

HOW CLOSE ARE WE TO WAR WITH RUSSIA?

THE WORLD IS THE PRISONER OF PATTERNS THAT PRODUCED CONFLICTS IN THE PAST

BY CECIL BROWN

Widely Known Author, Lecturer, and Mutual-WMCA Commentator on International Affairs



BLUNT
REPORT

War's aftermath! These famished children, wolfing food scraps, personify the millions of needy Europeans who must be succored by the United States and its post-

war allies if they are not to fall prey to Communism. To many of them the democracies' solemn promises of freedom sound hollow, mean simply freedom to starve.

UP TO NOW, the United States has been spared the major results of war. Many other nations know war's frightful consequences—cities sacked, factories wrecked, hundreds of thousands of civilians maimed or killed in their own homes, a countryside devastated, a national economy ruined. Those are the consequences we face the next time.

Will it take war to stop Russia? This means atomic bombs, orange-size, which can treble the destruction of Hiroshima. It means superpoisons, condensed in containers no larger than a lump of sugar, capable of killing millions. It means germ warfare. It means bombers striking at any industrial section of the United States or Russia. It means guided missiles and rockets.

Of course, as before, we would try to fight a war far from home. But wishing it to be that way is not enough.

General George Kenney, commanding officer of the U. S. Strategic Air Command, says the U. S. would be the prime target of any future aggressor—meaning Russia; that the first attack would come across the North Pole. He says that, in the first twenty-four hours, 25 million Americans would die right in their own home towns!

Or there is the report made by the President's Commission on Universal Military Training. The commission, basing its finding on the most expert advice, reported that an atomic war after 1955 is possible—and that in such a war 12 major American cities could be wiped out in the first day!

All the military power we have now or will have, say the experts, makes it doubtful if devastation and death can be confined to other countries and our own country spared.

The nations of the world have put themselves into an absurd position. They are trying to achieve peace by a method that gives no nation any real security. We are trying to gain safety and security by *physical power*. And the Russians are trying to do the same. In depending on physical and material power,

we and the Russians are hoodwinking ourselves. But that's the way two antagonistic worlds are rushing toward each other. Two desperate hungers gnaw at people in every country. One hunger is for food; the other, for peace.

Those hungers raise a multitude of questions. Most of them revolve around the beautiful, distorted dream of peace. For without peace the getting of food can be a brief affair. Under the spell of approaching war, obtaining food takes on the atmosphere of the last supper before the holocaust.

In trotting after this peace the world says it wants, there is one question above all others we have to ask ourselves.

Is Russia An Expanding, Aggressive Totalitarian Power?

Without a correct understanding of that basic question, we're lost in a hopeless mass of confusions. Without answering that question, the day-to-day tussles with Russia are bewildering.



Cecil Brown:

A crack radio reporter, is known as a crusader for truth. He has been a foreign correspondent since 1937, when he went to Europe, first as a news service reporter, certain that there would be another World War. Since then his authoritative on-the-spot war reporting - from Greece, Yugoslavia, Syria and the Far East - has spell-bound audiences.

WAR WITH RUSSIA?

The widespread view is that the Soviet Union is a dictatorship as total as it is possible for Russian officials to make. Even so, Americans are surprised and fearful because the Russians engineer a grab of Czechoslovakia, or refuse to agree to international control of atomic power, or stay out of the European recovery program.

There's no reason for surprise, and not much point in denunciation. A dictatorship has to act that way. If a dictator operated otherwise, he would soon be out of business.

The record speaks for itself. Up to the time of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union had annexed 280,000 square miles of territory containing 22 million people. But even so, must a dictatorship operate in an aggressive manner?

Yes, if it has the power to do so. We saw that in the German, Japanese, and Italian dictatorships. The question is whether the Soviet type of dictatorship, like the others, can only be stopped by war. There is no mystery about how the Soviet dictatorship operates. This is the record. A dictatorship is intolerant of the opinions of others. In a dictatorship once a principle has been decided upon, tolerance of a difference of opinion is treasonable, compromise is weakness and a danger. A dictatorship with power has to eat its way with an insatiable appetite from one country to the next. A tyrant can never feel secure until there are no people who are free.

A dictatorship operates on this basis—a cancerous fear of its own people and a mounting fear of all other people. It is a tyranny because it fears the expression of the free will of its people. It substitutes the censor for individual thinking, the gun for the voluntary cooperation of its people.

Does The Soviet Union Want War?

No nation ever *wants* war. An aggressor nation hopes to reap advantages without fighting. But it always runs the risk of war. A nation that's the object of an aggressor's greediness usually doesn't want war either and tries to avert it. If its wish for peace is stronger than its ability to recognize facts about an aggressor, or it hasn't the ability to amass power, then it pays the price of defeat. Or it may suffer unnecessary damage, as did Britain.

Does Soviet Russia Need A War?

Not the shooting kind. She needs victories, however, diplomatic or otherwise, to compensate her people for their privations. Russia needs peace for the development of a country still in the early stages of her industrial revolution. She needs time to raise living standards. There's no necessity for Russia to maintain a huge army to avert unemployment. There's work for all in developing a country that occupies one sixth of the earth's surface.

Does The United States Want War?

The Communists say yes. The evidence is to the contrary. The American dream is not expansion. It is isolation. The American wish in the past was not to have to face up to world problems, though that wish is evaporating under the triphammer of Russian aggression. It doesn't make much sense to say we want war when we fell all over ourselves to demobilize while Russia went on producing weapons of war after World War II.

Does The United States Need A War?

Moscow says we do, that capitalism needs a war to try to save itself. It's a curious argument. A victorious war finished off capitalism in England. The gravest concern of capitalists is how, in an atomic war, the United States could fight, clean up after the so-called victory and still retain a free enterprise capitalist system. If there is anything a high-producing, high-living, peace-loving America wants, it certainly is not war.

Well, If Neither Side Wants Or Needs A War, What's The Reason For All This Tension?


The tension is not attributable to Russia's having what she calls a Communist government, nor to the fact that Russia has tyranny and a totalitarian dictatorship. Tension and conflict come primarily because *Russia wants to impose that tyranny on others*. The United States and the countries of western Europe don't intend to see that happen.

Is The Existence Of Communism In Russia A Danger To The United States?

Not much of a danger. The danger of communism lies not within Russia

3

WAR WITH RUSSIA?



Death-dealing rockets, far larger than this captured German V-2, would rain down out of the skies on U. S. cities in another war.

but in the fact that Moscow is the fountainhead of an international conspiracy. That makes the Communist parties in different countries agents of Moscow. Right now, we have a vivid demonstration of how that works. Communist parties are under instructions to sabotage the European recovery program.

Communists synchronize their activities with the desires of the Soviet Union. The record is that Soviet officials have said time and again that their desire is to make the world theirs.

Does that create a danger of war? It certainly does.

Isn't There A Fight For Power Mixed Up In This, Too?

Indeed there is. Whatever social systems nations may have, when there are two big powers, there is competition, and there are the makings of conflict. Nothing now in sight can remove that source of friction.

Isn't Antagonism Between The Communist Economic System And The Free Enterprise Capitalist System A Basis For Conflict?

No need for it to be. It complicates dealings, but if two nations want to exchange goods they can do so no matter how differently their trade is organized. There's nothing to prevent our buying a ton of Russian manganese ore and selling them a tractor or wheelbarrow. We trade with socialist Britain.

But Doesn't Stalin Say He Wants Peace?

Surely he does. Everyone says he wants peace: Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, Peron, Attlee, Tito, De Gaulle. Heads of states say they want peace while their bombers are warming up and their troops are moving up to the frontier.

If We Can't Believe What Is Said About Wanting Peace, How Do We Judge?

By deeds. Hitler said he wanted peace, even after his troops had invaded Poland. Stalin's insistence that he wants peace is belied by his actions.

Would This Trend Toward War Be Halted If Our President And Stalin Sat Down For A Heart-To-Heart Talk?

Conferences are often worth trying; here, the stakes are high. But it de-

WAR WITH RUSSIA?



One more demonstration of war's wicked destruction in this picture of a Russian restoration crew at work on a Donbas coal mine, dynamited by retreating Germans.

depends on what they talked about. Spheres of influence? But Russia makes it evident that she would like to see her influence extended all through Europe.

Suppose the United States and Russia could agree that "neither would interfere in the legitimate sphere of interest of the other, the two spheres to be defined by agreement." What would the agreement be? The spheres of interest would remain just where they are now.

The Russians would consider their sphere all of Europe, including Greece, Italy, France. Also, Russia would maintain, as she has before in entire falsehood, that Communist parties are expressions of the people in those countries.

No one supposes that Russia is going to abandon her Fifth Column in France, Italy, and elsewhere. Why should she? In exchange for our not interfering in Eastern Europe? That's no deal for Russia. She knows that we are hardly able to interfere in Eastern Europe now.

But Wouldn't Setting Up Well-Defined Spheres Of Interest Help To Prevent War?

If such an improbable agreement could be reached, it would ease the tension for a time—until the Soviet Union found it advantageous to push into the Western sphere of interest. The Kremlin officials maintain that history is marching toward world Communism. So, they ask, why limit ourselves to a sphere of interest? Why not speed up the inevitable by giving history a push?

But Wouldn't Setting Up Well-Defined Spheres Of Interest Help To Prevent War?

If such an improbable agreement could be reached, it would ease the tension for a time—until the Soviet Union found it advantageous to push into the Western sphere of interest. The Kremlin officials maintain that history is marching toward world Communism. So, they ask, why limit ourselves to a sphere of interest? Why not speed up the inevitable by giving history a push?

But Aren't Some Agreements With Russia Better Than Mutual Stand-Offishness?

That takes another question. What good are paper agreements which Russia tears up before the ink is dry? And still another: what reason is there for supposing that Moscow would accept a carefully marked out sphere of in-

WAR WITH RUSSIA?

terest? Russia found Czechoslovakia not quite friendly enough because the Communists were about to suffer election setbacks, and so absorbed the country. Yugoslavia, under Tito's Communist control, had to have a friendly Albania, which became Communist. Bulgaria and Yugoslavia will not be satisfied until they, along with Russia, have a "friendly" Greece.

In This Struggle Between The U. S. And Russia, Is There A Third Group Of Powers Which Could Mediate?

There is none. Most of Europe is the socialist middle road between Russian Communism and American capitalism. In a political sense, and military too, the seventeen countries of the Marshall plan have cast their lot with us. Five nations actually are in a military pact intended to resist Soviet expansion. Far from being a mediating group, they are on our side. Those countries are Britain, France, The Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

Are We At War With Russia Now?

No question of that. Of course, it is not the shooting kind but it is certainly not peace. It's a war for the souls of men. To prevent the shooting kind, we are trying to maintain peace not by collaboration with Russia but by intimidating Russia against expansion. For us that involves expense and energy almost as great as a shooting war.

Where Is The War Being Fought, And How?

It's being waged all around the world. One form of Soviet warfare we saw in the recent uprising in Bogota, Colombia, while the Inter-American conference was going on. That kind of warfare is frequent—conspiracy, subversion, and provocation of local disturbances. That kind of warfare is used where Russian power is far away.

In areas where Russian power is next door, the Soviet Union uses political pressure. It builds up the spectre of possible use of the Red Army to make the victim cave in. That's the technique used against Finland successfully, and thus far, unsuccessfully against Turkey. Russia also uses the method of civil war to gain her ends. That's the case in Greece and China.

Spots of immediate danger of open warfare between Russia and the West are areas in which Western power and Russian power meet, such as Berlin, Vienna, and, to some extent, Korea. There the Russians test us by trying to force the Western powers to retreat. At this writing, a direct use of Russian force to occupy all Berlin probably would be the signal for a shooting war.

Can American Military Power Stop Russia?

One thing is obvious. Russia will not be stopped by the *absence* of American military power, real, not potential. A dictator understands the language of force. It is not possible to browbeat with insults and threats men like Stalin and his cohorts. A dictatorship with power will move where it can, unless and until it meets democratic resistance.

But Is Military Power The Road To Peace?

It hasn't been. The United States and Russia are each frightened about the intentions of the other. What do they do about it? Each of two giants engages in an arms race, a contest to produce more devilish weapons than the other. One tries to show the other that it can't get what it wants without going to war to get it. And to go to war would mean taking on a nation armed to the teeth. That kind of situation in the past has produced wars.

Well, We Are Arming, Our Military Is Scooping Up Billions For The Armed Services, So Won't That Stop Russia?

Yes, until Russia feels capable of challenging our power, or our will to use it. We are trying to surround Russia with Soviet-resisting states. Russia, by different methods, is trying to surround us with anti-American states. The danger is that, at some time, one of the other powers will cry, "I must break out of this noose!" The breaking out process is war.

Will The American People Want To Maintain This Huge Military Machine?

That depends on whether we really mean to halt totalitarian expansion. Maintenance of the machine is part of the alternative to using it in war. Russia will continue attempts to expand. The price of our resistance comes high.

How Much Military Power Is Needed To Prevent War?

More than Russia has, and one inch more readiness to use it. We have to estimate our strength in relation to Russia's, as she does every minute with us.

WAR WITH RUSSIA?



American boys in experimental Universal Military Training unit at Ft. Knox. Says Cecil Brown: "Russia will not be stopped by the absence of military power."

Much of our power depends on the power developed by Western European nations. They won't have any power worth mentioning for a few years. For that reason, the trend now is to provide American military assistance to Europe.

Europeans can't feel secure when they know their countries could be over-run easily. We are not going to win many friends by promising Frenchmen, Italians, and Belgians that if Russian armies invade their countries we will drive them out by dropping atomic bombs on Paris, Rome, and Brussels.

But Can We Produce Enough To Do All That?

No. There are limits to our actual and potential power, wealth and energy. So we have to choose the areas we are determined to prevent the Russians from occupying. If it's a choice between France and China, the strategic position of France gives it priority.

If This Military Pressure Doesn't Work, Would Russia Fight A War Now?

Probably not. Soviet officials are noted for their patience; they appear convinced history will drop into their Communist laps a collapsing world.

The now-in-use system of Soviet aggression is inexpensive, relatively easy to operate. Besides, the democracies continue social and economic injustices on which Communists can build in each country.

Despite The Widespread Belief That Neither Russia Nor The United States Wants Or Needs War, Could War Come Suddenly?

Yes, from a miscalculation. "The American objective is all aid—short of war; the Russian objective is all mischief—short of war." Lots of room for a miscalculation in that formula. Russia aims to push where there's give. It might turn out that there was no give before a withdrawal could be made.

Stalin has hot-headed office boys in Belgrade and Rome. There are tons of emotional dynamite in Italy, Berlin, Iran, Palestine, Korea, Latin America.

Has Time Been Wasted In Resisting Russia?

Yes and no. Yes, because Russia since the end of the war has gained tre-

WAR WITH RUSSIA?

mendous advantage. All Eastern Europe is now under Communist control. No, because the grand aim and effort of the United States was to trust Russia, to "work things out." The effort was the logical sequence of a war in which we fought as partners. Efforts to "play ball" with Russia were made because the alternative was what we now have—high tension and war danger.

What Of The United Nations? Can't It Keep The Peace?

Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the U. N., stood beside the grave of Franklin D. Roosevelt last April. His words answer that question. "The boycott, the by-pass, and the backdown are not the way to make the United Nations stronger, nor the way to serve the cause of peace."

No world organization can endure when its actions are vetoed on any and every provocation where national interests suffer. That's what Russia does. No world organization can endure when a big power sanctions the use of force to upset a recommendation of the United Nations, especially when that same power instigated the recommendation. That's what we did in the backdown on Palestine.

What Else Is Needed To Stop The Russians?

People who are on our side! How do we make friends and influence people in a world crawling with hatred and personal aggression? There are many ways. People want shelter, clothes, enough to eat. The European recovery program is a gigantic first step. The threat of Soviet expansion can also stimulate endangered nations to create long-denied opportunities for their people.

People want certain freedoms. One is the opportunity to make their will felt in their governments. They want to feel that they can get justice in courts, can express themselves freely, assemble openly. The whole history of the world is a struggle for these rights. We stand for them.

But Do We? Do We Have The Energy, Ability, And Desire To Project Democratic Ideals?

The evidence is not too convincing. Where it is less convincing, there Communism becomes stronger.

A young Italian, just before the recent elections, was urged to vote anti-communist and thus preserve his freedom.

"Freedom!" he snorted. "Freedom to starve. That's what I have here."

That's what millions of people have and they want no more of it. Millions of Chinese, Italians, Latin Americans who are sympathetic to Communism know nothing whatever about Marxism, Stalinism, Communism, or Soviet tyranny. They are sympathetic to Communism because they want a chance to live, which their present feudal land systems and economic injustices deny them.

The Communists promise to break up the land. That's a powerful attraction to people in countries where land hunger is great, food hunger always present.

What Is The Basic Issue Between The United States and Russia?

The dispute is not between Capitalism and Communism, as some of our officials would like to pretend and as the Communists insist. It is democracy versus dictatorship, decency versus tyranny, a free state versus a police state.

What Kind Of Governments Should We Support?

Those that try to provide political and personal freedom, those that are responsive to the freely-expressed will of the people. A nation that denies parliamentary rule, the right of opposition, freedom of speech, press, assembly, worship, is no friend of democracy.

In order to win friends to stop Russia, we must be champions of the rights of man. The House of Representatives tried to wreck that role by voting to invite Fascist Spain into the recovery program. When we team up with the tyranny of Fascism to oppose Soviet tyranny, we destroy our moral cause.

In Frustrating Russian Expansion, Are There Other Things We Must Do, Besides Making Huge Outlays For Military Power?

Many Russian agents are making progress among the one billion people of the Far East on one vital issue, racial equality. They say that the United States is not the friend of the Asiatic peoples because the U. S. has Aryan

WAR WITH RUSSIA?

racial supremacy ideas and carries them into the Far East when Americans go there. The friendship of the Asiatics is necessary for us to repel Communism.

How Far Can We Go To Avert War?

To the limit of our resources and the peak of our efforts. But not to the point of submitting to tyranny. Most Americans understand—and it's pretty important for the men in the Kremlin to understand—that there are issues more precious to us than peace.

What Can The Individual American Do In Deciding Whether It Will Take A War To Stop Russia?

Here are some suggestions. Individuals have to decide for themselves whether they are *concerned* about what goes on in the world or just curious about it.

They can decide whether they think sovereign power is too great a luxury in an atomic age. A system of world government is the alternative. It would have the power to prevent nations from infringing on the rights of others. It would engage in a worldwide fight against misery, injustice, and economic deprivation.

It would take a titanic personal revolution for most of us to bring our minds around to world government. And there is no guarantee that it would preserve freedoms and prevent war. What everyone knows, however, is that the world is now the prisoner of the same political patterns that have produced wars in the past. It is essential that we engage in a mighty pro-democratic, honorable and total effort to avert war now.



Your city hall, atom-bombed, could be gutted and pulverized as readily as was Hiroshima's Municipal Office Building. Picture preaches a succinct sermon for current peace efforts.