans. The leaders of the Labor and Tory Parties have become spokesmen of a foreign power.

Concerned only to defend capitalism and profit, the Labor leaders and the Tories openly betray Britain's national interests. Such differences as they allow themselves with America are those of the bankrupt junior partner striving to retain what it can in face of American pressure.

The restoration of British national independence, which has been given away by the leaders of the Tory, Liberal and Labor Parties, is the indispensable condition for Britain's recovery and political, economic and social advance.

The Communist Party declares that the leaders of the Tory, Liberal and Labor Parties and their spokesmen in the press, and on the BBC are betraying the interests of Britain to dollar imperialism. Our call is for the unity of all true patriots to defend British national interests and independence.

We stand for a Britain, free, strong and independent. We want our country to be subordinate and subservient to no foreign power, but to stand in friendly association and equal alliance with all powers that recognize and respect Britain's national interests.

The Communist Party would break with the policy of sell-out to America. It would restore to the British Parliament its exclusive sovereign right to control the country's financial, economic and military policy, close the country to foreign and capitalist penetration and restore the command of the British armed forces to British commanders.

To restore control of its own affairs to Britain, so that Britain's power could be used on the basis of an independ-

ent foreign policy, would be a great contribution towards the preservation of world peace.

The Communist Party therefore rejects all theories which declare national sovereignty to be out of date and thus seek to justify enslavement to American imperialism or aggression against other nations. Real international cooperation can only be based on the sovereign freedom and equal rights of all nations, great and small. Because of this, the cause of Britain's national independence is bound up with ensuring that all nations in the present Empire also enjoy full national rights and independence.

Within the British Isles, the enforced partition of Ireland and the maintenance of British troops in Northern Ireland must be ended, to enable Irish national unity to be realized. There must be full recognition of the national claims of the Scottish and Welsh peoples, to be settled according to the wishes of these peoples.

Above all, the Communist Party would solve the question of the relations of Britain with the countries of the British Empire.

The enemies of communism declare that the Communist Party, by *underhand subversive means*, is aiming at the destruction of Britain and the British Empire. But this is a lie; it is precisely the Tories and the Labor leaders who are doing this by their policy of armed repression and colonial exploitation. British colonial policy and armed repression have resulted in the undying resistance and hostility of the people of Malaya, Africa, and Egypt towards Britain.

In fighting to impose Syngman Rhee on the Korean people and in supporting reactionary puppets in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, it has earned the hatred of the people of Asia, and thus placed our country at loggerheads with the majority of mankind.

The colonial policy of the Tory and Labor leaders is not only a crime against the colonial peoples, it is draining away our manpower in endless colonial wars, and has cost, and will continue to cost, hundreds of millions of pounds. It has disrupted the production of food and raw materials. It can only weaken Britain still further. The colonial peoples struggling for national liberation can never be subdued.

The Communist Party would put an end to the present abnormal relations of colonial war and repression between the British people and the peoples of the Empire by establishing durable friendship with them on the basis of equal rights. This act of historical justice would help to wipe out the bitterness of the past and would enormously strengthen Britain on a new democratic basis.

All relations between the peoples of the present Empire which are based on political, economic and military enslavement must be ended, and replaced by relations based on *full national independence and equal rights*. This requires the withdrawal of all armed forces from the colonial and dependent territories and handing over of sovereignty to governments freely chosen by the peoples.

Only by this means can Britain be assured of the normal supplies of the vital food and raw materials necessary for her economic life, obtaining them in equal exchange for the

products of British industry, needed by those countries for their own economic development.

This would provide the basis for a new, close, fraternal association of the British people and the liberated peoples of the Empire. Only on this basis can true friendship be established between the peoples of the present Empire to promote mutually beneficial economic exchange and cooperation, and to defend, in common, their freedom against American imperialist aggression.

People's Democracy — the Path to Socialism

Only by the establishment of socialism can Britain's problems be finally solved and its people guaranteed a good life, lasting peace and steadily rising living standards. ...

The working people of Britain in industry and agriculture form the immense majority of the population and constitute with their families fully two-thirds of the population. To these must be added the great bulk of the clerical and professional workers, the teachers, technicians and scientists, *the working farmers, shopkeepers and small businessmen*, whose interests are equally threatened by the big landowning industrial and financial capitalists and whose security and future prospects are closely bound up with those of the industrial working class.

Together, these represent a mighty political force, fully capable of defeating the present exploiters and rulers of the British people and returning a majority to Parliament which represents the interests of all working people, and a government determined to carry through, with the active political and industrial backing of the people, a policy that will open out a new and glorious future for Britain. ...

The enemies of communism accuse the Communist Party of aiming to introduce Soviet power in Britain and abolish Parliament. This is a slanderous misrepresentation of our policy. Experience has shown that in present conditions the advance to socialism can be made just as well by a different road. For example, through people's democracy without establishing Soviet power, as in the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe.

Britain will reach socialism by her own road. Just as the Russian people realized political power by the Soviet road which was dictated by their historical conditions and background of Tsarist rule, and the working people in the People's Democracies and China won political power in their own way in their historical conditions, so the British communists declare that the people of Britain can transform capitalist democracy into a real people's democracy, transforming Parliament, the product of Britain's historic struggle for democracy into the democratic instrument of the will of the vast majority of her people.

The path forward for the British people will be to establish a People's Government on the basis of a Parliament truly representative of the people.

Such a People's Government would: —

Break the power of the millionaire monopolists and

other big capitalists by socialist nationalization of large-scale industry, the banks, big distributive monopolies, insurance companies and the land of the large landowners, and introduce a government monopoly of foreign trade.

Introduce a planned economy based on socialist principles aimed at fundamental social change.

Transform the existing unequal imperialist Empire into a strong, free, equal association of peoples by granting national independence to the colonies.

Make Britain strong, free and independent with a foreign policy of peace.

Break the political hold of the capitalist class by democratic electoral reform, democratic ownership of the press, the people's control of the BBC and the democratic transformation of the Civil Service, Foreign Office, Armed Forces and Police, the Law Courts and the administration of justice. ...

...working class unity, the united action of all sections of the working class movement — labor, trade union, cooperative and communist — is the vital need. Only by united action between all sections of the labor movement can the working class rally all its forces and all its allies for decisive action to win a Parliamentary majority and form a People's Government. ...

The electoral system would be democratically reformed with proportional representation and votes at eighteen, and the House of Commons would be made the sole national authority, freed from the restrictive influences of the House of Lords and the Monarchy.

Men and women who are determined and loyal advocates of the people's power will replace those who uphold the old system in all positions of authority in the Civil Service, the Armed Forces, the Judiciary and the Diplomatic Service. ...

It would be wrong to believe that the big capitalists will voluntarily give up their property and their big profits in the interests of the British people. It would be more correct to expect them to offer an active resistance to the decisions of the People's Government, and to fight for the retention of their privileges by all means in their power, including force.

Therefore, the British people and the People's Government should be ready decisively to rebuff such attempts.

The power of the working people, uniting all sections who recognize the need for social change and participate in carrying it through, as expressed and laid down through the elected Parliament, is alone capable of securing peace, high wages for working people, raw materials for British industry and markets for British goods, and creating the conditions for the establishment of socialism in Britain. ... □

People's Democracy as a Form of Political Organization of Society

— by A. Sobolev

Below we reprint a passage from the article "People's Democracy as a Form of Political Organization of Society" by the Soviet author A. Sobolev. This extract is the section of the article which discusses the problems of the paths to socialism in the capitalist countries, endorsing as a model the reformist "British Road to Socialism."

This article first appeared in the October, 1951 issue of the Bolshevik, the theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. It was reprinted in the May, 1952 issue of the CPUSA's journal Political Affairs, which noted that "Since its first appearance in the Bolshevik...this important article has been reprinted and widely discussed in a number of countries."

The passages cited in our report on the "British Road to Socialism" have been highlighted by the WA.

Lenin and Stalin proved that capitalism has long since become overripe, that it has played out its historical role. The transition from capitalism to socialism, while identical in its content in all countries, is effected in each country in its own way, depending on the concrete historical condi-

tions. Lenin emphasized that owing to the existence of national and state differences between various countries and peoples, it is necessary to the emancipation struggle of the working class in different countries to take account of the specific national features in different countries. The leaders of the international labor movement insist that full account must be taken of the concrete conditions, of the specific historical situation, they vigorously object to stereotypes and dogmatism in the solution of political questions, they call for exercising maximum flexibility in tactics and for utilizing in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class and all toilers all old and new forms of public activity.

It is especially important to find the forms of the transition or approach to socialism in conformity with the historical conditions.

At present, the emancipation struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries is developing in the conditions of the economic and political expansion of the American imperialists, of national betrayal by the ruling classes, of the ever mounting threat that these countries would be forcibly drawn into an aggressive war against the camp of

peace, democracy and socialism. In this situation, the communist parties in the capitalist countries consider as an urgent task the struggle against American expansion, against the aggressive policies of the imperialists, for national freedom and independence, for world peace and security.

This struggle is closely interwoven with the general democratic movement of the laboring masses against reaction, for the maintenance and extension of democratic liberties, for broad social reforms. The expansionism of the United States, the preparations for an aggressive war, the attacks on the democratic rights and liberties, the fascization of the political life — all of these are links in a single chain. Obviously, it is impossible to liquidate national enslavement, the subjection of the Marshallized countries to American imperialism, to uphold their independence, to preserve peace and block the road to fascism, without dealing decisive and successive blows to the internal enemies — the monopolists and landlords, who inspire the most reactionary internal and external policies.

The tasks of winning independence, securing a democratic development and preserving peace are general national, general democratic tasks. For their successful solution, the communist parties in the capitalist countries intensify the struggle for the masses, they strive to unite the broadest strata of the people in the fight for peace and national independence.

In contemporary conditions one of the political forms for rallying and uniting all democratic forces is the regime of people's democracy, which assures a progressive solution for all urgent questions and opens the road to socialism.

The significance of people's democracy for the solution of basic questions for the development of Britain is disclosed in the program of the British Communist Party, "The British Road to Socialism." The basic question of the program is that of the building of socialism, of the paths, forms and methods for the transformation of Britain on a socialist basis. The program subjects to sharp criticism the so-called "democratic socialism" of the Labor Party leaders, denounces the traitorous role of the Labor government in relation to the working class and the subservience of the right Laborites to the bourgeoisie. Life has demonstrated that the chatter of democracy and socialism by the Laborite leaders has in reality proved to be a fraud and deception, that the right Laborites have nothing in common with socialism or the interests of the working people.

Exposing the reactionary character of the domestic and foreign policies of the Laborite henchmen of the bourgeoisie, the program of the British Communist Party shows that only the transition to socialism can assure a radical, truly progressive solution of the urgent social, economic and political problems of the country. Stressing the historical inevitability and vital necessity of the socialist development of Britain, the Party declares that the decisive political question in the struggle for socialism is the question of power. "The people cannot advance to socialism," the program states, "without real political power, which must be

taken from the hands of the capitalist minority and firmly grasped by the majority of the people, led by the working class."

After showing that socialism alone can lead Britain to prosperity, can save it from oppression by the United States and lead it out of the war camp, can secure the free fraternal association of the peoples of the British empire, the program at the same time defines the path for the socialist development of Britain. Taking account of the experience of the working class in the countries of central and southeastern Europe in the struggle for socialism, the British Communist Party draws the conclusion that in the present conditions the establishment of Soviet power is not obligatory for the building of socialism, that there is a different road to socialism, the road of people's democracy, which accords more with the historical conditions of Britain. The program declares outright that Britain's road to socialism is by way of people's democracy.

"The British communists declare," the program reads, "that the people of Britain can transform capitalist democracy into a real people's democracy, transforming Parliament, the product of Britain's historic struggle for democracy, into the democratic instrument of the will of the vast majority of her people...."

As the program points out, the victory of people's democracy will mean the transfer of power from the hands of a tiny section of monopolists into the hands of the immense majority of the people, led by the working class. The establishment of people's democracy will make it possible to end the power of the monopolists by means of socialist nationalization of large-scale industry, the banks, and large landed property; it will make it possible to create a strong, free and independent Britain, to secure peace, liquidate the imperialist oppression of the colonies, transform the present Empire into a free association of peoples with equal rights, destroy the political power of the capitalist class and effect fundamental changes in the structure of the state.

The program states that in the struggle against the arbitrary power of the capitalists the working class can win a parliamentary majority and on this basis establish a people's government. Once the people's government is in power, fundamental change would be effected in the structure of the state, aimed at the democratic transformation of the state institutions, at transforming them to conform to the interests of the people. Parliament is retained but will be transformed, and in this changed form will be part of the state structure of people's democracy.

A basic condition for the establishment of a people's democracy is the formation of a broad coalition of the laboring people under the leadership of the working class. The program declares:

"The essential condition for establishing such a people's power is the building up of a broad coalition or popular alliance of all sections of the working people; of the organized working class, of all workers by hand and brain, of professional people and technicians, of all lower and middle sections in the towns, and of the farmers in the country-

side."

The need of building a broad popular coalition is referred to in a number of documents of the communist parties of France and Italy. Our policy, Togliatti declared, "stemmed from the conviction of the necessity of a profound transformation of the economic and political structure of our country, and it proclaimed at the same time the need of accomplishing this transformation by means of the broad collaboration of various social groups, ideological currents and parties."

The establishment of a regime of people's democracy is

possible as a result of the victory of a broad democratic front of all laboring people under the leadership of the working class. Such leadership insures the carrying out of fundamental reforms in the sphere of industry and agriculture, the shifting of power into the hands of the people and its functioning effectively, and national freedom and independence. Enhancement of the leading role of the working class presupposes the strengthening of its unity, and this is possible only on the basis of a consistent struggle against the right socialists, who split the working class and thus weaken it. ... □

The CPUSA's Liberal-Labor Approach to the Critique of Browder

An important question in the assessment of the post-war policy of the international communist movement is the struggle against Browderite revisionism.

Earl Browder was the principal leader of the Communist Party of the USA from the 1930's through 1945. Beginning in the mid-1930's Browder was instrumental in step by step eliminating the revolutionary and independent character of the CPUSA and hitching it to the tail of the capitalists. Browder's revisionism reached its zenith in 1944 when he liquidated the CP entirely. Within a year, however, Browder was criticized, the CP was reconstituted, and in February 1946 Browder was expelled.

Today it is commonly accepted that Browderism was the forerunner of Khrushchovite revisionism. Comrades are familiar with a few of the criticisms leveled against Browder in the 1944-45 period such as: his embellishment of the U.S. as a young, vigorous capitalism free of the classic features of capitalism such as economic crisis; his support for U.S. imperialist expansionism; his renunciation of the class struggle in favor of collaboration between labor and capital; his liquidation of the communist party; and so forth. It is also known that our Party has stressed that the CPUSA failed to thoroughly repudiate Browderism and for that reason fell easy prey to Khrushchovite revisionism.

But in light of the Central Committee's discoveries about the wrong policies that were followed in the international communist movement after World War II, it is necessary to look once again at the struggle against Browderism to ascertain from precisely what standpoint Browder was criticized and exactly what policy was advocated against the Browderite theses.

For this purpose the Central Committee has reproduced a pamphlet entitled *Marxism-Leninism Vs. Revisionism*, published by the CPUSA in February 1946.* This pamphlet contains the major documents of criticism of Browder by leaders of the CPUSA and by Jacques Duclos, then one of the Secretaries of the Communist Party of France. Study of this pamphlet reveals that the criticism of Browder did not

stem from sound Marxist-Leninist foundations. Rather, Browder was denounced only for his most outlandish rightist assertions, while his basic liberal-labor approach was left untouched; indeed, it was promoted. This report can only touch on a few of the most outstanding features of the criticism which show the extreme weakness of the struggle against Browderism of that time.

The Revolutionary Perspective Is Lost Sight Of

To begin with it is necessary to emphasize what is not said in the documents. Nowhere in any of the documents, including the Duclos letter, is there the slightest mention of the necessity to organize the working class for revolution. Talk of revolutionary organization, revolutionary struggle, or the revolutionary movement has been completely banished. One can find statements about social progress, socialist reorganization of society, social evolution, even the elimination of exploitation of man by man. But nowhere will you find the word revolution, nor will you find the presentation of a revolutionary perspective.

Now let us deal with Foster's criticism.† At the end of the report we will return to the Duclos criticism and we will see that it is basically the same. It is important to note that Browder is criticized by Foster in a few places for giving up the class struggle. But the conception of the class struggle

*All page numbers cited in this article are from this pamphlet. However, the pamphlet itself is not reproduced in this paper. It is available on request at cost. Note that the contents of this pamphlet were also published in another pamphlet by the CPUSA in January 1946 under the title "On the Struggle Against Revisionism."

†William Z. Foster was a working class fighter from before the First World War who joined the CPUSA in 1921. He was a major figure in the Party from those days until his death in 1961. He was a major figure in the fight against Browder in 1944-45 and in the reconstitution of the CPUSA.

presented in these documents is completely distorted and hemmed in. It means, at most, the struggle against only the biggest of the monopolies and then only to force them to abide by the Rooseveltian coalition and to pressure them into doing good things (ending fascism, achieving durable peace, reconstructing the U.S. economy, raising wages, etc.). But this will be gone into further later in this report. What should be emphasized here is that Foster actually agrees with Browder's condemnation of the policy of "class against class." On page 78 we find Foster criticizing "'Left' sectarian voices in our Party" for "generally adopt[ing] a class-against-class policy." This renunciation of the class struggle is further evidence of the non-revolutionary perspective to the criticism of Browderism.

It should be noted here, in passing, that Foster did not want the criticism of Browder to go too far, as is indicated by the above criticism of "'Left' sectarian voices in the party." Foster argued that the Party's line was basically correct as late as May, 1942 when Browder got out of jail in Atlanta. (See page 42) Further, although the repudiation of Browderism had hardly started, at the convention to reconstitute the Party Foster began to emphasize the struggle against "a sharp growth of 'Left' sectarianism...of which there are already manifestations" and to warn against "the mistake of over-correction." (p. 70) Thus Foster tried to narrow down the struggle against Browderism and quickly turn the struggle against the left.

The Fundamental Criticism of Browder

The fundamental criticism of Browder is that he believed that the domestic and international war-time alliances could be maintained after the war **without** struggle, whereas Foster held that struggle was essential to **maintaining** these alliances.

Browder advances his "new course" of class collaboration under the signboard of carrying out the Teheran conference decisions of the Soviet Union, the U.S. and Britain. Foster agrees that the Teheran decisions must form the basis for the CPUSA policy, but he argues that the decisions can only be carried out through struggle. On page ten Foster gives his description of the Teheran objectives:

"Among the major objectives established by the Teheran decisions are (a) the development of all-out coalition warfare for complete victory over the enemy; (b) an orientation toward an eventual democratic world organization of peoples to maintain international peace and order; (c) an implied unfolding of an elementary economic program with which to meet the terrific problems of postwar reconstruction." (Foster, Letter to the National Committee, January 20, 1944)

On page 12, Foster presents his chief criticism of Browder:

"All of which means that the **bulk** of monopoly capital

cannot be relied upon either to cooperate loyally, or to lead in a progressive application of the Teheran decisions. **It will yield in this direction only under democratic mass pressure.** Instead, our reliance must be upon the great democratic people, the real backbone of national unity, now organized in the main in and around the Rooseveltian camp. **The basic flaw** in Comrade Browder's report was that he failed to make clear this elementary situation, but instead tended to create illusions to the effect that these antagonistic forces, the bulk of big capital and the democratic sections of the nation, now locked together in one of the sharpest class battles in American history [this is Foster's astonishing description of the 1944 elections — ed.], can and should work harmoniously together both now and during the postwar period." (*Ibid.*, emphasis added)

This same theme runs throughout the writing of Foster and the other leaders of the CPUSA. Here, the report will give only two other quotes from later Foster statements on the same theme.

"In fact, his book, *Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace*, is an attempt to prove that the epoch of imperialism has passed and that we are now in a period of **inevitable** friendly collaboration between the capitalist and socialist sectors of the world; **a collaboration, which Browder would not base upon the strength of the USSR, the colonial countries, the new war-born democracies, and the labor movement of the world (as it must be if it is to exist)**, but upon the good will of the great capitalists, particularly the Americans, whose 'enlightenment,' 'high moral sense' and 'true class interests' will dictate to them this collaborationist course." (Foster, Report to the National Committee of the Communist Political Association, June 18-20, 1945, pp. 41-42, emphasis added)

"Browder believes that under the leadership of his 'enlightened' American monopolists, the imperialist ruling classes in this and other capitalist countries will peacefully and spontaneously compose their differences with each other, with the USSR, with the liberated countries of Europe, and with the colonial and semi-colonial countries, **without mass struggle.**" (Foster, Report to the Special Convention of the CPA, July 26-28, 1945 which reconstituted the CPUSA, p. 66, emphasis added)

Everyone Is for "National Unity"

The domestic side of maintaining the wartime alliances is the program of "national unity." This includes all of the slogans of the time, the defense of the "national interest," "patriotism," "championing the nation," etc., even though everyone admits that the U.S. has become the number one imperialist power in the world. Foster agrees with Browder on the necessity for the program of "national unity," but claims to disagree that the biggest monopolies

should be included in it. On page eight Foster gives his idea of "national unity":

"The enforcement of the Teheran decisions, both in their national and international aspects, demands the broadest possible national unity, and in this national unity there must be workers, farmers, professionals, small businessmen and all of the capitalist elements who will loyally support the program. But to assume that such capitalists, even if we include the Willkie [although he was Republican candidate for president in the 1944 elections, he was a liberal — ed.] supporters, constitute the decisive sections of finance capital, or can be extended to include them, is to harbor a dangerous illusion." (Foster, Letter to National Committee of the CPUSA, January 1944)

And on page 10 Foster declares:

"In this respect American monopoly capital has indeed given anything but a patriotic lead thus far or a convincing promise for the future. **The patriotic lead, on the contrary, has come and will continue to come from the national unity elements grouped mainly around the Roosevelt forces.** So far as the bulk of finance capital is concerned.... A real victory policy, as laid down at Teheran, can be achieved only in opposition to these elements, certainly not in easy collaboration with them, and above all, not under their leadership." (*Ibid.*, emphasis added)

This is Foster's criticism. Browder wants national unity of everyone while Foster claims to not want to include the "bulk of finance capital."

The Hoax of Opposition to the Monopolies

But Foster's call for "national unity" without the monopolies is predicated on the ridiculous hoax that Roosevelt is *not also a representative of finance capital*. Foster argues at length that the Roosevelt government is not only not based on the monopolies, but is at odds with them. In a striking passage dealing with the upcoming 1944 elections, Foster argues:

"Nevertheless, monopoly capital has found an obstacle in the Roosevelt Administration. This Administration is, in fact, if not formally, a coalition among the workers, middle class elements, and the more liberal sections of the bourgeoisie (with the special situation in the Democratic South). The big monopolists, after the first few emergency months of 1933, have in overwhelming majority come to hate the Roosevelt administration bitterly. They especially attack the domestic angles of his policies. What backing Roosevelt had from finance capital at the start has mostly leaked away from him. ...

"The substance of the present election struggle, therefore, is an attempt of monopoly capital to break up the

Roosevelt liberal-labor combination." (*Ibid.*, p. 13)

And Foster concludes, "We must go all-out for a continuation of the Roosevelt policies, as the only way to support effectively the Teheran decisions, both in their national and international implications. We must tell the people precisely who the enemy is that they are fighting — organized big capital — and mobilize our every resource to help make their fight succeed." (*Ibid.*, p. 14)

Foster has built up a whole case that Browder is against the class struggle because he promoted the National Association of Manufacturers and said he would shake the hand of J.P. Morgan. But then Foster creates the outrageous illusion that the Roosevelt government is not the instrument of monopoly capital, but instead a fighter against it. Foster's entire criticism boils down to this — Browder is not good because he supports the Republican Party monopoly capitalists while Foster only supports the Democratic Party *monopoly capitalists*.

The Duclos Article

But what was the international criticism of Browder? The famous Duclos article gives some idea of the nature of the criticism.†

The Duclos article quotes a lot from Browder, but explains very little. While giving a large number of quotes, most of which Duclos is presumably against, it makes virtually no comment until a brief summation at the end. The article also describes Foster's actions, and although showing some irritation that Foster did not oppose the liquidation of the Party, it seems to support Foster. But again, there are no definite comments so one cannot be sure precisely what is supported and what is not.

Nevertheless, from the little that Duclos himself actually says one can see that his chief criticism of Browder is basically along the same lines as Foster's.

Like Foster, Duclos criticizes Browder for wanting to ally with the *monopoly capitalists without any struggle*. On page 26 Duclos states:

"The fact that capitalism has learned to live in peace and in alliance with socialism is far from meaning that American monopoly capitalism has become progressive and that it can henceforth be **unreservedly** included in national unity in the struggle for the realization of the Teheran conference decisions." (emphasis added)

Like Foster, Duclos argues for national unity, but without

†Jacques Duclos was a secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of France. In the April 1945 issue of *Cahiers du Communisme*, theoretical organ of the FCP, Duclos wrote an article "On the Dissolution of the CPUSA." This article criticized Browder and the dissolution of the CPUSA. This article carried a lot of weight in the American party because of the prestige of the FCP in the world communist movement and it was a major document in the hands of Foster and others who waged the struggle to reconstitute the CPUSA.

the monopoly capitalists. On page 34 we find:

"We too, in France, are resolute partisans of national unity, and we show that in our daily activity, but our anxiety for unity does not make us lose sight for a single moment of the necessity of arraying ourselves against the men of the trusts."

And like Foster, Duclos defines monopoly capital only as those who are not in the Rooseveltian coalition and portrays the Roosevelt government as being against the trusts. To do this Duclos favorably quotes Henry Wallace, who was in the Roosevelt Cabinet in the 1930's, was Roosevelt's vice-president from 1940-44, and who was Roosevelt's Secretary of Commerce at the time the letter was written. Duclos declares on page 34:

"In the United States the omnipotent trusts have been the object of violent criticism. It is known, for instance, that the former vice-president of the United States, Henry Wal-

lace, has denounced their evil doings and their anti-national policy."

And again on page 35 we find:

"The former Vice-President of the U.S., Henry Wallace, present Secretary of Commerce, said rightly that one cannot fight fascism abroad and tolerate at home the activity of powerful groups which intend to make peace 'with a simple breathing spell between the death of an old tyranny and the birth of a new.'"

Thus the Duclos criticism of Browder is no better than that of Foster and the other leaders of the CPUSA. The criticism boils down to, in Duclos' words:

"It is clear that American Communists were right in supporting the candidacy of President Roosevelt in the last elections, but it was not at all necessary for this to dissolve the Communist Party." (pp. 34-35)

On the Dissolution of the CPUSA

—by Jacques Duclos

Below we reprint excerpts from the famous Duclos article which originally appeared in the April 1945 issue of Cahiers du Communisme, theoretical organ of the Communist Party of France. It has been taken from the pamphlet Marxism-Leninism vs. Revisionism published by the CPUSA in 1946.

Many readers of *Cahiers du Communisme* have asked us for clarification on the dissolution of the Communist Party of the USA and the creation of the Communist Political Association.

We have received some information on this very important political event, and thus we can in full freedom give our opinion on the political considerations which were advanced to justify the dissolution of the Communist Party.

The reasons for dissolution of the Communist Party in the USA and for the "new course" in the activity of American communists are set forth in official documents of the Party and in a certain number of speeches of its former secretary, Earl Browder.

[Duclos proceeds to quote extensively from Browder's writings but without giving his views. — WA]

The new political course outlined by Browder found but few adversaries among the leading militants of the CPUSA. At the enlarged session of the political bureau of the Party, those who spoke up violently against Browder were William Foster, president of the CPUSA, and Darcy, member of the Central Committee and secretary of the Eastern Pennsylvania district.

Foster expounded his differences with Browder in two

documents — in a letter to the National Committee of the CPUSA and in his introductory speech to the extraordinary session of the National Committee, February 8, 1944.

In these two documents, Foster criticizes Browder's theoretical theses regarding the change in the character of monopoly capital in the USA, the perspectives of postwar economic development as well as Browder's position on the question of the presidential elections.

In his February 8 speech Foster also attacks those who, on the basis of Browder's theses, suggested that strikes be renounced in the postwar period.

But in neither one of these documents did Foster openly take a stand against the dissolution of the Communist Party.

[Duclos then quotes from Foster's documents criticizing Browder's positions. — WA]

Without analyzing in detail Browder's full position on the dissolution of the CPUSA and creation of the Communist Political Association, and without making a developed critique of this position, one can nevertheless deduce from it the following conclusions:

1. The course applied under Browder's leadership ended in practice in liquidation of the independent political party of the working class in the U.S.

2. Despite declarations regarding recognition of the principles of Marxism, one is witnessing a notorious revision of Marxism on the part of Browder and his supporters, a revision which is expressed in the concept of a long-term class peace in the United States, of the possibility of the suppression of the class struggle in the postwar period and of estab-

lishment of harmony between labor and capital.

3. By transforming the Teheran declaration of the Allied governments, which is a document of a diplomatic character, into a political platform of class peace in the United States in the postwar period, the American communists are *deforming in a radical way the meaning of the Teheran declaration* and are sowing dangerous opportunist illusions which will exercise a negative influence on the American labor movement if they are not met with the necessary reply.

4. According to what is known up to now, the communist parties of most countries have not approved Browder's position and several communist parties (for example that of the Union of South Africa and that of Australia) have come out openly against this position, while the communist parties of several South American countries (Cuba, Colombia) regarded the position of the American communists as correct and in general followed the same path.

Such are the facts. Such are the elements of understanding which permit passing judgment on the dissolution of the American Communist Party. French communists will not fail to examine in the light of Marxist-Leninist critique the arguments developed to justify the dissolution of the American Communist Party. One can be sure that, like the communists of the Union of South Africa and of Australia, the French communists will not approve the policy followed by Browder for it has swerved dangerously from the victorious Marxist-Leninist doctrine whose rigorously scientific application could lead to but one conclusion, not to dissolve the American Communist Party but to work to strengthen it under the banner of stubborn struggle to defeat Hitler Germany and destroy everywhere the extensions of fascism.

The fact that all the members of the Communist Party of the United States did not sign up automatically in the Communist Political Association shows that the dissolution of the Party provoked anxieties, perfectly legitimate.

In the United States the omnipotent trusts have been the object of violent criticism. It is known, for instance, that the former Vice-President of the United States, Henry Wallace, has denounced their evil doings and their anti-national policy.

We too, in France, are resolute partisans of national unity, and we show that in our daily activity, but our anxiety for unity does not make us lose sight for a single moment of the necessity of arraying ourselves against the men of the trusts.

Furthermore, one can observe a certain confusion in Browder's declarations regarding the problem of nationalization of monopolies and what he calls the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Nationalization of monopolies actually in no sense constitutes a socialist achievement, contrary to what certain people would be inclined to believe. No, in nationalization it is simply a matter of reforms of a democratic character, achievement of socialism being impossible to imagine without preliminary conquest of power.

Everyone understands that the communists of the United States want to work to achieve unity in their country. But it

is less understandable that they envisage the solution of the problem of national unity with the good will of the men of the trusts, and under quasi-idyllic conditions, as if the capitalist regime had been able to change its nature by some unknown miracle.

In truth, nothing justifies the dissolution of the American Communist Party, in our opinion. Browder's analysis of capitalism in the United States is not distinguished by a judicious application of Marxism-Leninism. The predictions regarding a sort of disappearance of class contradictions in the U.S. correspond in no wise to a Marxist-Leninist understanding of the situation.

As to the argument consisting of a justification of the Party's dissolution by the necessity of not taking direct part in the presidential elections, this does not withstand a serious examination. Nothing prevents a communist party from adapting its electoral tactics to the requirements of a given political situation. It is clear that American communists were right in supporting the candidacy of President Roosevelt in the last elections, but it was not at all necessary for this to dissolve the Communist Party.

It is beyond doubt that if, instead of dissolving the Communist Party of the United States all had been done to intensify its activity in the sense of developing an ardent national and anti-fascist policy, it could very greatly have consolidated its position and considerably extended its political influence. On the contrary, formation of the Communist Political Association could not but trouble the minds and obscure the perspectives in the eyes of the working masses.

In France, under cover of Resistance unity, certain suggestions for the liquidation of the Party have been circulated, with more or less discretion, during the last months, but none among us has ever thought of taking such suggestions seriously. It is not by liquidating the Party that we would have served national unity. On the contrary we are serving it by strengthening our Party. And as far as the American communists are concerned, it is clear that their desire to serve the unity of their country and the cause of human progress places before them tasks which presuppose the existence of a powerful communist party.

After the Teheran decisions came the Yalta decisions which expressed the will of the Big Three to liquidate fascism in Germany and to help the liberated peoples to liquidate the remnants of fascism in the different countries.

It is scarcely necessary to recall that the material bases for fascism reside in the trusts, and the great objective of this war, the annihilation of fascism, can only be obtained to the extent in which the forces of democracy and progress do not shut their eyes to the economic and political circumstances which engender fascism.

The American communists have an especially important role to play in the struggle taking place between the progressive forces of the earth and fascist barbarism.

Without any doubt they would have been in a better position to play this role in the interests of their country and human progress if, instead of proceeding to dissolve their Party, they had done everything to strengthen it and make of it

one of the elements of the assembling of the broad democratic masses of the United States for the final crushing of fascism, that shame of the 20th century. It would be useless to hide the fact that fascism has more or less concealed sympathizers in the U.S., as it has in France and other countries.

The former Vice-President of the U.S., Henry Wallace, present Secretary of Commerce, said rightly that one cannot fight fascism abroad and tolerate at home the activity of powerful groups which intend to make peace "with a simple breathing spell between the death of an old tyranny and the

birth of a new."

The Yalta decisions thwart these plans, but the enemies of liberty will not disarm of their free will. They will only retreat before the acting coalition of all the forces of democracy and progress.

And it is clear that if Comrade Earl Browder had seen, as a Marxist-Leninist, this important aspect of the problems facing liberty-loving peoples in this moment in their history, he would have arrived at a conclusion quite other than the dissolution of the Communist Party of the United States. □

Resolution of the 2nd Congress of the MLP, USA

Against Trotskyism

We reprint below the Resolution of the Second Congress of the MLP against Trotskyism. This resolution was already published with the bulk of the Second Congress resolutions in the January 1, 1984 issue of *The Workers' Advocate*. We are reprinting it again in this issue for several reasons.

This resolution briefly explains the nature of Trotskyism, exploring both the historical opportunist role of Leon Trotsky and the main features of contemporary Trotskyism. It underscores that the underlying consistency in Trotskyite theorizing is its Menshevik and social-democratic essence, albeit at times covered over with extravagant "left" phrasemongering. The Trotskyite groups are in thrall to social-democracy, revisionism, and every sort of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois political trend or fad. They serve as a corrupting and disorienting force in the workers' and other mass movements in many countries. Thus the fight against this opportunist trend is an important task facing the class conscious and revolutionary workers.

The assessment of the character of Trotskyism is also important because various anti-Leninist revisionist currents spread a great deal of confusion on this issue. They take the political content out of the struggle against Trotskyism and say that to take a revolutionary stand means to embrace Trotskyism.

For example, in the late 1970's the Chinese revisionist leadership and their followers repeatedly made this charge against the Marxist-Leninists who took up the fight against the counterrevolutionary theory of "three worlds." The Beijing leadership and their followers absurdly held that to apply class analysis to the "third world" and, for example, to condemn such bloodstained regimes as that of the Shah

of Iran, was to be a Trotskyite. As well, during the 1960's, the Khrushchovite revisionists and their supporters also condemned all those who attacked revisionism as being Trotskyites.

Meanwhile, the followers of Beijing and Moscow, even while cursing the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists as Trotskyites, have no hangups about joining with the Trotskyites in various reformist schemes to undermine the revolutionary movement. This is because there are ideological affinities between Trotskyism and Soviet and Chinese revisionism.

Our study of the international communist movement in the post-World War II period shows that there was also a similar misuse of the label of Trotskyism at that time. As reformism and petty-bourgeois nationalism became fashionable in that period, opposition from the left against such policies was denounced as being Trotskyite.

The resolution below does not specifically deal with the question of the relationship of Trotskyism to the post-World War II period. Nevertheless, by explaining what Trotskyism is, it helps one distinguish between a Marxist-Leninist and a Trotskyite approach to the problems of that period. As the Second Congress resolution "On the Marxist-Leninist Classics" points out, our Party criticizes the errors of Stalin and the international communist movement in the post-war period, not to throw aside Leninism as the Trotskyites do, but in order to defend the Leninist principles that Stalin himself had defended in earlier days in struggle against Trotskyism and other opportunist trends in the Soviet Union. □

Trotskyism is another of the opportunist international trends working to undermine the revolutionary working class movement. The Trotskyites, both internationally and domestically, and often within a given Trotskyite group, are divided up into many different varieties and shades. They make up a hodgepodge of opportunist groupings influenced by social-democracy, revisionism, and every sort of petty-bourgeois and bourgeois political trend. One thing which they all hold in common, however, is that they all call themselves followers of Leon Trotsky. So to understand the nature of contemporary Trotskyism it is useful to refer to

the ideological and political characteristics of this notorious renegade from communism.

● From the early days of his political career, a most important feature of Trotsky's stand was that he cursed Leninism and Bolshevism. In 1903 the Marxist party of the Russian working class became divided between its revolutionary Marxist wing known as the Bolsheviks and led by Lenin, and its reformist and opportunist wing known as the Mensheviks. From that time on Trotsky was bitterly hostile to Lenin and the Bolsheviks and raved against Lenin as the leader of the "reactionary wing" of the party. While he re-

buked the struggle against opportunism as an alleged expression of "factionalism," and while he regarded himself as allegedly being above factions, actually Trotsky vacillated wildly between factions as he adopted an essentially Menshevik stand. He repeatedly joined on the side of the Mensheviks and liquidators against the Bolsheviks.

Trotsky didn't join the Bolshevik Party until the summer of 1917, the eve of the October Socialist Revolution. But even inside the Bolsheviks' ranks he was in continual conflict with Lenin and his Bolshevik line. He became a leader of the anti-Leninist "opposition."

After Lenin's death Trotsky posed as a great Leninist. Now, instead of directly cursing Leninism, as he had done for the two decades previous, he cursed "Stalinism" in order to continue his crusade against everything that Leninism stands for. Trotsky became one of the bitterest enemies of the Communist International and degenerated to the depths of organizing counter-revolutionary subversion against socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR.

● His repeated denunciations of the Leninist struggle against opportunism were a yellow thread running through Trotsky's infamous political career. Trotsky played the role of a shield for the Mensheviks and other opportunists and he periodically made common cause with them against the revolutionary Leninists. It was Trotsky who tried to put together the ill-famed "August bloc" of all the liquidators to fight the Bolsheviks. And later Trotsky cursed the fight waged by the Communist International against the treachery of social-democracy.

● A particular hallmark of Trotsky's anti-Leninist and opportunist stands was that he covered them in highfalutin phraseology. He was a master of "revolutionary" phrases that cost him nothing. Under this "revolutionary" verbiage Trotsky pursued his accommodation with the reformist social-democrats and his struggle against the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists.

● Trotsky held special hatred for Lenin's principles concerning the role and nature of the proletarian party. He fought the Leninist concepts of democratic centralism, of building a proletarian party with the iron discipline and single will that is required for the class war against the bourgeoisie. Trotsky called Lenin's Bolshevik system of organization a "barracks regime" and a "dictatorship" over the intellectuals by the workers. He abhorred proletarian discipline and espoused an aristocratic petty-bourgeois individualism. Trotsky advocated the typically social-democratic concepts of the party as a loose and amorphous grouping of divergent factions and trends.

Trotsky's theories on the revolution were anti-Leninist through and through.

● Under the signboard of "permanent revolution," Trotsky turned the Marxist concept of the uninterrupted nature of the revolution, and the growing over of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, into what Lenin called an "absurdity." Trotsky's "permanent revolution" meant skipping over the democratic revolution under

conditions where it was a historical necessity, such as in tsarist Russia. He considered the peasantry to be one reactionary mass and, like all Mensheviks, he rejected the idea of the proletariat becoming the leader of the peasant masses in the democratic revolution.

● Connected to this was Trotsky's hostility towards the national liberation struggles and democratic revolutions among the oppressed peoples under the yoke of imperialism. In particular, Trotsky theorized against the Leninist program of the proletariat becoming the champion and leader of the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples.

● Trotsky rejected Lenin's theory of the uneven development of imperialism and the possibility of building socialism in one (or several) countries. He theorized that it was not possible to build socialism in one (or several) countries without simultaneous socialist revolutions throughout Europe. From the outset he combatted Lenin's program for building socialism in the USSR and preached defeatism.

● Trotsky made a mockery of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the struggles for partial demands. On the one hand, Trotsky made use of radical-sounding phrases to belittle the importance to the revolutionary movement of the workers' struggles for partial demands and to denounce these struggles as alleged manifestations of reformism. On the other hand, Trotsky took up all the reformist utopias advocated by the social-democrats for patching up capitalism. He painted up these run-of-the-mill reformist schemes as being allegedly incompatible with capitalist rule, and in other flaming "revolutionary" colors. This was the content of Trotsky's anti-Leninist distortions of the concept of the transitional program.

● Trotsky put forward a number of other confused and contradictory theories. He vacillated to the right and to the left and snatched bits and pieces of ideas from different and even warring trends. The underlying consistency in Trotsky's theorizing was its Menshevik and social-democratic essence and its hostility towards Marxist-Leninist communism.

Contemporary Trotskyism has many variations and sub-trends. Some Trotskyite groupings still subscribe to many of Trotsky's particular anti-Leninist theories. Others have dropped a number of Trotsky's absurdities as unneeded baggage. All the Trotskyite groupings are characterized by their lack of ideological coherence; by their mimicking of whatever is fashionable; and by their habit of attaching themselves within the general ideological and political orbit of the stronger social-reformist trends — social-democracy and revisionism.

Some of the other features of contemporary Trotskyism include:

● The Trotskyites are totally liquidationist. They abhor the very idea of building a solid Marxist-Leninist vanguard party of the working class. Their concept of the proletarian party, if they have any such concept, is something of a debating society made up of a broad and loose federation of factions. Despite the revolutionary phrasemongering of some, the Trotskyites trail helplessly after the labor bureau-

crats and other opportunist forces of bourgeois influence on the working class.

● In the past, when the Soviet Union was still a bastion of socialism, the Trotskyites were among the most rabid enemies of the socialist system being constructed in the USSR. They cursed the first land of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a "degenerated workers' state." But now, with the restoration of capitalism and the emergence of social-imperialism in the Soviet Union, their term "degenerated workers' state" has become a term of endearment. Most Trotskyites have become big apologists of Soviet revisionism, just as they merge with all revisionism generally.

● The Trotskyites oppose the national liberation struggles and the democratic revolutions of the oppressed peoples suffering under imperialist slavery. Either they adopt pseudo-radical phrases to directly ridicule these liberation struggles or, in the guise of supporting the oppressed peoples, they glorify the bourgeois nationalist regimes, including various outright reactionary regimes, that stand in the way of the revolutionary struggles of the masses against imperialism and reaction.

In the U.S. there is an overabundance of Trotskyite organizations and grouplets, which, in a broad sense, break down into two general trends. There are the rightist and more openly reformist Trotskyites, and then there is a much smaller trend of "left" or "revolutionary" phrasemongers. These two trends are not mutually exclusive, but each brings to the fore different aspects of their common Trotskyite opportunism.

While they still call themselves "Marxists" and even "Marxist-Leninists," the more openly reformist Trotskyites

adopt a typically social-democratic, trade unionist and electoralist approach. They are enthralled to the labor bureaucrats, the soldout black leaders and other misleaders of the workers and oppressed. They use radical phrases to justify their loyalty to these misleaders on the left fringe of the Democratic Party and to cover their prettification of the Democratic Party itself. A number of these groups, notably the Workers World Party and the Socialist Workers Party, act as little helpers of Soviet revisionism in dressing up the Soviet Union, Cuba and other revisionist countries as "socialist." (Others, such as the flabby and ultra-reformist network known as the IS (International Socialists), say that the Soviet Union is capitalist.)

The "revolutionary" phrasemongering trend is no less anti-proletarian and anti-Marxist-Leninist. It also glorifies the labor bureaucracy and other corrupt forces. Its oh-so-radical phrases are not directed against the capitalist class enemy and its lackeys, but instead it directs its phrasemongering against the workers and the mass struggles of the working people. This phrasemongering trend is typified by the Spartacist League. The SL is particularly notorious for its super-"revolutionary" apologetics for the crimes of Soviet revisionism, and its screaming demands that the struggles of the masses the world over must be subordinated to Soviet social-imperialism.

Today in the U.S., as well as in other countries, the Trotskyites make up part of the opportunist and liquidationist forces that are undermining the revolutionary movement. This demands ideological and political work to combat their corrosive influence in the mass movements and among the working masses. □

The Workers' Advocate



Theoretical-Political Newspaper of the
Central Committee of the MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY, USA

- Editorial correspondence:
The Workers' Advocate
- Orders and subscriptions:
Marxist-Leninist Publications
- Rates: From vendor: 25¢

Via first class mail:

75¢ for single copy

\$4.50 for six issues

\$9.00 for 12 issues

ISSN 0276-363X