

Public Affairs

Vol. XIV - No. 1 - Autumn 1951

Policy Post-Mortem

Watson Kirkconnell

“YOU would be surprised, my son,” wrote old Count Axel Oxenstjerna, 17th century chancellor of Sweden, “with how little wisdom the world is ruled (*quam parva sapientia mundus regitur*).”

The cynicism of the old statesman would have ample scope in our own times as well. A post-mortem of the past ten years would provide examples of stupidity and folly rarely paralleled in history. To pass over them in silence might be the wisest course were it not that crucial policy decisions in 1951 are often jeopardized by the desire of political parties to conceal their lunacies in the very recent past, lest they forfeit the confidence of the populace and fall from power. It does not greatly matter that their critics are rarely people who have themselves a shining record for

perspicacity. The fact that in the United States, for example, the fatal wartime and post-war errors of policy were made by Democratic leaders has caused the Democratic party to strive with frantic piety to maintain the myth of F.D.R.'s superhuman wisdom and skill. At the same time, few Republican leaders had any better wartime record for political insight and judgement than the party that they assail with such bitterness. And in the frenzy to uncover (or to cover up) the shame of the 1941-1950 policies, the dust of a partisan struggle for domestic power tends to hide the real issue: that the facts of international life must be faced if the free world is to chart a course that can lead to safety.

This unpleasant duty is necessary even

if it leaves one open to a charge of pontificating hindsight. The war was fought by fallible men and some errors were inevitable. Hardly any Canadian can claim a record of infallibility throughout the war, partly because (as will be noted later) the springs of public information were so thoroughly poisoned. The present writer was showered with abuse from all sides in the 1941-46 period because of his consistent hostility to Soviet Communism (as well as to Nazism) yet when he was formally invited early in June 1943 to be one of the patrons of the organization meeting of the National Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship he too accepted, although it was on the expressly stipulated condition that the new organization should not be used "to whitewash the Communist conspiracy." In the significant sequel, my telegram of qualified acceptance went unacknowledged and my name was missing from the printed list of the Council's patrons.

II

WHEN the War ended in 1945, the Western Allies, and especially the United States, stood on an incomparable pinnacle of power. Their navies and air forces were by far the strongest in the world. Their armies, while perhaps numerically smaller than those of Stalin, were overwhelmingly superior in equipment and striking power. Yet within less than two years all of these advantages had been poured down the drain and almost every logical objective of the War had been lost. Even today we are only slowly crawling back to a point where our survival is not a bad risk.

In general, one may say that this disaster was the direct result of mental astigmatism on the part of political and military leaders alike. None were willing to confront and act upon realities with regard to Soviet Russia, and the sense of military comradeship against a common Nazi enemy strengthened the feeling that our Soviet "allies" were friends and good fellows who could be trusted to bring in a brave new democratic world after V-day.

The contrary was substantially true. The peoples of the Soviet were indeed human beings like ourselves; but Russians, Ukrainians, Georgians and the rest were all innocent victims of the Stalinist police state—all, that is, except that three per cent minority that exploits the other ninety-seven per cent and instigates reptile minorities in all non-Communist countries to inaugurate there the same system of murder and serfdom.

The chief basic fact of contemporary politics is the world-wide revolutionary conspiracy that was organized in and from Moscow in 1919 and the years immediately following. The Soviet Union and its ardent tools, the Communist parties of all countries, have in the past thirty years been wrought together into a vast, closely coordinated machine for propaganda, espionage, subversion and war. Article I of the Comintern Constitution states quite clearly that the objective is world revolution and the absorption of all countries into the Soviet super-state. Article III of that Constitution subjects every Communist in the world to the iron control of the Kremlin. The Program of the International explains specifically that the end can only be achieved by the murder of whole strata in the population of all countries. The same Program outlines the steps by which industrial countries (like Germany) peasant economies (like China) and colonial areas (like Indonesia) can all, by varying methods, be ultimately subjected to the same conquest.

THE character of the resulting regime is also painfully clear. Bolshevik socialism in practice has produced a slave state. The industrial worker is a serf who cannot leave his factory yet can be shifted anywhere by the state; he is savagely punished for lateness, unauthorized absence, or even accidental breakage; he cannot bargain over wages or hours; the factory bosses can cut off his rations and turn him out of his home; and the highly propagandized benefits of his social security system are reserved by law for a minority of shock brigaders. The peasant is likewise a serf, tied to his kolkhoz, overtaxed with burdens and penalties, and shot fo

any pilfering from his own crop. Beneath the suffering masses of workers and peasants lie the fifteen million victims of the Siberian forced labour camps. Masters of the slave empire are the political police, the MVD, with statutory power to arrest and punish without trial. At the centre of the bloody spider-web is the little Georgian despot himself, with the agony and death of countless millions to his credit.

All this was perfectly well known to Franklin Delano Roosevelt when on Feb. 10, 1940, he stated: "The Soviet Union, as everybody who has the courage to face the fact knows, is run by a dictatorship as absolute as any other dictatorship in the world." How did it happen, then, that during the next five years he gambled away the freedom of a dozen nations and jeopardized the future of the world by embracing that "dictatorship" as a virtuous and gallant friend? Some of the blame may be ascribed to the confidence that he placed in the opinions of men like Harry Hopkins, Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore. Some of it may have come with that blurring of judgement which sometimes afflicts men in high place. At any rate Roosevelt and Hopkins seem to have concocted a plan to convert Stalin to liberal Christian democracy:

- (a) By giving Stalin without limit everything he asked for, without conditions of any sort.
- (b) By getting Stalin to commit himself to fine general propositions like the Atlantic Charter.
- (c) By using all his influence in the United States and in other countries to push a propaganda campaign representing the Soviet cobra as a snow-white lamb.
- (d) By using the famous Rooseveltian charm in personal meetings, to convert the bloodstained despot into a Christian gentleman.

WHEN his former ambassador to Moscow, William Bullitt, presented him with a reasoned memorandum against this folly, Roosevelt merely replied: "Bill,

I don't dispute your facts, they are accurate. I don't dispute the logic of your reasoning. I just have a hunch that Stalin is not that kind of a man. Harry [Hopkins] says he's not and that he doesn't want anything but security for his country, and I think that if I give him everything I possibly can and ask nothing from him in return, *noblesse oblige*, he won't try to annex anything and will work with me for a world of democracy and peace." In defiance of every sane argument, F.D.R. proceeded to play this hunch and drag the world down to disaster in his mad gamble.

Glowing pro-Soviet propaganda now swept the country with White House instigation. The President aided and abetted Joseph E. Davies, who had spent only a few weeks in Moscow, in publishing and filming a propaganda book called *Mission to Moscow* and in stumping his country (and Canada) with the text: "In my opinion the word of honour of the Soviet government is as safe as the Bible."

THE campaign of official mendacity spread to Great Britain, where in 1943 the Minister of "Information", the Honourable Brendan Bracken, assured the public that "Soviet Russia has never broken its word." William Henry Chamberlain pilloried this lie in the *New Leader* for September 18, 1943, by surveying a whole series of Soviet treaties with neighboring countries regarding which the naked fact of history was that "Stalin broke every one of these treaties that it was physically possible for him to break." A fuller list of Stalin's treaty violations, compared in significant detail with those of his only possible rival, Adolf Hitler, will be found in Appendix I (pp. 219-232) of William C. Bullitt's *The Great Globe Itself* (New York, 1946).

The propaganda front was little better in Canada. Reference has already been made to the spectacular organization meeting in Toronto in June 1943 of the National Council for Canadian-Soviet Friendship, with the Prime Minister of Canada as chairman and Anglican and Roman Catholic archbishops cheek by jowl with Communists and crypto-Communists on the huge roster of patrons. This particular

racket (boycotted as such from the start by shrewd Australian Labour) gradually petered out in Canada to an unmistakable Red rump; but the corresponding propaganda mendacity of the Canadian Film Board continued for a long time to supply the Canadian public with films on Russia that were a lie from start to finish. A good example is one called *Our Northern Neighbour*. It begins by stating that in 1914 "scores of millions of Russian serfs" were toiling under Czarist despotism—although serfdom had been abolished in 1861. It then represents the Czarist war effort as hamstrung from the start by social discontent—although the Czarist armies fought with greater unanimity than the Soviet armies. (In the so-called Vlassov Army some 800,000 surrendered Soviet troops, enlisted with Hitler for service against Stalin; and five autonomous Soviet republics were liquidated by the NKVD for mutiny. There were no such defections to the enemy in Czarist times.) The film then shows Trotsky and Lenin at work in Russia organizing wartime revolution against the Czar—although Trotsky and Lenin were both abroad until after the Czar abdicated in March 1917. It shows the Red soldiers' attack on the Winter Palace in November 1917 as an attack on the power of the Czar, whereas the Czar has been gone for eight months and the Bolsheviks were overthrowing the free republic that had Kerensky at its head. And so the series of falsehoods marches on. It would be interesting to know if the Film Board is still using the film to corrupt an innocent public.

CANADIAN radio was also not immune to the spirit of the time and the C.B.C. had a veteran Communist and official of the "Labour Progressive Party" giving evening broadcasts all the way from Moscow into millions of Canadian homes at the taxpayer's expense for two long years. Canadian clubs were subjected to addresses by Leftists like Anna Louise Strong, Leopold Infeld and Raymond Arthur Davies; and even the Canadian Institute of International Affairs was sent by London a pro-Soviet lecturer in the person of the late Sir Bernard Pares.

III

IT is no wonder, in such circumstances, that the purposes for which the War was fought were hopelessly confused and bungled. Generally speaking, the American High Command simply fought to win, without realizing that war is an instrument of national policy and that logistics cannot be considered apart from political aims. The British general staff and political leaders were not so naive. They foresaw that Russia would inevitably seek to conquer and absorb as much of Europe (and the world) as possible, and therefore urged an attack through the Balkans that would set the Allies in Budapest and Warsaw on VE-day. Unfortunately Roosevelt (to avoid offending Stalin) and Marshall (on the score of logistics) would have none of it.

Stalin, of course, wanted his allies to provide a second front in the extreme west of Europe, leaving Eastern Europe to his absorptive mercies. So many vague reasons have been given for the ill-fated Dieppe attack (largely by Canadians) on August 19th, 1942, that it is illuminating to have General J. F. C. Fuller frankly identify it as "a good-will gesture to Russia" (*The Second World War*, p. 232). This is cold comfort for those uselessly bereaved in that bloody piece of politeness.

The same quixotic attitude seems involved in the decision in April, 1945 to mark time on the Elbe for three weeks so that the Russians should have the prestige of capturing Berlin, to mark time on the Budejovice-Pilsen-Karlsbad line so that Stalin might have the prestige of taking Prague and to mark time along the valley of the Enns so that the Soviets might have the prestige of taking Vienna. Churchill's protests over such decision were overruled. Hanson Baldwin has credited Eisenhower with effective objection to Churchill's strategic ideas, but a former member of Eisenhower's staff, now Dean of Rutgers, has assured me personally that Eisenhower agreed with Churchill in the matter and that the decisions that bestowed so many advantages on Stalin were imposed on Eisenhower by Washington itself. All major instructions in policy came pri-

marily from the President and the Secretaries of War and State.

Akin to these disastrous decisions were those which left Berlin an island in a Soviet sea and made the Red troops masters of Central Europe. Here Baldwin seems right in placing the blame squarely on the War Department of the U. S. A., which was impregnated with the Roosevelt-Hopkins delusion that the Soviets were political friends as well as military allies. For that matter, such had been the success of wartime propaganda that the populations of the Western democracies would no doubt have concurred overwhelmingly in the same assumptions.

BYOND the scope of the present article is the way in which various free nations of Eastern Europe were hypocritically turned over to the Soviet hangman at Teheran and Yalta without giving them a chance to discuss their own fate. We know now that the partition of Poland between Hitler and Stalin in 1939 was part of an actual treaty (since published) between the two rulers. We know that a million and three quarters out of a population of twelve millions were killed or deported to slow death in slave camps in 1939-41. We know that Stalin systematically vilified the legitimate Polish government and set up a puppet committee to take over in due course; that he invited Warsaw to rise against the Germans in 1944 and then stood by and let the Nazis slaughter the Poles; that the ink was scarcely dry on the Yalta Agreement for "free and unfettered elections" when he began a reign of terror that made such elections impossible; that he promised immunity to the Polish underground leaders and then committed them to penal servitude; and that the Soviet "liberation" of the Polish "ally" was an orgy of rape, murder and loot in which everything stealable from cattle to the port machinery of Gdynia was carried off by the "liberating" country. Comparable Soviet behaviour can be cited from all other Eastern European countries followed by a police regime of exploitation and genocide that is more active than ever today. All this must be borne in mind

as we face new peace overtures from our would-be conqueror and his Canadian agents and dupes.

IV

THE supreme political blunder of the war was the insistence on "unconditional surrender", a principle concocted by Roosevelt at Casablanca in January 1943 and only reluctantly acceded to by Churchill. Perhaps this was a mad gesture of good will towards Stalin, to assure him that the Western Allies would not make a separate peace. It is significant, however, that Stalin himself set up no such quixotic declaration but on the contrary distinguished clearly between Hitler and the Nazis on the one hand and the German people (and even the German army) on the other. Stalin saw that the mad policy of the West would leave a political vacuum into which Soviet power could move without hindrance and he facilitated that ultimate adjustment by proclaiming himself a friend of the true German people and at odds only with their Nazi tyrants.

It is probable that the formula of unconditional surrender prolonged the fighting by at least a year and cost countless unnecessary casualties. The revolt of Hitler's generals in 1944 might well have come a year earlier and have been overwhelmingly successful had it not been for this declared objective. Much as the tide flowed against Germany from 1943 on, Goebbels could always raise the slogan "Victory or Bolshevism", since Roosevelt had given the Reich no other alternatives. The Swedish journalist, Arvid Fredborg, who spent much of the war in Berlin states: "During the first half of 1943, moral disintegration reached such a point that hardly a single German remained quite loyal."

In the Far East, the slogan was equally disastrous. Freda Utley, in her new book, *The China Story*, declares: "According to the testimony of General Bonner Fellers, Roosevelt before he left for Yalta had received from General MacArthur unofficial Japanese peace overtures amounting to an acceptance of unconditional

surrender, with the sole reservation that the Emperor should not be deposed. General MacArthur had recommended negotiations, but Roosevelt brushed his suggestion aside. This was corroborated by Rear Admiral Ellis M. Zacharias (retired) in *Behind Closed Doors* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1950) p. 63."

Again it is hard to see why that Japanese surrender should not have been accepted, apart from self-hypnotism by a slogan-fetish and a desire to throw everything Stalin's way. To have accepted that surrender would have saved many American lives on Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Its availability makes nonsense of the claim of Yalta apologists that the conquest of Japan "was officially estimated likely to cost two years and half a million American lives." All that was needed was for Roosevelt to concede the retention of the Emperor, a point ultimately granted in any case. Terms even half as reasonable as those now being offered in 1951 would have cleared up the Pacific theatre in February 1945. Instead of disgracefully bribing Russia with Chinese resources at Yalta to break her treaty with Japan and enter the Eastern war for a rich prize in loot (and, as it proved, the ultimate conquest of China and half of Korea), he could have kept Russia out of the Japanese-occupied territories entirely. He could have diverted such American power to Europe as would have helped to mitigate Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. And in the long run, the Emperor was to be recognized in any case. Roosevelt, however, would have none of it, and his successor, Mr. Truman, presently authorized the atomic massacres at Hiroshima and Nagasaki of the civilian populations of a country that had for several months been trying to surrender on honorable terms.

No wonder General Fuller, in his strategic history of the War, declared regarding the "unconditional surrender" slogan: "These two words were to hang like a putrifying albatross around the necks of America and Britain."

V

A WORK of prime importance for any understanding of the chief military error of the war—the misapplication of air power—is the *United States Strategic Bombing Survey* written after the war by impartial specialists appointed by the American government.

The conclusions of that survey are emphatic. Area or population bombing, which sought to break an enemy's will to resist by destroying cities and their civilian inhabitants, proved bankrupt in practice. Strategic bombing, which concentrated on such key resources as oil, coal and transportation, was spectacularly successful and was decisive in bringing the War to an end. Statistics show that Germany military industries actually stepped up their output rapidly to the end of 1944, while 3,600,000 homes were destroyed, 7,500,000 persons rendered homeless, 300,000 killed and 780,000 injured by air attacks. Within six weeks of a single attack on Hamburg in which 100,000 were killed, the industrial output of the city's factories, mainly untouched on the outer perimeter, was back at full capacity. On the other hand a concentration on key plants late in 1944 was the beginning of the end. As reported in the *Bombing Survey*, 85 per cent of Germany's chemicals, 90 per cent of its rubber, nitrogen and gasoline, 92 per cent of its oil and 97 per cent of its aviation gas were destroyed. Hence, for example, at the Baranov bridgehead over the Vistula alone 1200 German tanks were captured for simple lack of gasoline. Production Minister Albert Speer, early in March 1945 and before Allied troops had crossed the Rhine, reported to Hitler that "the German economy is headed for inevitable collapse within four to eight weeks."

Experts differ as to who was most to blame for concentrating on the savage and ineffectual bombing of populations. The American, Major George Fielding Eliot, declared that "Germany had turned

back to her terroristic philosophy of war, that widespread and ruthless destruction of an enemy nation, including civilians, was the surest means of breaking that enemy's will to resist. The British tenaciously clung to a studied concentration on vital points essential to the enemy's war effort." The Briton, Major-General Fuller, on the contrary, accuses his country of conducting "a war of devastation and terrorization unrivalled since the invasions of the Seljuks . . . appalling slaughterings that would have disgraced Attila," and accuses Mr. Churchill, on the testimony of J. M. Spaight, Principal Assistant Secretary of the U. K. Air Ministry, of starting it all with the first population bombing (of Freiburg) on May 11, 1940. Other cities followed, and the Germans are alleged not to have retaliated seriously until nearly three months later. Still another critic, Francis V. Drake, writing in the *Reader's Digest* for July, 1951, charges the British with four years of useless savagery in population bombing, partly as revenge for the sufferings of London, while he credits the Americans with the final planning and success of the really strategic bombing that ended the war. That his version is badly biassed is shown by his failing to mention three of the most terrible cases of population bombing, all by Americans, viz., the obliteration of the peaceful city of Dresden and the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Conditioned as we have been by our own wartime propaganda, we often fail to realize that the Western Allies, who did far more of this bombing of civilians than the Germans and infinitely more than the Russians, have achieved in many parts of the world a reputation for "frightfulness" that is a deadly handicap when we talk about possessing greater peacefulness and humanity than the Communists. In calculating the climate of world opinion today, we need to remember that these massacres, in which the Germans shared and which now appear to have been a military mistake, have given us a sinister reputation. Our enemy's propaganda has made the most of this horror, and exploits once again his own shrewder analysis of military principles. This is not to say

that Stalin would not be ready to use plenty of atomic bombs on the crowded cities of the New World. With fewer of them, however, and little concern for what might happen in retaliation on the 800 million slave labourers at his disposal, he is more likely to concentrate on those strategic centres of oil chemicals and transportation that would paralyse our resistance without destroying the bulk of the resources and factories that he covets for his world empire.

VI

BUT let us pass on to consider the world of 1951 in which these errors of the past have their relevance. Sprawled from the Elbe to Vladivostok along the northern part of the great Eurasian-land mass lies the vast continuous empire of world Communism, with a combined population of 800 million people. To the south of it are scattered a long range of Asiatic peoples, also totalling 800 millions, at various stages of nationalism and economic extremity. Africa, with its 193 millions, is a potential prize for geopoliticians but its areas of political development are still peripheral or inchoate. The non-Communist part of Europe with 265 millions, is, on the contrary, highly developed politically and industrially. In population the Americas are fairly equally divided between 156 millions in the Latin-American republics and 160 millions in the United States plus Canada.

From their interior position, Russian world-conquerors can plan their chess-moves with rare skill. The possibilities are formidable. Japan has always had a large Communist party, and if Japan is re-armed the Reds can be counted on to infiltrate the new army in perilous numbers. In Indo-China, the Communist forces of Ho Chi-minh were trained in China by Chinese and Russian officers and reviewed by Marshal Meretskov before going into action. They are chiefly supplied with Czech and East German weapons; and behind them are large concentrations of Chinese Red troops. In Siam, the Chinese colony of three millions is strongly favor-

able to Mao and constitutes a dangerous Fifth Column. Their press is for the most part openly Communist.

In the case of Burma, where the corrupt and incompetent socialist government of Thakun Nu is opposed by at least eight insurgent groups including the Karen Christians, 25 divisions of Red Chinese troops under General Liu-Po-Chang are poised at the northern frontier, with large Czech and East German arms dumps at Kyeng-Hung. In Malaya, a carefully organized Red guerrilla revolution, originally directed straight from Moscow by short wave to Chinese Communists in the country, has been exceedingly successful in terrorizing the population and pinning down large British forces.

In Indonesia, once the best governed of all colonial empires, wartime Japanese occupation was followed by a Communist-led nationalist uprising, with the warm approval of the United States. Soekarno, now president, is alleged to be, like Ho-Chi-minh a graduate of the Lenin Institute in Moscow, and the largely uncontrolled campaign of massacre and outrage against the Dutch is part of the Kremlin's plan by which all Western influence is to be destroyed in Southeast Asia.

Farther south, in Australia, the Communists control all of the strategic trade unions and have slowed economic activity down to a half-paralysed crawl. In India there is a violent Communist underground, directed by Russian and Czech agents who roam the country at will. My latest air-mail letter from a Canadian Baptist missionary tells of 300 Communist murders in Southern Madras, followed by police reprisals against the terrorists. There is widespread dissatisfaction at the tyranny of the Congress Party but no prospect of any alternative to its virtual dictatorship. In the meantime, the Red Chinese occupation of Tibet has somewhat dampened Mr. Nehru's enthusiasm for Red China but not his rampant hostility to all Western nations. The same Red action in Tibet probably accounts for the hasty patching up of the political split in Nepal, especially since a Nepalese Council for Democracy (really a Red government-in-exile) has already been set up in Red

China, led by Moscow-trained Nepalese intellectuals.

IN Pakistan there is little Communism, but there is great bitterness over India's seizure of Moslem Kashmir; and the apparent partiality with which India has been treated in London and Washington has led the Pakistan government into flirtation with Moscow. Kashmir incidentally borders on Sinkiang and Tibet, both now occupied by Communist forces.

Iran, because of its oil resources, is of vital importance to the West, but the country suffers from unemployment, poverty, stagnation and a corrupt government. The selfish propertied minority that has refused to face taxation of itself and has blocked every effort to bring economic reform to the suffering masses, has now successfully diverted national hatred from itself to the well-managed Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. In the looting of the latter, the corrupt ruling caste will merely add to its own unsavory wealth and the Kremlin (a shrewd master of the whole puppet-show) will benefit by the blow to the oil supply of the free world. Important, as a potential base for defence against Russia, is the Republic of Turkey. In the country's first really free elections, held in 1950, the Democrats beat the Republicans by a plethora of promises including the right to strike, which is certain to be exploited by Moscow. Farther south the Arab states, burdened with a million despairing refugees driven from their age-old homeland in Palestine by American-armed and American-financed Israelis, blame Truman and the United States for allegedly supporting Israel for the sake of the Jewish vote in New York. The new Israeli state, moreover, is not economically viable in terms even of its present illegally seized territories, and its impending seizure of Transjordan will tend to throw the Arabs into the arms of Stalin. Yet it is impossible to negotiate with these Arab states, for they are all hopelessly corrupt and incompetent. There is no guarantee of permanent ministries; political murders and *coups d'état* are endemic, and politicians who treat with the West are promptly repudiated or liquidated.

THE Egyptian government is corrupt, capricious and violently anti-British, and tries to funnel off national discontent over economic misery by demanding the Suez Canal and the Sudan. The distress of a gravely over-populated country makes for effective Communist propaganda. There has also been a very effective Communist network of conspiracy in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco; likewise in Abyssinia, where there is an enormous staff at the Soviet embassy. For work in Central Africa, the Russians like the Nazis before the War, are busy learning Swahili.

In Europe, all countries east of the Iron Curtain have been effectively welded into the Soviet economy except Finland, which maintains a precarious freedom at the mercy of Moscow, and Yugoslavia, where Tito, a convinced Communist with an evil record, has refused to subordinate his own dictatorship to that of Stalin. Here again, Truman's diplomacy has been as bankrupt as that of Roosevelt. This past year's crop failure in Yugoslavia was not due to drought but to peasant resistance to Tito's compulsory collectivization and the country is ripe for trouble; yet Truman has come to Tito's rescue without any strings attached, and the martyred population interprets this as American support for the present hated tyranny.

In jointly administered Austria, where the Soviet General Belkine is in charge of kidnapping, espionage and sabotage, assisted by Colonel Motinov (once a star performer at Ottawa), there was an attempt last fall to seize the country by direct action; and it will certainly not be the last. In Italy, plagued by poverty and over-population, the Communists have lost ground in the past three years but still have a dangerous following among the peasants and in the industrial districts of the North.

France, next to Germany, occupies a key position in West European defence; yet an official figure puts the Communist membership in the French army at fifteen per cent; the chief labor organization (la Confédération Générale du Travail, with three million members) is Communist-dominated; and a nation-wide poll taken in December, 1950, shows that one

French citizen in three would still vote Communist in spite of the worsening international situation. The French Ministry of Information has just published a well-documented article on the Cominform plans for seizing power in France in case of war, by taking over post offices, telephones, telegraphs, radio stations, air fields and railways by trained and well-armed commando groups in every region of the country.

The integration of non-Communist Europe has been furthered by such treaties as the Treaty of Cooperation signed on March 17, 1948, by Britain, France, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg; the North Atlantic Treaty signed on April 4, 1949, by ten European countries, Canada and the United States; and the Statute of the Council of Europe signed on May 15, 1949, by ten nations (Britain, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Eire, and Italy) with the subsequent adherence of Greece, Turkey and Iceland. The Council of Europe deliberately excluded matters of mutual defense, but the North Atlantic Treaty was military in its intent and steps have been taken to implement it by a pooling of resources and staffs and a positive program of rearmament, in view of the colossal threat of Soviet military power to the non-Communist world.

IN the case of the United Kingdom, the chief strategic weakness lies in the infiltration of Communists into key positions in industry. Thus the coal-miners are led by the top-flight Communist Arthur Horner, and the power of the Communists to paralyse the English ports has been shown repeatedly. Within the past year, the Construction Engineering Union elected a Communist as its Secretary and the Yorkshire Federation of Trades Councils elected a Communist as its President.

The chief centres of Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere are in Mexico and Guatemala. In November 1941, even while the Western World was giving Stalin abundant help in his fight against Hitler's armies, a great Communist program of subversion for the Western hemisphere was organized at a conference

in Mexico City by emissaries from Moscow. Here the great Pan-Slav racket was set on foot, with a coordinating committee in Montevideo, and by 1947 sixty per cent of Latin America's 1,250,000 Slavs were in Moscow-controlled organizations. Military forces for ultimate revolution were also part of the program launched in 1941 and by 1945 there were nearly two thousand officers in full-time service and much larger numbers of other ranks trained and on call. They are strongest in Mexico, Guatemala, Cuba, Costa Rica, and Haiti. In 1947, they were massed in Cuba to invade San Domingo and were only frustrated by the Cuban government under pressure from Washington. Some members of the force have also been used in Venezuela to bring the Leftist Béthancourt to power; in Panama City for organized riots; to terrorize San Salvador in 1948 after the election of a conservative president; and in an attempt at revolution in the Dominican Republic in 1949. Much of the Communist success in Latin America is due to the strong pressure of Roosevelt's regime in wartime to force the Latin American republics into friendly relationships with Soviet Russia. Needless to say, Stalin exploited this situation to the limit.

THE least corrupted by Red influence of all countries of the world are the United States and Canada, yet even here, as we know to our cost, the amount of infiltration has been very serious. In Canada in wartime, the National Film Board, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and Wartime Information Board gave evidence of Red activity, and even the National Research Council had its termites, as revealed in the Espionage Report. Almost up to the present, certain major labour groups including the United Electrical Workers, the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, the Lumber and Sawmill Workers and the Canadian Seamen's Union were completely under Communist control. Almost up to the present also, two big city newspapers had been persistent fellow-travellers. In the United States, there has been a comparable domination of strategic labour groups and infiltration

even into such liberal publications as the *Atlantic Monthly* and *The Nation*. Still more serious in the case of the United States was the infiltration of Government, especially the State Department, by Communists and eager fellow-travellers who worked effectively for those policies of Roosevelt that have nearly brought our civilization to disaster.

VII

IT would perhaps be tiresome to stress at great length the significance of past errors in this present year of grace and peril. A brief statement should suffice.

The first moral to be drawn is the folly of ascribing any sincerity to the present peace campaign of the Kremlin. Over a period of nearly thirty years Stalin has broken nearly every treaty he ever made except the treaty that he himself sought out with the unspeakable Hitler. Soviet political scientists have candidly described treaties as devices for disarming a man that you intend to murder. In their current policies the Soviets are trying to achieve two ends: to build up a vast and powerful military machine manned by a total population conditioned for war and at the same time to weaken the military potential of the West by a thousand devices of intrigue, espionage, sabotage and propaganda. A woman in East Germany writes me that she and other members of a "Peace Committee" are busy writing letters, under orders, to all American women who have lost husbands or sons in the Korean War, urging them to ally themselves with the (Soviet-organized) World Peace Committee. Very probably the same sort of psychological campaign against those bereaved by the Korean War is being waged from other "peace committees" in other countries as well. Anything that weakens the fibre of an enemy is considered a valid weapon in this newest phase of warfare.

When, therefore, we have been recently urged over a national hook-up to extend a right hand of magnanimity and good will to Stalin and be assured of a peaceful future for the world, one is aghast at the

puerility of it. Roosevelt gave the Russian wolf eleven billions worth of supplies and arms; he tossed him the freedom of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, even of China; and the wolf cynically swallowed them all and instead of turning into a Christian sheep-dog—as Roosevelt and Hopkins had blithely prophesied—he remained more wolfish and carnivorous than ever. What more would our Utopian counsellors have us cast into his maw except our own freedom and that of the other free remnants of the world? After a decade in which Communist slavery has been triumphantly extended to cover a third of the human race, the Red Wolf must simply snicker at the innocence of those who would voluntarily surrender still another nation to him in the blessed name of peace.

A SECOND fundamental duty on our part is to distinguish between the Communist despots and the populations that they rule. The peoples of the U.S.S.R. including the Russians themselves, are the first and greatest victims of the Red conspiracy. Stalin and the Bolshevik Party have been at war with their own people ever since 1917 and have waged that war with every conceivable weapon from the propaganda of school, press, radio, cinema, and theatre to the tommy-guns of the political police. That fifteen millions are today in concentration camps is proof that the peoples of the Soviet empire are still struggling against their conquerors and oppressors, and hence that the Russians, Ukrainians, Byelo-Russians, Georgians and the rest are our natural allies against a common enemy in the Kremlin.

Failure to realize this fact helps to account for one of the worst features of the Yalta Agreement, the scandalous fugitive-slave contract, agreeing to hand back to the Soviet executioners all escaped Soviet citizens found in the Western zones. Millions were herded back to their death, amid scenes of indescribable anguish and frequent suicide. In view of that infamous performance by Allied politicians,

implemented by Allied armies, it is vastly more difficult to explain to the rest of the enslaved populations that we are really in favour of their freedom and would not sell them out to Stalin in the same old way if they yielded again, *à la Yalta*, to the wild-eyed gambling of our peace-fakers.

The strength of the Allies at the end of World War I grew out of Wilson's campaign to distinguish between the Kaiser's government and the German people. Clemenceau scuttled that advantage at Versailles by imposing an unconditional peace on those who had surrendered in 1918 on very clear conditions. He thus paved the way for Hitler. Stalin was shrewd enough in World War II to profess regard for the German nation and army as against their Nazi masters, while Roosevelt's "unconditional surrender" policy made our task incomparably harder. In the case of the East European Golgotha, we must not confuse the crucifier and the crucified and insult the latter by lavishing political kisses on the former—as the peace-plotters would urge us to do. An international of freedom must include the 194,000,000 non-Communists of the U.S.S.R.

THIS argument leads on to my final one—that for the tactics of any future war we should be thinking in terms of strategic bombing and not of population bombing. If we are seeking to free the prisoners of a slave-camp, we would scarcely bomb the prisoners' barracks in preference to the guardhouse and the ammunition stores. Moreover, we are supplying Stalin with unexcelled propaganda weapons if we assume that our atomic bombs will be dropped on Soviet cities. He himself has no regard for human life, as his destruction of millions of his own people has made clear. But when we, who preach that human life is sacred, go on to plan for the bomb-massacre of millions of men, women and children, we give the Kremlin material for a priceless propaganda attack on our own hypocrisy and barbarity. It is hard for the victims of Soviet tyranny to believe in our good faith if they stand

in dread of obliteration at our hands. Contrariwise, the blows that those same atomic weapons could deal to Stalin's industrial and war potential is incalculable. The anonymity (to us) of the victims of a hundred East European and Asiatic Hiroshimas and Nagasakis would leave them none the less human and pitiful. From an analysis of World War II one may suggest that population bombing is not even good logistics. It is certainly bad Christianity.

A LAST-MINUTE postscript would record a warning against the recurrent delusion that Chinese Titoism is impending and can be fostered by surrendering Formosa and admitting Red China to the United Nations. Even Joseph and

Stewart Alsop are trying to revive this dangerous myth. On the contrary the solidarity of Red China and Red Russia is monolithic. Mao's rise to leadership in 1930-31 was engineered by Moscow, and he was one of three Chinese members of the Executive Committee of the Comintern from 1935 until its faked dissolution in 1943. Huge portraits of Mao and Stalin were carried side by side in Moscow on May Day and in the East Berlin "Youth Festival" in August 1951. *Pravda's* recent statement that a gigantic air force is being built up in North Korea is a further proof that Mao is completely with Stalin. For the West to surrender strategic interests in the hope of wooing him away from the Soviet bloc would be in line with the worst errors of ten crazy years.

The New Society

The disillusioned Soviet wit who said twenty-five years ago that the inevitable development of history was not toward the victory of the proletariat but towards the victory of the secretariat spoke prophetically. This is the new class whose members have yet to see the whole of which their work is a part. Their blinders are a menace to the functioning of modern industrial society, and for their enlightenment we have only the feeble devices of publicity of that magic abracadabra of modern management, the "organization chart."

PETER F. DRUCKER,
in "The New Society".