

A Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism

Editor: V. J. Jerome

Fighting War with Peace and Democracy

By William Z. Foster

THE BOURGEOIS world is now boiling with speculation, ranging from the incongruous to the ridiculous, regarding the recent proposals of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China to settle the Korean war, and the whole train of peace events that have accompanied them. The pen-pushers and windjammers of capitalism are ever on the hunt for "Red plots," and all sorts of sinister and subtle manifestations in the situation. The "Reds," they say, are only maneuvering for time, are seeking to put the capitalist world off guard, so they can seize upon a key moment to strike, and so on. But such speculations are rubbish. The general meaning of the situation is very simple and constructive; namely, that the Soviet and Chinese peoples, in line with their basic Socialist peace policy, have raised their efforts to establish peace to a new level. They are fighting the war drive of American imperialism and its allies with a great strengthening of their own drive for peace.

WALL STREET'S PUSH FOR WAR

For several years past our Party has been pointing out the key facts that American imperialism is aggressively striving for world domination, and that it accepts as a foregone conclusion that such international mastery can be established only through a major anti-Soviet war. All important post-war U.S. policy, at home and abroad, has been actively based upon this general assumption. Not only has Wall Street considered another world war to be inevitable, but it has been definitely striving to bring about such a war. There can be no other possible rational explanation of the general complex of aggressive American policy. To assert that this policy is for defensive purposes, as the Government would have us believe, is utter nonsense.

The general political substance of what has been happening during the postwar years is this: The United States, forging ahead with its pro-

gram of imperialist conquest, has cunningly misrepresented the indignant revolutions which produced the Eastern European People's Democracies and People's China as being only so many parts of an alleged drive of the Soviet Union for mastery of the world. With this bugaboo as its ideological weapon, the United States has been feverishly organizing the capitalist world for an early all-out capitalist assault against the U.S.S.R. and the whole world peace camp. This is the anti-Soviet crusade, Hitler-fashion, and it has been carried out under hypocritical slogans of the defense of world peace and democracy.

The Soviet Union and the People's Democracies of Asia and Europe, true to their Socialist character, have steadily countered the war drive of the United States by active policies of peace. The preservation of world peace was thus the heart of their long series of proposals—for international control and outlawing of the atom bomb, for the unification of a democratic Germany, for progressive universal disarmament, for an immediate cease-fire in Korea, etc. Despite these peace policies of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, however, the United States, on the basis of its great wealth and production, was able to create a synthetic war scare, a phony crusade against Communism, and a ferocious world armaments race. Thus, it succeeded in developing a dangerous international tension. It was not, however, able to provoke the anti-Soviet war that

Wall Street was planning. In these basic facts, as we shall see, lies the explanation of the dramatic peace proposals now being put forth by the Soviet Union and People's China.

THE FAILURE OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The reasons why the United States, despite all its fabulous outlay of money and its furious anti-Soviet campaign, has been unable up to date to provoke a world war are fundamental. To wage war against such powerful countries as the Soviet Union, People's China, and the European People's Democracies, it was imperative that the United States should have the whole-hearted support of the American people for such a war, and also, and especially, that it have behind it the more important capitalist countries of the world. Wall Street, however, has not been able to accomplish either of these objectives, much less both of them together.

For several years past our Party has been pointing out, correctly, the growing failure of American foreign policy. By this, in the most basic sense, we have meant that the United States, under the dictation of the Wall Street monopolists, was failing in its attempt to precipitate a world war under conditions in which it believed it might have at least a ghost of a chance for success. In this broadest respect, its Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Nato, etc., in short its whole foreign policy, has failed.

American foreign policy has suffered an especially dramatic failure since the advent of the Eisenhower Administration to power. There can be no doubt that Eisenhower, Dulles, and company, with the support of the loyal Democratic opposition—Stevenson, Truman, et al.—planned immediately to spread the Korean war into a general attack upon People's China. This was the clear implication of their intensification of the war in Korea, their increased shipment of arms to Chiang Kai-shek, their plans to develop an invasion of the Chinese mainland from Formosa. But this whole project struck a two-pronged snag. First, the American people displayed unmistakable signs of alarm at the belligerent attitude of the new Administration, and second, capitalist Europe and Asia were outspoken in their opposition to the war line of American imperialism — more so than at any time since the United Nations was formed. Even the wildest atomaniacs in Washington had to pay heed to this widespread popular resistance here and abroad.

THE INTENSIFIED PEACE CAMPAIGN

The peace camp of the world is obviously drawing some concrete conclusions from the continued bankruptcy of American foreign policy, which has been so dramatically illustrated since Eisenhower took office. Their conclusions would appear to be about as follows: first, that it is the peace resistance of the peoples of the world, those in the Socialist

countries and those in the capitalist lands, that is stalling the war campaign of American imperialism; and second, that, therefore, by an intensification of this peace resistance, the drive of Wall Street to war can definitely be halted. The peace efforts that were made previously by the peace-loving peoples were able to slow up American imperialism considerably, but not to stop it. The new peace pressures, however, are calculated to do just this.

The dramatic moves for peace being made during recent weeks by the countries of Socialism and People's Democracy are obviously part of a general pattern to maintain world peace despite the Wall Street warmongers. They include such important steps as those for the exchange of war prisoners, for an immediate armistice in Korea, the Berlin conference for the regulation of air traffic into that city, the acceptance of the American proposals as a basis for discussion of world disarmament, the agreement upon the election of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, etc.

The success of this current intensified peace campaign has been very marked. Generally, the peoples of the world are accepting the U.S.S.R.-Chinese peace steps as bonafide efforts to guarantee the peace of the world. Consequently, many capitalist governments have been compelled to state that they were taking these moves at face value. Never were the Wall Street war plans and war alliance so shaky as they are now.

CONSTERNATION OF THE AMERICAN WARMONGERS

On the other hand, the peace offensive of the U.S.S.R., People's China, and the European People's Democracies has thrown the American war camp into confusion and dismay. Big Business, in fright about a major economic crisis, got a real "peace scare" and stocks tumbled in Wall Street in a manner not seen since the Great Economic Crisis of October 1929. The Federal government, obviously highly embarrassed by the prospect of peace, could not openly oppose the U.S.S.R.-Chinese proposals, so it proceeded to throw cold water on them, to sow pessimism as to their genuineness, and generally to sabotage them. Never in the history of the United States has there been such an organized, concerted effort by all the organs of propaganda to discredit a proposition as that now being directed against the peace proposals of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies. Every possible effort is being made to recreate the old atmosphere of international tension.

At this writing, it looks as though the bloody Korean war will finally be settled, upon the initiative of People's China and the U.S.S.R. The Wall Street warmongers are watching with alarm and consternation the approaching possible end of this, their beloved war, which has brought them at least \$50 billion in profits and which they hoped to expand into a general war against China, with possibilities of a world war. Consequent-

ly, in the face of a mountainous world peace sentiment, they are trying to raise many new issues as obstacles to a Korean armistice, such as the unification of Korea as a pre-condition to a cease-fire, the linking of peace in Korea with peace in Indo-China, a demand for an all-Far Eastern settlement, etc. The McCarran decision against the Communist Party and the attack upon the twelve progressive organizations, by which it hoped to smear the Soviet Union as interfering in the life of the United States, are part of the general attempt to muddy the world situation and to re-develop international war tension.

President Eisenhower, in a desperate effort to gain the world political initiative, laid out American foreign policy in his speech of April 16. This pronouncement, while loaded heavily with peace phraseology, consisted essentially of a long series of ultimatums to the U.S.S.R. along the established lines of aggressive American policy. As a sample of these demands, Eisenhower had the insolence to insist in essence that capitalist rule be again established in the People's Democracies. There was not a single concession to peaceful relations in the whole speech. If anything constructive ever comes out of this speech, this will be entirely because of the peace efforts of the U.S.S.R. and China. The speech in fact, was hailed all through the American press and radio virtually as a "peace ultimatum," with many threats that the Soviet Union must bow to Eisenhower's demands, "or

else." Obviously, American Big Business conceives the Soviet Government's conciliatory position as a sign of weakness and is proceeding upon that basis. This is a political mistake of the first magnitude, for the present Soviet peace campaign is conceived in strength, not weakness. The events of every passing day, such as the firm reply of the *Pravda* editorial of April 25, confirm this fact.

Every effort is being made to blow up the Eisenhower speech into a great peace pronouncement; but what is really thought of it around the world was voiced by Aneurin Bevan in England, who said (*N. Y. Times*, April 19): "If we want conciliation we don't demand everything and give nothing. You are not going to get peace in the world if you insist on the Soviet Union accepting a whole range of humiliating conditions and giving nothing at all." The arrogant response of the United States to the peace proposals of the U.S.S.R. and People's China, by flouting world peace sentiment, can lead only to further embarrassments and defeats for American foreign policy.

GENERAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE SITUATION

Bourgeois writers and commentators, in their frustration and confusion, are trying to interpret the current peace moves of the Soviet Union as a repudiation of Stalin's policies. But this is nonsense. Stalin was long a brilliant champion of the conception that it is possible for Socialist

and capitalist countries to co-exist peacefully in the world. In his very last public utterances—at the time of the 19th Congress of the C.P.S.U.—Stalin reiterated this theory and he also stressed the fact that it is possible for the masses to halt the war drives of imperialist powers. What is happening now in the Soviet peace campaign is the concretization of these basic policies of Stalin, the great Marxist-Leninist theoretician and leader. The present peace offensive, stemming from the 19th Congress, is the fruition of the historic peace policy of the U.S.S.R.

The peace developments of the past few weeks constitute a major victory for the peace forces of the world, and by the same token, a serious defeat for warlike American imperialism. To what degree this people's victory will block the world war plans of Wall Street remains to be seen. The great lesson to be learned from it now is that it demonstrates that when the masses of the world militantly speak out for peace the plans of the warmakers are thrown into disarray. The effective halting of American imperialism's war drive would create a whole new world situation, which it is needless here to try to forecast.

FIGHTING WAR WITH DEMOCRACY

Besides fighting war with peace, the U.S.S.R. is also fighting it with democracy. The latter phase, closely related to the first, is one of the most important aspects of the whole current peace offensive.

One of the marked features, during recent years, of the political life of the U.S.S.R. has been its highly centralized and disciplined character. This has developed for a twofold reason: first, as a defense against malignant external enemies and their internal agents; and second, in order to facilitate the carrying through of the enormous tasks of Socialist construction and general national effort that the U.S.S.R. has faced during this whole period. This strong, self-imposed democratic discipline is a tremendous weapon in the hands of the U.S.S.R., something that no capitalist country can hope to develop. This explains why the capitalist world has been at such great pains to discredit it in the eyes of the workers of their countries. They have denounced the U.S.S.R. as "a police state," and thereby dedicated to a war policy. They have sought by every means in their power to identify the U.S.S.R. with "fascism." On this basis, they have tried to pin upon that country the responsibility for the danger of another great war.

But all this is sheer slander. The Soviet Union is now, and always has been, the most democratic country in the world. Its Socialist democracy, based on the people's ownership of the means of production, and the workers' control of the government, is upon an altogether higher level than can possibly be achieved under the capitalist system. Soviet democracy received its concrete formulation in the Stalin Constitution, adopted in 1936. This Constitution,

besides guaranteeing the rights of free speech, assembly, worship, etc. also establishes the right to work, education, leisure, and complete social security—rights which do not exist anywhere in the capitalist world. The Stalin Constitution also establishes complete equality of women with men, before the law and elsewhere, and it places on a plane of equality and harmony all the many peoples and nations which comprise the Soviet Union.

With the development of the Hitler menace, the Soviet people found it necessary to adopt an extensive voluntary discipline. During the war, under the guidance of the powerful Communist Party, this discipline reached its highest development. It was one of the most basic factors in generating the enormous power of the Soviet Union, which was decisive in winning the war and in saving the world from fascist slavery. Some elements of this strong national democratic discipline in the face of dangerous foes have continued over into the post-World War II period under the imperative necessity of resisting the violent war drive of American imperialism for world control.

Now, however, the Soviet people, as part of their heightened fight for world peace, and in line with their advance into Communism, while increasing *political* vigilance, find it impossible to relax, to a greater or lesser extent, many of the democratic controls which have been indispensable during the past years of hard struggle against capitalist

tack and threatened encirclement. Various signs of this have been recently in evidence. First, there was the wholesale amnesty of prisoners in the Soviet Union, coupled with a call for a re-examination of the Soviet penal code. Second, there were the heavy reductions in prices of the people's necessities—a sure sign that the Soviet Union is not following a war policy. Third, there was the dramatic dismissal of the case against the 15 doctors—it was a misfortune, of course, that this case developed in the first place, but the democratic way in which the Soviet Government dismissed it and frankly recognized the error that had been made, was without parallel in world democratic history. Fourth, there was the reception of the group of American small-town editors in Moscow, an event which clearly indicated the desire of the U.S.S.R. to ease travel and tourist conditions between the West and the East. And fifth, there was the editorial in *Pravda*, again sharply criticizing bureaucracy and one-man leadership tendencies in the Soviet Union.

This relaxing of war-born disciplines and controls in the Soviet Union is an organic part of the intensification of the peace campaign. It is tearing to shreds the capitalist lies that the U.S.S.R. is a police state, based on secret police, concentration camps, and guarded by an "iron curtain." The Soviet people have clearly understood the democratic character of their national disciplines, but indisputably tens of millions of people in the capitalist

world, deluged by hostile imperialist propaganda, have grossly misunderstood these disciplines. But this serious misunderstanding will be liquidated. The U.S.S.R. is standing forth more clearly than ever as the great world champion of peace and democracy, and all the power of the world capitalist propaganda machine will not be able to obscure this basic fact.

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Obviously the Communist Party of the United States, situated as it is in the heartland of American imperialism, has grave responsibilities in the present critical world situation. Its first great task is for itself to understand clearly what is taking place in the world, and then to carry this understanding militantly to the masses. We must realize profoundly that the peace forces of all countries are making a determined effort to save the peace of the world, and that the warmongers, gathered under the leadership of American imperialism, are making a desperate effort to break up this peace offensive, to keep the Korean war going, and to intensify the general war orientation upon which Wall Street and its Washington agents are basing all their plans and hopes.

The world peace forces have won a tremendous victory so far in breaking the log jam in Korea, but the struggle is by no means yet won. Especially, we must try to prevent the masses from being fooled by the "peace" demagoguery of Eisenhower,

Dulles, and others. We must make them understand that Wall Street wants war and is organizing for war, and that the Eisenhower Administration is orienting entirely on this basis. At this moment, the heart of American foreign policy is to prevent an armistice in Korea.

The Draft Resolution of the National Committee, which is now being discussed by the Party, gives the correct general tactical line for our tasks during this critical period. This is no time for sectarian isolation. Nor should we be stayed by the new attacks from the McCarran Board and Department of Justice. In substance this line needs to go to the broad masses of the working class, the Negro people, and all other peace-loving forces, organized as they are by the millions in their conservative-led organizations. At the same time, every progressive organization in the country should make it the center of its attention to establish closer relationship with the masses, who are now aroused by a new hope for the establishment of peace in the world. Conferences, national and local, should be organized to reach out to the masses in all organizations with the message of peace.

One of the most important of the many specific peace tasks confronting us is to liquidate the prevalent fear among the working masses that the ending of the Korean war and of the armaments race would necessarily mean the growth of a huge mass unemployment. This reassurance can be accomplished only on

the basis of a program which will show the way to jobs in a peace economy. The fear about jobs is so acute that even the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. have been forced to pay attention to it, in their programs and in Reuther's proposal to Eisenhower for a Government-sponsored national conference on the question. But the key thing is to move the masses in the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions in the struggle for a practical peace-economy program. This would help to overcome their fear about jobs and strengthen their pressure for peace. At the same time, this situation presents a splendid opportunity, as well as an urgent duty—for the independent industrial unions to come forward with a program of peace and jobs, together with proposals of a general labor conference and of united-front activity to achieve labor's demands. So far, however, these unions have failed to adopt such a comprehensive program and united leadership.

In the present situation we Communists must be very well aware that we have to do with an important change in the world situation, and with still more far-reaching changes in the offing. If the peace forces can bring the Korean war to an end and otherwise slow up the American-led warmakers, this could be of decisive importance in the maintenance of world peace for an indefinite period. If, on the other hand, the war forces can break up the present peace offensive, as they are seeking desperately to do, then the danger of war will be greater than ever.

Reader's Guide to Further Study

The foregoing article deals with the following questions relating to new international developments in the fight for peace and their significance for the United States, as well as the underlying conditions for the further expansion of socialist democracy:

1. What is *new* in the current peace proposals of the Soviet Union and People's China? Why were they put forward at this time? Do they represent a basic change in the foreign policy of these countries?
2. How did the XIX Congress of the C.P.S.U., and Stalin's work, *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.* lay the basis for the present peace proposals of the Soviet Union?
3. How should the response to these proposals by the U.S. Government be evaluated? By other capitalist governments, especially that of Great Britain? What general conclusions should be drawn from this for labor and the people's forces in the U.S.?
4. How is the further development of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union today related to the political and economic strengthening of the Soviet Union? How is it related to the perspective of transition from Socialism to Communism, as projected by the XIX Congress?
5. How does the extension of socialist democracy contribute to the fight for peace?
6. What new opportunities have opened in the fight for peace in the U.S.? How can the advanced peace forces utilize these opportunities to extend peace activity? What weaknesses and mistakes, both of Right-opportunist and "Left"-sectarian nature, must be overcome to guarantee the broadening of the peace movement?

SUGGESTED SUPPLEMENTARY READING

- Joseph Stalin: *Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 27-30.
G. M. Malenkov: *On the Threshold of Communism*, pp. 24-30.
Constitution of the U.S.S.R. (pamphlet).
V. J. Jerome and Betty Gannett: "The People Can Win The Battle for Peace," in *Political Affairs*, May, 1953, pp. 11-15.
Pauline Hosek: "Some Problems in the Fight for Peace," in *Political Affairs*, May, 1953, pp. 59-65.