Soviet Ambassador Novikov Assesses the Americans – Sept. 1946

*An excerpt from a telegram to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, DC, to the Kremlin in Moscow*

 The foreign policy of the United States, which reflects the imperialistic tendencies of American monopolistic capital, is characterized in the postwar period by a striving for *world supremacy*. This is the real meaning of many statements by President Truman and other representatives of American ruling circles; that the United States has the right to lead the world. All of the forces of American diplomacy – the army, the air force, the navy, industry, and science – are enlisted in the service of this foreign policy. For this purpose broad plans for expansion have been developed and are being implemented through diplomacy and the establishment of a system of naval and air bases stretching far beyond the boundaries of the United States, through the arms race, and through the creation of ever newer types of weapons.

 1a) The foreign policy of the United States is conducted now *in a situation that differs greatly*  from the on that existed in the prewar period. This situation does not fully conform to the calculations of those reactionary circles which hoped that during the Second World War they would succeed in avoiding, at least for a long time, the main battles in Europe and Asia. They calculated that the United States of America, if it was unsuccessful in completely avoiding direct participation in the war, would enter it only at the last minute, when it could easily affect the outcomes of the war completely ensuring its interests.

 In this regard, it was thought that the main competitors of the United States would be rushed or greatly weakened in the war, and the United States by virtue of this circumstance would assume *the role of the most powerful factor* in resolving the fundamental questions of the postwar world. These calculations were also based on the assumption, which was very widespread in the United States in the initial stages of the war, that the Soviet Union, which had been subjected to the attack of German Fascism in June 1941, would also be exhausted or even completely destroyed as a result of the war.

 Reality did not bear out the calculations of the American imperialists.

 b) The two main aggressive powers, fascist Germany and militarist Japan, which were at the same time the main competitors of the United States in both the economic and foreign policy fields, were thoroughly defeated. The third great power, Great Britain, which had taken heavy blows during the war, now faces enormous economic and political difficulties. The political foundations of the British Empire were appreciably shaken, and crisis arose, for example, in India, Palestine, and Egypt.

 Europe has come out of the war with a completely dislocated economy, and the economic devestation that occurred in the course of the war cannot be overcome in a short time. All of the countries of Europe and Asia are experiencing a colossal need for consumer goods, industrial and transportation equipment, etc. Such a situation provides American monopolistic capital with *prospects for enormous shipments of goods and the importation of capital* into these countries – a circumstance that would permit it to infiltrate their national economies.

 Such a development would mean a serious strengthening of the economic position of the United States in the whole world and would be a stage on the road to world domination by the United States.

 c) On the other hand, we have seen a failure of calculations on the part of U.S. circles which assumed that the Soviet Union would be destroyed in the war or would come out of it so weakened that it would be forced to go begging to the United States for economic assistance. Had that happened, they would have been able to dictate conditions permitting the United States to carry out its expansion in Europe and Asia without hindrance from the USSR.

 In actuality, despite all of the economic difficulties of the postwar period connected with the enormous losses inflicted by the war and the German fascist occupation, the Soviet Union continues to remain economically independent of the outside world and is rebuilding its national economy with its own forces.

 At the same time *the USSR’s international position is currently stronger than it was in the prewar period*. Thanks to the historical victories of the Soviet weapons, the Soviet armed forces are located on the territory of Germany and other formerly hostile countries, thus guaranteeing that these countries will not be used again for an attack on the USSR. In formerly hostile countries, such as *Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, and Romania*, democratic reconstruction has established regimes that have undertaken to strengthen and maintain friendly relations with the Soviet Union. In the Slavic countries that were liberated by the Red Army or with its assistance – Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia – democratic regimes have also been established that maintain relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of agreements on friendship and mutual assistance.

 The enormous relative weight of the USSR in international affairs in general and in the European countries in particular, the independence of its foreign policy, and the economic and political assistance that is provides its neighboring countries, both allies and former enemies, had led to the growth of the political influence of the Soviet Union in these countries and to the further strengthening of democratic tendencies in them. Such a situation in Eastern and Southeastern Europe cannot help but be regarded by the American imperialists as an obstacle in the path of the expansionist policy of the United States.

 2a) The foreign policy of the United States is not determine at present by the circles in the Democratic Party that (as was the case during Roosevelt’s lifetime) strive to strengthen the cooperation of the three great powers that constituted the basis of the anti-Hitler coalition during the war. The ascendance to power of President Truman, a politically unstable person but with certain conservative tendencies, and the subsequent appointment of (James) Byrnes as Secretary of State meant a *strengthening of U.S. foreign policy of the most reactionary circles of the Democratic party*.

 The constantly increasing reactionary nature of the foreign policy course of the United States, which consequently approached the policy advocated by the Republican party, laid the ground work for close cooperation in this field between the far right wing of the Democratic party and the Republican party. This cooperation of the two parties, which took shape in both houses of Congress in the form of an unofficial *bloc of reactionary Southern Democrats and the old guard of the Republicans* headed by (Senator Arthur) Vandenberg and (Senator Robert) Taft, was especially clearly manifested in the essentially identical foreign policy statements issued by figures of both parties. In congress and at international conferences, where as a rule leading Republicans are represented in the delgations of th United States, the Republicans actively support the foreign policy of the government. This is the source of what is called, even in unofficial statements, “bipartisan” foreign policy.

 b) At the same time, there has been a *decline in the influence on foreign policy of those who follow Roosevelt’s course for cooperation among peace-loving countries.* Such persons in the government, in Congress, and in the leadership of the Democratic party are being pushed further and further into the background. The contradictions in the field of foreign policy and existing between the followers of (Henry) Wallace and (Claude) Pepper, on the one hand, and the adherents of the reactionary “bipartisan” policy, on the other, were manifested with great clarity recently in the speech by Wallace that led to his resignation from the post as Secretary of Commerce. *Wallace’s resignation means the victory of the reactionary course* the Byrne is conducting in cooperation with Vandenberg and Taft.

 3. Obvious indications of the U.S. effort to establish world dominance are also to be found in the increase in military potential in peacetime and in the establishment of a large number of naval air bases both in the United States and beyond its borders.

 In the summer of 1946, for the first time in the history of the country, Congress passed a law on the establishment of a peacetime army, not on a volunteer basis but on the basis of universal military service. The size of the army, which is supposed to amount to about one million persons as of July 1, 1947, was also increased significantly. The size of the navy at the conclusion of the war decreased quite significantly in comparison with wartime. AT the present time, the American navy occupies first place in the world, leaving England’s navy far behind, to say nothing of those of other countries.

 Expenditures on the army and navy have risen colossally, amounting to $13 billion according to the budget for 1946-47 (about 40 percent of the total budget of $36 billion). This is more than 10 times greater than corresponding expenditures in the budget for 1938, which did no amount to even $1 billion.

 Along with maintaining a large army, navy, and air force, the budget provides that these enormous amounts also will be spent on establishing a very extensive system of naval and air bases in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. According to existing official plans, in the course of the next few years *228 bases*, points of support, and radio stations are to be constructed *in the Atlantic Ocean and 258 in the Pacific.* A large number of these bases and points of support are located outside the boundaries of the United States. The Atlantic Ocean bases exist or are under construction in the following foreign island territories: Newfoundland, Iceland, Cuba, Trinidad, Bermuda, the Bahamas, the Azores, and many others; in the Pacific Ocean: former Japanese mandated territories – the Marianas, Caroline and Marshall Islands, Bonin, Ryukyu, Philippines, and the Galapagos Islands (they belong to Ecuador).

 The establishment of American bases on islands that are often 10,000 to 12,000 kilometers from the territory of the United States and are on the other side of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans clearly indicates *the offensive nature of the strategic concepts* of the commands of the U.S. army and navy. This interpretation is also confirmed by the fact that the American navy is intensively studying the naval approaches to the boundaries of Europe. For this purpose American naval vessels in the course of 1946 visited the ports of Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Turkey, and Greece. In addition, the American navy is constantly operating in the Mediterranean Sea.

 All of these facts show clearly that a decisive role in the realization of plans for world dominance by the United States is played by its armed forces.