

---

# ON THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

BY EARL BROWDER

**T**WENTY-TWO years ago, on November 7, 1917, in the fires of the first World War, the working class of the former tsarist empire seized power under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, and inaugurated the first socialist revolution in history.

Today, we celebrate the successful construction of a socialist society in the Soviet Union, in the opening phase of the second imperialist world war, which may well place the socialist revolution as the order of the day in another or several other capitalist lands.

The Communists, the Bolsheviks, have always been the firm and uncompromising leaders and organizers of the struggle against imperialist war, against the slaughter of the peoples for the purpose of aggrandizement of a group of monopoly capitalists at the expense of another and at the expense of the working people of all lands. It was upon the basis of the struggle against the war that the Party of the socialist revolution first won the allegiance of the working class and the majority of the toiling people, in a great country, obtained state power in its hands, and proceeded to build a new society based upon common ownership and operation of the national

economy for the common good of all the people.

Since the imperialist ruling classes of Germany, England and France have again thrown the world into war, the lessons of the last war and its culmination in the first socialist revolution take on an immediacy and sharpness that demand deep study and application in the light of the new world situation, and of the particular situation in each country.

What was the relation of the war to the first socialist revolution? Comrade Stalin has stated this question with his own peculiar clarity and brevity, when he said:

"Three factors, external in nature, account for the comparative ease with which the proletarian revolution in Russia succeeded in breaking the chains of imperialism and thus overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie.

"First: the factor that the October Revolution began in a period of desperate struggle between the two principal imperialist groups, the Anglo-French and the Austro-German, at a time when, engaged in a life-and-death struggle, these two groups had neither the time nor the means to devote serious attention to the struggle against the October Revolution. This factor was of the utmost importance for the October Revolution, which was thereby enabled to take advantage of the fierce clash within the imperialist world to strengthen and organize its own forces.

"Second: the factor that the October Revolution began during the imperialist World War, at a time when the toiling masses, tormented by the war and thirsting for peace, were by the very logic of events being led to the proletarian revolution as the only way to escape from the war. This factor was of extreme importance for the October Revolution, since it put into its hands the mighty weapon of peace, made it easy for it to connect the Soviet revolution with the ending of the hated war and thus created mass sympathy for it both in the West, among the workers, and in the East among the oppressed peoples.

"Third: the powerful working class movement in Europe and the maturing of a revolutionary crisis in the West and in the East called forth by the long drawn-out imperialist war. This factor was of inestimable importance for the revolution in Russia, since it assured it of reliable allies outside Russia for the latter's struggle against world imperialism."\*

Thus the struggle against imperialist war, the struggle for peace, was of the most decisive significance in the rise of the first land of socialism, the first realization of the teachings of Marx and Engels, which took place under the guidance of their great continuators, Lenin and Stalin.

#### WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE NEW IMPERIALIST WAR?

The capitalist newspapers of America, ably seconded by the Norman Thomas Socialists, the Social-Democratic Federation, the Trotskyites and Lovestoneites, have been shouting hysterically that the Soviet Union is responsible for the new imperialist war. Who is really responsible for the war? This is a crucial question, upon the answer to which depends our

judgment on the character of the war, and of how to fight against it.

First of all, it is clear that the forces bringing this war upon the world arose from within the capitalist nations, that it is correctly described as "a family affair" among them, to use the terms of that most intelligent Tory commentator, Dorothy Thompson. Capitalist Germany, imperialist Germany, is at war with capitalist-imperialist Britain and France. Even those who slander the Soviet Union admit by their very slanders that it is unreasonable to expect the imperialist powers to maintain peace, and by inference demand that the socialist Soviet Union should promote peace among them. Thus the very accusation against the Soviet Union, that it is responsible for the war, is found at the first critical examination to concede implicitly a higher moral stature to the land of socialism than to any capitalist country, not excepting the U.S.A. No one would think of saying that the U.S.A. is guilty for this war because it failed to prevent its outbreak, but the very ones who slander the Soviet Union the most unrestrainedly, unwittingly give the highest possible compliment when they assume that the Soviet Union had the moral responsibility to prevent the war.

Well, the Soviet Union itself, supported by the Communists of all lands, had a much keener and a conscious understanding of its role as the world leader in the organization of peace. It lived up to that role to the limit of the last possibilities. If the war finally broke upon the world, it was only after the Soviet Union had

\* J. V. Stalin, *Leninism*, Vol. I, p. 115, International Publishers, New York.

exhausted every possibility to prevent it, but had failed due to the fact that not one single capitalist country could be found to support these efforts.

From 1931 to 1938, a long series of imperialist aggressions were committed by Japan, Germany and Italy, the so-called "have-not" imperialisms, those who felt "wronged" by the results of the last World War and set about a forcible redistribution of the world. At any time during that period, up to the great Munich debacle in September, 1938, it was easily within the power of Britain, France, and the United States, by a sincere cooperation, to have halted these aggressions without resort to arms. Especially was this possible, since the active collaboration of the Soviet Union was offered, indisputably so since its entry into the League of Nations in 1934. The Soviet Union, not at all interested in maintaining the *status quo* resulting from the last World War, was deeply interested in preventing it from being changed by resort to war which would only plunge the peoples into deeper misery and endanger the Soviet Union also, disturbing it in its peaceful construction of the new socialist society.

Why was this series of aggressions not halted? Because the ruling classes in Britain, France and the United States were not sufficiently interested in doing this, because they were more interested in maneuvering against one another and weakening one another, and above all because they cherished the ambition, not too secretly, to build up these aggressive powers, Germany, Japan and Italy, as a force to which they assigned the historic task of destruction of the Soviet Union. This

latter factor especially became the obsession of the British bourgeoisie, headed by Chamberlain, who swallowed hook, line and sinker the bait cunningly laid by Hitler in the so-called "Anti-Comintern Axis." World peace was not organized, because the British and French bourgeoisie, with the enthusiastic support of the "heroes" of the Second International, and the benevolent neutrality at best of the American ruling circles, were less interested in peace than they were in inciting a war against the Soviet Union.

It was for this ambition that Chamberlain and Daladier made the enormous sacrifices of both honor and power to Hitler at Munich, for this they joined in strangling the infant Spanish republic, for this they stoically endured both insult and injury from Japan. No price was too high to pay, thought these gentlemen and the ruling classes they represented, so long as they believed they were purchasing a deadly war for the destruction of the Soviet Union.

This is the policy which directly and immediately is responsible for the systematic undermining of world peace, and for the outbreak of the present imperialist war. And for this policy the ruling classes of all the capitalist countries are equally responsible. All other factors are secondary. This was the policy which, when it was openly exposed as bankrupt by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact, led directly to the war.

#### HOW THE SOVIET UNION DEFEATED THE WAR PLOTS AGAINST IT

Why did Chamberlain fail in his

plots to embroil the Soviet Union in war, a war for which he had built up Hitler and the "Anti-Comintern" Axis at such a stupendous price?

Chamberlain's plots crashed on the rocks of the swiftly growing strength of the Soviet Union, and its consistent peace policy which won the support of millions upon millions of workers and toiling people in the capitalist and colonial lands.

First, let us examine the growing strength of the Soviet Union. In 1920, Lenin described the position of the Soviet power in the following terms:

"We are surrounded by imperialist states, which detest the Bolsheviks with all their heart and soul, which are spending vast sums of money, ideological forces, the forces of the press, and so on, and which yet were unable in three years to defeat us in war, although we are, from the military and economic standpoint, infinitely weak. We have not one-hundredth of the forces of the combined imperialist states, and yet they are unable to stifle us. They cannot stifle us because their soldiers will not obey; their workers and peasants, fatigued by the war, do not want a war against the Soviet Republic. Such is the position now, and on this position we must base ourselves. What it will be several years hence we do not know, since every year the Western powers are recuperating from the war."\*

If the Soviet Union had been eighteen years later in such a position, with not one-hundredth of the combined forces of the imperialist states, then truly Chamberlain might have succeeded in the object of his plots. But while the imperialist powers were recuperating from the last war, the Soviet Union was rising in strength also; and from 1929 onward, when the

imperialist powers were going through the deepest economic crisis, from which they never fully recovered, the Soviet Union was making spectacular economic advances, multiplying its national income by more than nine times during the First and Second Five-Year Plans. From the last position in volume of economic production, among the great powers, it advanced to first position in Europe, and in the world second only to the United States.

This tremendous economic advance improved the relation of forces in favor of the Soviet Union in many respects. Due to its socialist system, which distributed the benefits of the economic achievements among the whole population, the Soviet Union was the only land which consistently raised the standard of living and the cultural level of its peoples throughout this period, in which even the United States suffered catastrophic setbacks. Through the elimination of class divisions and national oppression in the country, the Soviet Union alone among great nations secured an unexampled solidarity and moral unity of its population. And upon this solid foundation, it was possible for the Soviet Union to build such defensive powers, in the form of its Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet (tested by the Japanese militarists with catastrophic consequences to themselves), as adequately to guarantee the security of its borders against all enemies.

In this historic development, the world was presented with proof of the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist system. This was stated by Comrade Stalin, in his speech to the

\* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 282, International Publishers, New York.

conference of Stakhanovites, in the following words:

"Why was it that capitalism smashed and defeated feudalism? Because it created higher standards of labor productivity, it enabled society to produce an incomparably greater quantity of products than was the case under the feudal system. Because it made society richer. Why is it that socialism can, should and certainly will defeat the capitalist system of economy? Because it can furnish superior models of labor, a higher productivity of labor, than the capitalist system of economy. Because it can give society more products and can make society richer than the capitalist system of economy can."\*

Add to all these factors, known to all realistic students of world affairs, and certainly pressing upon the attention of Hitler, the additional fact that the conspiratorial agents of world reaction and fascism that worked inside the Soviet Union to prepare its downfall when it should be attacked—the Trotskyites and Bukharinites—had been detected in their nefarious work, rounded up, and put out of business. Then we begin to understand the considerations that finally brought the Nazi dictatorship which acts for German imperialism and monopoly capital to the point where it was ready to cry quits to its much-touted ambitions to crush the Soviet Union, and to turn instead against those powers which, by their craven and dishonorable course of appeasement, had lost their moral force and cohesion, turned all honest stomachs, abandoned every consideration except their own selfish imperialist greed, and which conducted what amounted to a civil war against their own peoples.

\* Joseph Stalin, *The Stakhanov Movement in the Soviet Union*, pp. 4-5. Workers Library Publishers, New York.

Already a year ago, at the twenty-first anniversary celebration at Madison Square Garden, it was possible for the writer to answer the stupid propaganda of the Munichmen about the supposed "weakness of the Soviet Union" in the following words:

"If it were true that the Soviet Union is weak, perhaps the news might reach Adolph Hitler. And if Hitler heard it—and believed it—he might be tempted to seize those broad rich Ukrainian wheat fields, the thought of which has obsessed him for so many years. Hitler had always moved first against the points of least resistance; today he is much more busy in Latin America than in preparing to cross the Ukrainian borders much closer at hand. Can it be that Hitler has also heard about Soviet weakness? If so, his actions prove that he, at least, does not believe these fairy tales. . . . There could be no more conclusive testimony than this to the strength of the Red Army, Navy and Air Fleet, and of the socialist economy and culture which it defends."\*

That last sentence contained an error. There could be more conclusive testimony, and the world received it when Von Ribbentrop flew to Moscow to sue for a Non-Aggression Pact on behalf of Hitler, who abandoned his Axis allies and his whole ideology merely for the formal assurance that the Soviet Union, always pledged to a policy of non-aggression, would not commit or be a party to any warlike act against Germany.

Such were the forces which brought Chamberlain's plots to ignominious collapse, and finally proved to the world that the Soviet Union had become one of the decisive powers, which could no longer be excluded

\* Earl Browder, *Fighting for Peace*, p. 184. International Publishers, New York.

from world councils with impunity, whose voice must be heard in all decisions involving the destiny of peoples.

IN WHOSE INTERESTS DID THE  
SOVIET UNION ACT?

The Soviet Union acted in the interests of its own one hundred and seventy million population, and of its new socialist society. That is so clear now that even the most inveterate enemies of the Soviet Union themselves proclaim that "Stalin is the only victor" in the world-shaking events of the past two months. It would therefore seem unnecessary to spend further words to establish that the government of the Soviet Union has truly represented and protected the interests of its own people. Can as much be said of any capitalist government in the world?

But that is not the end of the question. The Soviet Union has always declared that it has no interests that are in conflict with the true interests of any other people anywhere in the world, that on the contrary its own advancement can only be of help to other peoples. That this is true of the present world situation, as well as in the past, is a fact of which we can quickly assure ourselves by a brief review of confirmed developments.

First, consider China, a people numbering over four hundred million, the largest single national family in the world, which has been suffering from the most shameful and wanton aggressions since 1931, without serious help from anywhere but the Soviet Union. Our American newspaper scribes and pharisees raised a great outcry that the

Soviet Union had "betrayed China" by the Non-Aggression Pact, and especially by its truce in the hostilities with Japan on the Mongolian border, although they had never been able to arouse any excitement or indignation against the U.S. furnishing Japan with more than half of all her imports necessary to her war on the Chinese people. But already it has become clear that the Chinese people, precisely through the break-up of the Axis and the consequent increased help of the Soviet Union made possible thereby, have administered decisive military defeats to the Japanese invaders, and turned the tide of their long and heroic war of national liberation. Unquestionably, the Soviet Union acted also in the interests of the Chinese people, a population equal to that of all Europe.

Second, the eleven million Ukrainians, Byelo-Russians and Jews, formerly under the oppression of the corrupt and semi-fascist Polish "government of colonels," who had been completely abandoned by their British-French "guarantors" to the tender mercies of Nazidom, have been saved by the Red Army from the horrors of war, have received for the first time in history possession of their own land, with full national and cultural liberation, have been freed from capitalist exploitation and brought into the socialist system, have been freed from the nightmare of foreign enslavement.

Third, the small Baltic countries, which had been assigned the role, in the old Chamberlain-Hitler conspiracy, of military base from which the projected war against the Soviet Union should be conducted, have

been shown the error of their past ways, and by abandoning them have secured from the Soviet Union their first real guarantees of peaceful development, economic expansion and national independence.

Fourth, the Balkan countries, famous in history as the "cockpit of Europe," victims for generations of imperialist intrigues, have been given the opportunity, if they can free themselves of the imperialist entanglements of their governments, of keeping out of the present imperialist war from which they have nothing to gain but new burdens and oppressions.

Fifth, the United States, and all peoples of the Americas, have distinctly improved their international position as the direct result of the break-up of the "Anti-Comintern Axis," which had threatened their national interests and domestic tranquility. From the hysterical howlings of the U.S. capitalist press against the Soviet Union, one could never guess that precisely the acts against which they are most furious brought distinct benefit to America (even including American capitalists); but that is the undeniable truth. Shamefully enough, American imperialist circles already speculate openly about using their present stronger position in relation to Japan, not for helping the Chinese people, but to come to an agreement with their imperialist rivals for *joint* exploitation and oppression of China.

Sixth, when we consider the working class of all lands, and the toiling farmers, it is clear that the victories of the Soviet Union have furnished them with a tremendous moral stimulus and encouragement, which will greatly im-

prove their situation, whatever their country.

The world bourgeoisie, landlords, militarists, and exploiters generally, suffered a great defeat and setback. But the workers, farmers and oppressed peoples, of all lands, found their interests truly represented and advanced by the Soviet Union and its great victories.

#### CONSEQUENCES OF THE IMPERIALIST WAR

When the British and French governments rejected all effective proposals for collaboration with the Soviet Union to preserve peace, they had already stripped the impending conflict down to a fight for their imperialist interests as against German imperialism. In such a war the working class and toiling peoples have nothing to gain on either side, they cannot support it directly or indirectly, they must fight against the continuation of such a war, and must bring it to the earliest possible conclusion.

This war is a continuation of the last World War, with no difference in essence or principle. It is brought about by the fundamental contradictions of monopoly capitalism. It is an expression of the general crisis of the capitalist system, and in turn it deepens and intensifies that crisis. The whole capitalist world is being driven by the war into a phase of most acute and profound crisis.

As a consequence, one of the first developments is the rapid disappearance of the differences between the so-called democratic and fascist capitalist states, which become indistinguishable insofar as their dictatorial character is concerned, which is the

dictatorship of monopoly capital. The so-called democracies become even more hostile to the Soviet Union than the fascist states, all of them becoming quite vicious when the Soviet Union demonstrated that it could be dealt with only upon the basis of equality. The slogan of democracy against fascism, which directed the struggle for the erection of the real peace front that could have stopped the war, thus loses its objective foundation in the real situation of the world. The war has wiped out its reality, and requires that it be replaced with a new direction of the struggle. Where before the war it was a question of preserving peace and the remnants of bourgeois democracy, now both are already wrecked, the issue is raised of the very existence of the capitalist system.

This new situation is most sharply presented by the belligerent countries. But we cannot expect that the United States will be an exception, even though it has not entered the war. Already, even while remaining neutral, the bourgeoisie of the U.S. has moved sharply toward an extreme reactionary position. The former New Deal liberal bourgeoisie is fraternizing on the most cordial terms with the former anti-New Deal camp, and we can be absolutely certain the touching new friendships are based upon reactionary, not liberal, agreements. In the first weeks after the opening of the war, we were much too slow in seeing this profound regrouping in a reactionary direction, and in sounding the alarm against it. President Roosevelt has made most serious concessions to this trend, has shown no signs of tak-

ing up arms against it. While his role may continue equivocal, and much depends upon himself—if he could break with the reactionary trends of his class, and really fight for non-involvement in the war and for its speedy end, he could salvage something of his former role—it must be expected that the liberal bourgeoisie will rapidly shed its liberalism; on this we must have no illusions. That the labor movement has sensed this new development quickly is witnessed by the sudden subsidence of the formerly sweeping demand for the third term.

The American capitalists, large and small, have been swept into a frenzy of greedy expectation of a war boom, of war profits, from the furnishing of materials of all kinds to the belligerents, from capturing their foreign markets especially in Latin America, from dismantling the social security and labor legislation, and from raising a reactionary movement against labor and civil liberties for the people. They are eager to grow rich out of the catastrophes of other people and the oppression of the workers at home. That is why they rage so viciously against any suggestion that the war should stop; that is why the American newspapers are more enthusiastic for the war by a hundred times than the press of the belligerent countries, that is why they are even now, while the U.S. is officially neutral, proposing to outlaw the Communist Party, a step that Britain has not taken or even suggested after two months of actual war.

It is very instructive to see how, with military precision and promptness, the Norman Thomas Socialists,



the Social-Democratic Federation, the Lovestoneites, and the Trotskyites, and all the army of provocateurs and stool pigeons, have moved into the campaign of the American bourgeoisie against the Soviet Union and against the American Communist Party. The most solemnly-proclaimed "principles" are dumped overboard without a word of explanation, as witnessed in the obscene performance in the American Labor Party in New York, where Socialists and Lovestoneites voted without an instant's hesitation a pledge of aid to Britain and France, a denunciation of anyone who calls this an imperialist war as an "agent of Moscow," just so that they could help put over a condemnation of the Communist Party and the Soviet Union. The counter-revolutionist Trotsky suddenly came out as the protagonist of the democratic peace front—after denouncing it for years when it was possible of achievement, he became converted at the moment when the bourgeoisie had destroyed it but wanted to exploit the sentiment against fascism for its own imperialist ends. With all the promptness and precision of an army marching to orders, all the enemies of socialism and the Soviet Union, the enemies of the Communist Party, sprang to the heel of the bourgeois reaction. Now, as in 1914, they are prepared to do their utmost to help the bourgeoisie overcome the crisis, and to prevent the working class from coming to power to achieve socialism.

#### THE REGROUPING OF CLASS FORCES IN THE U.S.

To get a clearer picture of what is happening in class relations in the

U.S., it is valuable to review the main outlines of the past few years. For several years up to 1929, when the great crisis broke out, American monopoly capital had been riding a high horse, unchallenged master and without serious opposition. From 1929 to 1933, it tried to ride through the storms of the crisis, under Herbert Hoover, without any serious change in policy whatever, placing the terrific burdens of the crisis squarely upon the masses without the slightest alleviation, and trampling popular rights underfoot. This aroused a great mass movement of protest and struggle, especially among the sixteen millions of unemployed and among the farmers, veterans, etc., and at the same time led to the complete paralysis at the beginning of 1933 which ushered Roosevelt into the Presidency.

The first two years of the New Deal was a period of "national unity" of all the bourgeoisie, mainly based upon the devaluation of the dollar and suspension of the anti-trust laws, with the organized labor movement brought into line with the concession of Section 7a of the N.I.R.A., and the edge taken off the unemployed movement by a growing measure of relief employment at bare subsistence wages. But as the monopolist bourgeoisie awoke to the fact that Roosevelt's measures had pulled them out of the hole, that their system could still continue to function even if haltingly, as they became more and more angry and frightened at the establishment of the principle that the government had the responsibility for furnishing jobs and social security to the people—they came out in a great campaign for a

return to the good old days of Herbert Hoover; this was the period of the Liberty League in which the bourgeoisie split sharply into a reactionary and a liberal camp, which led up to the 1936 election, and the overwhelming victory of the liberal camp with the support of the overwhelming mass of the labor movement.

By 1938, the reactionary bourgeoisie had gathered its forces sufficiently and fought with such tenacity, that it began to disintegrate the liberal bourgeois camp, which began to witness more and more desertion to the reaction, and which therefore had to lean more and more upon the labor movement. The trade unions had also been split, through the machinations of monopoly capital working through William Green and the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., which had determined to halt at all costs the great organizing campaigns in the basic industries, and therefore expelled the unions of the C.I.O., which became the main labor base of the New Deal so far as leadership was concerned. The inner relationships within this alignment were already through the year 1939 becoming quite strained, due to the continued capitalist crisis which was driving the whole capitalist world toward war.

The outbreak of the war in Europe has broken down that alignment and started a new regrouping of forces. Roosevelt and the liberal bourgeoisie have immediately moved toward a reconciliation with their reactionary class brothers, from whom they have been estranged for several years, while the labor movement (excluding the top bureaucrats of the A. F. of L.) has

moved toward a more independent position, to the Left, and loosened its political ties with the liberal forces that move in the opposite direction. This is the general outline of the shifting class relations and the directions in which they move.

#### THE EMBARGO ISSUE AND THE FIGHT AGAINST THE WAR

The so-called Neutrality Act, adopted in 1935, did not reflect a foreign policy on the part of the U.S., but rather the absence of such a policy. It was applied to the Spanish Republic, in order to fall into line with Chamberlain's strangulation policy, misnamed "non-intervention"; while its application to the Far East was withheld. The repeal or fundamental revision of this Act became a necessary demand conditioning the fight for American support to efforts to organize world peace. Roosevelt's tentative efforts in this direction over two years, known as his "peace policy" although it was never a definite policy of the Administration as a whole, which was divided, secured the energetic support of the progressive and labor movement, and of the Communists, with but small results except the beginnings of a great shift in mass opinion away from isolationism.

With the outbreak of the imperialist war, however, this issue took on an entirely new aspect. It entirely lost its original significance, and became a confused and subordinate issue, on both sides of which are reactionary, profiteering and war-minded imperialist circles, and on both sides of which are masses of sincere peace-loving workers, farmers and middle classes

who are opposed to any involvement in the imperialist war. But as the issue approaches a decision in Congress, at the moment this is written, the character of the debates around it have already gone far to stamp the proposed revision as a conscious taking sides in the imperialist war, as a measure taken for the purpose of helping the British and French imperialists. All those who fully recognize the character of this war as an imperialist one, therefore, have more and more definitely thrown their influence for the retention of the embargo and the defeat of the revision.

This is the position the Communist Party has taken; but at the same time we have emphasized that the real fight for peace has not crystallized as yet, on this issue. It would be the greatest stupidity, for example, and extremely dangerous, to assume that the principal spokesmen for, and Congressional supporters of, the retention of the embargo, constitute the "peace party" in the U.S., while those on the side of revision are the "war party." That would be to assume that Hearst, Vandenberg, Coughlin, Lindbergh, Hoover, the *Chicago Tribune*, Henry Ford, etc., were heading the "peace party," instead of being, as they are in reality, the most hard-boiled reactionary imperialist spokesmen in the country. That would be to assume that the Republican Party, which furnishes the main body of anti-repeal votes in Congress, is really entitled to the label, which it is preparing for itself in the 1940 election campaign, for purely reactionary and imperialist purposes, of being the party which will "keep America out of war." It would be to

forget that, while the main body of the American bourgeoisie is hostile to the Soviet Union, the most vicious proponents of American participation in war against the Soviet Union are most of them in the pro-embargo camp.

No, the real "peace party" in the U.S., the real camp of struggle against the imperialist war, will be formed of the masses who are now seriously confused and divided on the immediate issue of the embargo law, just as the real war party consists of the reactionaries, profiteers, and monopolists, and their hangers-on and agents, who are on both sides of the immediate issue. Therefore, when we advocate maintaining the embargo (and even extending it to a much broader scope), it is with the sharpest differentiation between ourselves and the reactionaries who support the embargo, and the most serious warnings against misuse of this issue by the reactionary camp to confuse and mislead the masses in the 1940 elections.

#### THE NEW DECISIVE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Now as never before, the Soviet Union emerges before the world in its magnificent role of liberator and protector of the toiling masses against the catastrophes of capitalism, oppression and imperialist war. The capitalist world has proved its incapacity to maintain peace, and has demonstrated that its ruling classes and leaders do not want to maintain peace. The capitalist world is plunging into its deepest and most profound crisis. In sharpest contrast, the Soviet Union has maintained peace for its own people,

and has saved a series of small nations from the disasters of war; it has turned the tide for the liberation of the Chinese people from their invaders; and it has done this on the basis of its own great and growing moral force, inner strength and clear policy, without drawing the sword or shedding a drop of blood.

The Soviet Union arose, twenty-two years ago, on the basis of the struggle for peace and against imperialist war.

It registers its great achievements today in the same cause. It stands as a great shining light, the supreme example, showing the suffering masses of all lands that they are not fated to helpless disposal at the hands of their war-making rulers, that they can take their own destiny into their own hands, that given the will and the understanding they are an invincible power that can bring peace and socialism to the whole world.