atomic bomb internationalists of the type found in the U. S. Democratic and Republican parties; together with shameless fascists such as the ruling class and regime of Portugal. It is not impossible that Dictator Salazar will soon be joined by Dictator Franco and Fascist Spain will become one of the "democratic" forces lined up against Russia.

The oppositionists are also, in the main, a motley crew. There are, of course, the adherents of Russian State Capitalism who argue that the Pact is a virtual declaration of war against the "peace-loving" Soviet Union. Many of the U. S. "free-enterprisers" such as the *Wall St. Journal* and Walter Lippman also are to be found amongst the opposition. There is, too, a not inconsiderable antagonism to the Pact amongst some so-called socialist groups, such as the Independent Labor Party of Britain. The I. L. P. sees the present world situation in its correct light, a conflict between American and Russian Imperialism. It sees Britain and the western European nations as merely the tail to the top dog America. It does not like the idea of Britain being America's floating air-craft carrier, nor of America fighting Russia "to the last Briton."** Nor does it see any great difference between American or Russian military occupation of those countries. It would like very much to see Britain become "America's Tito," assert her independence of the U. S. and get out of the line-up.

Generally speaking, the antagonists of the measure see it as a definite war move on the part of these nations, and as a threat to the future of the United Nations. They look to see the tempo of the armaments race increase tremendously with the net result — *war* — and the possible obliteration of civilization.

**Clarence Cannon (Democrat) of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriation Committee, on April 13th, urged Congress to endorse the Arms-for-Europe program on the ground, that the U. S. must equip the soldiers of other nations and let them send their boys to the holocaust so we won't have to send ours over.

THE REAL STORY

Although there may be much to be said for either of these attitudes, there is yet a third analysis to be made, the scientific socialist analysis. We know that the Pact will not stop war, but on the other hand we also know that when war does break out it will not be because of the Pact. Wars are caused by economic reasons inherent in the capitalist mode of production and will continue to convulse the world in bloody upheavals as long as the capitalist system exists. It is not military pacts that we need, but a socialist working class.

Let us look at the nature of the world in 1949.

So far as capitalism today is concerned there are but two nations left in the world — the U. S. A. and the U. S. S. R. All other countries, whether behind or outside the "Iron Curtain" are but satellites of these two powers: economic, if not openly political, dependencies. The Soviet Union carries on its imperialism more along classical lines, — open force and terror, or the threat of such action. It uses for this purpose both its own armed forces and its loyal "communist" foreign legion. The U. S. A., while also quite experienced in the use of the mailed fist, as our "Good Neighbors" to the south of us have had occasion to learn, conducts most of its annexation by means of the almighty dollar. The Truman Doctrine, The Marshall Plan, and the North Atlantic Pact are all giant steps in the march of American Imperialism. It is U. S. *money* which forces Western Europe into the role of Uncle Sam's tail.

America, which in 1822 confronted Europe with her Monroe Doctrine and told the nations on the other side of the Atlantic to stay out of her back-yard, today finds that her back-yard has expanded considerably. While F. D. R. made the discovery several years ago that "our frontier is on the Rhine," his successor now finds that even that frontier is not nearly good enough for this country. Today's conflict is in truth a battle for the world. With the North Atlantic Pact the chips are down — America confronts Russia with a line and dares her to cross it.

THE WORKERS

Having thus laid bare the basic reason for the Pact, the question arises, what about the workers of these lands which have signed it? Since it is quite apparent to anyone who is not blinded by Russian patriotism that Soviet methods are anything but desirable; that the Russian dictatorship is tyranny to the nth degree, should we not recognize that the whole question is one of "the lesser of two evils" and support the Western alliance? Many "progressive" workers, as we have pointed out say *yes*. They argue that it is a purely defensive alliance and that among the signatories are the "socialist" countries of Britain, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg and France. They contend that these "socialist" democracies require time to build their "revolutionary new society." In the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation News for April 6, 1949, the Canadian "socialists" have the following to say:

> **"Those who ignore the participation of socialist parties and people in the pact, and speak as if capitalist America was in complete control, wittingly or unwittingly parrot Soviet propaganda. Only a presumptuous kind of socialism, thousands of miles from the danger spot can take it upon itself to sweep away the powerful influence of democratic socialism in Western Europe and to ignore its fears and its opinion on such a matter as the pact."**

This is a pretty argument. It reminds us of the one used by the Communists about the "iron-curtain" countries. These countries are all supposed, according to the C. P., to have their own democratic "communist" governments and anyone who speaks as if Soviet Russia is in complete control are merely parroting capitalist propaganda. The "socialism" of the C. C. F. differs from the "socialism" of the Cominform only in the type of government advocated. Both would retain the wages system from which flows surplus value (exploitation), poverty and wars.

We deny that our analysis of the North Atlantic Pact is a parroting of Soviet propaganda, in any way, shape or form. But we refuse to be taken in by "socialist" capitalism any more than we have ever been fooled by "communist" capitalism. It is all well and good for our pseudo socialists to tell us that under what they are pleased to term democracy, socialists have the right to spread their propaganda openly, while in Russia, such action would lead to prompt liquidation. We can admit this but at the same time we must point out that the self-styled socialists have not seemed to avail themselves of this opportunity. They have, on the other hand, for the last 50 years, contented themselves with a continual agitation for the reform of capitalism. Their entire philosophy apparently rests upon the assumption that ordinary working people are incapable of assimilating socialist understanding and that *their* intellectual leadership must carry on a constant battle for workers' rights under the wages system.

LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE

Had the reformist "socialist" parties of the world concentrated upon the spread of scientific socialist knowledge to the extent that they worked to patch up capitalism, we would by this time be much closer to a classless society than to a third world war.

Furthermore, the argument of the "lesser of two evils" and the need to wipe out dictatorships should be worn out by this time. It has been used by "socialists" and "communists" through two world wars and the so-called peace that lay between them, yet there is more privation, suffering and dictatorship in the world today than there was 35 years ago! And now, after all the shambles, the lost lives and broken bones suffered by the workers in the last "Crusade," we find our professed socialists stepping forth as the recruiting sergeants for a third world war. Not having