

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

HOW TO STOP IT ?

By
R. SWARUP

Read & Approved
BY
SRI AUROBINDO

Published by
PRACHI PRAKASHAN
88, NETAJI SUBHAS ROAD
CALCUTTA—1



1950

RARE 321.030 947
Sw 26 R



Library IAS, Shimla



00012118

Printed by
P. C. CHATTERJEE
AT THE MODERN ART PRESS
1/2, DURGA PITURI LANE
CALCUTTA—12

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This book should have been in the readers' hands two and a half months earlier. But the inordinate delay arose out of quite unforeseen reactions from so many printing houses in Calcutta.

Presses like the Statesman, Newmans, Baptist Mission, Edinburgh Press, Sri Gouranga, Alliance Press, Saraswati and Imperial Art Cottage refused to print the book for one reason or the other. Some of them did not want to touch anything so out-spoken and politically controversial ; some thought it might be seditious and refused to accept whatever the assurances we offered ; yet others politely told us that they were too busy with other jobs for the time being. Our experience at one place was rather shocking. Having agreed to undertake the job and having provided us with an estimate and detailed advice in every respect, the work was turned down at the last moment for reasons best known to them. While in a few cases the reasons, we hope, were genuine, in most cases, we could feel a vague fear of trouble which the communists might occasion through their control of the Press Employees Union or by direct damage to the machines. We trust that this fear is not shared by the top management.

Personally, we should have liked not to mention this unfortunate experience. But we feel that it has a larger importance and it is only right that many more people should know it. We are strengthened in our belief that while the atmosphere is reeking with communist propaganda, who have unrivalled facilities in that direction,

true facts about Russia and Communism find it difficult to reach the public, partly through indifference, partly through lack of vigilance and courage on our part. If social democracy ever dies, it will be due to this moral indifference and ordinary business caution and calculation. The sound and fury which the Communists make and the blackmail they practise should not paralyse us into inaction. We have to see and accept and suffer for the light of truth wherever we find it.

At the end, we thank Messrs. Modern Art Press and especially Mr. S. C. Guha for undertaking the job. He was really a godsend after all the disappointments we met.

SYNOPSIS

CHAPTER ONE

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

	<i>Page</i>
PREFACE	v—xiv
INTRODUCTION	1—2
Russia threatens world freedom—Russia has already subjugated 10 countries and about 150 million people—Creation of a United Democratic World Front, the only check against this threat to our very existence.	
SOVIET AGGRESSION	2—3
Russia's ideological commitment to having a war or series of wars.	
TO A COMMUNIST WAR IS INEVITABLE	8—4
Fascist and Communist approach to war is the same—'Tactical' Truce.	
SOVIET AGGRESSION PRESENTED AS SOVIET DEFENCE: USUAL COMMUNIST BEHAVIOUR	4—6
'Soviet Defence' a conception co-equal with the destruction of the rest of the world—Communists fight for personal ends in the name of impersonal principles—Illustration from a science book to show the above point.	
THE CHANGING FORMS OF IMPERIALISM	6—8
(i) Physical incorporation of the defeated people—Slavery, oldest form of imperialist exploitation—(ii) Imposing oneself as a ruling class over an alien people—Subjugation, a further development—(iii) Incorporation of the wealth of the defeated people—Booty and Tribute, a still further development—(iv) Exploitation in trade—further softening of exploitation.	
HOW A COMMUNIST DISTORTS FACTS OF TRADE	8—9
Not all trade is imperialism, but where there is imperialism, it will tend to make use of trade channels as well for exploitation.	

RUSSIA PRACTISES ALL ABOVE FORMS OF IMPERIALISM ...	9
Process of softening reversed—Russia combines all above forms of imperialistic exploitation with a new vigour and ruthlessness.	
RUSSIA MAKES SLAVE OF FOREIGN POPULATION ...	9—18
She captures foreign nationals <i>enmasse</i> for work in her slave camps—Seizing operations—a Russian document on seizing operations quoted. It shows method and care of details perfected over a long period of time—800,000 out of five million Balts captured in their homes and deported to Russia—Testimony, in an open court, of Communist Frau Margarete Bauber, wife of internationally famous Hans Neumann, Communist, German Politbureau Man—Stalin's agreement with Hitler to hand him over inconvenient communists—In a Soviet concentration camp, twice as big as Denmark—conditions of the inmates—Freedom of movement—Food—Sex-life—Called back to Moscow to be handed over to Nazis—Why such testimony doubted and even disbelieved.	
ESTIMATED RUSSIAN CAPTURE OF FOREIGN CITIZENS ...	18—22
Russia captured 1,080,000 Poles. According to another estimate the number was 1,470,000—Three million German prisoners of war still in Russia—Only 12,513 Italian prisoners of war returned out of 60,000 captured by Russia—200,000 prisoners captured and deported from Bessarabia—900,000 Japanese captured from Manchuria—Decent people find it difficult to believe such horror, even about dictators.	
DIRECT LOOT	22—23
Russia removed wealth of the value of 13 billion dollars from East Europe and West Asia—East Germany robbed of $\frac{1}{3}$ of her total industrial producing assets of current production.	
RUSSIAN TRADE IMPERIALISM	24—25
Russia pays nominal price for goods from satellite countries, but sells them at world price—'Tito affair', partly a result of resistance to Russian trade imperialism—Russia permits her stronger vassals to exploit weaker ones.	

LOCAL COMMUNIST PARTIES AND RUSSIA ... 25—28

Local communist parties are agents of Russian imperialism—Stalin's conception of 'Socialism in one country' takes into account this strategic role of the communist parties—Testimony of George Padmore, Negro Leader, Ex-Comintern Executive—Russia helped German invasion of France and French Communist party helped French defeat.

CHAPTER TWO

CAN WE STOP THIS MENACE?

INTRODUCTION ... 29

Meeting communist menace by understanding their tactics—Liquidation of the nations as a preliminary to digesting them—Strategy of invasion—Revolution.

POLITICAL STRATEGY OF DISRUPTION ... 29—30

Ideological demoralization of the people to facilitate final Soviet penetration—Obligation to undertake illegal activities—Lenin's advice to use ruse, cunning, evasion.

THREE CONTRADICTIONS OF DEMOCRACIES ... 30—31

Non-communists exhorted to indulge in 'Three-fold struggle' corresponding to 'Three-fold contradictions' of capitalism—Cooking up slogans.

A WAY OUT ... 32—34

Combating communist tactics by understanding the nature and extent of our own differences—Peaceful solution of differences—Co-operation is more universal than conflict—There is no generalized conflict—There is no guaranteed solution.

INVENTING CONFLICTS AND DIFFERENCES ... 34

To prove his postulated contradiction, a communist invents artificial conflicts.

COMMUNISTS NO LONGER BELIEVE IN THEIR 'CONTRADICTIONS' BUT THEY WILL ALWAYS POSTULATE THEM ... 34—37

Their postulation of 'contradictions' wins them a following—Varga, Russia's official economist, denies any further validity of 'three contradictions'—Sharp reminder to Varga—Varga discreetly eats away his words.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC THINKING	37—40
A 'thought system' suited to promote the cause of disruption—According to a communist every economic relationship involves a relationship of exploitation and hegemony—In everybody who works for a living he sees a paid agent—The reasoning has a deductive appeal—A knowledge which comes too late.	
DISCUSSION OF SURPLUSES	40—41
Imperialism explained in terms of three surpluses—Contrary to this theory, Capitalist America imported surplus capital.	
SURPLUS GOODS	41—43
The theory leads to contradictory conclusions—False notion of deficiency of purchasing power—Trade between industrially developed countries.	
SURPLUS CAPITAL	43—44
Capital export involves deferred repayment—On communist reasoning this repayment is impossible.	
COMMUNISTS CONDITIONED TO SEE SURPLUSES AND EXPLOITATION EVERYWHERE	44—46
Communists have two standards to judge Russian and non-Russian economic relations—The above analysis does not mean that exploitation has ended—Communism is no remedy for exploitation. It is its accentuation ten-fold.	
COMMUNIST ECONOMIC THINKING FURTHER DISCUSSED ...	46—49
Communist view leads to exaggerated notions which in turn lead to exaggerated conflicts—Business lending and borrowing, a routine affair, not involving control or hegemony—Communist party of India sees only forms of imperialist exploitation in our hard-won freedom—Lenin sees exploitation both in the concentration of capital, as well as in its dispersal.	
COMMUNISTS STICK TO THEIR INVENTED VOCABULARY EVEN WHEN IT COMPLETELY FAILS TO EXPLAIN CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC FACTS	49—52
Communist leaders believe they can win only when others mutually exhaust themselves—Colonial exploitation hardly explains imperialist	

prosperity—Industrial-imperialist countries their best markets—American prosperity entirely based on America's domestic economy—our poverty also based on reasons of internal low productivity—The prosperity of richest countries based on foreign capital.

They give us reasons why we should be a divided house—In their logic death and destruction make for life and growth—They hate all leftist movements particularly the socialists—Foreign capital does not explain colonisation.

A PLEA FOR PROPORTIONS	...	...	...	52—59
There is good deal of exploitation but we should not forget a vaster base of prosperous co-operation.				
SELLING WEAKNESS AND DIVISION	...	...	...	53—54
Russia and her agents have vested interests in our division and disruption.				
THEY MAKE A TACTICAL ARGUMENT	...	...	...	54—55
CONCLUSION	...	...	...	55—56
Communism is Devil's instrument in thwarting man's spiritual evolution.				

PREFACE

Many people who realise the danger of Russia's expansion and her ideological weapon, namely, the world communism, and, are also conversant with the Bolshevik tactics, drive and resources, ask the question rather in dismay: How to meet this danger? Well, the answer is simple: By understanding this danger and by helping this understanding to spread amongst the masses. That is our most sure defence. ;

There are other people according to whom this danger is more imaginary than real. Their individual reasons are different, depending on whether they have illusions about Russia or about communism or both.

At least some of the people who believe in Russia are people who believe in equality, liberty and prosperity, and they believe that these things have been realised in Russia. So they believe in Russia.

This is a question of facts; and, fortunately, or unfortunately, there are enough facts to show that these values have been ruthlessly exterminated from there. Today, they are conspicuous by their absence. Let us talk fairly and frankly from the soviet sources themselves about their wages as well as their prices, their labour laws, their Concentration Camps, their judiciary, their political parties, their average life-expectation; and the picture would be revealing. It is the picture of deliberate mass-murder of the whole sections of people, liquidation of the peasantry, ruthless suppression of the labour, wholesale liquidation of rival political parties and dissentient comrades, a consumption-standard which, today, is

appreciably lower than it was in 1913. It is the picture of the above with lots of industrialism—that is staggeringly expanded production of coal, iron, zink, tractors etc.—thrown into it. Many people confuse this increased production of coal, iron, zink and tractors with the increased production of food, clothing and housing. But the two things are not the same.

These facts, though available, are not widely known. So, many people who do not take care to know and check what they are in a hurry to believe become Russophiles of various intensities, ranging from ardent Father-Land communists through fellow-travellers to vague admirers. On the other hand, those who are not so ignorant and who could not help seeing the Slave Labour Camps, dekulakisation, purges, liquidations and mock-trials, but who must, as if by some interior compulsion stick to some illusion-world, find justifying reasons, at any rate, palliatives for all this cruelty and holocaust and farce in causes outside the functioning of the Bolshevik party, generally in a hostile environment, or, more particularly, in the wickedness of the victims themselves.

There is another section of people who have no illusions about Russia, but they have illusions about communism. They make a distinction between Stalinist Russia and Marxist Communism, and believe that the two have as little to do with each other as catholic inquisitions with true Catholicism.

We believe that for all practical purposes this distinction is unmeaning.

To start with, in its expansive days, World Communism cast Russia in its own image. But very soon this Russia acquired her own ambitions, shape and

impulsion under the leadership of Stalin. Now this Stalinist Russia in order to perpetuate and expand, in turn, had to create World Communism in her own image. And to-day, there is no other communism except the one conceived, enjoined and subsidised by Russia.

And thus international communism of today has suffered a double mutilation, a two-fold vulgarisation. In Plato's words, it is twice and even thrice removed from Reality.

It will not help anybody to confuse or misunderstand the true relations and the true order of primacy between these two forces. Today Russia is not an instrument of world-revolution, but world communism is the instrument of Russian national expansion. This reversal of roles is not a new thing in history. It has happened again and again. The author creates, but very soon that which is created, acquires a life, purpose and drive of its own, many times driving the author to do its bidding. The eternal Frankenstein!

These two forces combine in their mutual vulgarization of each other to give birth to a new exploitation ever more ruthless, total, cruel, wicked and hideous, a type the like of which the world has never known before. Shri J. B. Kripalani calls it "Bolshevik Imperialism". This imperialism is nothing but perfected serfdom and slave-owning of old adapted to an age of machines and factories, operated for the profits of a power-hungry group, who organize internal regimentation to facilitate external expansion and domination.

This streamlined super-Imperialism is waging a two-frontal War: One internally in individual countries through the local communists; the other internationally

through its own organised military strength. The two are very well co-ordinated to achieve the same imperialist end.

We in India can meet the internal threat by constantly improving our social and economic structure, by abolishing the extremes of poverty on one hand and luxury on the other, by producing as much as we possibly can under healthy environments, and by learning to be contented with what it is possible to produce at any stage. Let us prepare ourselves in our inner life for this big revolution.

People think it is easy to make this revolution. So it is fashionable these days for many people to go about talking of revolution and changing the society *fundamentally*, without absolutely any inner preparation to know what is fundamental, and how it can be brought about. The Russian experiment has shown that mere sound and fury will not do anything.

The same experiment shows that we cannot achieve our objective by aping the industrial economic development of the west and by slavishly importing their technique, but we shall have to find and perfect a method which is suited to the Indian conditions. Unfortunately, we cannot depend on our industrialist class for anything. They have shown no vision even in aping the western technique, much less developing a new one more adapted to Indian conditions. Speaking frankly, they are not creative industrialists, but parasitic middlemen who make their money by very shady practices. With a few exceptions like the Tatas, there is no vision in their work and no honesty and social conscience in their dealings.

Their only justification is that our public administration is worse than these private agencies.

We can meet the communist threat on the international plane by realising our unity with the democratic countries of the world. The strength of Democracy is indivisible, and anything that weakens it at one point will weaken it at all points. Let us strengthen our ties of friendship with the democratic countries, particularly Britain and America. Let us stop playing in the hands of the communist propaganda which aims at dividing those it wants to destroy.

Our distrust of these countries is of many kinds: that they are imperialists, capitalists and what not. This is a big question which we cannot fully go into here. But it will suffice to say at present, that all these charges are meaningless when they are not positively untrue. England has shed imperialism, and America was never in it, and, at present, freely giving instead of taking. And the one is as courageous and generous as the other; for, to give up what is rightfully not yours is as difficult as giving away what is yours.

Again, England, today, is socialist, if socialism has any meaning. At present she has hardly 45 persons with an income exceeding Rs. 90,000/- annually. Similarly in America where the people die prematurely due to over-eating as we die here due to under-eating and where practically every family possesses a car, a radio, a refrigerator, and electrically fitted flat with flush and bath, the ordinary categories of socialism do not apply at all. Those who still try to fit this country into those categories, either do not know what socialism is, or they

want to keep alive a public grievance for a private indulgence.

Perhaps, it can be more rightly argued that inspite of this unheard-of material prosperity, the people are not particularly happy. But this cannot be a legitimate criticism by a socialist, but a criticism of a certain type of socialism which has degenerated into a superstition that happiness depends on the possession and multiplication of more and more material goods without knowing the bounds. The American riches without corresponding American happiness only shows that there is no such correspondence, and refutes the marxist socialists. It only shows that while there should be enough for a healthy living, there are things which can only and adequately be approached and tackled through an effort that is mental and spiritual.

So, while we must join our forces with other nations to promote peace, we must give up our present foreign policy which is based on extremely simplified notions of the issues involved. According to this policy, we believe that they are war-mongers and we are peace-makers; that to the two quarreling blocks we can bring peace by telling them from our superior heights that they are both wrong. We declare to them that in their way lies world destruction, and that the mankind can only be saved in our way. What is that way and how to make it effective we do not say. By 'our' way, we perhaps mean the Gandhian way. Well, it is obviously true that mankind can grow only by truth and love, while falsehood, hatred and suspicion can only diminish and dwarf us. And, though, obscure as our mind is, we shall make mistakes about love and truth and not know them, yet if we try hard enough and are sincere enough it is very probable that our path will be lightened.

So, yes, most surely, the Gandhian way is the right way. But just imagine Gandhi as a pacifier, a mediator between wrong Indian Nationalism, and wrong British Imperialism. No. Gandhi was not a meditator but a leader; leader of Indian Nationalism because it was in the right. Of course, he was a leader who not only served a just cause but constantly searched within to make sure that what he championed did not degenerate into chauvinism, and that he was not provoked into hatred and ill-will against those whom he was opposing and resisting. And, thus, he taught us a technique of fighting in which both the parties win. Today Britain has given up her Empire, yet there is a look of triumph in her face shining as much as it shines in ours. And though communists and many others of their way of thinking argue that since Britain has won, we must have lost—because they believe that for somebody to win, somebody must lose—but this need not be true except in a very superficial sense.

Let us rise to this conception of a purified struggle if we can, but let us not go about as a mediator and peace-maker with nothing in our head and hands except a bag of epithets, both praiseworthy and blameworthy, and divide them rather equally amongst what we call the two power blocks, and think we are serving peace.

In fact, there is a good deal of need and scope for this purified form of struggle, at least in dealing with the communists outside the iron Curtain. We can appeal to their goodness because there is a lot of good in them. Communism in many communists, in its origin, is based on a generous impulse, but very soon it gets overlaid with less reputable forces at the top. You see it works like

this. Man lives on many planes of existence simultaneously. There is a spiritual pull upward into greater freedom and fullness; there is also a downward pull towards self-limitation, self-frustration, unwholesomeness and error; or, speaking in religious terminology, into evil. In many people the two forces tend to get confused. The generous impulse towards mutual help and wider sympathy and self-widening and enlargement becomes mixed up with the lower nature, exclusive possession, appropriation, ambition, vanity, bravado and ignorance, with the result that these people grow into a greater version of their own ego and ambition at perfect peace with their conscience. A communist starts by believing that a good cause justifies any war, but he ends by believing that a good war justifies any cause. He believes that a democracy which does not ensure a minimum standard of living is a fraud and worth abolition; but he ends by believing that wherever he has abolished freedom and democracy, he has given a higher standard of living. He sees that many countries who have a high production of aluminium, asbestos, pig iron, copper have also a high standard of food, clothing and housing; and then he makes the mistake of thinking that if he also feverishly produces the former, he will have plenty of the latter. He finds that there is an element of economic abuse in certain economic relations; from this he argues that wherever there is any economic relationship, there must be some economic abuse. He finds that some of these abuses are remedied by instituting governmental control and ownership; then he mistakenly thinks that wherever he has instituted those controls and restrictions, he has removed all those economic abuses and exploitation. And, thus, because of this psychological mix-up, the forces of justice, freedom and fullness, peace and plenty are still

more crushingly defeated and forces of darkness, exploitation and oppression are still more strengthened.

Communism is chokeful of such school-boys' howlers and misguided generosity. But let us explain these howlers, separating communist idealism from communist passions, the communist facts from communist make-believes, patiently and persistently; and, I am sure that many people would turn away from this creed. Let us remember that in the world ex-communists are more numerous than communists; and though the former are not as strong as the latter—because they are unorganised and without the power and prestige and money of Russia behind them—it proves one thing conclusively: that they found communism insufficient.

In the following pages it is shown that communism, which both expresses Russia as well as is expressed by Russia, is an evil—one of those blind and ugly forces which enter into human affairs from time to time to darken and diminish the human significance. It is an evil sufficiently theorised and idealised to deceive even the most clever and idealist. It thrives on powerful propaganda and its strength lies in organised misinformation and distortion, retailed cheaply and universally on home-delivery basis in convenient packages to suit the emotional and mental level of its victims. The best way to fight this evil is to provide complete information on the subject—information as well as perspective. Let in the fresh air and sunshine of facts and cobwebs spun by lying propagandists will disappear, and mists and vapours exhaled by them will dissolve away.

Prachi Publications will try to do that, but it is hoped that people with better resources and organisation will come forward and take up the task.

At the end, I have to acknowledge that this book, in the entire process of its production, is the result of the co-operative efforts of many friends. In a very real sense it belongs to them; I am merely their meeting point, undeservedly made responsible for the fame or shame of it. I have also to state a fact, that Sri Aurobindo read and approved the book. Personally, it is very gratifying to me and strengthens me, but I shall not presume to thank him. For if he has chosen to bless it, he knows the best.

Rishikesh,
January, 1950.

R. Swarup.

CHAPTER ONE
RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM : HOW TO STOP IT

CHAPTER ONE

RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

The freedom and prosperity of the world are being threatened by Russian Communism-fascism. The threat is not local or continental, but global. The danger is not restricted to Europe alone, but extends to the whole world, Asia, Africa, Australia and America.

Communist-fascist Russia has already subjugated more than 100 million people and annexed more than half a dozen countries in the continent of Europe alone; but her man-hunger and land-hunger are not quenched. Her vast armies of spies and agents in the shape of local communist parties are feverishly active in every nook and corner of the world to facilitate her Slav-national expansion, exactly after the well-tried pattern of Hitler's fifth columns, only more magnified and better organised.

Russia is ideologically committed to a programme of world-wide domination with the subordinate co-operation of the communist parties everywhere.

The only method of stemming this fast-increasing danger is to forge a United World Democratic Front. If we stand up and tell Stalin, the Emperor of Russia, that the common people of the world are united in their determination to survive, it will convince him and his agents. If we tell him that the common people of the world are

prepared to back their will to survival materially and morally to the last drop of their strength, the dictator will take the hint and retire.

Beyond this strength of unity, beyond this united will to live and let live, there is no defence for democracies, especially weak countries like Norway, Denmark, France, Italy in the West and India, Burma and Australia in the East.

But the friends of dictatorship and totalitarianism are active. They are busy doing their best to weaken the peoples' common will to resist aggression by creating confusion and sowing suspicion within the democratic camp. After killing freedom and democracy in their own country, they go about making use of that freedom and democracy in other peoples' countries in the service of those who are sworn enemies of freedom.

In this small book, we shall discuss the following points:—

- (1) The nature of Russian aggression, always presented under the name of Soviet defence;
- (2) the strategic place, local communists hold in this annexationist policy;
- (3) and finally, in the next chapter, the methods and tactics they pursue in order to weaken the will of the people to resist aggression.

SOVIET AGGRESSION

Russia is determined that she cannot live alongside with other nations. She has held this belief for more than a quarter of a century. Stalin acceptingly quotes Lenin:

“ We live not only in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet

Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either one or the other will conquer. And until that end comes, a series of most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

Given this expansionist dream, it is only too natural that the Russia-dominated Communist International should give it an ideological rendering and do its best to realize this dream for Russia.

It says,

"To overthrow the international bourgeoisie and create an international Republic, all means will be used, including force of arms."

TO A COMMUNIST WAR IS INEVITABLE

If one studies communist literature, one will find that to the communists, as to the Fascists, war is both natural as well as moral. To both, war is necessary, inevitable. But while according to the latter, this inevitability is biological, according to the former, it is historical and dialectical. So the communists very aptly claim that they do not preach a war, but merely predict it.

According to Mussolini war puts the stamp of nobility on those who have the courage to embrace it; according to Lenin war is a calamity, but it is not correct to base a policy 'on this trivial reasoning.' War is a great social catalyst and brings about those long-sought-for "objective conditions" which are indispensable for communist parties to seize power. Lenin says,

"There has been no great revolution in the world which was not connected with wars."

A war is historically inevitable, in the nature of things, 'bourgeois' things. And the communist party as an embodiment of this scientific necessity, must lend history a helping hand. Hence:

"The goal is to consolidate the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries."

But the communist espousal of an ultimate war is not inconsistent with their espousal of a temporary peace. For that is a question of tactics and strategy which according to Stalin "changes with the passage of revolution from one stage to another remaining essentially without change for the whole period of a given stage."

So we see that Russia's objection to war is not fundamental, but tactical, not to having war eventually but to not being allowed to choose the time for waging it.

SOVIET AGGRESSION PRESENTED AS SOVIET DEFENCE: USUAL COMMUNIST BEHAVIOUR

Committed to aggression, nevertheless, Russia takes care not to come out with her national-expansionist aspirations too openly but presents them as measures of "Soviet Defence."

First, no-where, no other nation except Russia has held, till now, a conception of self-defence which is more or less co-equal with world domination. What is Russia threatened with? With "Capitalist Encirclement." What does her safety consist in? In the domination or destruction of all "Capitalists".

Like all true communists everywhere, Bolshevik Russia has a special talent for a wolf-in-the sheep's skin policy. Everywhere, communists scrupulously take care to look an aggrieved party and to appear as if they were fighting for impersonal, legitimate rights of the people instead of fighting for their own aggrandizement.

But psychology tells us that the distinction between fighting for 'rights' and fighting for domination is not very clear cut, and in most cases the two coalesce into each other.

Let us remember that people who fight for their 'rights' are not necessarily the people who are aggrieved.

Second, people who are really aggrieved are not necessarily the people who fight for their rights.

Third, whenever there is a chance to fight and an organization pledged to fighting, you can always be sure that the people who will come to join it are not the people who are aggrieved, but people who love fighting and aggressing.

Following is a scientific illustration of this psychological point. "Ann A, the first child of the family, was deliberately instructed by her father to "stand up for her right" and to strike back at her companions if they teased her or if she did not "get a fair deal". Such teaching began in the child's third year: and it was not long before Ann was, in the words of an observer, "the terror of the neighbourhood." Her companions almost invariably were younger and weaker children whom she could "boss around." She became a bully.

This is what Russia and her communist parties are. They beat and usurp, abuse and aggress but if the others

decide to fight them back, they feel robbed and attacked and burst into tears of righteous indignation and say that to fight them back is fascism or reaction or imperialism or whatever other term of abuse they can lay their tongue to.

The author continues: "The child was obviously the object of the father's projection. He confessed that he had always suffered abuse at the hands of the other children."

This case proves what we have already said, namely, that people who suffer abuse are not necessarily the people who fight it, and are not the people who derive any benefit if it comes as a result of fighting. But such is the history of man that as long as people suffer abuse, there will always be some who will exploit this fact to their own advancement and advantage. Some men can always trade on the disadvantage and disaster of others. They have vested interests, revolutionary or reactionary, in any form of human tragedy—famine, flood, war, pestilence or stray killing. What else could explain the Bolshevik civil war, the killing of Kulaks, mass enslavement of hundreds of millions of people, the threat of a third World War? What else could explain this murder, big or small, in the name of defence and justice? Most obviously the people who build their position and power on this mass-killing and mass-murder.

THE CHANGING FORMS OF IMPERIALISM

Now, we shall not discuss further Russia's ideological and psychological preparation for an expansionist role, but the nature and quality of this expansion itself.

We discussed this question in our pamphlet, "Let's Fight the Communist Menace," and would touch upon it again.

In discussing this question, we can do no better than begin with a quotation by Stalin: "Revolution in the past usually ended in one group of exploiters replacing another group of exploiters at the helm of Government. The exploiters changed, exploitation remained."

What Stalin means to say is that in the course of history, forms of exploitation have changed—a truth of which Russia is the best illustration. Let us study those forms.

1. **Physical incorporation of the defeated people.**—Restricting ourselves to only one aspect of this exploitation, namely, inter-group exploitation, that is, exploitation of one society by another society, we find that in its most primitive beginnings, it manifested itself in the head-hunting campaigns organised by different societies against each other for purely religious and sadistic reasons. But by and by, these campaigns assumed an economic character. Instead of being killed the "out-group" population, were made slaves and incorporated into the population of the victorious group as an inferior class, as "herwers of wood and drawers of water."

2. **Imposing oneself as a ruling class over an alien population.**—Later on, the victorious groups, instead of removing the defeated people to their own country, dispossessed the latter of their land and other possessions and imposed themselves as a ruling class over them.

In olden times these two forms of exploitation were combined in differing degrees, depending on many factors,

but always determined and defined by the victor-and-vanquished status of the two groups.

3. **Incorporation of the wealth of the defeated people.**—Later on, this inter-national exploitation changed its character still more and became less barbarous and rigorous. Instead of people being removed physically to the mother country and made into slaves, they were allowed to remain wherever they were, but the product of their labour was removed instead as in Roman Imperialism.

4. **Exploitation through trade.**—In time, this form of imperialism was replaced by a less rigorous one, namely trade imperialism, which does not mean that wherever this is trade there is imperialism and exploitation, as the Communists think ; but only that there is a form of imperialistic exploitation which shows itself in unfavourable terms of trade. It was no longer a unilateral appropriation of other people's wealth, but a mutual exchange of goods. Nevertheless so long as this imperialism lasted, the terms of trade were defined to the advantage of the more powerful partner.

It is only in the later phase of human relationship as we approach contemporary history, that the trade relationship (which in itself does not constitute an imperial-colonial relationship, but which could be turned into one under favourable circumstances) became an equal and fair exchange of goods free from all onesidedness.

HOW A COMMUNIST DISTORTS FACTS OF TRADE

From the fact that historically there has existed a form of imperialism which showed itself in trade, a communist makes two distortions.

First distortion: that wherever there is trade as between democratic countries, there is imperialism.

Second distortion: that wherever there is little trade as between Russia and other countries, there is no imperialism, which is quite incorrect as we shall see below.

RUSSIA PRACTISES ALL ABOVE FORMS OF IMPERIALISM

While the last vestiges of inter-national exploitation were dying out from the rest of the world, Russia adopted forms of inter-national exploitation which are most primitive and most barbarous and are found only in the darkest periods of history, what is worse, in no other period or stage of economic development could these exploitations have been carried on with anything even remotely approaching the extent and efficiency of our present industrial civilisation.

I. RUSSIA MAKES SLAVE OF FOREIGN POPULATION

In the 18th and 19th Century nations went out in search of land, to colonize it with their surplus population. But now in the 20th century Russia goes out in search of people, to seize them and send them to work in slave camps in the colds of Siberia.

How these "Operations" (as they are called by the Soviet Administration) of seizing and deporting people are carried out, is a harrowing story and reminds one of the "head-hunting" of predatory imperialistic societies of olden days. The only recent phenomenon comparable to these "operations" was the slave-trade in the 18th century when Negroes of Africa were bought and caught by business companies, to be sold in America to work on plan-

tations. Often these slaves were shipped under such terrible conditions that as many as half of them died on the way.

For a detailed study of modern slave-trading, read "Forced Labour in Soviet Russia" by David Dallin and Boris Nicolacvsky. The book is documented and written on the testimony of thousands of people who have worked in Soviet slave camps. Some 34 secret documents issued by the NKVD to its local administration in the three Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia also fell into the authors' hands, microfilm copies of which have been deposited with the New York Public Library.

We reproduce a part of one of these document in order to emphasize the grim nature of the NKVD horror and organized slave hunting and the strategic place native communists hold in the programme of Russian imperialism and exploitation.

The authors say that on June 4, Serov, the Deputy Commissioner of the NKVD of the Soviet Union, sent out two further instructions. In order to determine the number of men needed for the operation, he instructed the local agencies (evidently on the basis of a standing order) to calculate on the following rule—"One operational official, one member of the NKVD, and one representative of the local group of the communist party." These men must "carry out the operation of two families." Now we give the quotations from the above mentioned book:

"Care must be taken that the operations are carried out without disturbance and panic, so as not to permit any demonstrations and other trouble not only on the part of those deported but also on the part of a certain section of the

population hostile to the Soviet Administration.

“ Operation shall be begun at daybreak. Upon entering the house of the person to be deported, the senior member of the operative group shall assemble the entire family in one room, taking all necessary precautionary measures against any possible trouble.

“ After completion of the search, the deportees shall be notified that by a government decision they will be deported to other regions of the Union. The deportees shall be permitted to take with them household necessities not exceeding 100 kgm. in weight.

“ The delivery of the deportees from the village to the meeting place at the railway stations must be effected in day-light.

“ In view of the fact that a large number of deportees must be arrested and distributed in special camps and that their families must proceed to special settlements in distant regions, it is essential that the operation of removal of both the members of the deportees' family and its head should be carried out simultaneously without notifying them of the separation confronting them.....

“ The convoy of the entire family to the station shall, however, be effected in one vehicle and only at the station of departure shall the head of the family be placed separately from his family in a car specially intended for heads of families. During the assembling of the family

in the home of the deportees, the head of the family shall be warned that personal male's effects must be packed in a separate suitcase as a sanitary inspection of the deported men will be made separately from the women and children.

“Red Army men of the convoying forces of the NKVD shall surround the entrainment station. After the railway car has been filled with the necessary number of families, it shall be locked. After the people have been taken over and placed in the deportation train, the chief of the train shall bear responsibility for all persons handed over to him and for their delivery to their destination.”

And thus in this organised and orderly fashion 200,000 men and women were seized and deported from the three Baltic states in 1941 when the Soviet Union annexed them.

By how many has the number of deportees in these countries gone up after the “second liberation?” Sometime ago a news-item appeared in the *Statesman* reporting that a meeting of 88 Balt-refugees protested against the continued deportation of their countrymen. According to them, the number had swollen to 800,000 which constitutes 16 p. c. of their population.

What are the conditions of the camps which these unfortunate deportees fill? According to Dr. Julius Margolin of Tel Aviv whom the Russians arrested in 1940 for some visa irregularity, there were 4 or 5 classes of inmates. Those at the top were called *Predurki*, who made the camp aristocrats. They were drawn from the criminals and smugglers and bamboozlers. The second class was called

Rabotyagi, people who had not lost their strength. The third class at the bottom where *Dokhodyagi* made of "persons who had lost resemblance to the human form."

Mr. Gonnadi Khoyma Kov, speaking about the Solovetski Island, where he spent several years himself, says that standard punishment in winter was to send prisoners bare-foot down 273 ice-covered steps to haul water from a frozen lake ; their feet usually froze into icy stumps.

The Bolshevik hunger for slave labour is so voracious that it has neither spared the citizens nor the foreigners, neither the communists nor the non-communists. Here is the testimony of Frau Margarete Bauber, the wife of Hans Neumann, the internationally known communist of the German Politbureau, in the " Kravchenko Case " as a voluntary witness, in an open court, as reported in the *Manchester Guardian* of the 24th February, 1949.

"She had the unusual experience of passing, in January 1940, from a Soviet Concentration Camp Karaganda, in Kazakstan—to Ravensbruck, because she was one of the 400 Germans in Soviet detention who had been handed over by the Kremlin to the Nazis under an agreement between Hitler and Stalin. Most of them were German communists who had been arrested, like Hans Neumann, during the purge of 1947, and were as much enemies of the Nazi regime as of the Soviet.

"The witness described how in the party of thirty, which included herself, three men had to be dragged across the bridge over the Bug at Brestlitovsk. One of them, a Hungarian Jew,

who had edited a Communist Paper in the Ruhr, was immediately attacked by the S. S. Guard on the German-occupied bank of the river, while another, a young communist workman, was going to certain death because in his absence he had been convicted of killing a Nazi.

“The Soviet authorities also handed over to the Nazis the prisoners’ papers, so that there was no possibility for the witness of concealing her connection with Hans Neumann. The Gestapo refused to believe that she had come out of a Soviet prison and she was sent straight to Ravensbruck. There her story of her experiences in the Soviet Union earned her the hatred of the German and Czech communists, and she had to make a hurried escape from the camp when it was liberated by Russian troops in April 21, 1945.

“Hans Neumann was the author of the German communist slogan “strike the Nazis wherever you meet them” which was later modified in favour of “Resistance by propaganda.” Neumann opposed the modification. Falling steadily from grace, Neumann, who had been a member of the German Politbureau and the Committee of the Comintern, was sent on a Mission to advise a Communist Newspaper in Spain and then on another to Switzerland, where he was arrested. A German demand for his extradition was refused, and he was expelled from Switzerland to the Soviet Union.

“He and his wife arrived in Moscow in 1935, in disgrace as deviationists. Their old friends

scarcely dared to visit them. Neumann, after being repeatedly summoned for interrogation was finally arrested in April, 1937 and his wife was arrested in December of that year. She was sentenced early in 1938 to 5 years in a 'Labour Education Camp' as a socially dangerous individual whose ideological deviations in 1931-5 amounted to counter-revolutionary activities dangerous to the Soviet State (of which at that time she was neither a citizen nor a resident).

"The 'Camp' Karganda was an area in Kazakstan about twice the size of Denmark. The nomad Kirghiz had been forced to settle down and the large areas thus left free were cultivated by prison labour. In a 'free settlement' the prisoners were allowed to walk along the streets between the huts where they lived and 500 yards on either side of it when not at work. Beyond those limits they were liable to be shot at.

"In the reprisals blocks, where the witness had spent all her time (except for the first four weeks) because she tried to submit a petition for the revision of her sentence, the prisoners were only allowed out of their huts to their work in the fields, and lived in a barbed wire enclosure. In the 'free settlement' there was a shop at which a few articles and some extra food could be bought for the 20 Kopeks a day which the prisoners received, in addition to their rations. A whole month's ration was forfeited if the allotted work for a single day was not completed.

Not even the slightest comfort was allowed in the reprisals block.

“ Husband and wife were never sent to the same camp. In theory, any sexual relations between the prisoners were punishable, but in fact as long as they did not assume the character of conjugal stability (in which case the prisoners were sent to different camps) their inevitability was so far recognised that a special section of the camp was established for the children born. There the women condemned for ordinary crimes could see their children but the ‘ Politicals ’ could not. The prisoners were lodged in mud-huts, much inferior to the stables of the cattle.

“ It was from this misery that the witness was summoned back to her prison in Moscow, without explanation. She found herself with about 20 other German and Austrian women. They were offered good and plentiful food, new clothes and even taken into the city to a hairdresser. Everyday some of the women were taken away and there were new arrivals. After about a fortnight she and two others were taken to a railway station, which they recognised as that from which trains left for the West.

“ The three women were put into a prison carriage and informed that their sentences had been commuted to immediate expulsion from the Soviet Territory. They hoped that they were being sent to the Baltic Frontier but after three days found themselves at Brest-Litovsk. On the train the witness heard the last news

of her husband from an Austrian whose prison had been in Solovki, on the white sea-coast. There he had shared a cell with an Englishman, Mr. Hamilton Gold, who had been condemned to 10 years imprisonment. Mr. Gold had been in a prison cell in Moscow with Hans Neumann who, in the middle of 1938, had declared that he would never sign the declaration that had been put before him by the NKVD.

“Mr. Gold was an English communist who had just visited Russia as a tourist, had taken work there as a Radio Engineer, had accompanied a Soviet Unit to Spain when the Soviet Unit was withdrawn. On his return to Russia he had been arrested and finally sentenced.”

But even the testimony of such trusted and important fellow-communists does not convince the communists. On the contrary, those who from their sad experience are forced to give such testimony, earn nothing but hatred and calumny from their former comrades with whom they had worked, lived and shared their joys and sorrows and ideals. This is not an isolated example. Bertrand Russell, ex-communist, world's one of the topmost thinkers and philosopher, met the same fate. He says that to denounce the methods and reality of Russia cost him more friends than anything else in his life.

What are the reasons for this disbelief? First reason is individual-psychological. Living in frustration and disorganisation of personality. There is an inner compulsion to believe in a utopia where there is no let or thrall, no check to infinite self-expansion. The second reason is socio-political. Vested interests with empires to build and who look forward to being ministers and commissars spend

billions of roubles to organise this 'phenomenon.' They first organise on a mass scale dis-organisation of personalities and then large-scale rationalisations of these disorganisations, taking care that these rationalisations centre round their interests and expansion and power. They first make people suffer from a permanent sense of injury and hurt, real and imaginary, and then, when the people are thoroughly 'reduced,' worn out and disorganised, they come out with a conjurer's trick and juggler's utopia cleverly hiding within it Russian power and prosperity, loot, booty, cheap colonisers for her vast siberian spaces, forced labour producing and working for her bureaucracy, NKVD, Red Army officials, Party members and high jobs for the loyal local agents. They organise mass persecutions mania (and it is a very pleasant sensation for many people to believe that they are persecuted) and mass-identification with an imagined Russian Paradise. Given this inner need to believe in a handy salvation and utopia, and vested interests to organise this disability of the mind, there is no wonder that no objective testimony avails.

ESTIMATED RUSSIAN CAPTURE OF FOREIGN CITIZENS

The Russian man-hunger has spared no country that has fallen prey to her aggression either through the invasion of the Red Army from without or through the *coup d'etat* of her agents from within. We have already given roughly estimated figures of people deported from various countries to work in the slave camps of Siberia in our pamphlet 'Let's Fight the Communist Menace.' We reproduce the relevant portions below:—

(1) *Poland*.—According to Polish Government records, Russia seized more than a million Poles and deported them

to different parts of Russia to work in slave camps in 1940, knowing very little at the time that only an year after they would be allowed to go back according to an agreement with General Sikorski of Poland. Incidentally this great mass of people brought stories of slave camps behind the Iron Curtain, scanty information regarding which had always been trickling before through inmates and officials who had managed to escape from there. 2,70,000 died in one year. Such were the conditions in the Soviet Camps.

(2) *Germany*.—Exact figures are not available. According to Soviet sources themselves there were about 4 million German prisoners of war. But only one million were repatriated. Miss Toni Sender of the American Federation of Labour speaking before the U. N. said that between 50,000 to 100,000 Germans are mining Uranium for Russia in the Bragebirge region of Saxony and Czechoslovakia alone. According to Mr. Mayhew, the NKVD has imprisoned in the Soviet zone of Germany more people than Hitler saw fit to confine in the same territory for 12 years.

(3) *Italy*.—According to Italian Government reports only 12,513 people returned from a total of 60,000 Italian prisoners of war in Russian hands.

(4) *Bessarabia*.—About 200,000 men were seized, captured and deported from Bessarabia.

(5) *Manchuria*.—900,000 Japanese living in Manchuria were deported in 1945.

To the above number must be added hundreds of thousands of Russians, Hungarians, Finns and so on.

In the new Democracies the communist parties are repeating the Russian pattern of trials and purges. They

are accusing thousands of their people of plots and collaborations and sabotage and hundreds of thousands of them are being "liquidated" as class enemies. But strangely enough a large number of them are being deported to Siberia to work for Russia. Only recently the communist government of Czechoslovakia had to agree to the deporting of 80,000 Czech skilled labourers to Russia behind the Urals.

Ever since our pamphlet came out, some friends flatly refused to accept the figures given there. There are two reasons for this violent and determined refusal. One reason we have already discussed. They do not believe because they do not want to believe. They have certain ideas of an ideal society and so much is their need for a utopia that they are desperately determined to believe that it exists in some country safely screened away by an iron-curtain from any examination. There is also a second reason. People are not informed on the subject and the facts that we had given depict an amount of horror which decent people find difficult to believe even about a totalitarian, power-maniac and devil-driven dictatorship. We admire these friends' liberalism, charity and generosity in regarding others on their part. But this liberalism should not remain so uninformed; otherwise it can prove most mischievous. For the information of such friends, we quote from the 'The Philosophy of Betrayal' published by Russia Today Society of England, a communist-run organisation, in reply to Arthur Koestler's 'The Yogi and the Commissar.' Speaking of Polish deportees, it does not deny the fact as believing communists and uninformed liberals do, but justifies it. The pamphlet says:—

"Perhaps 20 p. c. of the population in Soviet occupied territories was Polish in 1939, i.e.,

between 2 and 3 millions, including a huge army of officials, garrisons and their families, land-owners and nobility and their dependants. With the Nazis in Poland proper and War by them against the Soviet Union inevitable sooner or later, the soviet authorities very naturally removed all those Poles in this territory who might be considered as potentially more sympathetic to the Nazis than to themselves, to territories farther East."

Conditions were so bad that more than 1/5 (more than two lakhs—200,000) of the total deportees died in transit and in camps within a short period of one year. To this, the pamphlet says,

"It will be obvious that hardship there would inevitably be under the circumstances, and hardship there undoubtedly was. But with its very existence at stake the Soviet Government had to give first place to the interests of the Soviet people."

The human element is a term like any other term in the communist equation. The Soviet dictators in the name of Soviet people—that is the measure for all communists and fellow travellers. While the former usurp and enslave, the latter interpret this usurpation and enslavement as beautiful, radical and just, a rare privilege of those who have the good fortune and good sense to fall a victim to them.

About the Japanese prisoners of war, *Tass*, the Official Russian news agency, declared in Moscow on Friday, the 20th May, 1949 that by November 1949 Russia will have repatriated all Japanese prisoners of war except

those accused of war crime. According to the same agency there were 594,000 Japs in Russian hands on V-J day in 1945. A gross under-statement, but even that should be sufficient to show Russian proletarianism.

Do what you can with these figures. The communist agents and fellow-travelling apologists will explain them away, because they can no longer deny them. In the case of Poles, it was the 'expected German invasion;' in the case of Japanese, it was, perhaps, the 'expected past invasion.'

Prisoners of war, they say; Yes, prisoners of war, if you like. But of what kind and in what sense? They were prisoners of war in the sense that a war was made on them to make prisoners of them. Russia invaded Japan a few days before the latter unconditionally surrendered as a result of the American atom-bomb, in order to capture booty and prisoners, and made them to work as slaves in Siberia* for four years after the war had ended and before the opinion of the free people of the world could force her to yield a promise to release the unfortunate victims by six months hence.

II. DIRECT LOOT

Besides man-catching, Russia has adopted another form of international exploitation which is found in olden times—namely direct loot of wealth of subjugated people. Up to 1947 she had removed wealth of the value of \$13 billions from East Europe and West Asia. She removed machines, tractors and other capital goods from Manchuria, Poland, Hungary and East Germany thus ruining the economic life of these countries. She removed

* A few thousand of them were also picked up for special treatment to prepare them for an eventual fifth-columnist role.

\$1,000,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000 worth of goods from Rumania while under agreed reparations (which is again loot in the context of modern wars, whatever name one may give it to hide its true nature) she was entitled to only \$8,000,000,000. She removed cattle and horses. One million Soviet troops lived off Rumania's land for two and a half years.

Again out of the total war damage to Hungarian industry estimated at \$845,000,000 more than \$124,000,000 was a result of Soviet removals. After the armistice, for years the proportion of the national income being absorbed by the Soviet occupation, was as high as 35 p. c.

That was during the time when these countries were facing starvation and America was sending them free supplies of wheat and medicines.

While Russia was removing wholesale heavy machinery, plants, even scientific laboratories and other capital equipment from Eastern Germany estimated at one-third of the total producing assets, she found she could not put them again. So she decided to leave the rest and work them wherever they were. Now German factories and German labourers are producing goods in their own country, but the produce of that labour goes to Russia. The same thing is happening in other Russian controlled countries. We have already said that according to Miss Toni Sender, 50,000 to 1,000,000 Germans are mining Uranium for Russia in Saxony and Czechoslovakia. German man-power, Czechoslovakian mines and material and Russian fruits! A good division of labour between the communist countries!

III. RUSSIAN TRADE IMPERIALISM

This direct exploitation has been supplemented by another form of exploitation, namely trade exploitation and trade imperialism. Poland was selling a part of her coal to USSR at \$1.50 a ton while the current world price was \$12. On the other hand she had to pay Russia the world price for oil—oil drawn from her own wells.

Czechoslovakia was paying 50 p. c. more than the world price for Soviet wheat. Similarly with Bulgaria. Her main export, tobacco, would purchase far more in the world market than it does in Russia. That explains why Mr. Traiche Kostov, Vice-Premier of Bulgaria, Chairman of the Bulgarian Committee for Economic and Financial Questions, member of the Politbureau, was arrested on the 4th April, 1949, on a charge of "lack of sincerity and friendship towards Russia, particularly during the Russia-Bulgarian trade negotiations"—to quote the words of the central committee of the Bulgarian Communist party. Tito's refusal to be instrumental in Russian exploitation of Yugoslavia is one of the causes of the "Tito Affair."

So, only in the light of the above can Borba's charge against Russia for using "capitalistic methods" in trade relations be understood and explained. The Yugoslav Communist Party paper declared that the Soviet Union was using "capitalistic methods" in her trade with other Socialist countries and that she violated agreements and put economic pressure on Yugoslavia in order to bring about a change in regime. All this gave the lie to Cominform claims that Russia's relations with the Eastern States were based on "equality and full reciprocity," the paper maintained.

Russia had always insisted on "world prices" as the basis of her trade with the "Peoples' Democracies" but

world prices, Borba argued, were really dollar prices and therefore often well below prices prevailing in economically backward countries. Russia's policy, the paper implied, was, therefore, "close to economic exploitation of the socialist countries."

This is not all. Russia not only exploits what are called New Democracies, for herself, she also allows her favourite countries to exploit such of these democracies as are not equally favoured by her. She has built up a graded or graduated system of exploitation, or what in Ecology is known as "a system of food chain." Poland and Czechoslovakia asked Yugoslavia for 377 tons bauxite for one tractor ; 60,000 tons of maize for one truck-engine, 180 tons of gypsum for one motor-cycle !

Germans in Prussia are being beaten *en masse* and forced to work for Poland.

This is what Russian Imperialism is—a scientific combination of all forms of exploitation ranging from the most primitive to the most modern.

LOCAL COMMUNIST PARTIES AND RUSSIA

Local communist parties play a very strategic role in the programme of Russian national-expansion. We shall discuss their role in greater detail some other time; here we shall do no more than touch upon this aspect of Russian imperialism. Some people believe that after Stalin came into power with his slogan "Socialism in one country," communist parties and communist movement became a local concern and local affair of each country, involving no overall loyalty to Russia. This view is

incorrect. Stalin himself understands the problem differently. He says:

“First of all there is the question; can socialism possibly be established in one country alone by that country’s unaided strength? This question must be answered in the affirmative. Then there is the question: can a country where the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established, regard itself as fully safeguarded against foreign intervention, and the consequent restoration of the old regime, unless the revolution has been victorious in a number of other countries? The question must be answered in the negative.”

Solution of the Russian internal problem with the help of the Russian communist party and solution of her foreign problems with the help of all the communist parties of the world! We could give a dozen quotations from Stalin expressing the above sentiment, but that is not compatible with the space-schedule of this book.

Mr. Paul Sweezy, the marxist economist, sums up the Russian point of view in the following words.

“In brief, socialism can be built up in one country, but its permanence is assured when socialism has been victorious on an international scale. This solution of the problem, it will be seen has the effect of setting a task for Russian Socialism without diminishing its interest in the establishment of socialism elsewhere. The probable course of the world revolution remained a vital concern to the Bolsheviki. Hence it is not surprising that this question

constituted, so to speak, a branch of the solialism-in-one-country problem."

So communism elsewhere, as a branch of communism in Russia, suffered a deterioration unknown in history. Colonial and socialist struggles in the hands of the communist parties lost their indigenous character and became counters in the chess-game of Russian foreign policy. When she entered an alliance with France against Germany, the communist leaders in French colonies were told to stop believing and preaching that France was an imperialist country. When she entered into an alliance with Germany against the whole world, the communists everywhere were told to stop believing that Germany was a Fascist country and, instead, begin preaching that the rest of the nations were fascists.

George Padmore, the Negro leader, member of the Comintern Executive from 1923 to 1934, says :—

"I was at the time the Secretary of the International Trade Union Committee of Negro workers, the anti-imperialist centre of the African liberation movement. I continued to carry on my work from Paris, but the Comintern having decided to change its line in conformity with the foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. instructed me to change my attitude, especially in relation to France and Britain.

"I was told to boost the League and to stop all criticism of French imperialism—especially of its militarisation of subject peoples.

"I declined to agree to this betrayal of my people and requested that a delegation of Negro Communist leaders should be received by

the Comintern, in order to present our views on this new policy. The G. I. declined and I had no alternative to resignation. Immediately the usual campaign of slander began, in which communists characterised me as a disruptive element and an agent of British Imperialism. ”

When as a direct result of Soviet-Nazi Pact, Hitler felt encouraged to invade France and France fell, the French communist party would not even mention Hitler or Germany, but explained the whole affair as an invasion of “foreign imperialism.” They contributed to French weakness and consequent defeat by organising strikes in key war-industries.

Later on when Hitler turned on Russia and America became an ally, Browder, the communist leader of America contemptuously dismissed those who talked of American monopoly-capitalism and welcoming it said, “Capital has a perfect right to monopolise itself.” The American communists “dissolved” their party to allay the suspicion of the American public.

So, we see that imperialism, monopoly-capitalism, fascism or democracy are not definite things or given quantities but highly changeable phenomena determined purely by temporary needs of Russian foreign policy. There are no socialists, communists, capitalists, democrats, fascists, imperialists, nationalists, bourgeoisie, or proletarian, truthful men or scoundrels, but Russian needs make them so.

CHAPTER TWO

CAN WE STOP THIS MENACE?

CHAPTER TWO

CAN WE STOP THIS MENACE ?

We have discussed the maniac greed of Russia for world domination, we have discussed the kind of domination it is and we have discussed the important role her communist fifth columns play everywhere in paving the way for her expansion. Can we stop this spreading menace ? Can we check the activities of the communist agents ? Yes, we can. We can meet their menace by understanding their tactics.

We can check and even smash the Russian military might if need be only if we are on our watch and not caught unprepared. But military force is not the only force she employs in her war against the rest of the world. In fact military intervention comes, if and when it does, only as a final act to close a more or less long-drawn drama. Over a preliminary period the nations are softened and liquified by disruptive tactics with the help of the local fifth columns before they are finally swallowed and digested. This strategy if it can be summed up in one word at all can be called the strategy of invasion-revolution, or military-political strategy. In particular cases which of the two elements dominates is determined by the specific circumstances of the case.

POLITICAL STRATEGY OF DISRUPTION

Here we shall discuss only the political part of this overall strategy—that part of the strategy which aims at spreading division and suspicion among the people of the

non-communist world, undermining their morale, their confidence and their will to resist final Russian penetration with the help of the local communist agencies.

Even in this case we shall not discuss all the methods resorted to by these agencies in order to wage a struggle, which in the words of the Comintern "must inevitably turn into a civil war," the statutory obligation on their part as "sections of the Third International" to "learn systematically to unite legal with illegal work—regardless of whether the party as a whole is legal or illegal," their pledge as "sections" of the same Russia-dominated organization to work for "the annihilation of their (non-communist countries) entire government apparatus, from top to bottom, parliamentary, judicial, military, municipal". However relevant and important, we shall also dispense with a discussion of their cynical disregard and repudiation of all purity of means. According to Lenin, given the end, "it is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth." However, we shall reserve the discussion of their means in general for another occasion. Here we shall restrict ourselves only to one part of their political strategy—the technique of dividing the enemies.

The technique itself is old, and has been an indispensable concomitant of all exploitation and conquests. But the ruthlessness is new and has acquired an inhuman efficiency in the hands of Russia and her vassalite communist parties.

"THREE CONTRADICTIONS" OF DEMOCRACIES

More specifically the technique consists in exploiting the differences that exist and must exist in a complex civilization like ours. Communists have a name for these

differences and difficulties which they call "three contradictions of capitalism," and they stand for exploiting them to facilitate their own domination. On the basis of these three "contradictions," they invite the non-communist world to be locked in a mutually-exhaustive three-fold cross-struggle ; industrially backward nations to fight industrially advanced nations ; industrially advanced nations to fight amongst themselves ; and people within each nation whether industrially backward or advanced to fight each other in what is called a "revolutionary civil war."

The task of the communist parties is to "sharpen these contradictions" and help the non-communist world to come to a head and seek a "revolutionary solution" of their contradictions by engaging in the three-fold struggle corresponding to the three-fold contradictions. That is why the Comintern enjoins upon its "sections" the communist parties located in different countries.

..... "when there is no revolutionary upsurge, the communist parties must advance slogans and demands that correspond to the everyday needs of the toilers, linking them with the fundamental tasks of the communist International."

Given the "fundamental tasks," the necessary slogans can always be got up ; firstly, because people will always have everyday needs of one kind or the other under all circumstances ; and, secondly, because "needs" of the people, not being a fixed quantity and not depending on any determinate criterion, and left to be interpreted by those who have "fundamental tasks of the communist International" to fulfil, can also be cooked up like the slogans.

A WAY OUT

How can we save ourselves from these disruptive actions? By becoming conscious of them. Let us understand (1) the nature and extent of our differences, pin them and particularise them and (2) evolve a machinery to solve them peacefully as they arise from time to time.

Speaking of the latter point first, the requisite material for the machinery already exists in the goodwill, enlightenment, and co-operative spirit of the democracies of the world. How else can we account for some of the stupendous things that have happened, like the voluntary withdrawal of Britain from India, Burma and Ceylon, the Marshall Plan, Western Union and the Atlantic Pact. These will go down in history as unique achievements of all generations and nothing that may happen again can detract from the large-heartedness and broad-mindedness on which these solid achievements are built.

Envolving a machinery to solve our differences, a machinery which already exists in rudiments, will be a great step forward, but that is not all. We should sharply understand, appreciate and evaluate the extent and nature of our differences.

First, let us always bear in mind that there is preponderantly more co-operation than conflict, and there are more things we agree on than we disagree about. But the natural tendency of the mind is to take the former for granted, and exaggerate the latter beyond their rightful place, very much like a sufferer from tooth-ache who takes for granted the joy that nourishes and upholds his whole existence, but exaggerates his temporary ache.

Now, it is only right that he seeks alleviation of the pain, but what would you say of him if he curses and renounces his whole joy and life because of a local and temporary pain?

Second, if we think over the question a little, we shall find that differences and grievances of some kind or the other are a permanent feature and will always exist. *But if every time there is a grievance and wrong and injustice in the relations of two men, we read a generalised conflict in human affairs, we are out for self-destruction.* The tendency to regard a particular wrong as a manifestation of a deeper wrong, the tendency to read into every case of "differences," a "deeper, universal conflict," and behind that, a still "deeper and more universal contradiction" must be given up.*

The insufficient realisation of the above truth, and insufficient vigilance against this false tendency of the mind; plays into the hands of a communist. Everytime there is an act of exploitation he regards it as a manifestation of a deeper exploitation. Everytime there are un-

* The worst thing about looking deeper than the fact is that people who suffer from this tendency lose all perspective. They lose the capacity to distinguish. For example, consider a very foolish book "The Truth about the American Diplomats" by Annabelle Bucar, an American communist employed as a clerk in the State Department as a part of communist tactics to stealthily fill strategic positions, told to leave the American Embassy in Russia and affix her name to a book already written for her by the Russian Intelligence Service. In this book the 'author' says that her parents migrated to America, but when they reached there, they found they had "in reality" been "imported", like "other immigrants to America!"

By a similar perversion they find that tens of millions of people, Russians and non-Russians who have been seized at night and taken in closed vans and armed trains to Siberia are not forced deportees but, "in reality" are "volunteer-soldiers", who freely offered to serve anywhere for the proletarian Fatherland.

favourable terms of trade in a particular transaction, he sees trade imperialism. Everytime there is a commodity not marketed or marketable, he sees in it a general insufficiency of the capitalist market. And since a particular transaction is one-sided, and a particular commodity not marketable, he concludes, let us abolish all trade, all markets.

This is an important point, and in order to bring it into full consciousness, we shall discuss the whole communist economic thinking. We should have liked to do the same with their philosophical thinking which they have made into an argument for their mass-murder and massacre, as they have made their economic thinking into an invitation to the democracies to indulge in mutual self-slaughter, but we shall resist the call for reasons of space.

But before we take up the question of communist economic thinking, we shall make two observations.

INVENTING CONFLICTS AND DIFFERENCES

Not only does a communist see behind every particular case of "differences," a "deeper, universal conflict," and behind that, a still "deeper and more universal contradiction" but after he has postulated that deeper contradiction, he goes about seeing, believing and creating its more obvious manifestations—conflicts, differences and disagreements.

IMPORTANT COMMUNISTS NO LONGER BELIEVE IN THEIR 'CONTRADICTIONS' BUT THEY WILL ALWAYS POSTULATE THEM

Secondly, he may not even believe in his contradictions, but so long as it pays him, he will always postulate them.

Look at facts. On our side we are slowly but surely evolving a machinery to settle our differences more or less peacefully as they arise and must arise on specific points from time to time; but, on the side of Russia, she is always on the look out to exploit them and invent them. She has always been doing that ; but strangely enough, even today, when those differences which she calls the "three contradictions," no longer exist, she postulates them. And what is more she and her agents will always postulate them and believe in them, like an old maid who must postulate and believe in her past beauty, which won her lovers.

But while they will always believe in what they want to believe, by some kind of psychological fixation that will look ridiculous to thinking people, it must be admitted that they still can deceive some unwary people. This, in part, explains why even when some of them no longer believe in these contradictions, they still continue harping on them because it wins them their supporters. And so long as people are not cautious enough not to be taken in by them, they will always marshal statistics and ' facts ' in order to prove what they themselves no longer believe. Recently Mr. Varga, the official Russian economist continuously suggested in the columns of *Pravda* that a heavy slump might not descend upon the U. S. A., the citadel of capitalism, for some years to come; that even capitalist America had developed controls which could hold off a slump or minimize its effects ; that in other Western countries notably Britain, the state was taking over an increasing control of the economy. On the question of the possibility of clashes or wars among the " capitalist nations," he doubted whether they were any longer possible owing to the immense power in the hands of the U. S. A., which

was in itself a stabilizing factor. Finally in implied reference to the orthodox Leninist hope of clashes between native peoples and "possessing powers," he briefly touched on the British policy in India and elsewhere, hinting that it might be the beginning of an easier relationship between the Western and some, at least, of the Asian people.*

No wonder *Pravda* accused him of suggesting that Western countries may not, after all, collapse through their "internal contradictions"; that they might work their way to socialism and economic salvation through reform and not necessarily through Marxist revolution; accused him of denying the Leninist thesis that the workers' lot in capitalist states must become worse; and of totally rejecting the inevitability of wars and clashes among Western countries.

Finally, Voprosi Ekenomik warned that "if comrade Varga continues to be stubborn in insisting on his reformist errors, then there will be no profit in his continuing further scientific work." Not only Varga, but the whole of the Institute of the World Economics and World Politics of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. was chided by the Bolshevik, the theoretical organ of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. It said: "With all conspicuousness was demonstrated the weak development of self-criticism among our economists. Certain comrades instead of criticizing the mistakes and giving a business like consideration of the controversial statements made in comrade Varga's book, respectfully appealed to come to an agree-

* Taken from the *London Times*. But for a fuller acquaintance with Mr. Varga's views read his book "The Changes in the Economics of Capitalism as a Result of the Second War", published in 1946.

ment with the author on some formula which could be acceptable to all."

Discretion being the better part of valor, there is no wonder that after the above warning Mr. Varga should hurriedly withdraw what he had held, and to give added sincerity to his recantation should attack the "organs of international reaction" for "this systematic spreading of news" which is "a part of an ideological preparation for the future war."

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC THINKING

But so long as there are sympathies to win, we could be sure that power-grabbing communists will insist on and "prove" all kinds of differences and contradictions within those they want to divide as a preliminary to conquest and rule over them. To achieve this end, they have devised a complicated 'economics,' or rather picked it up from the cross currents of economic thought to develop it into a whole system of disruptive tactics. First taken up for "instrumental reasons," now it is believed in its own right and makes instruments of those who have not the mental capacity to get out of it.

In any society, even in a stage of most rudimentary economic development, men enter into some kind of economic relationship with each other. But a communist by pointing out that economic relations exist, concludes that they represent so much exploitation, imperialism and capitalism. Behind every item of trade inside the non-communist world, he sees "surpluses," behind every act of lending and borrowing, he sees "control" and "hegemony;" behind every Rs. 100 a green grocer makes, he sees "surplus value." In every peasant owning one acre

or more, in every hawker, shopkeeper, tailor, he sees a "petty-bourgeoise," to be made use of before the revolution and to be destroyed after the revolution is won. In every Rs. 100/- a man contributes to a school, or college or political party (excluding the Communist Party) he sees "capitalist control" of "our education and politics." In every teacher or professor (except communist ones who are many) he sees a bought intelligentsia. In every journalist and author (except those who are communists and fellow travellers, and there are plenty of them writing for the "capitalist press" and "capitalist publishing houses" making fat money) they see a marionette, tied up with a silver thread and constantly being pulled up to indulge in "anti-soviet propaganda." So, in the very fact that a person eats as an employee, a journalist, a lecturer, an engineer, an author, a painter, he sees a puppet, a paid man, a bourgeois philosopher, a bourgeois economist and so on. His objection is that they eat.

Over and over again men of thought found occasion to remark that he who pays the piper calls the tune—it does not need a communist to make this observation. From this the communist logician argues that wherever there is a tune, there is payment, a paymaster and a paid piper. This kind of reasoning is indicative of his own logic and morality. Because he believes that those who are paid for their work must be mere tools in the hand of those who pay, his scrupulously followed practice in his country is to make mere tools of those whom he pays. Lord Buddha taught that we become what we think.

A reasoning, which is essentially so defective and crude, yet deceives many people. They, so to say, "realise" its truth daily from their "personal experience." Working as a part of a bigger whole they remember the number of

times they feel a check on what they think they would have done if there had been no check. They remember those checks, forgetting their advantage and freedom within these checks which must exist in any type of corporate activity beyond a rudimentary one. The consciousness of 'being controlled' acquires an added intensity from genuine cases of exploitation, opportunistic careerism and nepotism—instances of which are by no means rare.

So you see that this type of reasoning has a seductive appeal for people before they have known communism. But after they have known it, it is too late for repair or even repentance. They are gagged and disciplined. MVD, "the eyes of the Revolution," stares at them. They are hauled back and forth like coal or scrap iron to be used up in "socialist reconstruction" with a dictated song on their lips :

"Get into the ranks of toiling man
In the wattle for the Five-year plan."

Or, they slowly die away helped by a progressive writer in the amorous illusion of a young girl singing to them :

"I sensed his double-love of life
When he said: "we beat the record,
Joe Vasek and I, by 20%."

But, perhaps, we are digressing. Let us return to the question under discussion.

THIS MODE OF REASONING HAS A WIDER INFLUENCE

This communist way of thinking influences people otherwise beyond the appeal of communism. Here is a friend who in a letter says, "Communism is chosen because

it rationalises brutality, gives it a great historical, sociological, cosmological vindication and purpose." But the same friend in the same letter says, "In a capitalist country there is a sort of relative necessity (aboslutely, there is none) to have colonies in the sense that they have surpluses and do not know what to do with them at home."

So, you see, communist economic thinking is in fashion and by being in fashion has a great capacity for mischief and dividing people who will otherwise be friends. Let us put this fashionable reasoning to a searching analysis.

LET US DISCUSS THESE SURPLUSES

Communism is at bottom a form of Numerology. Communists have a weakness for the Number 3. Three terms or three stages make their dialectics. What they call Monopoly-Capitalism, is constituted of three contradictions. The solution to this three-fashioned monopoly-capitalism lies in three-fold struggles. In the same magic-spirit, they explain Imperialism in terms of three surpluses: (1) Export of surplus goods ; (2) export of surplus capital ; (3) export of surplus population. We shall leave the last one out of the discussion.

For example take America. As a capitalist country, the argument runs, she is condemned to have surpluses to export.

Well, first, let us remember, that, as a matter of fact, for long, as a capitalist country, she had surpluses to import. Her whole industrial might is built upon foreign capital. So if here we have a capitalist country, who as a capitalist country, had had surpluses to import, what

becomes of the communist necessity for a capitalist country to have surpluses to export? A communist argues: "Logically, a capitalist country must have surplus goods to export, but factually it has surpluses to import." Then bursting into angry denunciation of facts, he says, "Down with these bourgeois facts. They don't co-operate."

Elsewhere logic and explanations that do not explain facts are discarded; in communist thinking facts that do not bear out a certain logic and explanation are twisted or discarded.

SURPLUS GOODS

When a communist maintains that a particular country has surpluses to export, what he has in mind is no more than a simple fact that goods are exported by that country, and this fact he calls surpluses. But anybody would tell you that these exports have to be exchanged for imports. That is instead of spending the money on what that country exports, she spends it on its equivalent—that is on what she imports. So where are the surpluses? But if we must insist on these surpluses, we shall reach a very absurd conclusion. Looking to a country's export we shall say that she produces such a surplus of goods that she has to export them, and looking to her imports we shall say quite a contradictory thing, namely that she is so deficient in producing them that she has to import them. The only way out of this dilemma would be to preach austerity or self-sufficiency on national basis, a kind of economy which fascist national countries like Germany and Russia preparing for war take to without promptings from any quarter.

And further why this self-sufficiency on national basis alone? Why not on individual basis, as well? A national state can be accused of surpluses in the same sense and with the same justification as any individual who is producing more than he needs in order to sell it to those who need his 'surplus' to get the 'necessary exchange' to enable him to buy the 'surplus' of those who in their turn produce more than they need.

The surplus-goods theory of imperialism is based on a false notion, namely, that a capitalist country does not create sufficient purchasing power to absorb all the goods it produces, and hence colonies must come forward to provide this balance of purchasing power. But from where do the colonies come by this excess purchasing power. This argument says that while industrially developed countries, "Imperialist countries," are unable to create sufficient purchasing power to buy their goods, industrially backward colonies create the same purchasing power in such large excesses that they not only absorb their own goods (and surpluses too if the colonies are capitalist countries; and to a communist they are), but also the surplus goods of the mother countries! Beware!

Putting the surplus-goods-export theory of imperialism in a nut shell, Communists say: Colonies create an excess of purchasing power big enough to absorb the excess goods of the imperialist countries.

This surplus-goods theory of international trade would look equally absurd if we were to regard trade between two industrially-advanced countries like England and America. Looking at their exports to each other we shall think that their home purchasing power is so deficient that they have to seek a profitable foreign market in each other. Looking at their imports we shall think that they

create so much excessive home purchasing power that they have to spend it on the 'surplus goods' of each other. Following this logic we shall be constrained to say in the same breath that their purchasing power is too deficient and too excessive; that, as a whole, they are a better and worse market than each other at the same time which is as absurd as to say that two persons of unequal sizes are shorter and taller than each other simultaneously.

But on the contrary, if we say that England is a better market for some American goods, and America a better market for some British goods, then where are the general surpluses and general deficiency of purchasing power which the communists so much talk of and which is the real cornerstone of their whole thinking?

SURPLUS CAPITAL

After discussing the surplus-goods-export-theory of imperialism, let us take up the surplus-capital-export-theory of the same.

Export of capital is the same as export of goods with the only difference that in the former you do not insist on immediate equivalent imports. Now when a communist says that a capitalist country has surplus capital to export, he means that that country has goods to export without importing their equivalents. And so long as she remains a capitalist country, it will hold good—that is as a capitalist country she is permanently condemned to have goods to export without importing their equivalents. So on this logic, no mechanism exists and it is impossible for a capitalist country to convert her right to immediate repayment into ultimate realisation. So as a capitalist imperialist

country, she is condemned to give perpetually and perpetually postpone her right to repayment.

Now, we say that if that is true why should we be afraid of this kind of surplus which is never paid back, and why call it imperialism, financial loot and the rest?

It is loot when a country imports more than it exports ; but if that is possible for a capitalist-imperialist country to do, what happens to the deficiency-of-purchasing-power-theory of capitalism and surplus-goods theory of imperialism ?

We have discussed some of the absurd results the surplus-capital theory of capitalism and imperialism would lead us to expect, like the fact that some of the countries, as capitalist countries, with the highest standard of living, had capital to import, which is quite contradictory to this theory. Besides, the same objections and contradictions that apply to the conception of surplus-goods trade apply to the conception of surplus-capital export ; for one reason, because capital export is just trade with the element of time introduced into it ; but if it can not ultimately be converted into trade, it is a free gift.

COMMUNISTS CONDITIONED TO SEE SURPLUSES AND EXPLOITATION EVERYWHERE

The communists, themselves conditioned to see imperialism, colonialism, surpluses, capitalism and so on everywhere teach us to do the same in every item of trade, lending, borrowing and producing—in short, in every economic relationship of any kind outside the ambit of Russia and her satellites. And we have unwillingly taken to this way of thinking.

To illustrate, when the democracies trade, they are merely disposing surpluses which they do not know what to do about. But when the Soviet Fatherland or "Ptoples' Democracies" trade, they are doing fair exchange, supplying the needs of each other. When the Democracies trade, they are indulging in imperialism or colonialism, or exploitation—so a communist says and many others join him in the chorus. And thus we discredit each other and call each other names and play into the hands of the communists and help Russian expansion.

By whatever we have said above we do not want to suggest that there are no areas of exploitation within the democracies and there is no room for more equitable mutual exchange. But what we do say is that:

(1) This exploitation is not of a type and character which the Communists avow ;

(2) and not so ubiquitous that it is to be found in every single act of trade or lending or borrowing ;

(3) and wherever it exists, it is so obvious that one need not master communist learning and scholarship in order to find it.

And, of course, we hold that because of certain bad things in the relationship of certain democracies, which are capable of elimination, it will be sheer disaster to do anything that encourages communism, which is after all nothing but a glorified name for cannibalism.

Countries trade not because they are capitalist or socialist, but because of their geography, population and resource-base. Capitalist America with her vast resources and population spends and earns only about 5% of her total national income on and from foreign trade ; but half a dozen socialist countries of Western Europe have to spend

between 30% to 50% of their income on imports and consequently earn the same proportion of their income from their exports.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC THINKING FURTHER DISCUSSED

But to a communist things do not look the same as they do to others. According to him if there is an economic relationship between two persons or institutions, there is imperialism, capitalism or exploitation of one kind or the other between them.

This proposition is the unconscious major premises behind many political controversies, heated debates, and mutual political billing of today.

If the exaggerations of this view are corrected, much of communism would die away. This point is so important that we shall elaborate it still further.

Let us take a concrete example—Mr. Ferdinand Lundberg, author of “America’s 60 Families” says:

“ J. P. Morgan & Company, traditionally ready to make personal loans to non-Morgan Commercial Bank Chieftains (thus bringing them under its wing).....”

Thus, to Mr. Lundberg’s way of thinking, lending money is equal to controlling people whom you lend money. He forgets that, in business, lending and borrowing are matters of routine and done in an ordinary business way without involving control or exploitation except in very isolated cases. He forgets that in business the body of persons who lend money are generally the same persons

who borrow it. Then, does he maintain that the same set of persons are both masters and slaves, controllers and the controlled, exploiters, and the victims at the same time?

If one were to follow this logic seriously and tried to build Mr. Lundberg's control-free world, one should abolish all banking, all commercial and industrial lending and borrowing.

He goes on further. By taking up one group, namely Morgans, and adding up all the single relations this group enters into with other groups, he concludes ;

“These various connections, with their varying degrees of control, dominance, influence, bring roughly \$77,600,000,000 of corporation assets into some relation to the Morgan groups . . . is more than one-fourth of American corporate wealth.”

But if you can show that A has economic relations with B, C, D, by that sheer fact you have also shown that B, C, D, have economic relations with A directly, and with each other indirectly, and if every relation to you means either control, or dominance or influence, and if by entering into relation with B, C and D, A controls or dominates or influences them, by that very fact B and C and D control, dominate and influence A and dominate, control and influence each other.

Thus taking these thousands of families (which his 60 families eventually turn out to be) one by one, and every time showing that each of them controls one-fourth, or one-fifth of the total American corporate wealth, he reaches the absurd conclusion without his realizing it that taken

together they control a wealth 100 times or 1,000 times greater than the American nation ever possessed !

Similar reasoning pervades the whole communist economic and political thinking, high or low. In a small pamphlet ' Indo-British Big Business Deals ' (with a subtitle ' New Forms of Imperialist Exploitation ') brought out by the Communist party of India, the author claims :

" We show how Indo-British business deals are a plan for the perpetration of the enslavement of India, economic and political—a new method of imperialist exploitation of India by the British "—

with the help of Indian Big Business, he forgets to repeat. One should not be surprised by this claim if one remembers that a communist is a person who has been taught to see exploitation everywhere and for him any economic deal between two countries is an imperialist deal and between two persons of the same country, a capitalist deal. We have not fully read the propaganda-pamphlet but even a cursory glance is sufficient to show that it is strewn with statistics and quotations, the meaning of which the author hardly understands.

In another pamphlet published by the Communist Party of India, we found the same distorted economic thinking. There, it has been concluded that since in a certain country nitrate is being produced by the finances of another country, the former country is a colonial country and the latter an imperial country.

Invariably, wherever a communist can show an exchange of commodities, he institutes an Imperial-Colonial relationship, a capitalist-proletarian relationship, competition, dumping, hegemony, slavery, exploitation etc.

This thinking is met not only in the lower rung of Communist hierarchy, it is equally ubiquitous in their highest circles. Lenin in his book "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" gives a quotation:

"The concentration movement of the bank is narrowing the circle of establishments from which it is possible to obtain credit and is consequently increasing the dependence of big industry upon a small number of banking groups."

Again the same. So, *unless a person is his own banker, his own producer, his own consumer, his own source of raw-material, his own market for surplus goods, his own outlet for investment, he is a monopolist, imperialist, capitalist, and it is hegemony control and dependence.*

But when Lenin is confronted with the fact that in spite of this centralisation of functions, there is a wider dispersal of capital and increasingly more people are coming to hold stocks in a company, he comes out with another quotation, "the one-pound share is the basis of British Imperialism."

So, for communists, whatever the facts, the conclusion is the same. The conclusion is the same because the motive is the same, to discredit and blacken what they have already decided to kill and smash instead of improve and reform.

**COMMUNISTS STICK TO THEIR INVENTED VOCABULARY
EVEN WHEN IT COMPLETELY FAILS TO EXPLAIN
CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC FACTS**

Lenin says and Stalin quotes him acceptingly that they can win when all those "hostile to us have become suffi-

ciently entangled, are sufficiently at loggerheads with each other, have sufficiently weakened themselves in a struggle which is beyond their strength."

Their intention is obvious—to make the rest of the people fight each other and weaken each other, so that they triumph.

In order to facilitate their task, they have invented a vocabulary which has a bad name to give to every human and economic relation we may enter into. They tell us that world trade is not a mutual exchange of goods, but an Imperial colonial exploitation. And yet, taking a pre-war year 1928, the four countries China, India, Burma and Ceylon representing classical examples of colonialism accounted as a whole for only 3.75% of the total world trade, a figure which includes 1.75% receiving. But even if we forget the receiving part (which one is always tempted to) could a person with any sense of proportion make this 4% trade explain and judge 96% trade?

They tell us that the industrial-imperialist countries need the agricultural-colonial countries as a market for their surplus goods, when in point of fact, the industrial-imperialist-countries are their own best markets. Taking a year at random—say 1928—we find that Germany was the second most important source of imports for Great Britain and Great Britain the second most important source of imports for Germany. The first most important source of import for both these highly industrialised countries was U. S. A., another highly industrialised country.

They tell us that America is rich because she is an imperialist-exploiter country, when we know that in her most prosperous year before the war, namely 1929, she derived only 6% of her total national income from exports of her

goods to the outside world (mostly to rich countries like Canada, England, Australia) even if we forget about the 5% of the national income which she contributed to the income of the world in the same year.

They tell us that in India we are poor because our wealth is being drained off by world imperialism in general and British Imperialism in particular, when we know that as a matter of fact (if we express our total relations with the rest of the world in economic terms—trade will accurately measure it) the value of our foreign exports is only 9% of our total income, even if we forget 10% value of the imports we receive from outside. Could a person with any sense of proportion explain our poverty in terms of the marginal 9% of our income?

They explain American prosperity in terms of the marginal 5% of her national income even which she does not receive freely from the world. In a similar way, they explain Indian poverty in terms of her marginal 9%, even for which we get an equivalent.

Similarly, they tell us that to seek foreign investment is to seek foreign control, and that foreign capital does not mean prosperous economy but further impoverishment and exploitation. In point of fact, acceptance of this logic leads to most absurd results. We find that, today, the richest countries are those which invited the largest amount of foreign investment. We know that the strength and prosperity of America is built on foreign investment. In 1914, when she had already become a first-rate industrial country, foreign investment in America was estimated at between 4 and 5 billion dollars. British Investment in the same year in America was nearly \$3,673,900,000 and in India only \$1,844,600,000. Yet she was not twice as "colonial" as India was. In the year 1938 foreign invest-

ment in Canada with a population of about 7 million, was \$3.7 billions; in India with a population of 380 million only \$2.8 billion. If foreign investment should make for poverty of a nation, Canada and Australia should be the poorest countries ; but they are the richest.

In the year 1938, Germany's foreign obligations were very near the Indian obligations—about \$2.6 billion ; yet it did not make their political status the same, which it should on the communist reckoning. India was preparing to wage a colonial struggle ; Germany was preparing to wage an imperialist war.

A PLEA FOR PROPORTIONS

The above analysis has been elaborated not to suggest that there has been no colonialism, Imperialism or exploitation. There has been plenty of these. But they have been of a character and scope quite different from what the Communists conceive. To read colonialism, imperialism or exploitation in every single act of trade, lending and borrowing is stupid. *A world to be free from "communist exploitation" will have to be free from all exchanges, all trade, all credit, all division of labour, in short of all production.* You can well imagine what a pretty kind of world it should be.

The above analysis has been developed in great detail in order to discourage bellicose and exaggerated notions of things which the Communists teach. Unless we are very cautious and vigilant, we can lose all sense of proportion and harm our best interest. It is unfortunately true that there is lots of pinching and stealing, grabbing and scrambling, legal and illegal in every country—and nowhere more so than in Russia, where exploitation of working masses

has reached a devastating point (10-12% of the privileged class eat away 50% of the national income) ; but the sight of these ugly facts should not blind us to a far vaster basis of honest co-operation, mutual exchange of prosperity, mutually advantageous division of labour and all that has made life richer and better for everybody, particularly in the West where the organisation of trade, credit and production have been largely applied. The more constructive approach, and the only responsible approach is to try to improve things instead of smashing them, wherever democracy exists and gives us a say in the matter and things are not beyond the united action of common men as they are in totalitarian countries like Russia.

SELLING WEAKNESS AND DIVISION

Russia has grabbed 10 countries because democracies were not united. Now that they are united, Russia can expand no more. Naturally enough she denounces this unity as aggressive.

Russia can expand only through weaknesses and division of the rest of the world. The local communist leaders can receive their spoils only if Russia expands. So between themselves they agree and say:—let the world be weak and divided and Russia expand and let the local communist leaders share the booty. After agreeing upon their respective share and strategy they go about selling weakness and division.

They say that their chance comes when those they have decided to subjugate "have become sufficiently entangled, and are sufficiently at loggerheads with each other." Knowing what they want and knowing what conditions can bring them what they want, they make every

effort to bring about conditions that they know will bring them what they want. They go about sowing distrust and division among those they have decided to enslave.

THEY MAKE A TACTICAL ARGUMENT

They say to us: "Look! You are not producers, peasants, labourers, clerks, composers, shopkeepers managers, engineers, or teachers. On the other hand, appearances notwithstanding, fundamentally, you are mutual exploitators, bourgeoisie, proletariats, imperialists and colonials, henchmen and paid agents. The fundamental thing about your economy is mutual exploitation and resultant production if any is a by-product".

And like Nietzsche's Zarathustra they continue "we teach you war and civil war. If you are equally rich, fight as class rivals. If you are unequally rich or poor, fight as class enemies. People with income of Rs. 100/-! Come out and gird up your loin. Fight and kill the people with Rs. 200/-. But if the fight is too much for you unaided, unite with people of Rs. 150/-, to kill the people with income above it and after that is done, you can kill the people above Rs. 100/. We have a name for it: Paralysis of classes."

They continue, "Fight, kill; and as long as you fight and kill, any reason is good enough—any cosmology is good enough. For, as long as you are on the war path, you are on the right path. Never forget, that fighting and killing and mutual destruction, somehow, by some inner compulsion, mysteriously and miraculously add upto the strength and growth of a society, to its pride and prosperity and happiness."

They further add, "And moreover by fighting and killing you have nothing to lose—we shall give you all the inequality you ever possessed. But you have everything to gain—the excitement of street-riot".

They close with a note of warning, "But be warned against those Mansheviks, Christians, Socialists—particularly Socialists. They are paid agents of Duponts, Morgans, Tatas and Birlas. They will do their best to mislead you and deceive you and entice you from the true war-paths of Marxism—Leninism—Stalinism. They will tell you to live and produce and improve together when you should be killing and destroying each other. They will tell you to associate as producers of different utilities and of different abilities, when you should be fighting as mutual-exploiters, class enemies and class rivals. Moreover in their mistaken zeal for reform they will tell you to unite to destroy exploitation, when the most obviously right thing to do is to divide to destroy production. Do not be deceived by those paid agents—those Trumans, Cripps, Atlees, Blums, Nehrus, Jai Prakashes, Schumachers."

That is the strategic logic presented—repeatedly in many and various words by Russians expansionists and the local communist leaders who stand to profit by this expansion.

This logic which is essentially an instrument and justification of Russian imperialism, deceives many people because it is sold by native distributors.

CONCLUSION

Let us refuse to be deceived by this 'tactical' logic, and then we are safe.

This does not mean that we should not give expression to genuine grievances and work and fight for real and tangible improvements; it only means that we should not be on the look out for imaginary grievances and fight and kill for imaginary cures.

The communists conjure up imaginary grievances and suggest imaginary cures to bring about the defeat and extinction of democratic forces. They do it for the profit of it, for the fun of it. The Mammon and the devil in them !

Democracy (however imperfectly realised) is the political expression of those conditions which alone constitute the basis and guarantee of our material well-being and spiritual growth. But there is something in our own selves which is antagonistic to this promise, which wants to defeat and humiliate the material and spiritual growth. Communism is the expression of humanity's antagonism towards its own progressive divinisation. We are never damned. We choose to be damned. We self-will to be damned. Communism is an expression of that "choice" and "freedom"—humanity's will to self destruction and self damnation.

In Sri Aurobindo's words, communism is a "Hostile Force." It shows that we need all vigilance and self-searching to survive this attack of the "Asuric-Forces."

