

A. A. ZHDANOV

ON

The International Situation

Report made at the Conference of
the Nine Communist Parties held in
Poland, September, 1947.

Obtainable from Newsagents and
Bookshops, or direct from the
Publisher, W. P. Coates, Buckingham
House, 6, Buckingham St., Adelphi,
London, W.C.2.



Price 2d.

1947

11

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



A. A. ZHDANOV

ON

the International Situation

Report made at the Conference of
the Nine Communist Parties held in
Poland, September, 1947.

Obtainable from Newsagents and
Bookshops, or direct from the
Publisher, W. P. Coates, Buckingham
House, 6, Buckingham St., Adelphi,
London, W.C.2.



Price 2d.

1947

11

Scanned / Transcribed by
the Socialist Truth In Cyprus — London Bureau
Web: <http://www.KibristaSosyalistGercek.net>
<http://www.kibristasosyalistgercek.net/intro.htm>
E-mail: info@KibristaSosyalistGercek.net



THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

A. A. Zhdanov's Speech on the
International Situation, delivered
at the Information Conference
of Representatives of the Nine
Communist Parties — U.S.S.R.,
France, Italy, Yugoslavia,
Czechoslovakia, Poland,
Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania—
held in Poland at the end of
September, 1947

A. A. ZHDANOV'S SPEECH

1.—THE POST-WAR WORLD SITUATION

THE ending of the Second World War has led to considerable changes in the entire international situation. The military rout of the bloc of Fascist countries, the anti-Fascist liberation character of the war, and the decisive role of the Soviet Union in the victory over the Fascist aggressors, have resulted in a sharp change in the relation of forces between the two systems—the socialist and capitalist systems—in favour of Socialism.

What is the essence of these changes ?

The main outcome of the Second World War was the military defeat of Germany and Japan, the two most militaristic and aggressive countries of capitalism. The reactionary, imperialist elements throughout the world, especially in Britain, the United States and France, placed special hopes on Germany and Japan, primarily on Hitler, Germany, in the first place as a force most capable of dealing a blow to the Soviet Union in order, if not to wipe her out, at any rate to weaken her and to undermine her influence ; secondly as a force capable of smashing the revolutionary working class and democratic movement in Germany itself as well as in the countries that became victims of Hitlerite aggression thus strengthening the general position of capitalism.

This was one of the main reasons of the pre-war so-called Munich policy of appeasement and encouragement of Fascist aggression, the policy which was consistently pursued by the ruling imperialist circles of Britain, France and the U.S.A. But the hopes placed by the Anglo-French-American imperialists on the Hitlerites were vain. The Hitlerites proved to be weaker, and the Soviet Union and the freedom-loving peoples stronger than the Munichites thought. As a result of the Second World War, the main forces of militant international Fascist reaction were smashed and put out of action for a long time to come.

In this connection the world capitalist system as a whole has been dealt yet another serious blow. The most important result of the First World War was a breach in the united imperialist front and the removal of Russia from the world

system of capitalism, further, as a result of the victory of the Socialist system in the U.S.S.R., capitalism ceased to be the only and all-embracing system of world economy. The Second World War and the defeat of Fascism, the weakening of the world positions of capitalism and the strengthening of the anti-Fascist movement led to the break away from the imperialist system of a number of countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe. In these countries new, popular democratic regimes have arisen.

In these countries representatives of workers and peasants representatives of the progressive intelligentsia have come to power. Since the working class everywhere displayed the greatest heroism, the greatest consistency and irreconcilability in the anti-Fascist war, its authority and influence among the people has grown immeasurably. The new democratic power in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Albania, supported by the popular masses, proved capable of carrying through in the shortest possible time progressive, democratic transformations such as the bourgeois democracies are incapable of achieving.

The basis was laid for State, national ownership, a new type of State was created—the *people's Republic*, where power belongs to the people, where big industry, transport and the banks belong to the State and where the leading force is the bloc of all classes of the population engaged in useful employment headed by the working class. As a consequence, the peoples of these countries have not only rid themselves of the grip of imperialism, they have laid the basis for the transition to the path of Socialist development.

As a result of the war, the international importance and authority of the U.S.S.R. has grown immeasurably. The U.S.S.R. was the leading force and spirit in the military defeat of Germany and Japan. The democratic progressive forces of the entire world rallied around the Soviet Union. The Socialist State withstood the direst trials of the war and emerged victorious out of the life and death struggle against its most powerful enemy. Instead of becoming weaker the U.S.S.R. has become stronger.

There have been substantial changes in the features of the capitalist world. Out of the six so-called "great

imperialist Powers"—Germany, Japan, Britain, U.S.A., France and Italy—three have been eliminated as the result of military defeat, viz., Germany, Italy and Japan. France has also become weaker and has lost her former place as a great Power. Thus only two world imperialist Powers are left—the U.S.A. and Britain, but one of them, Britain, is resting on undermined foundations.

During the war British imperialism proved to have become much weakened both militarily and politically. In Europe, Britain was helpless in the face of German aggression. In Asia, Britain—although the largest imperialist Power—was unable to hold on to her colonial possessions by her own efforts. Having temporarily lost her connection with the colonies, Britain became dependent militarily and economically, on supplies of American foodstuffs and industrial goods. Since the war the financial and economic dependence of Britain on the U.S.A. began to increase.

Although after the war Britain managed to get back her colonies, she came up against the increased influence of American imperialism there. During the war the U.S.A. had developed her activities in all these regions which before the war had been considered as spheres of influence of British capital (the Arabian, East and South-east Asia). America has also extended her influence in the Dominions of the British Empire, and in South America where Britain's former role to a considerable and ever increasing extent is passing to the U.S.A. The sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system as the result of the Second World War is seen in the mighty surge of the national liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries, which threatens the rear of the capitalist system.

The colonial peoples refuse to live any longer in the old way, and the ruling classes of the metropolitan countries cannot rule them any longer in the old way. Attempts to suppress the national liberation movement by military force now encounter ever increasing armed resistance from the colonial peoples, and lead to prolonged colonial wars, such as that of Holland in Indonesia, and of France in Viet Nam.

Itself the result of the uneven development of capitalism in various countries, the war has led to a further sharpening

of this differentiation. Only one of all the capitalist Powers—the U.S.A.—emerged from the war not weaker, but considerably stronger both in economic and military respects. American capitalists made great fortunes out of the war, the American people did not, as the result of the war, experience either privations, or oppressive foreign occupation, or air bombing, while the human losses of the U.S.A., which, in fact, entered the war at the last stage when its result was already pre-determined, were relatively small.

In the U.S.A., the war gave an impetus to extensive development of industrial production and a decisive increase in exports, mainly to Europe.

The ending of the war faced the U.S.A. with a number of problems. The capitalist monopolies are aiming at preserving their profits at the former high level. With this object in view, they are trying to maintain the wartime volume of contracts. But this requires the preservation by the U.S.A. of all those foreign markets which had absorbed her products during the war, and the conquest of new markets, since the purchasing capacity of the majority of States has fallen as a result of the war.

The financial and economic dependence of these States on the U.S.A. has also increased. The U.S.A. has invested abroad credits to the value of 19,000 million dollars, without taking into account the investments in the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund. The main competitors of the U.S.A.—Germany and Japan—have disappeared from the world market and this has created new, very great possibilities for the U.S.A.

Before the Second World War, the most influential reactionary circles of American imperialism followed the policy of isolationism and refrained from active intervention in European and Asiatic affairs. Under the new post-war conditions, however, the masters of Wall Street have adopted a new policy. They put forward a programme for the utilisation of the whole of American military and economic might, not only to preserve and consolidate foreign positions won during the war, but also to enlarge them to the maximum, and for the U.S.A. to take the place of Germany, Japan and Italy on the world markets.

The sharp decline in the economic might of other capitalist States gave rise to the possibility of a strategic exploitation of their post-war economic difficulties, thus facilitating the subordination of these countries to American control, and, in particular, to take advantage of Great Britain's post-war economic difficulties. The U.S.A. has proclaimed a new, openly predatory, expansionist orientation.

The new, openly expansionist orientation of the U.S.A. has as its aim the establishment of the world domination of American imperialism.

In order to consolidate the U.S.A. monopoly position in world markets, which arose from the elimination of the two largest competitors of the U.S.A.—Germany and Japan—and the weakening of the capitalist partners of the U.S.A.—Britain and France—the new orientation of U.S.A. policy involves a broad programme of a military, economic and political character. This programme aims at the establishment in all the countries that are the object of U.S.A. expansion, of the political and economic domination of the U.S.A., thus reducing these countries to the position of satellites of the U.S.A., and establishing in these countries such regimes as would eliminate any resistance by the working class and democratic movements to the exploitation of these countries by American capital.

The U.S.A. is attempting to impose this new political course not only on its military enemies of yesterday, and on neutral States, but to an ever greater degree on its war allies.

Special attention is being paid to exploiting the economic difficulties of Britain, the U.S.A.'s ally, and at the same time its age-old capitalist rival and competitor. The American expansionist orientation is based on the assumption that it is desirable, not only to keep Britain in the grip of economic dependence on the U.S.A. established during the war, but further to increase the pressure on Britain in order gradually to deprive her of control over her colonies, to displace her from her spheres of influence and to reduce her to the status of a vassal Power.

Thus the new U.S.A. policy is directed towards the strengthening of her monopolistic position, and envisages reducing her capitalist partners to subordination, and dependence on the U.S.A.

But athwart the path of the U.S.A. striving for world domination stands the U.S.S.R., this bulwark of anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist policy, with her growing international influence, as well as the countries of the new democracy, which have escaped from control by Anglo-American imperialism, and the workers of all countries—including those of the U.S.A. herself—who do not want new wars which would only lead to the increased domination of their oppressors. Hence the new expansionist and reactionary course of the U.S.A. policy is orientated for a struggle against the U.S.S.R., against the new democratic countries, against the working class movement in every country, against the working class movement of the U.S.A. herself and against the liberating anti-imperialist forces of all countries throughout the world.

American reactionaries, perturbed by the successes of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., the successes of the countries of new democracy and the growth of the working class and democratic movement in all countries of the world in the post-war period, have modestly decided to assume the role of "saviours" of the capitalist system from Communism.

Thus the openly expansionist programme of the U.S.A. is very reminiscent of the Fascist aggressors' adventurist programme which suffered such an inglorious fiasco. These aggressors also were but recently claiming world domination.

Just as the Hitlerites masked their preparations for predatory aggression by their anti-Communism, in order to ensure the possibility of oppressing and enslaving all nations and, in the first place, their own people, so the present-day U.S. ruling circles mask their expansionist policy and even their offensive against the vital interests of the U.S.A.'s weaker imperialist competitor—Britain—by alleged defensive anti-Communist aims. The feverish arms race, construction of new military bases, the establishment of *places d'armes* for American armed forces in every part of the world, is falsely and hypocritically justified by the plea of "defence" against an imaginary military threat on the part of the U.S.S.R.

By means of threats, bribery and blackmail American diplomacy is snatching from other capitalist countries, and

in the first place from Britain, consent to the legal consolidation of advantageous American positions in Europe and Asia—in the Western zones of Germany and Austria, in Italy, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Iran, Afghanistan, China, Japan, etc.

American imperialists, regarding themselves as the main force opposed to the U.S.S.R., the countries of the new democratic States and the working class democratic movements in all countries of the world, and as the bulwark of the reactionary, anti-democratic forces in the entire world, literally on the very day after the end of the Second World War started to restore a front hostile to the U.S.S.R. and world democracy, and to encourage the anti-popular, reactionary forces of collaborators and former capitalist stooges in the European countries liberated from the Hitlerite yoke, which were beginning to organise their life according to their own choice.

Following Churchill's lead, the most venomous imperialist politicians who had lost all sense of proportion, began to advocate plans for the speedy realisation of a preventive war against the U.S.S.R., openly demanding that the temporary American monopoly of the atomic weapon should be used against the Soviet people. The instigators of a new war are attempting to frighten and blackmail, not only the U.S.S.R., but other countries as well and, in particular, China and India, representing the U.S.S.R. as a possible aggressor and themselves as friends of China and India and saviours from the Communist danger, called upon to help the weaker countries. Thus are they seeking to achieve the aim of preserving China and India under imperialist domination, and preparing their further political and economic enslavement.

2.—THE NEW ALIGNMENT OF POLITICAL FORCES IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD AND THE FORMATION OF TWO CAMPS — THE IMPERIALIST AND ANTI-DEMOCRATIC CAMP ON THE ONE HAND AND THE ANTI- IMPERIALIST AND DEMOCRATIC CAMP ON THE OTHER

THE radical changes in the international situation and in the situation of various countries which took place as a result of the war have changed the whole political aspect of the world. A new alignment of political forces has come into being. The further we are removed from the end of the war the clearer become the two basic orientations in international politics, which correspond to the division of the two main political forces in the world arena—the imperialist and anti-democratic on the one hand and the anti-imperialist and democratic on the other.

The principal, leading force of the imperialist camp is the U.S.A. Britain and France are in alliance with the U.S.A. The existence of the Attlee-Bevin Labour Government in Britain and the Socialist Government of Ramadier in France does not prevent either Britain or France steering a course parallel with the imperialist policy of the U.S.A. in all basic questions as U.S.A. satellites.

The imperialist camp is also being supported by such colonial Powers as Belgium and Holland, countries with reactionary anti-democratic regimes such as Turkey and Greece, and countries dependent both politically and economically on the U.S.A., like those of the Near East, South America and China.

The basic aim of the imperialist camp is the strengthening of imperialism, the preparation of a new imperialist war, the struggle against Socialism and democracy and all-round support for reactionary pro-Fascist regimes and movements. For the solution of these tasks, the imperialist camp is prepared to rely on reactionary and anti-democratic forces all over the world and to support former war enemies against its own war allies.

The anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist forces constitute the other camp, and the U.S.S.R. and countries of the new

democracy constitute the mainstay of that camp. It also includes countries which have broken with imperialism and which have firmly adopted the path of democratic development such as Rumania, Hungary and Finland. Indonesia and Viet Nam belong to the anti-imperialist camp; India, Egypt and Syria sympathise with it. The anti-imperialist camp relies on the support of the workers and the democratic movement in all countries, on the fraternal Communist Parties of all countries, on the fighters of the national liberation movements of the colonial and dependent countries and on the support of all the democratic and progressive forces in every country of the world.

The aim of this camp is the struggle against the threat of new wars and imperialist expansion, the consolidation of democracy and the elimination of the remnants of Fascism.

The ending of the Second World War confronted all the freedom-loving peoples with the most important task of ensuring a stable democratic peace that would consolidate the victory over Fascism. The leading part in the solution of this basic task of the post-war period belongs to the Soviet Union and her foreign policy. This follows from the very nature of the Soviet Socialist State, which is completely alien to any aggressive exploiting aims and is interested in the establishment of the most favourable conditions for the construction of Communist society.

One of these conditions is world peace. As the bearer of a new, higher social system the Soviet Union reflects in its foreign policy the aspirations of all advanced mankind, which is striving for a durable peace and cannot be interested in a new war—the product of capitalism.

The Soviet Union is the faithful champion of freedom and independence for all peoples, the enemy of national and racial oppression and of colonial exploitation of any kind. The general alignment of forces between the world of capitalism and that of Socialism, which has changed as the result of the Second World War, has increased still more the importance of Soviet foreign policy and increased the scale of its foreign political activity.

All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-Fascist camp have rallied around the task of ensuring a just and democratic

peace. This was the soil on which the friendly collaboration of the U.S.S.R. with the democratic countries in all questions of foreign policy has grown and flourished. These countries—and in the first place the countries of the new democracy, such as Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Albania, which played an important role in the war of liberation against Fascism, as well as Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and partly Finland, which have joined the anti-Fascist front—all of them have become in the post-war period staunch fighters for peace, democracy and for their own freedom and independence against all the attempts of the U.S.A. and Britain to reverse their development and drag them again under the imperialist yoke.

The successes and the growth of the international prestige of the democratic camp were not to the liking of the imperialists. Even during the war the activity of the reactionary forces in Britain and the U.S.A. were constantly growing and were calculated to disrupt the co-operation of the allied countries, drag out the war, bleed the U.S.S.R. white and save the Fascist aggressors from a complete rout. The Sabotage of the Second Front by the Anglo-Saxon imperialists with Churchill at their head clearly reflected this tendency, which in essence was the continuation of the Munich policy under the new, changed conditions. But while the war was on, the reactionary circles of Britain and the U.S.A. dared not act openly against the Soviet Union and the democratic countries, understanding full well that the sympathies of the masses of the people throughout the world were unreservedly on the latter's side.

In the last months before the end of the war, however, the situation began to change. During the negotiations at the Berlin three-Power Conference, in July 1945, the Anglo-American imperialists already demonstrated their unwillingness to take into account the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the democratic countries in the last two years has been a policy of struggle for the consistent implementation of the democratic principles of the post-war settlement. The States of the anti-imperialist camp became faithful and consistent champions of the application of these principles, without deviating from their

stand by a single iota. This is why the main task of the foreign policy of the democratic States since the war has been the struggle for a democratic peace, for the liquidation of the remnants of Fascism and the prevention of the rebirth of Fascist, imperialist aggression, for the consolidation of the principles of equality of rights among nations and respect for their sovereignty, for a universal reduction of armaments in general and the prohibition of the most destructive arms designed for the mass extermination of the civilian population.

In solving all these tasks, Soviet diplomacy and the diplomacy of the democratic States came up against the resistance of Anglo-American diplomacy, which since the war has steadily and consistently pursued the course of rejecting the general principles of the structure of the post-war world proclaimed by the allies during the war and of replacing this policy of peace and consolidation of democracy by a new policy tending to the disruption of universal peace, the defence of Fascist elements, and the persecution of democracy in all countries.

The joint action of the diplomacy of the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries is of tremendous significance. It aims at solving the problem of armaments reduction and prohibition of that particularly destructive form of weapons—the atom bomb.

On the initiative of the Soviet Union a proposal was made in the United Nations Organisation (UNO) for the universal reduction of armaments and for the recognition as a first priority of the prohibition of the production and use of atomic energy for military purposes. This proposal of the Soviet Government encountered sharp resistance on the part of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. All the efforts of the imperialist circles were directed towards sabotaging this suggestion by the incessant and futile raising of all sorts of obstacles in order to prevent any effective practical measures from being taken.

The activity of the delegates of the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries in the various bodies of the U.N. organisation is characterised by systematic, persistent day-to-day struggle for the democratic basis of international co-operation, for the exposure of the intrigues of the imperialist conspirators against the peace and security of the peoples.

This, for instance, is shown particularly clearly in the discussion of the situation on the northern frontiers of Greece. The Soviet Union together with Poland came out resolutely against the utilisation of the Security Council for discrediting Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania, who were falsely accused by the imperialists of aggressive acts against Greece.

Soviet foreign policy proceeds from the fact of the co-existence over a lengthy period of two systems — capitalism and Socialism. From this it follows that co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the other systems is possible providing the principle of reciprocity and the fulfilment of obligations undertaken freely are observed by all.

It is well-known that the U.S.S.R. has always been and is loyal to the pledges it has made. The Soviet Union has shown its will and desire for co-operation.

An absolutely opposite policy is pursued in the U.N. organisation by Britain and America, who do everything to shake themselves free from the pledges they entered into previously and to untie their hands for the pursuit of a new policy based not on the co-operation of peoples but on setting them against one another, on the violation of the rights and interests of the democratic peoples, on the isolation of the U.S.S.R.

Soviet policy pursues the course of maintaining loyal, good-neighbourly relations with all States which show a desire for co-operation. In its relations with countries which are genuine friends and allies of the Soviet Union, the latter has always conducted herself, and will continue conducting herself, as a loyal friend and ally. Soviet foreign policy is aimed at the further extension of the friendly assistance of the Soviet Union to these countries.

Defending the cause of peace, Soviet foreign policy rejects the principles of revenge against defeated peoples. As is well-known, the Soviet Union stands for the creation of a united, peace-loving, demilitarised democratic Germany. In formulating Soviet policy with regard to Germany, Comrade Stalin said that, briefly, the policy of the Soviet Union in the German question amounted to the demilitarisation and democratisation of Germany. . . . The demilitarisation and democratisation of Germany was one of the most

important conditions for the establishment of stable and lasting peace.

However, this policy of the Soviet State with regard to Germany is coming up against the resistance of the imperialist circles of the U.S.A. and Britain. The session of the Foreign Ministers' Council in Moscow in March-April, 1947, showed that the U.S.A., Britain and France were prepared not only to work for disrupting the democratisation and demilitarisation of Germany, but even for the liquidation of Germany as a unified State, for its dismemberment and for the conclusion of a separate peace.

The pursuit of this policy is now taking place in a new situation, in which America has departed from the old course of Roosevelt and is going over to a new policy, the policy of preparing for new military adventures.

3.—THE AMERICAN PLAN FOR THE ENSLAVEMENT OF EUROPE

THE transition of American imperialism since the end of the Second World War to an aggressive, openly expansionist course has found expression both in the foreign and home policy of the U.S.A. Active support for reactionary, anti-democratic forces throughout the world, the undermining of the Potsdam decisions to demilitarise and democratise Germany, the patronage of Japanese reactionaries, the extension of war preparations, the accumulation of stocks of atom bombs—all this is accompanied by an offensive against the elementary democratic rights of the working people inside the United States of America.

Characterising the expansionist foreign policy inspired and conducted by American reaction, Zhdanov pointed out that it provides for simultaneous activity in all directions: firstly, military-strategic measures; secondly, economic expansion, and thirdly, ideological struggle. American imperialism is conducting a consistent policy of militarising the country. He continued:

Whereas at the beginning of the Second World War, the army of the U.S.A. occupied 17th place among the armies of the capitalist countries, it now occupies first place among

them. While accumulating atom bombs, American strategists do not hesitate to speak of preparations for bacteriological warfare being made in the U.S.A. The military-strategic plan of the U.S.A. provides for the creation, in peace-time, of numerous bases and *places d'armes* at a considerable distance from the American continent and destined for use for aggressive purposes against the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the new democracy.

Despite the fact that the war has long ended, the military alliance between Britain and the U.S.A. continues, and even the joint Anglo-American Staff of the Armed Forces continues to function. Under the banner of agreements on the standardisation of arms the United States has extended its control over the armed forces and military plans of other countries, in the first place of Britain and Canada. Under the banner of the joint defence of the Western Hemisphere the countries of Latin America are being drawn into the orbit of the military expansionist plans of the U.S.A.

The Government of the United States of America has declared it as its official task to assist in the modernisation of the Turkish Army; the army of the reactionary Kuomintang is trained by American instructors and equipped with American materials. The military clique is becoming an active political force in the U.S.A., providing on a large scale statesmen and diplomats who are following an aggressive militarist course in the whole policy of the country.

The economic expansion of the U.S.A., is an important supplement to the realisation of her strategic plan. Foreseeing the forthcoming economic crisis, the U.S.A. is anxious to find new monopoly spheres for capital investment and surplus goods. The economic aid of the U.S.A. pursues the broad aim of the enslavement of Europe by American capital. The more difficult the economic position of one country or another, the harsher the conditions which the American monopolies are trying to dictate to it. But economic control leads also to political subordination to American imperialism. Hence the extension of the monopoly spheres of American surplus goods is combined by the U.S.A. with the acquisition of new *places d'armes* for the struggle against the new democratic forces in Europe.

American "aid" almost automatically leads to the change of the political line of the country on which that "aid" is bestowed. Parties and persons come to power who are prepared to carry out a programme of home and foreign policy to the liking of the U.S.A. and on instructions from Washington (France, Italy, etc.).

Finally, in striving for world domination and an anti-democratic line, the U.S.A. is also conducting an ideological struggle. The basic task of the ideological part of the American strategic plan consists in blackmailing public opinion, spreading slanders about the imaginary aggressiveness of the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy, and in this way to represent the Anglo-American bloc in the role of countries defending themselves, thus absolving it from the responsibility for preparing a new war.

During the years of the Second World War the popularity of the Soviet Union increased tremendously. By its self-sacrificing, heroic struggle against imperialism, the Soviet Union gained the love and respect, of the working people of all countries. Before the eyes of the whole world, the military and economic might of the Socialist State, the invincible power of the moral-political unity of Soviet Society has been clearly demonstrated.

The reactionary circles of the U.S.A. and Britain are anxious to expunge this indelible impression which the Socialist system is making on the industrial workers and working people by hand and brain generally, of the whole world. The warmongers are well aware that in order to make it possible to send their soldiers to fight against the Soviet Union a long ideological preparation is necessary.

In the ideological struggle against the U.S.S.R. the American imperialists, lacking understanding of political questions and demonstrating their ignorance, are plugging, above all, the conception which represents the Soviet Union as an allegedly anti-democratic, totalitarian force, and the U.S.A., Britain and the whole capitalist world as a democratic force. This platform of the ideological struggle, of the defence of bourgeois pseudo-democracy and of the charge of totalitarianism levelled against Communism, unites all enemies of the working-class without exception beginning

with the capitalist magnates and ending with the leaders of the Right-Wing Socialists, who seize with alacrity on any slander against the U.S.S.R. with which their imperialist masters prompt them.

The pivot of this fraudulent propaganda is the assertion that a system of many parties and the existence of an organised opposition of the minority are symptoms of genuine democracy. On this basis the British Labourites, who spare no efforts in the fight against Communism, would like to discover antagonistic classes and a corresponding struggle of parties in the U.S.S.R. Political ignoramuses, they cannot understand that for a long time now there have been no landlords and capitalists in the U.S.S.R., no antagonistic classes and, therefore naturally there can be no multiplicity of parties. They would like to find in the U.S.S.R. bourgeois parties dear to their hearts, including pseudo-Socialist parties, acting as imperialist agencies; but to their regret history has doomed these exploitationist bourgeois parties to disappearance.

Not sparing words in slandering the Soviet regime, the Labourites and other advocates of bourgeois democracy at the same time regard as perfectly normal the blood-stained dictatorship of a Fascist minority over the peoples of Greece and Turkey, they close their eyes to many crying violations of the norms even of formal democracy in the bourgeois countries, and pass over in silence national and racial oppression, corruption, and the unceremonious violation of democratic rights in the U.S.A.

One of the trends of the ideological campaign which is accompanying the enslavement of Europe, is the attack on the principle of national sovereignty, the call to reject the principle of the sovereign rights of peoples and to replace it by the idea of a "World Government." Seized on by the bourgeois intellectuals from among the day-dreamers and pacifists, the idea of a "World Government" is taken advantage of not only as a means of pressure for the ideological disarmament of peoples who are defending their independence from attacks on the part of American imperialism, but also as a slogan especially directed against the Soviet Union, which is consistently and untiringly defending the principles

of genuine equality and of safeguarding the sovereign rights of all peoples, great and small.

Under present conditions imperialist countries such as the U.S.A., Britain and the States close to them, are becoming dangerous enemies of the national independence and self-determination of peoples, and the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy, reliable bastions of the defence of the equality and national self-determination of peoples.

It is highly symptomatic that American military-political intelligence men of the type of Bullitt, yellow trade union leaders of the type of Green, French Socialists headed by the obdurate apologist of capitalism Blum, the German Social Democrat Schumacher and Labourite leaders of Bevin's type are closely co-operating in the realisation of the ideological plan put forward by American imperialism.

The "Truman doctrine" and the "Marshall plan" are a concrete expression of the expansionist aspirations of the U.S.A. in the present situation. In essence both these documents are an expression of a single policy, although they differ in the form of presentation. Both documents contain one and the same American claim to the enslavement of Europe.

The "Truman doctrine," which is calculated to grant American aid to all reactionary regimes coming forward actively against the democratic peoples, is frankly aggressive. Its publication caused a certain amount of indignation even among the circles of American capitalists which are prepared for anything.

The progressive public in the U.S.A. and other countries has made resolute protests against the provocative, openly imperialist speech of Truman. The unfavourable reception accorded the "Truman doctrine" made the "Marshall plan" necessary as a more veiled attempt to carry out the self-same expansionist policy.

The essence of the nebulous, deliberately veiled formulations of the "Marshall plan" is to knock together a bloc of States bound by obligations to the United States of America and to grant American credits as payment for the renunciation by European States of their economic and, subsequently, also their political independence. At the same time the

basis of the "Marshall plan" consists in the restoration of the industrial areas of Western Germany under the control of American monopolies

Despite the fact that the "Marshall plan" provides for the final reduction of Britain as well as France to the position of secondary Powers, the Labour Government of Attlee in Britain and the Socialist Government of Ramadier in France have seized hold of the "Marshall plan" as an anchor of salvation Having already got caught in the noose of financial dependence on the U.S.A., the Labour Government of Britain is seeing its only way out in another loan. Therefore it saw in the "Marshall plan" a way out of an economic cul-de-sac, a chance to obtain new credits.

British politicians, moreover, counted on taking advantage of the creation of a bloc of West European countries—debtors of the United States of America—in order to play within that bloc the role of chief American bailiff who might possibly succeed in enriching himself at the expense of weaker countries. The British bourgeoisie hoped that by using the "Marshall plan," rendering service to American monopolies and submitting to their control they would succeed in partly restoring their positions in the Balkans and the Danube area.

In order to invest the American proposals with greater external objectivity it was decided to draw France into the preliminary work of preparing the implementation of the "Marshall plan"—France, who had already half sacrificed her sovereignty in favour of the U.S.A., inasmuch as the credit granted to France by the U.S.A. in May, 1947, was conditioned by the elimination of the Communists from the French Government.

On instructions from Washington, the Governments of Britain and France invited the Soviet Union to take part in the discussion of the Marshall proposals, a step calculated to mask their anti-Soviet character. It was thought that, inasmuch as it was well known in advance that the U.S.S.R. would decline to discuss the proposals of American aid on Marshall's conditions, it would be possible to lay at her door the blame for "not wishing to promote the economic restoration of Europe" and thereby to set against the U.S.S.R. the countries which need real assistance; if, on

the other hand, the Soviet Union did take part in the negotiations, then it would be easier to catch the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe in the trap of "European economic restoration with American aid."

The "Marshall plan" was in that case to assist in the realisation of one of the most important tasks of the general American programme: that of restoring the power of imperialism in the countries of the new democracy and to force them to renounce close economic and political co-operation with the Soviet Union.

The representatives of the U.S.S.R., in agreeing to discuss the "Marshall plan" with the Governments of Britain and France in Paris, exposed at the Paris Conference the unsound nature of the task of evolving an economic programme for the whole of Europe and revealed the attempts to create a threat of interference in the internal affairs of the European countries and of violating their sovereignty by the formation of a new European organisation under the ægis of France and Britain.

The representatives of the U.S.S.R. showed that the "Marshall plan" did not conform to normal principles of international co-operation, that it harboured within it the danger of splitting Europe, the threat of subordinating a number of European countries to the interests of American capitalism, and was calculated to give help to the German monopoly concerns in preference to the Allies, since the "Marshall plan" clearly attributed a special role in Europe to the restoration of these concerns.

This clear position of the Soviet Union tore the mask from the plan of the American imperialists and their Anglo-French bailiffs. The all-European conference failed scandalously. Nine European States refused to take part in it. And even among the countries which agreed to participate in the "Marshall plan" discussions and in the working out of concrete measures for its realisation, this "plan" was received without particular enthusiasm, the more so since it very soon became clear that the Soviet Union's view that this plan was still remote from real, effective aid was fully confirmed.

However, the attempts to knock together a Western bloc under the ægis of America continue. It is necessary to note

that the American variant of the Western bloc cannot but encounter serious resistance even in countries already so dependent on the United States as Britain and France. The perspective of the restoration of German imperialism as a real force capable of opposing democracy and Communism in Europe cannot tempt either Britain or France. Here we see one of the main contradictions inside the Anglo-American-French bloc.

The American monopolies, like the whole of international reaction, apparently do not count on Franco or the Greek Fascists as any kind of reliable bulwark for the U.S.A. against the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies in Europe. They therefore place great hopes in the restoration of capitalist Germany, as a most important guarantee of success in the struggle against the democratic forces in Europe. They trust neither the Labourites in Britain nor the Socialists in France, deeming them, despite all their servility, to be insufficiently trustworthy quasi-Communists.

That is why the question of Germany, and in particular of the Ruhr basin, as a potential war-industry basis for the anti-Soviet bloc is a most important question of international politics and a question of dispute between the U.S.A., Britain and France

Thus, the Western bloc is being organised by America not on the model of the Churchill plan of the United States of Europe, which was conceived as an instrument for promoting British policy, but as an American protectorate in which sovereign European States, not excluding Britain herself, are assigned a role not very different from that of the notorious 49th State of America.

American imperialism is treating Britain and France ever more insolently and unceremoniously. The bi- and tripartite conferences on the fixing of the level of industrial production for Western Germany (Britain—U.S.A., U.S.A.—France), are a deliberate violation of the Potsdam decisions and, at the same time, demonstrate how completely the United States ignores the vital interests of its partners in negotiation.

Britain and, particularly, France, are compelled to listen to the American diktat and to accept it meekly. The conduct of American diplomacy in London and Paris recalls, in many

ways, their conduct in Greece, where the American representatives no longer deem it at all necessary to observe any decencies, appointing and replacing Greek Ministers at will and behaving like conquerors.

Thus, the new plan for the "Dawesification" of Europe is, in effect, directed against the vital interests of the peoples of Europe and represents a plan for the enslavement and subjugation of Europe to the United States. The Marshall plan is directed against the industrialisation of the democratic countries of Europe and, consequently, against the basis of their independence. And if the plan for the "Dawesification" of Europe was doomed to failure at a time when the forces of resistance to the Dawes plan were incomparably weaker than now, today there are surely quite sufficient forces in Europe, even without the Soviet Union, which, given the will and the resolution, can disrupt this plan of enslavement.

It is only a question of the will and readiness for resistance on the part of the peoples of Europe. As far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, it will make every effort to prevent this plan from being realised. . . .

In relation to the "Marshall plan" the camp of the democratic countries has revealed itself as a mighty force standing guard over the independence and sovereignty of all European peoples which do not submit to blackmail and intimidation, or allow themselves to be deceived by the intrigues and manoeuvres of dollar diplomacy.

The Soviet Government has never objected to taking advantage of foreign, and even American credits, as a means of speeding up the process of economic restoration. However, the Soviet Union always insisted that the conditions of the credit should not be of an enslaving nature and should not lead to the economic and political subjugation of the debtor to the creditor States.

Guided by this political conception, the Soviet Union has always adhered to the position that foreign credits must not become the main means of restoring the economy of a country. The basic and decisive condition of economic restoration must be the utilisation of the internal forces

and resources of the country itself and the creation of its own industry.

Only on that basis can the independence of a country be safeguarded from the encroachments of foreign capital which constantly displays a tendency to take advantage of credits as an instrument of political and economic enslavement. This is precisely the nature of the "Marshall plan," which is directed against the industrialisation of the European countries and is, consequently, calculated to undermine their independence.

The Soviet Union tirelessly defends the position that the political and economic relations between various States must be built exclusively on the basis of the equality of the partners, on mutual respect for their sovereign rights. Soviet foreign policy, in general and Soviet economic relations with foreign States in particular, is based on the principle of equality, the safeguarding of mutual advantages from the agreements concluded. The agreements with the U.S.S.R. are agreements to the mutual advantage of their participants and never contain any sort of encroachments on the State independence or the national sovereignty of the contracting parties.

This basic distinction, characteristic of the agreements between the U.S.S.R. and other States, stands out particularly clearly at the present time in the light of the unjust, unequal treaties concluded and in course of preparation by the United States.

Soviet foreign trade policy does not know unequal agreements. Moreover, the development of the economic relations of the U.S.S.R. with States interested in the matter shows on what basis normal relations between States should be built. Suffice it to recall the recently concluded agreements of the U.S.S.R. with Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and Finland. In this way the U.S.S.R. has shown clearly by what paths Europe could find a way out of the difficult economic situation.

Britain could also have had such an agreement, if the Labour Government had not, under external pressure, destroyed the already formulated agreement with the U.S.S.R.

By the exposure of the American plan for the economic enslavement of the European countries the foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. and the countries of the new democracy have rendered an undoubted service. At the same time it is necessary to bear in mind that the U.S.A. herself is threatened with an economic crisis. Marshall's official generosity has its solid reasons: if the European countries do not receive American credits, the demand of these countries for American goods will shrink, and that will hasten and intensify the approaching economic crisis in the U.S.A.

Therefore, if the European countries are sufficiently steadfast and prepared to resist enslaving credit conditions, the U.S.A. can be forced to retreat.

4.—DUTIES FACING THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IN THEIR EFFORTS TO RALLY THE DEMOCRATIC, ANTI-FASCIST, PEACE-LOVING ELEMENTS IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE NEW PLANS FOR WAR AND AGGRESSION

THE dissolution of the Comintern, in accordance with the needs of the development of the Labour Movement under the conditions of the new historical situation, has played its positive role. The dissolution of the Comintern has forever put an end to the slanders of the enemies of Communism and the Labour Movement to the effect that Moscow allegedly interferes in the internal life of other States, that the Communist Parties of the various countries allegedly act not in the interests of their own peoples but on orders from abroad.

After referring briefly to the early role of the Comintern and the reason for its dissolution, Zhdanov continued:—

In the four years since the dissolution of the Comintern a considerable strengthening of the Communist Parties, a strengthening of their influence, has taken place in almost all the countries of Europe and Asia. The influence of the Communist Parties has increased not only in Eastern Europe but also in almost all the countries of Europe where Fascism rules, as well as in those countries which were under German occupation—in France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Finland and so on.

The influence of the Communists increased particularly in the countries of the new democracy, where the Communist Parties are the most influential parties in the State

The Communist movement is developing within a national framework, but at the same time it is faced with interests common to the parties of the various countries.

Zhdanov dwelt briefly on the international intercourse between the Socialists, co-operators, scientific societies, etc., of various countries and then declared :—

Since the majority of the leadership of the Socialist parties, especially the British Labourites and the French Socialists, are acting, in effect, as an agency of the imperialist circles of the U.S.A., the Communists are called upon to play a special historical role: to head the resistance to the American plan for the enslavement of Europe, to expose courageously all internal accomplices of American imperialism.

At the same time the Communists must support all truly patriotic elements who do not want to see their country dishonoured, who want to fight against the enslavement of their country by foreign capital and for its national sovereignty

It is necessary to bear in mind that between the desire of the imperialists to unleash a new war and the possibilities of organising such a war there is an enormous gap. The peoples of the world do not want war. The forces that work for peace are so considerable, so large, that if these forces are steadfast and resolute in the defence of peace, if they display stamina and firmness, the plans of the aggressors will be completely defeated.

One must not forget that the clamour of the imperialist elements about the war danger is intended to frighten the nervous and vacillating and to wring concessions for the aggressor through blackmail. The main danger confronting the working class is in the under-estimation of its own forces and the over-estimation of the forces of the enemy.

Just as the Munich policy in the past gave a free hand to Hitlerite aggression, so concessions to the new course of policy of the U.S.A. and to the imperialist camp can make its inspirers even more insolent and aggressive. Therefore the

Communist Parties must head the resistance to the plans of imperialist expansion and aggression pursuing all paths—State, economic and ideological; they must rally and unite their efforts on the basis of a common anti-imperialist and democratic platform and gather around themselves all the democratic and patriotic forces of the people.



15056