

World Events
INTERPRETED BY  SCOTT NEARING

Vol. VII, No. 2

Spring 1950

Letter 66

Peace Through Force?

Implications of the Super-Bomb

Churchill "An Undisguised Radical"

European Empires Disintegrating

Communism the New World Order

The Spread of Communism

Problems Facing Communism in 1950

Can Communism Keep the Peace?

Utilizing the New Social Forces
by Scientific Social Engineering

Published four times a year by the
WORLD EVENTS COMMITTEE
125 Fifth St., N. E., Washington 2, D. C.

\$1.00 a year

25 cents a copy

"To put a worthwhile truth in circulation
is a good day's work."

PUBLICATION OFFICE NOTES

● A group has been formed here in Washington for the study and discussion of Scott Nearing's writings and lectures. They have chosen his *Tragedy of Empire* as their first topic. We hope their example will be followed in other localities.

● *The Present World Situation and What We Can Do About It* is the title of a 6-page leaflet we are reprinting from two recent issues of *World Events*. We ask your cooperation in getting wide distribution for it. We can send 30 for \$1.00—single copies, 7 cents, to cover cost of mailing. Stamps accepted.

● Because of its timeliness and lasting value, we are planning to reprint as a 24-page pamphlet the section of this issue of *World Events* entitled "Communism the New World Order" (page 12 to end). But we shall first have to get together \$100 in advance orders and contributions. Would you be interested to help? The pamphlet will sell for 10 cents plus postage, or 12 for \$1.00 postpaid.

● A good friend of *World Events* has given us 200 copies of George Seldes's latest book, *The People Don't Know*, because of his high opinion of the book and also his desire to help increase the circulation of *WE*. The book sells for \$3.00. It presents in most readable fashion what Seldes learned on a tour of Europe on both sides of the Iron Curtain and exposes the campaign in this country to "keep the American people artificially alarmed," as Senator Dulles put it. We will send a copy to anyone who sends in three new subscriptions to *WE*. If you cannot obtain or donate all three right now, we will gladly send you coupons which you may use later.

WORLD EVENTS COMMITTEE

World Events

Analyzed and Interpreted by Scott Nearing

Vol. II, No. 2

SPRING 1950

Letter 66

Friends:

ON JANUARY 31, 1950 President Truman ordered the Atomic Energy Commission to produce hydrogen bombs. This is the same man whose directive vaporized tens of thousands of men, women and children in Hiroshima and Nagasaki during August 1945. He has now authorized the production of weapons whose destructivity is from ten to a thousand times greater than that of uranium bombs.

A brief explanation accompanying the President's order stated, "It is part of my responsibility as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces to see to it that our country is able to defend itself against any possible aggressor. Accordingly I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or super-bomb. Like all other work in the field of atomic weapons, it is being, and will be, carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security."

Like "national defense," the "peace and security" slogan is an unanswerable argument if we accept the assumption underlying it—that peace and security will probably result from a stockpile of atomic weapons. How valid is this assumption?

Months before President Truman gave the order to make super-bombs, Dr. Vannevar Bush, war-time head of the scientists and technicians who played so large a part in rubble-izing Germany and Japan between 1942 and 1945, wrote his *Modern Arms and Free Men* (Simon & Schuster, 1949.) After a careful analysis, Dr. Bush concludes in this book that there is no defense against atomic bombs carried by high-flying, speedy planes or guided missiles or planted in strategic locations. He

repeated this assertion before a congressional committee in February of this year. The only answer to atomic bombs is to drop them on the enemy and to do it first.

Within a week of the presidential order for the hydrogen bomb, the Federation of American Scientists, with 1,500 members, published a formal statement regarding atomic weapons, declaring, "1. We can be sure that, if we build H-bombs, the Russians will build them also; we must have no illusions of security based on a monopoly of a super-weapon. 2. The kind of security we want can be had only by building a stable peace."

The statement continued: "The question which faces us today is whether the United States will persist in its avowed policy of seeking peace through agreement or whether it will pay lip-service to this policy while relying on force" (*New York Times*, 2/6/50).

PRESIDENT TRUMAN is for force. He still talks in terms of his old formula: "The United States now has a fighting strength greater than that of any other nation in the world" (Message on Conscription, 11/23/45). "The United States today is a strong nation; there is none stronger . . . We are determined to remain strong" (Army Day speech, 4/6/46).

Defense Secretary Louis Johnson is of the same mind. "Government and industry," he says, "are co-operating in the development of newer and more effective weapons and armament in an effort to achieve for America the highest degree of military preparedness" (Speech to the National Association of Manufacturers, 12/7/49). On February 3, 1950 the United Press reported Mr. Johnson as stating that the country's defenses were stronger than at any time since 1945 and were getting stronger every day. Russia, he said, was the only possible world aggressor. "We want a military establishment sufficient to deter that aggressor and sufficient to lick hell out of her if she doesn't stay deterred" (*New York Times*, 2/3/50, p. 2).

Truman and Johnson believe in peace through power. They are ideological brothers-in-arms of the militarists who tried to impose on the world by force of arms an Egyptian peace, a Roman peace, a British peace, a German peace. Their power makes them arrogant. They do not realize that peace can come only through readiness to give and take, to meet "the enemy" a

little more than half way, awareness that cooperation is possible only among equals and willingness to admit mistakes and rectify past errors.

Their language is not that of peace by agreement, but of war, a fight to the finish and unconditional surrender. In a recent article Major General J. F. C. Fuller wrote that such a fight, waged with present-day weapons will lead to the annihilation of all the contestants.

Truman and Johnson are talking in the twentieth century and thinking in the nineteenth. Both are suffering from the Maginot Line delusion. They assume that U.S.A. super-bombs will drop on the Soviet Union, but they forget that, at the same time, USSR bombs will be dropping on the United States. Both men should ponder the Vannevar Bush study and remember what happened in Europe from 1939 to 1945.

In his *Modern Arms and Free Men* Dr. Bush points out that only the rudiments of mechanized war appeared in the 1914-18 fighting. While soldiers were engaged in front-line battle, planes moved back and forth across no-man's-land, showering death and destruction on cities and people. During that struggle there were, however, few guided missiles and no atom bombs. The instruments of mechanized warfare were not tried out until after 1939; it was not until the 1939-45 struggle that science and technology got into their stride. The past decade has written a new page in the art of war. The substance of that page is that there is no longer any such thing as national defense, but only national destruction through the use of mechanized, armed force. Neither the President nor the Secretary of Defense seems to have read that page.

Implications of the Super-Bomb

THE DECISION to manufacture super-bombs was important from a practical point of view because it showed that U.S. top policy-makers are still thinking in terms of the pre-1939 era. Theoretically, it was important because it showed the moral bankruptcy of U.S. politicians and scientists.

On February 4, 1950 twelve top-ranking U.S. physicists, headed by Prof. Hans A. Bethe, of Cornell, urged the Washington government not to be the first to use the hydrogen bomb.

They took the position that the United States should produce the super-bomb but should not initiate its use. Their argument ran as follows:

1. The hydrogen bomb is "no longer a weapon of war but a means of extermination of whole populations."
2. "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb, no matter how righteous its cause . . . Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization."
3. Nevertheless, in the absence of international control, the United States must proceed to manufacture super-bombs. "Until we have international control, we cannot afford not to have the hydrogen bomb."
4. Speaking for the group of twelve physicists, Prof. Samuel K. Allison, of the University of Chicago, said, "There is no one here who will not obey the President's directive" to proceed with the production of the hydrogen bomb (*New York Times*, 2/5/50).

Here is an excellent example of the opportunistic thinking which has dominated United States leadership since the turn of the century—McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, the small-fry of the intervening administrations and then, over-topping them all, Franklin D. Roosevelt, with his lip-service to principle and his unflinching resort to expediency.

NOTE THE FORMULA to which Professor Bethe and his colleagues have committed themselves:

1. The super-bomb is wicked, monstrous.
2. Under existing conditions we have no choice but to produce this monstrosity.
3. If Our Leader orders its manufacture, every one of us will obey Him.
4. While we are willing to help in the building of a wicked and monstrous lethal engine, we believe that it should not be used by the U.S. Government until the enemy leads off.

This is precisely the attitude of the German intellectuals

during the early days of the Nazis. They were opposed on principle to what the Nazi regime was doing but, if the orders of the Leader or the necessities of Fatherland defense required their services, they were willing to go along.

Hanson W. Baldwin, *New York Times* military critic, had an article in the February 1950 *Atlantic Monthly*, dealing chiefly with the dropping of uranium bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These bombs were dropped, Mr. Baldwin argues, "not to secure a more equitable peace but to hasten victory. By using the bomb, we have become identified, rightfully or wrongly, as inheritors of the mantle of Genghis Khan and all those of past history who have justified utter ruthlessness in war."

Mr. Baldwin points out that, while the people of the United States think of themselves as naïvely idealistic, the record tells a quite different story. The U.S., he writes, did not ratify the Hague Convention of 1899, outlawing dum-dum bullets, nor the Geneva Protocol of 1925, outlawing the use of biological agents and gas in war. As the war in the Pacific drew to a close, he continues, the Washington government was seriously considering the use of gas against the Japanese and a shipload of biological agents, to be used in destroying the Japanese rice crop, had already crossed the Pacific. Furthermore, in Asia as in Europe, the U.S. air force followed a policy of obliteration bombing.

Such policies, Baldwin declares, may result in "the salt-sown fields of Carthage or the rubble and ruins of a Berlin, Tokyo or Hiroshima," but unrestricted warfare can end only in disaster to all who practice it.

In the recent conflict, Baldwin concludes, U.S. military tactics "brought new horror to the meaning of war; the ruins of Germany and Japan, the flame-scarred tissues of the war-wounded, attest our efficiency. And on August 6, 1945, that blinding flash above Hiroshima wrote a climax to an era of American expediency. On that date we joined the list of those who had introduced new and horrible weapons for the extermination of man; we joined the Germans, who had first utilized gas, the Japanese, with their biological agents, the Huns and the Mongols, who had made destruction a fine art."

Where Do They Think They Are Going?

WHERE DO THE President and his supporters think they are going?

Surely they cannot imagine that they are proceeding in the direction of peace. Centers of armed power in the past have made not peace, but war.

Surely they cannot believe that mankind will be attracted by their weapons of mass terror and destruction. Since when has terror engendered loyalty?

Surely they cannot hope to buy their way into the affections of Europeans and Asians by spending or lending billions of tax dollars. The recipient of charity traditionally turns away from the giver, while the borrower comes to hate the lender.

Truman's spending-lending-arming spree has lasted nearly five years. What are its results to date?

1. In various countries grabbers and exploiters threatened by popular movements have turned to the Truman administration for help. Many of them have got the money and arms they asked for. Each Washington grant of support to a minority of grabbers and exploiters has alienated the exploited majority. Are the Marshall Plan countries ready to stand by the U.S.A. in an atomic war against the U.S.S.R.? Britain, improbably. France and Italy, emphatically not.

2. Since 1945 the U.S.A. has taken part in half a dozen undeclared wars in which imperialists, landlords and capitalists were financed, armed, organized and directed by U.S. interests and personnel. This happened in Indonesia, Greece and China. Four other such wars are still in progress—in the Philippines, South Korea, Indo-China and Formosa. In each of these four wars U.S. money, arms, equipment and military advisers are helping to suppress popular movements. Such a policy could not win the support of the people, but only of their masters and exploiters. Most notable among the examples of the outcome which ultimately follows such a policy was the 1949 débâcle for the Nationalists in China.

3. In 1950 U.S. influence, based upon the assumption that this country is a progressive force, has been all but dissipated.

Particularly among colonial peoples, the United States today is looked upon as imperialist and reactionary.

4. Even though present U.S. policy may not guarantee peace, its advocates insist that it will surely bring victory—(a) victory by imperialists in an age which has repudiated imperialism, (b) victory by exploiters in an age which has repudiated exploitation, (c) victory by proponents of competition in an age which can survive only on the basis of cooperation, (d) victory by an isolated, even though industrialized nation, based upon military operations across two oceans and directed against the Eurasian heartland of the planet.

Such claims might have made sense before 1947. Today they are groundless and pointless. In the name of a fast disappearing culture pattern, the Truman administration is making war on the emerging social order. Any such program is foredoomed to defeat.

A friend has offered to pay for reprinting as a leaflet for free distribution the preceding 6½ pages (together with one on "Blood Money" which had to be omitted for lack of space) provided there is sufficient demand from "World Events" readers. Orders should reach us by May first. Stamps or currency to cover postage will be appreciated. Please specify quantity desired.

WORLD EVENTS COMMITTEE

Churchill "an Undisguised Radical"

FOR A LONG TIME I have been looking for a way to describe the world ideological position of U.S. big businessmen and politicians. *U.S. News and World Report* (Feb. 24, 1950) has at last met my need in an article headed "Mr. Churchill: 50 Years of Radicalism."

"By American standards", the article declares, "Mr. Churchill and his party in 1950 are not conservative, but radical." Fair Deal Democrats find that Churchill's conservatives advocate a welfare state, job security, free public medical care, government subsidies for housing and government-supported farm prices. The article continues, "Such ideas do not suit Britons who want to abandon socialism immediately

and turn the clock back to the days before government interference in business and in industry." To such Britons and to the editors of *U.S. News and World Report*, Mr. Churchill is "an undisguised radical."

"Back to the days before government interference in business and in industry"—how far back are those days in U.S. history? Money is one of the most essential features in a commodity economy such as that existing today in North America. Another important feature of a commodity economy is an accepted standard of weight and measurement. The Constitution of 1789 delegated to Congress the power to regulate the value of money and to fix standards of weight and measurement. The government of the United States therefore has been "interfering" in business since the founding of the Republic.

Government "interference" in industry dates back at least to 1815, when U.S. manufacturers, who had begun production or expanded their plants during the blockade accompanying the War of 1812, found themselves at the war's end confronted with quantities of British, Dutch and French manufactures, "dumped" in the American market at prices below those being charged by the "infant" U.S. industries. "We must have protection against this unfair European competition or we shall perish," U.S. business spokesmen told Congress. Result—the Tariff Act of 1816 and the long succession of tariff legislation from that day to this.

Government interference in business and industry began with the early days of the Republic and has continued ever since. During the roaring days of railroad consolidation and trust organization preceding the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 and the orgy of profiteering and speculation from 1922 to 1929, the role of government was minimal. At other times it has been more extensive, as it was during the early 1930's, when big business, suffering the inevitable consequences of the 1922-29 profiteering spree, was flat on its back, with inflated prices falling, badly managed banks closing, over-expanded industries running part-time and sixteen millions of unemployed tramping the streets. It was at this juncture that Great Engineer Herbert Hoover set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which shoveled billions from the Federal Treasury into the coffers of

banking and business concerns whose senior executives had turned their energies from the prosaic job of supervising production, sales and the distribution of dividends to the more exciting game of gambling on the stock market.

Tariff subsidies and R.F.C. loans were small-change affairs, however, in comparison with the real "government interference" which accompanied the wars of 1898, 1917-18 and 1941-45. The lean years of the 1890's were brought to an end by the program of military spending incident to the Spanish-American War of 1898. Depression engulfed U.S. industry in 1913. From 1930 to 1939 the U.S. economy suffered the most profound and prolonged business slump in its history. Revival after both these economic set-backs was based upon federal-government war-spending, which reached a high point of \$100 billions in 1945.

High levels of productivity and employment from 1946 to 1950 have resulted in part from the expansion of federal spending from a \$4-\$5 billion annual level in the early 1930's to a \$42-\$43 billion annual level in the late 1940's. This ten-fold expansion of federal spending within two decades has absorbed the economic surpluses and postponed a second post-war depression of staggering proportions.

U.S. BIG BUSINESS has denounced "government interference" all through the years but, whenever it has faced serious difficulties, it has run to Washington, asking for hand-outs, subsidies and outright gifts. Without such "government interference," U.S. big business long since would have been swept into the ash-can of history.

Mr. Churchill's "radicalism" is based on the type of "interference" which he advocates. Government backing for business is a "legitimate" form of interference, but government support for farm prices, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions and public health measures is undisguised radicalism.

Americans who want to know how others see us should read chapter 8 of Stuart Hughes's *An Essay for Our Time* (Knopf 1950). Europeans, Professor Hughes observes, look upon the Truman administration as conservative. "After all, President Truman's maximum program is less socialist than that of the British Conservatives."

European Imperialism Disintegrating

ON FEBRUARY 23, 1950, British voters elected a parliament divided almost evenly between the Labour Party and the Conservatives. The intensive election campaign brought out a record vote. There is every reason to believe that the results represent the present division of opinion in the British Isles.

With two major parties, neither of which has a working majority, and no minor parties to participate in a coalition, Britain has joined the group of weak West European governments heretofore headed by France and Italy. In no one of these countries can a strong policy be initiated or followed because in each of them the middle classes hold the balance of power and the middle classes are weak, indecisive, vacillating, timid.

As long as colonial territories were being divided up and world markets were being won, British, French, Italian and other profit-seekers were able to mobilize and lead the middle classes along the path of empire. Today the situation is reversed. Colonial revolt has wrecked the empires. War has dislocated and disrupted international trade and commerce. The spread of communism has taken the initiative from the profiteers and forced them into a defensive position. The erstwhile centers of capitalist power are split along class lines, with no group strong enough to win a working majority and make policy.

France and Italy have been in this plight for decades. Britain has now joined their ranks. Germany, divided politically between West and East, is concentrating its energies on national unification. West Europe, despite Marshall Plan aid and Atlantic Pact guarantees, has a shattered economy and a disintegrating polity, which once was capitalist and is not yet communist.

There could be no clearer example of a social system in the process of transition from one culture level to another, indecisive, vacillating, hesitant. Marshall Plan aid can no more

build strength into such a society than the billions spent on Chiang's Nationalists was able to help them win.

I should like to repeat the words used by Secretary Dean Acheson in his letter of transmittal in the Chinese White Paper of August 1949—"The . . . inescapable fact is that the . . . result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the Government of the United States . . . It was the product of internal Chinese forces, forces which this country tried to influence, but could not."

At some time in the not too distant future, historians of Marshall Plan aid will be saying the same thing about West Europe. The old order is dying there as surely as it died in China. The new order will take over there as surely as it took over in China. All the gold in Fort Knox and all the atom bombs stockpiled by the Truman administration cannot alter this basic death-birth process which is transforming the modern world.

Mao Is Worth Reading

THE COMMITTEE FOR a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (80 East 11 Street, New York City) is publishing a series of documents dealing with the Chinese People's Republic. One of these, *The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China*, by Mao Tze-tung, sells for 35 cents. Another, on *The Dictatorship of the People's Democracy*, also by Mao, sells for 25 cents. If you have not read Mao's writings, you will be delighted by his objectivity, the relentless logic of his analysis and the directness of his thinking and his style. I cannot read Chinese and therefore do not know how Mao's words sound in the original but in these translations they have much of the dignity and simplicity of Lincoln.

China is passing through a profound social transformation. Such an experience always calls to the center of attention men and women who write and say what their fellows are experiencing. It seems more than probable that Mao is one of the men whose names will go down in world history among the foremost personalities of this age.

Communism, the New World Order

I SHOULD LIKE to devote the remainder of this *World Events* issue to the countries which are engaged in socialist construction. For the sake of simplicity and clarity I am going to call these countries "communist," and the movement which they represent "communism," although the countries themselves insist that they are working *toward* communism.

The proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic on October 1, 1949 gave to the communist sector of the planet a fifth of the human race, together with a large segment of its agriculture and a considerable part of its industry and commerce. From now on, mankind must not only take communism seriously, but must be prepared to accept it and deal with it as the culture pattern which is rapidly replacing capitalism.

At the outset, let us remind ourselves of the situation of the western world forty short years ago. Peace, prosperity and progress were taken as a matter of course by the upper and middle-class elements, while organized workers were advocating international solidarity and a world cooperative commonwealth. Wagering and colonialism seemed firmly established and were widely accepted as the heritage of mankind.

Victorian illusions of stability and security were shattered in the years following 1910. Revolutions began in Mexico in 1910, in China in 1911 and in Russia in 1917. During the succeeding years war has torn the old social order to pieces, revolutions have redistributed power and socialist construction has altered the social order for hundreds of millions.

Out of this chaos a pattern of social life has emerged and shaped itself under the leadership of the Russian Bolsheviks. From 1917 to 1945 it was in the Soviet Union alone that socialist construction could be seriously attempted. Only in Russia had the power of landlords and capitalists been broken sufficiently to make possible a social economy planned, organized and administered for community advantage, rather than for private profit.

Bolshevik builders of communism faced four obstacles—(1) custom, tradition and habit, through which the past always influences the present, (2) the war-damaged, backward, out-

moded culture pattern inherited from the Romanoffs, (3) a hostile world, doing its best to obstruct, sabotage and, if possible, overthrow Soviet society. (4) Every step taken by the Bolsheviks led into unknown territory, each move being in the nature of a trial and dogged by the overwhelming probability of error.

THROUGH 24 YEARS the Soviet people struggled to overcome these obstacles. In June of 1941 their frontiers were crossed by one of the largest and best equipped military forces ever brought together. Behind the Nazi-led military force stood the science, the engineering, the long established mines, factories and other installations which support mechanized war. Behind it also was an aggregate population far larger than that of the Soviet Union.

War tests the economy, the social solidarity, the will of a people to survive. The land of socialist construction was arrayed in battle against a foe which had overrun France in ten days and which expected to break the Soviet will-to-resist within three months.

After suffering a series of initial defeats, losing great numbers of men, vast stores of supplies and some of its vital industrial and agricultural centers, the Soviet forces made a stand before Moscow and Leningrad. The stand was successful. In his *Soviet Arms and Soviet Power* General Guillaume calls it a miracle. Winston Churchill, in his *Second World War*, states that "no other nation could have survived" under the conditions existing in the late fall and early winter of 1941. General Guillaume credits the successful Soviet resistance to three things—(1) the will of the Soviet people to resist, (2) the success of the Bolsheviks in remobilizing and adding to their armed forces, (3) the transfer of their heavy industry from territory occupied by the Nazis across the Urals into Siberia, the re-designing of their war equipment and, in the late autumn of 1941, a mass output of tanks, planes and guns superior to those of the invaders.

The battle for Moscow, General Guillaume argues, was the decisive battle of the war. It was won by the superiority of Soviet mechanism.

Within little more than two decades, the Bolsheviks had

renovated Tsarist economy, set up a Soviet state, trained a generation of scientists and technicians, planned and constructed a modern economy and mobilized popular support behind a form of social life capable of turning back the Nazis and overrunning eastern and central Europe. Bolshevism had demonstrated its survival value in a chaotic world wracked by war and overturned by revolution.

From 1917 to 1943, Bolshevism survived under difficult conditions. Then it began to spread into eastern Europe and Asia.

The Spread of Communism

BOLSHEVISM SPREAD in eastern Europe for several reasons. (1) There had been active revolutionary parties in eastern Europe before 1917. These parties joined the Communist International and continued their agitation through the two decades between 1919 and 1939. Much of the time they worked underground. (2) The war of 1939 led the Nazis into eastern Europe. Under this military occupation, the underground revolutionist forces joined other elements of the population in organizing the resistance to the Nazi invaders. (3) This movement reached its highest point in Yugoslavia. Under Marshal Tito the resistance forces made headway against the invaders, set up a government which cooperated with the West in the struggle against the Nazis and won independence before the cessation of hostilities in the spring of 1945. (4) Elsewhere in eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia and Poland, the Red Armies drove out the Nazis, occupied much of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire and took an active and paternal interest in the setting-up of peoples' republics in place of the governments which had collaborated with the Nazis. (5) Even before the shooting war ended in 1945, British and American interests were doing what they could to protect oil and other investments, regain access to markets and control the make-up and policies of East European governments. While the shooting war between the Anglo-American forces and the Axis powers was still under way, the cold war between the West Bloc and the East Bloc had begun over Poland, Iran, Trieste and the United Nations charter.

Long before Truman-Doctrine intervention in Greece and Turkey and Marshall-Plan intervention in West Europe (both in 1947), West Bloc and East Bloc were squaring off in preparation for a conflict. For a time Yugoslavia was Washington's whipping boy in the East Bloc and the State Department was stamping U.S. passports "not good for travel in Yugoslavia."

When the 1947-8 controversy over Marshall Plan Aid ebbed, there were half a dozen countries "east of the Iron Curtain" which were popularly described as communist. In each the Communist Party was the dominant political force. In 1947 representatives of these communist parties founded the Communist Information Bureau as a meeting ground on which major policy decisions were to be made.

POST-WAR ASIA likewise turned to the left. In many of the Asiatic countries there were individual citizens who had received their early training in the University of the East maintained in Moscow by the Communist International to teach Asiatics and Africans the science and art of revolution. Both the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist International were committed to a policy of backing movements for colonial independence. After 1927 the leftist elements in China, with the Chinese Communists playing an important leadership role, maintained themselves and increased their influence, not only in China, but in other sections of Southeast Asia. Soviet Siberia, occupying the entire northern third of Asia was a constant reminder and example of what Asiatics might hope to achieve in the way of industrialization under a planned economy. Even before 1939, therefore, Asian reformists and revolutionaries were organized and were broadening their influence.

War—in Manchuria and North China after 1931, in Central China from 1937 to 1941 and in Southeast Asia from 1941 to 1945—prodded Asians toward "governments of their own choosing." Japan, an Asian power, pushed its way into China in opposition to the interests of western empires. In 1942-3 the Japanese military drove British, Dutch, French and United States armed forces out of Southeast Asia, reached the borders of India and threatened Australia. These military victories

won by an Asian power over westerners disproved the widely held theory of western superiority and invincibility. They also "liberated" Asian colonials from the yoke of western imperialism. Even though the Japanese imposed a co-prosperity-sphere yoke that was equally galling, it was only a matter of a few months before Japanese domination was challenged and destroyed by the western allies.

Both Japanese and western agents urged the colonials to "rise against the oppressor" and provided them with arms and leadership. This same slogan had been dinned into Asian ears by communists ever since 1919. Example and propaganda bore fruit when the shooting war in the Pacific came to an end in 1945. No sooner had the Japanese laid down their arms than a rash of independence governments appeared all over the Far East. The Indian National Congress was leading India through dominion status to complete independence from Britain. The Chinese liberation forces were moving toward the Chinese People's Republic (proclaimed October 1, 1949) and the Indonesians, Burmese, Malayans and Viet-Nameese, under communist leadership, were demanding recognition as independent and sovereign governments.

Where Communism Spread

HAVING SURVIVED and grown strong in the Soviet Union, communism had spread into central and eastern Europe and into important sections of Asia. It is noteworthy that the movement was confined to areas dominantly agricultural, in which the old patterns of life had been uprooted by war—and usually by military defeat—and in which Communist Party leadership was more or less thoroughly established. There was a fringe of industrialization in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic area and Northern China, but elsewhere the economy was overwhelmingly agricultural.

Highly industrial regions in Germany, West Europe and North America were successful in resisting attempts to transform private-economy-for-profit into public-economy-for-use. The combination of (1) a well organized business-professional oligarchy, in control of mass production, the state apparatus and the channels of public information, and supported by (2)

a large, comfortable, gadget-supplied middle class, by subsidized farmers and by the bureaucracy of organized labor, provided a united front which the forces of revolution, even when they were numerically powerful and well organized, as in Germany, France and Italy, could not break.

Consequently, the Communist Revolution of 1917-1950 followed the line of least social resistance, penetrating those areas in which the ruling minorities had been weakened by economic change and military losses. As Lenin put it, the chain of capitalist imperialism broke at its weakest link.

From 1750 to 1910 the bourgeois revolution, during which business won out over the landed interests, followed a similar pattern—skirting the strongholds of feudalism in central and eastern Europe, crossing the Atlantic to the Americas and South Africa, and the Pacific to Japan and Australia, and only later penetrating and transforming the homelands of the Hohenzollerns, Hapsburgs and Romanoffs.

COMMUNISM HAS SPREAD with breath-taking speed. As lately as 1910, western peoples generally took it for granted that capitalism and imperialism were rich enough and powerful enough to "live forever." Capitalists controlled the means of production, the wealth and income, the state, with its police and armed forces, and the channels of public information. They were supported by ecclesiasts and educators. They were dispensing bread, beer, circuses and philanthropies on a vast scale. Yet, during 1917-1949 the capitalist oligarchs lost control of a third of the planet.

The oligarchs not only lost control. They were also compelled, despite their utmost economic, diplomatic and military efforts, to witness the rise of a formidable alien power. Capitalism had been built upon a private economy competitively operated for profit. The communist economy is publicly owned and is planned, coordinated and operated for use. The spread of communism, whether in the colonial areas or in the imperial homelands, could take place only at the expense of capitalism.

I have gone once again over this familiar ground because I wish to underline the fact that, during the past forty years, communism has become a world power in the same sense that capitalism became a world power during the period from 1650

to 1850 A.D. Having established that point, I now wish to take up some of the problems faced by the communists in the opening months of 1950.

Problems Facing Communism in 1950

LIKE EVERY PATTERN of social organization, communism can hope to survive only insofar as it is able to meet the over-all social requirements of its age. The present age is overshadowed by technological developments which have brought humanity within sight of economic abundance. It is passing through an era of violence and terror. It is honeycombed by fear, anxiety, hatred, revenge, the will to power, hope for security and aspirations toward freedom. It is seeking its satisfactions in the acquisition of goods and services, comfort and convenience, in gratification of physical appetites and in opportunistic sacrifice of objectives for immediate gains. Its new weapons of mass destruction and terror place in the hands of a few power-intoxicated policy-makers the possibility of plunging the modern world into a war of extermination. It is stridently and fanatically nationalistic. Because the means of securing and distributing information are so numerous and so continuously effective, it is more widely aware of social forces than any previous age.

Can the communists take over the world, coordinate it, shape it, control it and direct its destiny at least as effectively as the capitalists coordinated, shaped, controlled and directed the imperial-colonial world from 1750 to 1910? The capitalists have proved themselves unable to deal with the social forces which the developments of this age have released. Can communism succeed where capitalism has failed? If it can, Lenin was right and western man need not sink into a dark age between two periods of cultural expansion, but can pass immediately from a high level of capitalist development into an age of active socialist construction. If the communists cannot succeed, Spengler was right and the West is passing from its day of brilliant material achievement into its night of historical oblivion.

At this point I do not propose to discuss the effectiveness of communism as a socially constructive force within one country.

I take it for granted that the Soviet Union has demonstrated the feasibility of socialist construction within national frontiers and thus has met successfully the first great challenge faced by the communists. Rather, I am concerned here with the situation which has arisen since 1944—several countries, each committed to socialist construction, each sovereign in the national sense, each armed for “defense” and each indoctrinated with a double loyalty—to socialism and to motherland. That is the situation in 1950 which presents communism with its second major challenge.

Communism’s first challenge was fairly simple—the use of modern science and technology to construct a public economy and a planned society within the frontiers of one nation.

Communism’s second challenge is far more difficult—to plan, organize and administer a group of nations, clustered together geographically, each of them dedicated to the establishment of a publicly owned, planned economy for use and each of them armed and jealous of its independence.

Perhaps the matter can be put still more tersely thus: Science and technology have provided modern man with the means of wresting an adequate living from nature and establishing planet-wide order and peace. Capitalism was unable to adjust itself to the new survival requirements. Can communism make full use of its present opportunity?

Conflict in the Cominform

COMMUNISTS HAVE ATTEMPTED to meet the need for world order in three ways. The first was the Communist International, which functioned from 1919 to the beginning of war in 1939. The second was the attempt to gain collective security through general disarmament and the enforcement of the League of Nations Covenant. The third, the Communist Information Bureau, has existed officially since 1947.

The Communist International was organized as the general staff and central administrative office of the world revolution. Its sections were the communist parties of fifty countries. During its early years, its executive committee, in constant session at the headquarters in Moscow, spoke for the left wing of Marxist groups all over the planet. The aim of the Communist

International was a world-wide cooperative commonwealth in which human brotherhood would be an accomplished fact.

When the world revolution failed to materialize, Bolshevik leaders turned to the League of Nations. For a decade, beginning in 1926, they were the most insistent champions of disarmament. During the 1930's Maxim Litvinov added to the Soviet program two concepts which gained wide currency—"the indivisibility of peace" and "collective security." The Munich Pact of 1938 ended this Soviet effort for the establishment of world order and peace and brought a threat of encirclement, invasion and annihilation which lasted till 1944.

When the shooting ended in Europe, Red Armies were spread across eastern Europe north of Greece and Turkey. They had also occupied Vienna, Berlin, Prague and Warsaw. Following their military victory, the communist parties of the territory occupied by the Red Armies faced the problem of establishing order and peace in the communist sector of eastern Europe and Asia. The first phase of this effort to set up an ordered communist world was marked by treaties of friendship and mutual assistance and by trade agreements among the newly established peoples' republics and between these republics and the Soviet Union. The second phase was marked by the establishment of the Communist Information Bureau, or Cominform, composed of representatives from various communist parties, including those of states in eastern Europe which are attempting to build communism. The Cominform serves as a central office and meeting place. It is not a government; it has neither legislative nor executive authority.

Immediately after its organization, the Cominform enjoyed a considerable degree of prestige. It was strong enough, for example, to prevent the establishment of a Balkan Federation of Peoples' Republics, even though that program had won the support of a figure as prominent as George Dimitrov. Soon, however, it ran into a snag in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. First there was controversy in the Cominform and then an open rupture of relations between the Cominform and the Yugoslav Communist Party. The matter did not stop there, however. Since the Yugoslav state was dominated by the Yugoslav Communist Party, the state leaders of several eastern

European countries engaged in a duel of words with Yugoslavia, followed by a duel of diplomatic and economic sanctions in which the leading roles were played by representatives of the Soviet and Yugoslav communist parties and officials of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Word-banding between the contestants reached the level of intensity which has characterized factional struggles among Marxists during the past century. Marx himself was a master of epithet. Lenin, his pupil, equalled his master in this respect. Both have been outdone, however, in the verbal interchanges which have marked the Soviet-Yugoslav conflict.

I have before me a copy of the *Soviet Embassy Bulletin*, published every two weeks by the Soviet Embassy in Washington. This issue (2/10/50) carries an article headed, "Three Bloody Fascist Butchers: Tito, Tsaldaris, Franco," in which the following phrases occur: The terror of the Franco regime "pales when compared with the bloodthirsty deeds of the Tito clique in Yugoslavia"; "the ruthlessness with which the most loyal democrats and patriots of the country are being destroyed in Yugoslavia surpasses even the well known cannibalism of the butcher Franco"; "Yugoslavia today is a country of ruthless and mass extermination of people"; "Tito is of late resorting to one of the most brutal forms of exploitation—forced labor without pay in the interests of foreign capitalists"; "Tito in Yugoslavia, Tsaldaris in Greece, Franco in Spain, the bloodthirsty hangmen of their peoples"; "in the dungeons of the butcher Tito, patriots are tortured and executions and murders perpetrated day and night."

MUCH OF THE SOVIET-YUGOSLAV controversy has risen above this level of personal abuse. There are ideological differences concerning the meaning of "people's democracy", "dictatorship of the proletariat", "socialist construction." There are also practical problems arising out of the urgent need in Yugoslavia for new capital, the acceptance by the Tito regime of loans from the United States, a Yugoslav new economic policy under which some types of private enterprise are being tolerated as they were in the Soviet Union between 1921 and 1928, and the speed with which collective farming may be developed.

During the latter part of 1949 and the early weeks of 1950, Yugoslavia added new fuel to the flames by promulgating a policy of economic decentralism under which an over-all plan was prepared by the central government, but responsibility for the fulfillment of the plan was transferred to one or another of the republics which compose the Yugoslav Federation. This is a noteworthy departure from the pattern of power concentration in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet-Yugoslav conflict arose over the refusal of the Yugoslav Communist Party to accept and follow decisions reached in the Cominform. It developed rapidly into a power struggle between the Soviet Communist Party and the Yugoslav Communist Party, with the communist parties of neighboring states taking the Soviet side. Diplomatic and economic sanctions were imposed, not by the Cominform, which had no means of coercing its constituent members, but by the Soviet Union and its supporting states. The sanctions were imposed, not upon the Yugoslav Communist Party, but upon the Yugoslav state and its people. Thus ideological differences between Communist Party representatives in the Cominform led to a cold war between armed socialist states.

Yugoslavia, isolated economically from the Soviet bloc, turned for needed capital and industrial materials to the West Bloc, which meant, in effect, to the United States. The U.S. State Department, eager to break socialist solidarity behind the Iron Curtain, made haste to authorize loans and grant export licenses for the shipment of materials. Thus Yugoslavia became a pawn in the cold war between the West Bloc and the East Bloc.

We are not concerned here with the details of the Moscow-Belgrade controversy. Like all controversies, it has its partisans who insist upon the righteousness of the side they champion. Even if we desired to do so, we could not decide which side is "right" and which "wrong." Also, this is not our purpose.

What concerns us is not the controversy, but its implications. Foremost among these implications is the issue of war and peace.

Can Communism Keep the Peace?

Marxists have assumed that a communist world would be cooperative, orderly, peaceful. Yet here are states engaged in socialist construction, led by communist parties and having as their avowed object the establishment of cooperation and world brotherhood, but which are now involved in a typical international power struggle, denouncing and threatening one another and employing the familiar tactics of cold war.

Does this conflict mean that a group of states dedicated to communism will settle their differences by using diplomatic, economic and military weapons? If the answer is affirmative, what will humanity have gained if the hydrogen bombs which annihilate it are manufactured by communist, rather than by capitalist, physicists and engineers?

During my three months of speaking last winter, no other single question attracted more attention than "Titoism." People who take it for granted that the world must and will go communist—and there are many such all over North America, not a few of them in very high places—want to know whether a communist world will be able to maintain international solidarity and thus insure international cooperation, or whether the power struggle between nations and peoples will plague and destroy communism as it has plagued and is destroying capitalism.

Threats to Communist Solidarity

LET US BEGIN our analysis of the possibility of international communist solidarity by listing some of the forces which threaten it. Obviously such threats come chiefly out of the past and tend to follow the customary channels which have led the western world into its present bloody mess.

1. Ideological differences divide any movement in which they are permitted to predominate. If ideological differences come first, the movement will surely split and splinter. If the welfare of the movement comes first, differences in ideology can be subordinated to the need for solidarity.

2. National loyalties and national traditions stand high on the list of threats to communist solidarity. For several centuries the modern world has been building the independent armed state and, through the channels of propaganda, developing patriotic or state loyalties. This work has been so thoroughly done that today patriotism is the major loyalty of western man and was the primary factor responsible for wrecking the European socialist parties in the years from 1914 to 1918.

3. During the current struggle for the re-division of the world, nobodies have risen in a few short years from anonymity to positions of supreme authority. Those who have maintained their positions have been able to exercise great power and to bask in adulation. Gifted, ambitious men and women are taking advantage of the present era of confusion and transition to make themselves and their supporters masters of a party or state and to retain their mastery as the only means of holding on to their power.

4. Varying culture levels produce varying problems, varying interests and varying points of view which are not easy to harmonize or to coordinate into an over-all authority.

5. Anti-communist elements are doing everything in their power, through espionage, sabotage, propaganda and subsidy, to split the communist nations and peoples away from one another and set them at each other's throats.

Ideological Solidarity

WE HEADED OUR LIST of threats to communist solidarity with ideological differences. We shall therefore begin our discussion of the maintenance of communist solidarity with some comment on the meaning of communism.

First, let us agree that communism is not a geographical but a social conception. It is not confined to an area on the map but refers to a stage or phase of social development and a pattern of social organization and administration. In theory, therefore, any community which reaches that stage of social development and which follows that pattern should be described as communist.

Communism is a method of planning, organizing and administering a community which involves (a) collective ownership of the means of production, (b) a public, rather than private, economy, (c) the right and duty of every able-bodied individual to engage in some socially useful occupation, (d) the distribution of income, first in accordance with productivity and later in accordance with need, (e) equality of opportunity, (f) the subordination of competitive to cooperative techniques, (g) the conscious improvement of society by society.

The Soviet Union pioneered the development of communism. During the past few years other communities in Europe and Asia have made an attempt to follow a similar line of development, not primarily because it was initiated or practiced in the Soviet Union, but because, at their present stage of social evolution, the collectivization of the means of production and socialist construction are the logical next steps. The Soviet Union was the first instance—but only one instance—of a modern people moving consciously toward a communist social pattern.

As other communities repudiated the competitive, exploitive, nationalistic pattern of social life which the nineteenth century described as capitalism, each began the building of communism at its own cultural level. We have already noted that the communist bloc includes areas which are, or were, predominantly agricultural. In three decades the Soviet Union has transformed an agricultural economy into an economy which is predominantly industrial. On the other hand, the Republic of China, established in 1949, is still agricultural. For years to come, its economic activities will center about the construction of highways and railways, power stations and industrial enterprises. Three decades hence China may be as highly industrialized as the Soviet Union is today. During that time the Soviet Union presumably will have continued its development toward more advanced stages of communism and the gap separating the culture level of the two countries will therefore persist.

AT ANY GIVEN MOMENT the communities engaged in the task of building communism will be each at a different cultural level. No one community will have a monopoly of communism—either as to methods of procedure or as to levels

of achievement. Taken together, however, they will constitute the communist sector of the planet.

During the nineteenth century capitalism was at one stage of development in Britain and at another in the United States. All communities operating private enterprise economies for profit were "capitalist," though each was at a different stage of capitalist development.

During the twentieth century communism will likewise vary from one community to another. There will be varying rates of change, varying intensities of centralization and decentralization, varying degrees of popular participation in the making of public policy, varying competence in the carrying out of policy.

Solidarity among communist communities will be based, not upon identity, but upon common objectives, pursued at different tempos and by different means. How wide these differences can be, the history of the period will record, but that they will cover a very wide range goes without question.

Solidarity in Procedure

EACH COMMUNIST NATION will work out its own problems of planning, organization and administration. Together the communist nations must establish procedures under which they can avoid conflict and share in the common task of building up a planet-wide communist society. There are several ways in which this task may be approached.

1. The Soviet Union may surround itself with friendly sovereign peoples' republics, smaller in size, less wealthy and less powerful than the Soviet Union. Because of their relative weakness, these republics will be subordinate to the Soviet Union. This, in effect, has been the situation in eastern Europe since 1945. Out of this situation came the defection of Yugoslavia.

2. Smaller, weaker communities may be absorbed into the Soviet Union, either as a result of persuasion or through coercion, and may become member republics in the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics. The Baltic Republics, which had been a part of Tsarist Russia, joined the Soviet Union under

such conditions a decade ago. This procedure, followed to its logical conclusion, would bring the entire planet finally into a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, with Moscow as its capital.

3. A confederation of sovereign communist states may be established under a working agreement similar to the Atlantic Pact and the Pact of Rio de Janeiro. Each state would retain the chief attributes of sovereignty, including its national economy and national military organization. Such a regional organization could be established under the United Nations Charter.

4. Communist states might join the United Nations and, as their number increased, play a larger and larger role in shaping United Nations policy. In the course of time—and perhaps, not a very long time—the communist members of the United Nations could outvote their capitalist opponents and dominate U.N. policy in the same way that today the capitalist members of the U.N. dominate its policy and outvote their communist opponents. One of the major issues confronting the United Nations, then as now, would be the continuance of its present weak confederal structure or its transformation into a strong federal world government by delegating to it powers sufficient to enable it to make decisions and enforce them.

5. An independent confederation of communist states might be established, with a structure similar to that of the United Nations. All communist states might withdraw from the United Nations and join this new organization. The planet would thus be politically divided between a capitalist United Nations and a communist United Nations. The communist policy of "walking out" on United Nations deliberations is a step in this direction. The political division of Germany into a western area and an eastern area and of Korea into North and South Korea has institutionalized the idea. Indeed, if there is to be a West Bloc, headed by the United States, and an East Bloc, headed by the Soviet Union—a situation which has existed since 1945—nothing could be more logical than to have each bloc separately organized. Since the West Bloc has control of the United Nations, with a voting strength over the East Bloc of 3 or 4 to 1, the East Bloc has an additional reason for forming a

parallel, rival body. The split in the World Federation of Trade Unions, from which the West Bloc members walked out in 1949, is another straw moved by the same wind.

6. A Communist federal union might be established which would include the Soviet Union as one of its constituent members. This would place side by side the United Nations confederation, in which individual national sovereignty persists at a high level, and a World Federation of Socialist Republics, exercising sovereignty in matters of general concern but leaving to the member countries sovereignty over matters of local concern. In this sixth possible line of procedure the federal principle, which has been applied thus far only to continental areas would for the first time be established internationally and on a planet-wide basis.

WHATEVER PROCEDURE the East Bloc may adopt as a working device for preserving solidarity and providing for cooperation among the communist nations, the means employed must be adequate to maintain international order and peace in a world sharply divided along economic, political and social lines. At the outset, certainly, the central authority charged with the responsibility for co-ordinating the movement toward a communist world must be able to wield a large measure of power. Equally, the rights and privileges of individual nations must be carefully safeguarded; otherwise they will follow the example set by Yugoslavia, withdraw from the East Bloc and paddle their own canoes as best they can on the stormy seas of present-day power politics.

Serious procedural problems are presented by a world in transition. The conservatives, seeking to preserve themselves against change or replacement, fight a stubborn rearguard action in a situation which threatens to reduce their privileges or limit their authority. The revolutionaries, seeking their place in the sun, press forward resolutely and try to take advantage of each opportunity that will strengthen their position or augment their power. What is the primary objective of the contestants? If it is to win a victory, they will eventually risk a trial by battle. If it is to preserve world order and make the transition at the least possible cost, they will do everything short of shooting.

International Communist Institutions

WHICHEVER METHOD the communist states adopt in their dealings with the West Bloc, it is evident that, if order and peace are to be maintained among the nations composing the East Bloc, the communist states now in existence and those which subsequently join them will require four basic types of institutions.

1. International economic planning by an authority empowered to coordinate existing economic equipment and project new equipment. Such an authority would establish on the international (or world) level a planning department similar to those now existing on the national level in each communist state.

2. A political super-state, set up by the existing communist states and so designed as to attract into its membership other nations and peoples which might go communist. Without such an international political authority, international economic planning would be ineffective because the decisions of the planning body would be unenforceable.

3. An international office of communication and information, charged with the responsibility of laying an ideological foundation for international solidarity (a) by setting up and maintaining international channels of information, communication and publication and (b) utilizing these channels to create a super-national or international loyalty, especially among the young. (One of the most essential of the channels would be an international language, taught in the schools of all member nations and states.)

4. An international institute for cultural cooperation, based on the assumption that the widest possible range of national and local cultural autonomy should be preserved, provided such cultural autonomy does not hinder the functioning of the communist central authority. By emphasizing local cultural self-determination, the institute would offset the tendency toward power concentration at the center.

We have discussed some of the ideological, procedural and institutional problems which confront the communist nations

in 1950. The Soviet Union has pioneered the way in economic planning, in socialist construction and in cultural self-determination. International problems, from their very nature, cannot be met unilaterally by one nation, however effectively that one nation may be organized. On the contrary, they can be dealt with successfully only by the communist nations collectively. Recent developments in China and other parts of Asia increase the need for clear, cogent thinking and decisive organizational action that will anticipate and meet the international problems of a communist world.

Utilizing the New Social Forces

CAPITALISM'S SPECTACULAR DECLINE since 1910 has been due in large part to its failure to utilize constructively the new social forces released by science and technology during the past two centuries.

Capitalist economy thrives on scarcity. The new forces offer abundance.

Capitalism is nationalistic. The new forces are planet-wide in their scope.

Capitalist economy was built upon competition, including political and military competition between groups of profit-seekers or national governments. The new forces require cooperation for the effective functioning of power-driven machinery. Where the new forces were permitted to enter the competitive military arena, they led to devastation that bordered on annihilation.

Capitalist economy emphasizes the individual and individual (sovereign) rights. The new forces, essentially collective in scope, make social responsibility the primary test for survival.

Capitalist society did not meet the challenge of the power age and was unable to handle the social forces which clustered around mass production and instantaneous communication. Hence it was torn to pieces by forces which it did not comprehend and could not control.

Scientific Social Engineering

COMMUNIST SOCIETY must meet the challenge of the new forces or it will perish because of its failure to contain and direct them. In this respect it has several advantages over

capitalism. (1) It approaches social problems from an evolutionary point of view. (2) Its underlying principles are based upon the primacy of cooperation over competition. (3) It teaches the paramount importance of the collectivity and the secondary role of the individual. (4) It can function effectively only in the presence of abundance.

Communist mastery of the new social forces must be based upon several axioms of social organization and administration.

- 1—The one world of technology must become one world also economically and politically.
- 2—Our one world must exist to provide equal opportunity for all members of the human family, irrespective of nation, race, tradition, belief.
- 3—One world can function effectively only as long as it can maintain stability, order and peace.
- 4—Stability and order depend upon a sound balance between specialization, diversity and fluidity on one hand and coordination, efficiency and discipline on the other.
- 5—Such objectives will be achieved most easily through a science of social engineering and through its practice by socially conscious, competent, well trained men and women, eager to contribute their mite toward peace and human brotherhood.

PARALLEL WITH THESE five axioms of social organization and function are five axioms of association which apply to all types of human communities, communist as well as capitalist.

1. The major objective of association is the survival, maturation and unfoldment of successive generations of individuals. Hence the emphasis on social solidarity, stability and order as the most effective means through which to promote respect for life and encourage growth.
2. Relations between the individual and the group and between local groups and the general group can be stabilized most effectively in accordance with the principle of diversity within unity. Hence the importance of recognizing and encouraging difference and specialization so long as diversity does not threaten group solidarity and stability.

3. Tension and conflict enter into all social relations, from the family to the world community. At best, therefore, the social balance is precarious. It can best be maintained by persuasion. It will probably be upset by coercion, except when applied against tiny, recalcitrant fractions of an otherwise approving social group.

4. Rigidity of association should be avoided. Fluidity and liquidity should be encouraged, particularly under the pressure of new forces requiring the modification and adaptation of a social pattern which can no longer contain new forces released by social change.

5. That form of association is most enduring in which social responsibility is voluntarily accepted and implemented. The resulting mutual aid is advantageous for the individual, as well as for the social group.

Social axioms are generalizations based on observations made by natural scientists who have collated many facts of geology, biology, physics and chemistry. Social axioms seem to be true, notwithstanding notable exceptions to the general propositions which they are designed to classify and describe. New facts and new social situations will modify social formulations which we regard today as axiomatic. Nevertheless, social axioms embody our knowledge up to the present moment. They formulate our basic assumptions concerning human association. Until we have something more authentic with which to replace them, we should treat them as we treat accepted generalizations in any field of human endeavor.

I REALIZE that I have trespassed upon the time and attention of those who read this letter. It would have been easy to write something about the Moscow-Belgrade conflict, report the attitudes taken by both sides, attempt some evaluation of the two positions and let the matter rest there. This would have been mere reporting, with some editorial comment by the reporter. Instead of doing this, I have tried to analyze the social situation out of which the Moscow-Belgrade conflict arose and point out ways of avoiding similar conflicts in the future.

Analysis, such as that which I have been presenting in the

last few pages, is no easier to read than to write. Yet it is indispensable to an understanding of the events now taking place in the communist world. It is also necessary for meeting the issues which the communist world confronts.

Those of us who seek order, peace and a chance to get on with the essential business of life no longer have any reasonable choice. The capitalist world is breaking up economically and socially. It is disintegrating under our feet. Recent developments in West Europe and especially in Asia underline this fact. The communist world has survived and is spreading. If order and peace are to be established and maintained, it is the communists who must assume the major responsibility for their establishment and maintenance. It is therefore of vital concern to communists and anti-communists alike that the communists should think clearly, plan wisely and put their plans into execution, with the greatest good to the greatest number and the least harm to the least number as their central social objective.

Scott Nearing.

Jamaica, Vermont

Scott Nearing assumes sole responsibility for writing "World Events" but takes no part in its publication or distribution.

Special Notice

This is the most important and valuable number *World Events* has thus far issued. Believing that many of our readers will want copies to give to their friends, we have printed an extra quantity. While they last, we will send 10 for \$1.00, but let us hear from you promptly.

WORLD EVENTS COMMITTEE



Books, Pamphlets, Leaflets

BY SCOTT NEARING

Democracy Is Not Enough \$1.00; cloth binding, \$2.00
The Revolution of Our Time \$1.00
The Soviet Union as a World Power \$1.00
The Tragedy of Empire \$1.50; cloth binding, \$2.50
United World \$1.50; cloth binding, \$2.50
War or Peace? \$1.00

PAMPHLETS

From Capitalism to Communism.
The New Age—Dark or Golden?
What the U. S. A. Could Do for the World.
☞ 10 cents. Any 3 for 25 cents, 8 for 50 cents, 20 for \$1.00.

Why I Believe in Socialism.
The American Way of Life.
The Present World Situation.
☞ 5 cents. Any 6 for 25 cents, 12 for 50 cents, 30 for \$1.00.

LEAFLETS FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

War and Peace.
A Call to Action.
As Others See Us.
Teaching Is My Job.
The Hand of Destiny.
Reply to Louis Fischer.
The Way of the Transgressor.
Seeds of Its Own Destruction.
The Faith That Removes Mountains.
A Humanist Approach to Economics.