

Fixing the Blame for the Cold War

by Michael Straight

ALL our lives are dominated by a great struggle. The rulers of America regard it as a struggle between freedom and communism. The rulers of Russia regard it as a struggle between the masses and their exploiters; to the people of Russia, America and all countries it is a struggle for clothing, shelter and three square meals a day.

The conflict is not between freedom and communism; Russia is not communist, and we are not free. It is not between the people and their exploiters; exploitation is still present in Russia, and the basis of our government is popular consent.

To the extent that even the most exploited Americans are fired by the ideal of freedom, we are free. For freedom Americans—and Europeans—will fight and die. Soviet leaders are wrong when they assume that for us freedom is a mockery.

In turn we wrongly equate civil liberty and democracy. Civil liberty has been an outgrowth of capitalist democracy. But peoples may reach democracy by other roads than capitalism. For America and Britain, democracy today means the opportunity for the minority in politics to become the majority through the division of powers in government and the assurance of political rights. Yet our democratic origins lay partly in the French Revolution, which, in liberating the world from feudalism, asserted that democracy was the rule of the majority. In many Eastern European countries, whose peoples today are moving directly from feudalism to socialism, majority rule exists and makes its claim to democracy. Only in nations such as Germany, where the people themselves have been corrupted, is there no pretense of majority rule. And no sane American suggests that we should press for immediate democracy among corrupted peoples.

If the war we fought had any purpose, it was to achieve a stable world order, based on the Four Freedoms.

No Allied nation claimed a monopoly on the four freedoms or asserted that a future world society should be formed after its own image. The concept of One World, if it meant anything, meant that all the Allies would contribute in some measure to a one-world society. And the concept of the United Nations, if it meant anything, expressed the doctrine of the peaceful coexistence of communist, socialist and capitalist socie-

ties within the UN during the interim in which the one-world society would slowly emerge.

This doctrine, of peaceful coexistence, was the unwritten assumption of the entire Allied war effort. Teheran, Moscow, Yalta, San Francisco—all gave recognition to its validity.

Yet Russia and the Anglo-Americans fought two separate wars against the Axis. So we emerged with two worlds. As long as the doctrine of peaceful coexistence continued in force, they were two peaceful worlds. When the doctrine was shattered, they became two worlds preparing for war.

It is the breakdown of this doctrine that threatens all of us today. In this breakdown, the use of the veto, the scramble for strategic materials and bases, the domination of small countries, the imprisonment and execution of opposition leaders and the accumulation of atomic weapons are not causes but symptoms.

FROM Yalta, Roosevelt returned to assert that peace depended upon the achievement of an ever widening area of common ground among the Allies. Between a communist society with increasing liberty, and a capitalist society with increasing planning, the common ground of democratic socialism would constantly widen. In all countries the democratic progressive movement would gain strength and serve as a unifying force.

Instead, as the roundup in this week's *New Republic* demonstrates, all nations are being divided by the conflict between America and Russia. Each is sticking to its own rigid status quo, and where they meet, the contrasts between both societies are accentuated rather than modified. This conflict is reducing once independent and democratic nations to a colonial status in which, if American or Soviet armies or supplies are withdrawn, civil war must follow. It is blighting the spirit of a new internationalism and the hopes of political and social reforms. It is reducing vital peoples to pawns. In establishing the dogma, *he who is not for us is against us*, it strangles all center groups in favor of extremes of Right and Left, in which our own progressive country is identified with the extreme Right. As long as the conflict between Russia and America was limited, limits were set in other countries to the growth of both extremes. Now, as it becomes an all-out conflict, all

groups are rushing into one or the other armed camp in the panic-stricken belief that one side must lose and that the losers will be annihilated.

THE conflict between democracy and reaction is of course present in all countries. But in every country it is given a brutal and deadly force today by the impact of Soviet-American rivalry.

In the former enemy countries the purpose of the Allies was to eradicate fascism. That meant not imprisoning a few wretched men, but replacing the pattern of a fascist society with a superior democratic pattern—a pattern on which America and Russia could agree. As the hope of agreement died, the new society vanished with it. Fascism remained. Left alone, Germany would go fascist again within a few months. In the American zone, I. G. Farben is prosecuted while its counterparts are reinstated. In the Soviet zone, Von Paulus threatened to return with a call for a national assembly—a term first used by Quisling.

In dependent and undemocratic countries, progress toward freedom and democracy stumbles to a halt under pressure of Soviet-American rivalry. Four years ago we spoke of declaring Japanese-occupied Korea free, and then providing the technical assistance necessary for Korea to maintain freedom. Under Soviet and American occupation, Korea has sunk below the level of a colony. In Greece we are not yet ready to give real power to the liberals who ruled 15 years ago. We assert, quite rightly, that our presence is needed to prevent civil war. General Metaxas used the same phrases with more conviction in destroying Greek democracy 10 years ago.

Even in democratic countries, Soviet-American rivalry is destroying hope. In France democracy approached death during the occupation and was reborn in the Resistance movement. Catholic, Socialist, Communist and Center parties were bound together by the doctrine of coexistence. Today the spirit of the Resistance is almost gone and with it the unity of France. In Britain the breakup of the Labor Party and coalition with reaction is possible, because of the intolerable strain of a divided world. For Russia, and for America, even in the earliest stages of this struggle, the costs are also high.

It is hard to think through the problems of a planned democracy. It is simpler in the Soviet world to redouble the secret police and talk of revolutionary solidarity against capitalist encirclement. It is simpler, in our world, to seize on the scapegoat of communism, to distract attention from high prices and the housing shortage. Hostility and fear are carried by our press from the few to the majority and corrupt many progressives. Two years ago, Americans wanted to believe

that Russians were good, and recoiled from headlines crying war. Today, too many want to believe that the same Russians are evil, and reach for headlines of hatred almost hoping their prejudices will be confirmed.

In a universal vacuum of political morality neither Russia nor America makes any claim to leadership.

In Eastern Europe the spirit of domestic reconstruction is strong. Yet the heart has gone out of the international Communist movement. Its onetime positive internationalist and socialist faith has largely given way to opportunism, nationalism, anti-capitalism, worship of power, and fear.

Are we any better? America, the strongest nation in the world, offers to humanity as its dominant ideology, in this time of world crisis, anti-communism. Ours is also a totally barren ideology of negation and hatred and fear. If it continues long as our ideology, our society will perish.

Because in a world desperate for food and shelter anti-communism as a faith is less than nothing. What if General Eisenhower should issue marching orders to General Gavin: *The 82nd Airborne Division will proceed at once to surround, attack and destroy the theory of evolution?* It would be just as realistic as President Truman's directive to surround, attack and destroy communism with dollars and armaments.

In the war of attrition against communism, America is going to lose. We shall lose because our ideology has no roots among the peoples of the world. But communism will not win. This struggle, in Marx's words, will end "in the common ruin of the contending classes."

TODAY we're drifting, and in years during which the destructive power of war multiplies, drift is the most fatal policy of all.

Two policies are possible.

We can acknowledge the existence of two warring worlds, and accept responsibility for the economic, social and political welfare, and the military superiority of our world. Only if this superiority was overwhelming and lasting could this doctrine offer hope of peace. Yet even America has not the resources to mobilize and sustain such power. What banners the rulers of our world under this doctrine will raise, in the inevitable conflict which it prepares for, are unclear, for they must rule by force, suppressing opposition, conscripting capital and labor, and sharply reducing living standards. But its epitaph is certain: the ancient and murderous lie repeated once again, and so self-righteously, by President Truman at Rio: If you want peace, prepare for war.

The second policy is to start on the task of constructing a world society based on the four freedoms.

For America and Russia it means burying for good a great many icons. It means making up our minds very fast as to what we mean by the four freedoms. It means regarding progress toward the four freedoms in both countries as the means of survival; accepting democratic socialism as a way of life for most of the world, and setting out to find its American and Soviet counterparts while there is still time. I don't know what it takes in Russia, but in America it means facing the ugly truth that we who believe in the four freedoms are out of power today, and that only with ambition, organization and a working ideology shall we return

COLD WAR: The Churchill Legacy in Greece

by Leland Stowe

SO long as Constantin Tsaldaris, leader of the Greek monarchists, holds a key position in any Athens government the political future of Greece will be jeopardized.

His reactionary one-party government, even though it lasted only five days, represented the logically extreme conclusion of Winston Churchill's Greek policy. Despite Themistocles Sophoulis' premiership, Tsaldaris remains the strong man of Greece.

Who, in reality, gave Tsaldaris his chance at reactionary power? To understand the present Hellenic dilemma one must look closely into Churchill's muddled and bloodied Greek policy.

Churchill once told the House of Commons (December 8, 1944) that democracy "is not a harlot to be picked up in the street by a man with a tommy gun." Yet Tsaldaris' one-party Royalist regime owed its existence, and the monarchists owe their power, to British tommy guns and planes, plus American tanks and trucks.

The confused and even dangerous political situation in Greece lies a wet and wailing baby, right where the British deposited it last March—in the lap of our State Department.

That lap also holds the Greek people as a whole, for the State Department is being driven, through the operation of the Truman Doctrine, into ever greater interference in the internal affairs of their country. Meanwhile the Russians, having rounded up

the Balkan peoples into their own political lap, are trying through agitation and propaganda to get the Greeks to come in, too. Neither side appears willing to see the Greeks try to stand on their own feet.

Quite rightly, our assumption of responsibility for Greece has produced few cheers. There can be no debate about the tragic, corrupted mess-and-murder which dominates the present internal situation in Greece. The Communists and other guerrillas still fight in the mountains; they receive an unknown amount of aid from across the Albanian, Yugoslavian or Bulgarian frontiers. Although at least half a dozen non-Marxist, democratic parties remain in Greece, they recently refused to participate in a Tsaldaris Populist (monarchist) government. While London and Washington were promising the Greek people genuine democracy, the monarchists were able to seize power briefly against strong State Department opposition. They remain the dominating force in the confused political picture. How could this end-result emerge?

ALTHOUGH he was the one world statesman most intimately connected with the origins of the Greek political muddle, Winston Churchill has remained singularly uncommunicative about its beginnings in 1943-44. "All through 1944," he told the House of Commons in December of that year, "we have had the usual trouble with the Greek government and Greek troops in Egypt. There were mutinies and disorders." That was as close as Churchill came to discussing the famous so-called "Greek mutiny"—yet, even as he spoke, British soldiers were killing Greeks in Athens streets.

The Greek army and navy "mutiny" occurred in Egypt in the first week of April, 1944. British censorship was clamped down immediately with unprecedented ruthlessness. Twenty-four correspondents protested that they were permitted to make "no comment unless it reflects official [British] policy"; that they were not even allowed "to present any facts, political or otherwise, antecedent to recent troubles." The facts were that the EAM-ELAS Resistance leaders, like those in France, had asked for representation in their exiled government—for a national coalition in which the patriotic fighters in the Greek underground would have a voice.

The EAM had by far the broadest popular following in Greece, and included a small Communist minority among all shades of Leftists, Moderates and Republicans.

By April, 1944, the pressure for a coalition cabinet had grown greatly both inside and outside Greece. London's support of the Greek monarchy, behind British censorship in Egypt, had hardened. The British began secretly weeding out Greek Republican officers from the troops there. Several thousand officers and men, all Republicans, were placed in concentration camps. The directors of the Hellenic League of Liberation and the Greek Seamen's Association were arrested. Finally, Greek army and navy units in Egypt revolted against the British-supervised Royalists' purge.

THE British followed up the "mutiny" with the wholesale jailing of thousands of Republicans in the Greek forces in Egypt. But there had to be something which could be advertised as a Greek army. And Churchill's pro-

Leland Stowe, veteran foreign correspondent, covered the Italian-Greek war in 1940-41 and has twice revisited Greece. His book, *While Time Remains*, deals at length with that country. He is at present broadcasting weekly over the Mutual Network under sponsorship of the United Electrical Workers, CIO.

Copyright of New Republic is the property of New Republic and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.