

# Why

# HERE'S THE

**I**N SEPTEMBER, 1945, Generalissimo Joseph V. Stalin gave former Senator Claude Pepper this message for the American people:

***"Just judge the Soviet Union objectively. Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are and base your estimate of us upon facts and not rumors."***

The purpose of this editorial is to try to follow Stalin's advice. We are going to take an objective look at the Soviet record. We are going to base our estimate upon facts that are too frequently forgotten. They are forgotten in a trend toward wishful thinking which has increased with the growing threat of war.

Throughout the world today there are people who think that the present crisis can be resolved through some sort of deal with Russia. There are Americans who would cancel all of our government's commitments outside our own territory. There are Europeans who would abandon all plans to rearm their continent. These people would put their faith in diplomacy alone. Unrealistically, they would risk the preservation of peace on a naïve belief in the honesty, good faith and good intentions of the Soviet government, in spite of world Communism's aggressions and building up of military might.

What are the odds in such a fateful gamble? Let us try to find out. And let us begin with a short history of Soviet diplomacy.

In the past 25 years the Russian government has denounced or violated 28 treaties of neutrality, nonaggression, friendship or military alliance.

Russia and Finland signed a nonaggression pact in 1932. Russia invaded Finland in 1939.

Russia had treaties of nonaggression and military alliance with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Russia annexed those three Baltic republics in 1940.

Russia had a nonaggression pact with Turkey, and denounced it in 1945.

Russia signed a nonaggression agreement with Nationalist China in 1937, and a treaty of alliance in 1945. Almost immediately after signing the latter, the U.S.S.R. began looting Manchurian industry and giving to the Chinese Communists the Japanese arms which they seized as a result of their brief participation in the Pacific war. Yet, these treaties remained formally in force until Moscow recognized the Mao Tse-tung regime in 1949.

Russia still has a military alliance with France. But the Kremlin has given diplomatic recognition to the Communist Viet-Minh rebels in French Indochina.

The list of examples can be extended, but the pattern is the same.

Now let us see how faithfully the Russian government has carried out the terms of the Yalta and Potsdam declarations, the armistice agreements, the Allied control pacts and the peace treaties that so far have been signed.

The Yalta conference agreed to help liberated countries form "interim government authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

That was in February, 1945. On the 27th day of that month, Andrei Y. Vishinsky, now Soviet Foreign Minister, showed up in Bucharest and gave King Michael just four and a half hours to dismiss the Rumanian Cabinet and install a new one, hand-picked by Russia. Immediately after the Moscow Foreign Ministers' conference in December of 1945, Rumania's Communist Premier Petru Groza promised representatives of the United States, Great Britain and Russia that his government would maintain freedom of speech, press, religion and assembly, and hold "free and unfettered" elections. All these promises were violated.

In Hungary the Soviet members of the Allied Control Commission consistently acted without consulting their American and British colleagues, in violation of the Yalta and armistice agreements. They arrested political leaders of the opposition, and allowed the Hungarian Communist minority to force an elected government out of power. They dissolved Catholic youth organizations and dictated the size of the Hungarian army—all on their own.

Russia's domination of Poland dates back even before January, 1945, when the Kremlin formally recognized the "Lublin Committee," which it sponsored and controlled, as the provisional government of Poland. But Stalin agreed at Yalta to a coalition government for the country. A month later, Red Army authorities arrested 16 Poles whom they accused of working for the Polish government in exile, then functioning in London. In 1946 they started closing down the Polish Peasant Party of Former Premier Stanislaus Mikolajczyk.

The fiction of Polish independence was finally dissipated in November, 1949, when a Soviet officer, Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky, was appointed Poland's minister of national defense.

In Bulgaria, the Soviet chairman of the Allied Control Commission succeeded in blocking free elections in 1946.

Czechoslovakia remained independent until 1948. Then, with a Soviet deputy Foreign Minister on the scene, the Czech Communists whipped up a government crisis and took over—just before the scheduled national elections, which they seemed certain to lose.

Russia has blocked all efforts to write a peace treaty for Austria. It has seized industrial plants and other equipment. It has thwarted the establishment of democratic self-government. It has confiscated American publications. It has terrorized and arbitrarily arrested Austrian citizens. All these actions are in violation of Allied agreements.

# Can't be Trusted

## RECORD

The long and continuing story of broken agreements in Germany is familiar. But let us not forget that the Soviet government solemnly and formally pledged itself to treat Germany as an economic unit, to allow and encourage all democratic political parties, to limit reparations and to report on their removal, to stabilize taxes and wages in all zones, to guarantee freedom of speech and press, to permit free exchange of information, to wait for a final peace settlement before fixing a permanent German-Polish border.

All these and many other pledges have been flouted, and Eastern Germany has become an indoctrinated, regimented copy of the Russian police state.

It should also be remembered that hundreds of thousands of German and Japanese war prisoners in Soviet hands are still unrepatriated and unaccounted for, more than five years after the end of the fighting in World War II.

But, some will say, it is still possible to reach a diplomatic agreement without the burdensome and dangerous attempt to match Russia's military strength. For, after all, hasn't Stalin said that it is possible for Socialism and capitalism to co-operate and live in peace?

He has indeed, on several occasions and in no uncertain terms. When Alexander Werth of the London Sunday Times, asked him if he thought a friendly, lasting collaboration of the Soviet Union and the Western democracies was possible, Stalin replied, "I do, unconditionally." He made similar statements to Harold Stassen, Elliott Roosevelt, Roy W. Howard, and Mr. Pepper, among others.

We don't believe that Stalin would care to be accused of deviation from the teachings of Lenin. Lenin is still the unquestioned interpreter of the Marxian gospel; Stalin is his heir and his disciple. The disciple quotes him frequently and reverently. Yet, it was Lenin who said that any war waged by the proletariat to strengthen and extend Socialism was legitimate and "holy." It was Lenin who bluntly disposed of any talk of friendly, lasting collaboration in a statement which Stalin has frequently quoted:

**"We are living not only in a state, but in a system of states," Lenin said; "and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end comes, a series of clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."**

Foreign visitors to Moscow may have been given the impression that Stalin yearns for peace, that he is a thwarted planner of an international love feast. But there is another side to his postwar philosophy that he expounds strictly for home consumption. It represents essentially the same point of view that he argued in 1939, when he said that Germany had not attacked France and England, but that those two countries had attacked

Germany. Such reasoning fits snugly with the basic—and unchanging—Marxist line that capitalism breeds conflict, and that as long as capitalism exists wars will continue.

After the Nazis invaded Russia, Stalin did a lot of talking then about democracy and freedom-loving people and a "war of liberation." But once victory was won, he put the war back into Marxian perspective.

His first major policy pronouncement after the Nazis' defeat was his pre-election day speech of February 9, 1946. It was written in the usual jargon of dialectic materialism. But its effects were important enough to justify a few quotations here.

World War II, said Stalin, was the "inevitable result of the development of world economic forces on the basis of monopoly capitalism." Marxists know, he continued, that capitalism proceeds not by smooth and even progress but through crises and emergencies. Thus, World War I resulted from the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and World War II from the second.

Stalin's speech gave no word of thanks to his partners in the struggle, though he had been grateful enough when the help was needed. Since then, Soviet propaganda has increasingly insisted that the U.S.S.R. won the war singlehanded. It is clear from what followed that the 1946 elections speech was the signal that the wartime honeymoon was over.

Now, how are we to explain Generalissimo Stalin's contradictions? Perhaps it would be best to let him explain them in his own words. In commenting on diplomatic statements, he once said this:

**"Words must have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."**

This very condensed record shows, we believe, that the deeds and not the words are the guideposts to Soviet intentions. And we also believe there is nothing secret or mysterious about those intentions. It seems impossible that anyone could honestly hope, after reading even this brief summary, that appeasement, or concession unbacked by force, will limit the advance of Communism. It seems impossible to doubt that, as Thomas E. Dewey has phrased it, "Russia wants less than the whole world." Agreement may well be possible, but only at a time when the Soviet government finds itself faced by a strength and determination as great as its own.

The process of acquiring such strength is painful and prolonged. It demands effort and sacrifice. But there is no safe alternative course. So it must be done. And it can be done if our friends abroad and in the United Nations will hold fast to the sober realization that strength is the first requirement and the ultimate salvation.

—THE EDITORS



F. B. Anderson