

An Exchange on Nestor Makhno — Peasant "Anarchism," Pogroms and the Russian Revolution

(Workers Vanguard No. 656, 22.11.1996)

We publish below excerpts, taken from a substantially longer letter, which include the writer's arguments on the Makhno movement.

Oakland
27 September 1996

Dear apologists for wage labor and state capitalism:

I'm writing to refute several egregious Leninoid lies peddled by Joseph Seymour, in part 7 of his series, "Marxism vs. Anarchism" (*Workers Vanguard* (sic), page 7, 8/30/96). In the section of his article dealing with the Russian Revolution of 1917-1921, Seymour claims:

"The most significant counterrevolutionary force under the banner of anarchism was the Ukrainian peasant-based army of Nestor Makhno, which carried out pogroms against Jewish communities and collaborated with White armies against the Bolsheviks."

Seymour makes these accusations without providing any documentation, and with good reason, for outside of Stalinist hagiographies, Stalin-era fiction like Suslov's [actually, Sholokhov's— WV] *And Quiet Flows the Don* and Seymour's imagination no evidence exists to support his claims. Surviving partisans of the Makhnovist movement, for example Makhno's comrade the ex-Bolshevik Peter Arshinov in his *History of the Makhnovist Movement*, the anarchist historian Voline in his work *The Unknown Revolution*, and independent historians who are not friends of revolution or anarchism, like Stanford scholar Michael Palij, in his book *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno*, affirm that:

1. The Makhnovist Movement was a mass revolutionary movement of the poor in the Southern Ukraine, and fielded an army of several tens of thousands of partisans. This revolutionary movement lasted from 1918 until the final wholesale massacre of its partisans, and large numbers of non-combatant sympathizers, by the Bolsheviks in 1921.
2. An important part in the Makhnovist Movement was played by revolutionaries of Jewish origins, among them Voline. He was a key figure in the anarcho-communist "Nabat" confederation in the Ukraine during the Russian Civil War.
3. Jewish communities in the Ukraine furnished numerous combatants to Makhno's Insurrectionary Army. Jewish communities participated in regional revolutionary mass assemblies of workers, peasants and partisans called by the Revolutionary Military Council of the Makhnovist Army.
4. The Makhnovists named one of their free-

communist agricultural communes after Rosa Luxemburg, who was of Jewish origins.

Nestor Makhno and his comrades issued numerous proclamations against anti-Semitism, and Makhno himself killed instigators of violence against the Jewish population, including a ban dit named Grigorev. (See Arshinov's *History of the Makhnovist Movement*, pp 135-137.) Leah Feldman, who died in London in the late 1980's, was the last known survivor of the Makhno movement in the west. As a young girl, Feldman helped sew uniforms for the Makhnovist Army. Feldman, who was of Jewish origins, vehemently attested to the Makhnovists' violent hostility to anti-Semitism.

In *The Unknown Revolution* (p. 698), Voline quotes a Jewish historian, M. Tcherikover, interviewed in Paris, who was neither an anarchist or a revolutionary:

"It is undeniable that, of all these armies, including the (so-called) Red Army, the Makhnovists behaved best with regard to the civil population in general and the Jewish population in particular.... Do not let us speak of pogroms alleged to have been organized by Makhno himself. This is a slander or an error. Nothing of the sort occurred" [my italics].

With regard to Seymour's claim that the Makhnovists "...collaborated with White armies against the Bolsheviks":

1. Makhno fought against Austrian and German Imperialist forces and their allies among the local gentry, as opposed to the Bolshevik regime, who collaborated with these enemies of the world revolution by signing the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918.
2. Makhno's forces played a key role in the defeat of the Austro-German invasion of the Ukraine and in the defeat of the Ukrainian nationalist regime of Petliurain 1918.
3. Makhno's forces destroyed a significant portion of the White army general Denikin's forces in September and October 1919, thus crippling Denikin's attempt at that time to take Moscow.
4. Makhno's forces played the decisive part in the defeat of the White general Wrangel in late 1920. At that time an agreement was made between the Bolshevik state, signed by Frunze and Beta Kun, and the revolutionaries of the Makhno movement, where Makhno's forces were considered to be effectively a part of the so-called Red Army. This agreement is reproduced in Arshinov and Voline's works. Earlier, in May of 1919, the leading Bolshevik Lev Kamenev had journeyed to Makhno's headquarters and negotiated in person with Makhno.

The Bolsheviks are the only counterrevolutionaries the Makhnovists can be accurately accused of collaborating with.

Space considerations prohibit me from describing in great detail the counterrevolutionary treachery displayed by the Bolsheviks with regard to the Makhnovists. But those who read the sources mentioned above and who also read of how the Stalinists behaved during the Spanish Civil War will note many telling similarities....

Trotskyism is not a materialist weapon for understanding and changing reality, but a dogma, an impoverished amalgam of social democracy and Stalinism; an ersatz "socialism" devoid of social content. Trotskyism is a personality cult worshipping Lenin and Trotsky, around whom all history is made to revolve in a Ptolemaic fashion. The future can't be held hostage by the failures of the past.

For world communist revolution and the eradication of Leninism, Max Anger

The Poor, the Bad and the Angry

WV replies: Max Anger's raving defense of Makhno's peasant bandits provides a measure of the dementia that can be induced by bourgeois anti-Communism in the U.S. In their efforts to denounce the Bolshevik Revolution from the "left," anarchists invariably raise the Makhnoite movement of 1918-21 and the Soviet government's suppression of the 1921 Kronstadt mutiny. We have dealt at length with the latter, notably in an extensive commentary, "Kronstadt and Counterrevolution" (WV Nos. 195 and 203, 3 March and 28 April 1978), in the form of a review of Paul Avrich's *Kronstadt 1921*, a definitive account of this event by an American historian sympathetic to anarchism. We have not, however, previously discussed the Makhnoite movement. In addition to substantiating that Makhno's forces did engage in anti-Semitic pogroms, we therefore want to address the general significance of this particular episode in the history of the anarchist movement.

The Revolutionary Partisan Army of Nestor Makhno, as it was officially called, can be understood only in the context of class and national divisions and of the revolutionary turmoil and many-sided civil war which engulfed the Ukraine following the fall of the tsarist autocracy and the dissolution of the Russian empire. More than 90 percent of ethnic Ukrainians at the time were peasants or rural villagers. The peasantry was saturated not only with anti-Russian but also anti-Polish and anti-Semitic prejudices, fueled in part by the fact that landlords, particularly in the western Ukraine, were predominantly Polish while Jews had historically played the role of middlemen and moneylenders. Industry was concentrated in the eastern area bordering Russia. The industrial proletariat of this region—in the Donbass and the cities of Kharkov and Ekaterinoslav—was predominantly Russian or Russified. The cities also contained large, ghetto-

ized Jewish communities.

The overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and ensuing political chaos unleashed an elemental peasant revolt in the Ukraine as well as in Russia. The basic goals and outlook of the peasants were summed up by a liberal American historian of the Ukrainian civil war:

"Peasants who had always been landless now dreamed of obtaining some land; peasants who owned a little dreamed of getting more. The desire to come out of this 'Time of Troubles' with a private plot and a system of self-government appears to have been virtually universal." [emphasis in original]

— Arthur E. Adams, *Bolsheviks in the Ukraine: The Second Campaign, 1918-1919* (1963)

Militarily, the peasant revolt in the Ukraine took the form of locally based partisan bands personally loyal to their own chiefs, who took the traditional titles of ataman or batko ("little father"). The peasant partisans were generally hostile to the heavily Russian and Jewish cities. Moreover, for well over a year following the October Revolution, much of the Ukraine was alternately under the control of the pro-German, anti-Soviet Rada regime or the German puppet dictatorship of the hetman Skoropadsky. (For a sense of the Ukraine in this period, see Mikhail Baitalsky, *Notebooks for the Grandchildren: Recollections of a Trotskyist Who Survived the Stalin Terror*, Humanities Press [1995].)

Understandably, the core of Bolshevik support in the Ukraine was the Russian industrial proletariat in the eastern region along with a sizable fraction of the urban Jewish intelligentsia. Unfortunately, many of these Russian workers still retained chauvinist attitudes toward the Ukrainian peasant masses. Thus national divisions aggravated the economic conflict between the urban working class and peasant smallholders which was enormously intensified by the conditions of civil war and Western imperialist intervention. The conflict between the Bolsheviks and the Makhnoites was at bottom an expression of this class conflict and not at all a contest between the ideas of Marxism and anarchism. As Bolshevik leader Leon Trotsky wrote in a January 1938 article titled "Hue and Cry Over Kronstadt":

"Only an entirely superficial person can see in Makhno's bands or in the Kronstadt revolt a struggle between the abstract principles of Anarchism and 'state socialism.' Actually these movements were convulsions of the peasant petty bourgeoisie which desired, of course, to liberate itself from capital but which at the same time did not consent to subordinate itself to the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Nestor Makhno and the Nature of his Movement

Nestor Makhno was born in 1889, the son of a poor peasant, in the eastern Ukrainian village of Gulyai-Pole in the province of Ekaterinoslav. During the turbulent period after the Revolution of 1905, he

joined a local anarchist-communist group which helped finance its activities by armed robbery. On one occasion this resulted in the death of a security guard. When the tsarist police finally rounded up the Gulyai-Pole anarchists, they were sentenced to death by hanging*. Because of his youth, Makhno's sentence was commuted to life imprisonment at hard labor. At Moscow's Butyrki prison, he encountered a veteran anarchist (and one-time Bolshevik), Peter Arshinov, who educated the anarchist-minded peasant youth in the doctrines of Bakunin and Kropotkin.

Released from prison as a result of the general amnesty which followed the overthrow of the tsar in February 1917, Makhno returned to his native village, where he placed himself at the head of the burgeoning peasant revolt. In the spring of 1919, the Makhnoite forces were joined by Arshinov and a few months later by the prominent Russian anarchist intellectual Voline. However, the Revolutionary Partisan Army was not—present-day mythologizing to the contrary—an anarchist movement. In 1920, the official organ of the Makhnoites, *The Road to Freedom*, edited by Arshinov, stated categorically: "The Makhnovist army is not an anarchist army and does not consist of anarchists" (quoted in Michael Malet, *Nestor Makhno in the Russian Civil War* [1982]).

Rather, Makhno's forces consisted of peasant smallholders who were fighting for their own land and to freely market and dispose of their own produce.

Michael Palij's study of the Makhnoite movement, *The Anarchism of Nestor Makhno, 1918-1921* (1976), which Max Anger commends as scholarly and objective, explained:

"It would be a mistake to assume that the peasants in the region of the Makhno movement were anarchists; in reality, they knew and cared very little about anarchism or Marxism.... Although some of the anarchist principles were quite compatible with traditional peasant aspirations, the basic desire of the Ukrainian peasants was not the creation of an anarchist Utopia but the expulsion of all the foreign invaders who exploited them and disrupted their way of life."

The handful of agricultural communes established by the Makhnoite leadership in the Gulyai-Pole region encompassed only a small fraction of its followers. The overwhelming majority of Makhno's partisans were committed to their own private property. As Palij put it: "His partisans and the peasants understood the slogan 'free anarcho-communes' to mean free individual farms."

Max Anger's romanticized views notwithstanding, an army of largely illiterate Ukrainian peasants, with no prior experience in political struggle, was hardly capable of assimilating the principles of anarchist-communism. The rival Ukrainian partisan leader Grigorev claimed to be a Left Social Revolutionary (populist) while Makhno raised the black

flag of anarchism. Yet, whether they fought under ataman Grigorev or "batko Makhno," the social and political attitudes of the peasant partisans were essentially similar and could not have been otherwise. This was recognized by a majority of anarchists in the Ukraine and Russia at the time. Both Arshinov and Voline (in his book *The Unknown Revolution* [1955]) recount, quite bitterly, that most anarchists did not join or even support the Makhnoite movement, despite appeals from its leadership to do so. In Arshinov's words:

"The majority of Russian anarchists who had passed through the theoretical school of anarchism remained in their isolated circles, which were of no use to anyone. They stood aside, asking what kind of a movement this was, why they should relate to it, and without moving they consoled themselves with the thought that the movement did not seem to be purely anarchist."

— Peter Arshinov, *History of the Makhnoist Movement (1918-1921)* (1974)

The Makhnoite Movement and the Bolsheviks

Until the spring of 1919, relations between Makhno and the Bolsheviks were generally collaborative. For example, when Makhno was in Moscow in the fall of 1918 he secured a personal interview with Lenin, and the Soviet leader helped smuggle the anarchist militant back into the Ukraine, then under the rule of a German puppet regime propped up by German and Austrian troops. When Bolshevik forces entered the Ukraine a few months later, the peasant partisan bands of Makhno, Grigorev and others rallied to their side and were incorporated into the newly formed Soviet Army of the Ukraine. Makhno's forces were assigned a strategically vital section of the Red Army's southern front facing the counterrevolutionary White army of the former tsarist general Denikin.

Yet even in the period when he was a commander in the Ukrainian Soviet Army, Makhno willfully undermined the defense of the social revolution of which he claimed to be the purest partisan. Historian Arthur Adams writes: "Makhno supplied himself, sometimes by commandeering entire Bolshevik supply trains meant for the Southern Front. In the vast area centered at his home at Gulyai-Pole, he and his lieutenants made it quite impossible for the Communists to collect food or to set up local governments" (*Bolsheviks in the Ukraine*). Adams' account is corroborated in his own way by Arshinov: "The Communist authorities who penetrated into all parts of the region were received as foreigners and intruders.... The attempts to implant Communist institutions resulted in bloody collisions between the population and the authorities."

At the same time, the Makhnoites demanded that the central Soviet government in Moscow supply them with modern weaponry to fight the Whites. But in order to feed the workers in munitions facto-

ries or buy arms from abroad, the Soviet government had to collect surplus grain from the peasantry. By preventing this where they held sway, the Makhnoites sabotaged the military struggle against the Whites. In short, the Makhnoites wanted the Soviet workers state to economically support them but they refused—arms in hand—to give any economic support to the Soviet workers state. Soviet grain collection, often carried out by Russian or Jewish Communists, encountered an increasingly violent response among the Ukrainian peasantry, especially the kulaks, the wealthier peasants. In May 1919, Grigorev openly mutinied against the Red Army command. Declaring the Communists to be the main enemy, the ataman now called for an alliance of all anti-Bolshevik forces including the Russian Whites.

Makhno initially adopted a stated position of neutrality toward the Grigorev revolt, but his military actions were directed solely against the Bolsheviks. He resigned his Red Army command and with his most loyal supporters retreated behind the front lines. According to Palij: "As soon as Makhno left the front he and his associates began to organize new partisan detachments in the Bolsheviks' rear, which subsequently attacked strongholds, troops, police, trains, and food collectors." Needless to say, the Bolsheviks answered the Makhnoites in kind. In early July 1919, Makhno entered into a shortlived alliance with Grigorev. The attacks by Grigorev, Makhno and other armed peasant bands so weakened the Red Army that Deniken's Whites were able to occupy most of the Ukraine by the fall of 1919.

The withdrawal of the Red Army brought about a significant change in the political and ideological character of the Makhnoite movement. Until then, Makhno had been quite hostile to the bourgeois-nationalist forces led by Simon Petlyura, which were concentrated in the western Ukraine. From the fall of 1919 onward, however, the Makhnoites increasingly appealed to anti-Russian Ukrainian nationalism and entered into collaborative relations with the Petlyura-rites. Palij notes:

"Makhno's slogans assumed a more pro-Ukrainian, patriotic, and, at the same time, a more anti-Russian tone. Makhno began to brand the Bolsheviks not only as social, but also as national enemies; at the same time, his newspapers blamed the Bolsheviks for preventing the Ukrainian people from 'creating their own life by themselves' and urged them to 'take the authority into their own hands.' Also, the newspapers and Makhno himself appealed to the people to fight against the 'Moscovite oppressors' and to 'liberate our native Ukraine from the Russian yoke.'"

In this period, Makhno's partisans shared their surplus weapons with the Ukrainian Army of Petlyura. Though Petlyura, too, styled himself a "socialist," his forces were synonymous with anti-Semitic pogroms. Makhno, according to his former chief-of-staff Viktor Bilash, was even preparing to join Pety-

lura's Ukrainian Army, but this plan was jettisoned because his lieutenants strongly objected.

When the Red Army fought its way back into the Ukraine in 1920, Makhno did another about-face and offered the Bolsheviks a military alliance against the White army. The Bolsheviks demanded that Makhno explicitly incorporate his forces into the Red Army. In an October 1920 article, Leon Trotsky, then leader of the Red Army, insisted also that the Makhnoites "purge their troop of kulak bandit elements" and warned:

"We, of course, can only welcome the fact that the Makhnovites wish henceforth not to fight against us but with us, against [the White general] Wrangel. But our pact with the Makhnovites must certainly not be temporary in character. The working class of the Ukraine can never, and especially not in conditions of tremendous military danger, allow particular units sometimes to fight in our ranks and sometimes to stab us in the back. Waging war against the world's exploiters, the workers' and peasants' Red Army says: 'Who is not with me is against me, and whoever is with me is to remain in my ranks and not leave them till the end.'"

— Trotsky, *How the Revolution Armed*, Vol. 3(1981)

After Wrangel's White army was defeated, the Makhnoites sought to establish themselves as an independent military force in the Crimean peninsula with its strategically vital ports on the Black Sea. The Soviet government could not and did not tolerate this situation, especially given Makhno's treacherous history of allying with whatever military force he thought would best ensure his vaunted "independence." In late 1920, the Red Army suppressed the Makhnoite partisans. This had nothing to do with their formal anarchist doctrines, to which no one at the time paid much attention.

Makhno's Partisans Did Commit Anti-Semitic Pogroms

The war of the Ukrainian peasant armies against the Soviet power was accompanied by anti-Semitic pogroms on a mass scale. "Down with the Jewish Commissars!" was a battle cry of Petlyura, Grigorev and other Ukrainian nationalist chieftains. A member of the Jewish Bund in the Ukraine expressed the sentiments of the Jewish masses at the time: "The armed carriers of socialism, the Bolsheviks, are the only force which can oppose the pogroms For us there is no other way" (see "Revolution. Counter-revolution and the Jewish Question," Spartacist [English edition] No. 49-50, Winter 1993-94). As we noted in that article: "In its struggle to defend and consolidate the new proletarian state power against the White counterrevolutionaries, the Red Army necessarily had to sweep away the pogromist old order." Wayward elements of the Red Army who carried out excesses against the population, Jewish or otherwise, were subjected to the harshest disciplinary measures, like summary execution. The

various peasant bands arrayed against the Bolsheviks, in contrast, whatever the formal political views of their leaders. either actively fostered or adapted to the backward prejudices of their peasant base. As Trotsky noted in his October 1920 article:

"Exploiting the backwardness of the rural lower orders, their lack of confidence in the revolution, the kulak took the leadership of the countryside and counter-posed it to the town.... This was the basis on which both Petlyura's movement and Makhno's grew up. Petlyura regards himself as a statesman, has dealings with the Pope of Rome and with the French Freemasons, whereas Makhno regards himself as an Anarchist. But they both try to find support in a united countryside, raising this in revolt against the advanced proletariat.... Petlyura did this consciously—Makhno, without thinking."

Max Anger and other anarchists contend that, uniquely among Ukrainian anti-Bolshevik partisan forces, the Makhnoites carried out no crimes against the Jewish population. Some of his arguments can be described as circumstantial evidence. The Makhnoites' official proclamations and publications consistently denounced anti-Semitism. They named an agricultural commune after the Polish Jewish revolutionary Rosa Luxemburg. Voline, a leading Makhnoite, was Jewish. Yet these seemingly convincing arguments say nothing about what Makhno's partisans actually did on the ground.

Would Max Anger accept similar arguments from an apologist for the Stalin regime's murderous purge of Soviet Jewish intellectuals in the late 1940s and early '50s? After all, in the same period that Stalin ordered the killing of famous Yiddish actor Solomon Mikhoels and the arrest of prominent Jewish figures in the infamous "doctors' plot", official Soviet propaganda continued to strongly condemn anti-Semitism and to honor the German Jewish revolutionary Karl Marx. And a leading figure in the Stalin regime at the time was Lazar Kaganovich, a Jew.

Anger indignantlly demands "documentation" for our charge that Makhno's forces engaged in anti-Semitic pogroms. Such documentations can be found in the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in New York City (based before the holocaust in Vilna, Lithuania), perhaps the world's foremost research and archival center for East European Jewish studies. File No. 29 (Folios 2623-2681) of the Elias Tcherikower Archives at YIVO contains material on the Makhnoites in Yiddish, Russian and French, including *contemporary eyewitness accounts* by Jews living in the areas in which; Makhno's partisans operated. Thanks to the efforts of John Holmes, a sympathizer of the Spartacist League in the Bay Area who has researched the question, many of the YIVO materials are also available in English translation (as are copies of the original documents) at the Prometheus Research Library in New York, the central archival and research facility of the Spartacist League/U.S.

We did not say that Makhno and his colleagues officially preached anti-Semitism, but rather that his peasant-based army carried out pogroms. This point is also made by I. Klinov in an article polemicizing against Makhno apologists, published in the Yiddish newspaper Haynt {[Today], 23 July 1926). Klinov wrote: "There were many instances in which Makhno, led by a group of intellectuals which included Jews, behaved decently and one could even think that Makhno was a protector of the poor Jewish masses; these instances do not make up for the excesses that Jews had to suffer from the Makhnoites as from the other bands." Among the numerous Makhnoite atrocities documented in the YIVO files is one reported by M. Aspiz on 24 August 1922:

"At the end of December 1918 and the beginning of January 1919, Makhno's insurgent detachments fought with the Pelyuraites in and around Ekaterinoslav.... The Makhnoites looted and burned the 'Azyorne' marketplace. Also the entire commercial region was looted. As a result, when the battle ended 83 Jewish victims were brought to the cemetery for burial, only a small number of the fatalities being caused by accidental bullets and shells. The remainder were savagely slain by the Makhnoites."

Another account, presented by Wolf-Aaron Dubkin to the Odessa Kehillah (Jewish community organization) in late 1919, described how the previous August "a band of Makhnoites showed up in Bratskeye, near Elisavetgrad." The Makhnoites looted all the Jewish families and murdered a 75-year-old man who tried to prevent his daughter-in-law from being raped. In Kazatin, the secretary of the Poale-Zion organization reported that in October 1919 a Unit of Petlyuraites which included around 800 "Makhnoites" from Chudnov took the town. "They murdered the Jews Kodel and Belilovsky. Forty women were raped. The Makhnoites were there for 12 days."

As for the apparent discrepancy between the statement by Tcherikower cited in Anger's letter and the materials in the Tcherikower files, a YIVO archivist speculated to John Holmes that this could be partly explained by the fact that Tcherikower was based in Kiev, while many of the pogroms were perpetrated in outlying areas. Much new documentation on anti-Semitic atrocities by the Makhnoites has come to light with the opening of Soviet archives in the past few years. Before they rush to defend the Makhnoites against charges of anti-Semitic pogroms, we suggest that anarchists read the archival material in YIVO or the PRL, which is open by appointment to left-wing activists and qualified scholars.

Finally, the fact that Makhno's forces contained many pogromists is indicated by the material cited in Max Anger's own letter, the significance of which he distorts, either out of ignorance or deceit. It is true that Grigorev was a pogromist. It is also true that he was killed by Makhno's men. But it is not true that he was killed because he was a pogromist.

When Grigorev mutinied against the Red Army in May 1919, his forces carried out one of the worst atrocities in the entire Ukrainian civil war, killing some 3,000 Jews in the village of Elisavetgrad. Yet in early July Makhno entered into a military alliance with Grigorev against the Bolsheviks. However, Makhno and his colleagues distrusted Grigorev as an unprincipled adventurer who might suddenly turn on them. By getting rid of the ataman, they also hoped to incorporate his followers into their own army.

And that's just what they did. After Grigorev was killed at a joint assembly of the two partisan forces in late July, according to Arshinov's account: "The assembly also decided that the partisan detachments formerly under Grigor'ev's command would henceforth be part of the general insurrectionary army of the Makhnovists." Thus, Makhno and his anarchist colleagues knowingly recruited en masse into their ranks men who only a few months before had massacred thousands of Jews.

Certainly Makhno, Arshinov, Voline and their co-thinkers professed hostility to anti-Semitism. But they based themselves on an army composed of small property owners. That is why a majority of anarchists in the Ukraine and Russia at the time did not support the Makhnoite movement. Moreover, many Russian anarchists, such as Vladimir (Bill) Shatov, supported the Soviet workers state and fought with honor in the Red Army. Yet today almost all Western anarchists retrospectively embrace the Makhnoites as their own. Why is that? Because in their hostility to Leninism, they have bought into the anti-Communist prejudices which pervade the bourgeois societies in which they live and which have shaped their political consciousness.

(OCR-Scan des Artikels)