a Committee composed of 150 top men in America's business and university circles. In his introductory remarks, Mr. Richard Nixon, vice-president of the U. S. had the following to say:

"In the next five years, as in the last forty years, the primary danger, greater than the threat of military aggression from the Soviet Union, which confronts the free world, is in Communist gains and aggressions under borders rather than over borders.

"Where will those gains take place? It is quite obvious. In areas where the Communists are concentrating their limited resources. Some of them we read about in the paper today. We have all, of course, been alerted by the spectacular launching of the two satellites. We should be just as concerned by what would seem some rather mundane news reports in the papers — a trade mission to Ghana — a new agreement between the Soviet Union and Syria — a loan to India — and, of course, the economic agreement with Egypt." (p. 21 and 22 Soviet Progress vs. American Enterprise).

And Mr. Nixon, no slouch when it comes to understanding the problems of his benefactors — the American capitalists — summed up in the following pregnant language:

"In 1942, when this organization was founded, we were in a war, and I think it was perhaps much easier then, as we know, to alert the nation to its responsibilities, and certainly the results speak for themselves. Just as surely as we were in a war then, we are in a war today. We must recognize the characteristics of that battle. We must recognize that we are confronted with a potential enemy who uses non-traditional methods of conquest. Only then can and will we make the necessary sacrifices to meet and defeat our potential enemies, and those who would destroy our freedoms and those of the people who want to be free all over the world." (p. 25, ibid.)

This was undoubtedly Mr. Nixon's answer to the challenge thrown out by Nikita Khrushchev to an American editor, in his own coloreful words and style, barely one month previous to the CED anniversary meeting:

"We declare war upon you . . . in the peaceful field of trade." . . . "We declare war. We will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system." (Quoted in the introduction to The Ruble War by Howard K. Smith and five other news correspondents, p. 9).

* * *

To the spokesmen of American capitalism and their rivals in state capitalist Russia the threat of hot nuclear war is certainly disturbing, if not terrifying. But this is a concern which is not always with them. Even with the collapse of the Summit and the vitriol poured out by Mr. Khrushchev on the head of his quondam friend, Mr. Eisenhower, the fear of an imminent shooting war is not uppermost. On the other hand, the economic war is always with them, causing them fresh concern and incalculable loss of sleep. Mr. Clarence B. Randall, Special Assistant to the President of the United States put his finger squarely on the problem at the above-mentioned CED meeting when he pointed out that there is not enough understanding in the business community of the economic side of America's relations with the "underdeveloped" countries, such as Egypt, Syria, Pakistan, Afghanistan, etc.:

"In the first place," he stated, "the United States is no longer self-contained in raw materials. That is perfectly obvious to all of us. We have long had lacks such as tin, chromium, nickel, vanadium, wolfram, manganese; but we have now moved out into the heavy commodities. We are heavy importers of petroleum, iron ore, bauxite, and paper, and it is important to us in the future to assure those supplies." (p. 31, Soviet Progress vs. American Enterprise.)

It seems that Mr. Randall recognized that the underdeveloped countries of the world now constitute the only important new reservoir of the world's raw-material assets, and that he voiced the concern that future American industry should not be cut off from such sources. Furthermore, and of equal importance, is the knowledge that the backward areas of the world will one day be developed and be a possible market for American goods — unless the Soviet Union should get there first. And the business tactics of the Soviet rulers, the cut-throat competition brought into operation by these ruthless "gangster" businessmen is a constant source of irritation to the ulcers of the American bourgeoisie. Loans at ridiculously low interest charges, sales at prices far lower than the nearest competitors can offer, purchases at higher than normal prices — anything at any cost to keep their rivals out of these areas.

With the arrival of Soviet Russia on the world scene as an industrial nation, importing raw materials for an expanding industry, exporting commodities of all types, competing for foreign markets, even conducting a vast financial aid program of her own to underdeveloped areas the Marxian analysis becomes even more clear. In the space of a few years the USSR has changed its character from a more or less isolated economic nation into one in which both commodities and people move freely back and forth across its borders. During the ruthless tyranny of Stalinism there was, to be sure, an antipathy toward Russia by American capitalism, but there was never any real threat of armed warfare. The U. S. rulers were always prepared to shed crocodile tears for the victims of Bolshevism but as long as American propertied interests were not threatened there was nothing more tangible than tears. Once Russia had become firmly established in business, however, and in the same business as the United States, the unwritten jungle law of capitalism went into effect. These two gigantic combines of capital have been clawing each other ever since in cold wars and in small scale hot wars, threatening to bring down the entire world in an atomic shambles in the interests of their respective profits.

Moreover, to complicate the picture, the supposed ally of Soviet Russia, Red China, has entered the economic war with a vengeance in recent years. An underdeveloped nation itself, it has forged ahead sufficiently to be supplying free industrial equipment to areas in South-East Asia and to be making cash grants and long-term loans to countries such as Cambodia and Outer Mongolia. In the New York Times of June 1, 1960 we are informed of the "treaty of friendship and mutual assistance" between Peiping and Ulan Bator, the terms of which provide a loan by China of 200 million rubles ($50 million dollars) and for Chinese help "in the construction of a number of Mongolian public works and industrial enterprises." This aid program will include scientific as well as technical cooperation and economic assistance and bodes no good for Soviet Russia on the other side of the border.

In this connection a lot has been written lately of the deepening tensions between the two giants of the Communist orbit. In a recent column by John Harriman, financial writer for the Boston Globe, it was pointed out that most European industrialists believe "the threat to the peace of the Western World comes more from the United States than from Russia" because in their opinion the USSR "has identified Red China as the eventual enemy which will some day challenge Soviet power in Asia" and that some day Red China, bursting with her growing population, must explode into Russian Siberia. The feeling is that Russia might be forced into war with the U. S. through some possible American miscalculation, but that she would prefer to concentrate upon the Chinese threat and not be forced to fight on two fronts. As this situation develops it is interesting to note that capitalism can make enemies out of friends in short order — despite any so-called common ideology — and that shooting war (nuclear war in our times) can result only because of the existence of that other war, the economic war. The job, then is to get rid of capitalism, and soon.

HARMO