

**OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS**

This page in the original text is blank.



# OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

*A Revelation and an Indictment  
of Sovietism*

BY

**SAMUEL GOMPERS**

*President of The American Federation of Labor  
Author of "Labor and the Common Welfare,"  
"Labor and the Employer," etc.*

With the Collaboration of

**WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING**

*Author of "Sovietism: The A B C of Russian  
Bolshevism—According to the Bolshevists"*



NEW YORK

**E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY**

**681 FIFTH AVENUE**

Copyright 1921  
By E. P. DUTTON & COMPANY

---

*All Rights Reserved*

*Printed in the United States of America*

## FOREWORD

I HAVE been under the necessity of observing the Bolshevik movement from close quarters for many years. I have had to contend with it almost daily long before it seized the power in Russia in the name of Communism and Soviet. Trotzky is only one of the Bolshevik leaders who long sojourned in this country to plague the American labor movement. And the few thousands who have returned to Soviet Russia represent but a small part of the forces of revolutionary mania in America. These forces are not strong enough seriously to threaten American labor—provided they are isolated and understood. But they must be understood and isolated.

While the labor movement of the world is gradually but steadily shaking itself free of the illusion that the Soviets are a workingmen's government—the first workingmen's government—conservative powers are beginning to give them commercial and political support and a part of the press is engaged in finding virtuous reasons for this policy. The pace was set by the British-Soviet trade agreement and by Lloyd George's speech in Parliament in which he contended, with an intentional paradox but still quite seriously, that the Bolsheviks had suddenly become moderates. The work of labor in repudiating Bolshevism has thus become more difficult. Certain conservatives and reactionaries pretend—for motives of their own—that they no longer have much objection to

the Soviets. They are willing to trade with cannibals, to use an expression of Lloyd George. But labor cannot affiliate or associate with cannibals—or with tyrants who rule over labor by the Red Terror and the firing squad.

Whether an anti-labor despotism rules over one of the greatest peoples of the earth may be a matter of indifference to the masters of the British Empire as long as that despotism is willing to meet the Empire half way—and to sign away the title to the territories and natural wealth of the nation. It cannot be a matter of indifference to labor.

Labor's interest in putting forth the truth about the Soviets is in part altruistic. Labor's regard for the welfare of the Russian workers is deep and genuine. But it also knows that if an anti-labor despotism may be made to work in one country—however inefficiently—it will encourage the enemies of labor to try the same methods elsewhere. Moreover, if the Soviets are given a certain permanence and success as "moderates" by the aid of certain governments and financiers they will certainly continue to represent this success to the labor of the world as having come to them from their own efforts as "ultra-revolutionists."

The outward success of the Soviets—with capitalist backing—would cost the capitalists themselves dearly in the end. But labor would pay, and pay heavily from the beginning.

The Soviets may or may not reach a common understanding of real practical importance with cynical imperialists and capitalistic adventurers. There is no possible common ground between Bolshevism and organized labor. Nor will the proposed economic alliance between

Bolshevism and Reaction be able to force labor to compromise with the Soviets. In the long run this alliance will help to make still more clear to the wage-earners the true character of Bolshevism. But its first result is to re-inforce the already formidable Bolshevist propaganda.

The miserable collapse of the revolution called by the Soviets in Germany in March, following upon their failure in January and February to capture the labor unions of Italy and France, would have spelled the end of the Bolshevist menace as far as labor is concerned. But then came the British-Soviet trade agreement, the laudatory speech of Lloyd George, and a renewed flood of pro-Soviet propaganda from capitalist and so-called "liberal" quarters. So that the Bolshevist propaganda menace, while in a new form, is more threatening than ever, and continues to strike at all the foundations of our democratic civilization—and, in particular at the principles that underlie the labor movement.

The American labor movement has lost no opportunity to prove its warm friendship for the Russian people and for the Russian Revolution. It has not hesitated to send its greetings and offer of support even to Socialists such as those associated with Kerensky—although American labor is not and never has been socialistic. Officials of American labor unions have not scrupled for this purpose to associate themselves with certain Socialists of this country who supported the war in a common address to the Kerensky government. American labor also, in its earnest wish to reach the Russian people after the Bolshevist revolution, went so far as to address a mes-

sage to the Russian nation in care of the Soviets. Both messages are quoted in the Appendix.

From the early beginnings of the first Russian Revolution in 1905 every occasion has been seized to demonstrate friendship. In 1921 the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor once more reiterated its friendly attitude in the following words:

It should be understood clearly that between the people of the United States and the great masses of the people of Russia there has been, is and will continue to be the most earnest and sincere friendship, and that the people of the United States express no sentiment to the contrary except towards those in Russia who are destroying the opportunities of the Russian people for democratic self-government, and who, on the contrary, are imposing upon the Russian people a brutal, defenseless tyranny. This friendship is the friendship of the working people and of all the people of our country for a great people whose character and aspirations have ever justified the confidence, respect and friendship of all liberty loving people, and the earnest hope that the situation in Russia may so change that freedom, justice, democracy and humanitarianism may be the guiding principles of their every day lives. For that time and opportunity American labor fervently anticipates that the true bond of international fraternity may be established between the toilers of Russia and those of America.

The present volume endeavors to give a balanced and equal consideration to all the more important phases of Sovietism. But, naturally, I am in a particularly favorable situation to discuss the Soviet attitude towards labor both in Russia and throughout the world. The chapters dealing with this part of the subject should be of interest



not only to labor and its sympathizers but to the entire community.

I must take this opportunity to point out that the hostility of the Bolsheviks to the American Federation of Labor is of the same degree of intensity and of the same general character as the hostility of a large group of reactionary employers—a group to be found in all countries, but at the present moment far more aggressive and powerful in the United States than in any other nation of the globe. So closely identical are the anti-labor-union policies of the Bolsheviks and Reactionaries that a number of instances have already arisen of deliberate co-operation to destroy organized labor. But even when there is no definite alliance the similarity of the purposes and methods of the two groups bring it about that they spread an identical propaganda. The Reactionary, therefore, does not disguise the delight with which he reads of the Bolshevik attacks on organized labor, nor do the Bolsheviks disguise their joy at the victories of Reaction. Nor is this the only way by which Reaction aids Bolshevism; in its refusal to grant reasonable economic concessions and to cede to reasonable demands for political and legislative reforms, the Reactionaries inevitably drive the thoughtless and impatient into the arms of Bolshevism.

I have been obliged to deal continually with Bolshevism for the past four years. I have utilized in the present volume parts of several recent articles from the official organ of the American Federation of Labor, *The American Federationist*, of which I am editor, as well as certain material in the current report of the Executive

Council of that organization. Nearly all of it, however, is new.

Mr. William English Walling, who has collaborated with me, is the author of a number of books dealing with the international labor movement and of two volumes on Russia. He spent several years in that country at the time of the origin of the Bolshevist party and has followed it closely for the past fifteen years. His knowledge of Russia and the international labor movement, to which I can testify, has proved most helpful.

SAMUEL GOMPERS.



# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I

### America and the Soviets

	PAGE
THE POSITION OF AMERICAN LABOR—SECRETARY COLBY'S NOTE OF AUGUST 10, 1921—THE BOLSHEVIST ANSWER—SECRETARY HUGHES' NOTE OF MARCH 25, 1921—REVOLUTIONARY PROPAGANDA BY SOVIET TRADE COMMISSIONERS—TEST OF HUGHES' NOTE—SECRETARY HUGHES' REPLY TO PRESIDENT GOMPERS—SECRETARY W. B. WILSON'S DECISION <i>Re</i> THE DEPORTATION OF "AMBASSADOR" MARTENS—SECRETARY HOOVER'S VIEWS—THE HEARST NEWSPAPERS' INTERPRETATION—OTHER NEWSPAPERS—LENIN AS A "CONSERVATIVE"—THE OFFICIAL SOVIET REPLY TO THE HUGHES NOTE—LENIN'S SUPPOSED "COMPROMISES" AND "REFORMS"—"STATE CAPITALISM" ADOPTED—THE AVALANCHE OF ADVERSE EVIDENCE—THE PRO-BOLSHEVIST PROPAGANDA CONTINUES UNABATED—SOCIALIST, LABOR AND "LIBERAL" PRO-BOLSHEVISTS . . . . .	1-19

## CHAPTER II

### The Practical Foundation—Mendacious Propaganda

THE FUNCTION OF PROPAGANDA ACCORDING TO THE NINTH COMMUNIST CONGRESS—LENIN PUBLICLY ADVOCATES MENDACITY—LENIN VIEWED AS A "MAD DEMAGOGUE"—LENIN PUBLICLY PLANS TO DE-

	PAGE
STROY THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY—HIS CRUDE FALSEHOODS ABOUT AMERICA, ENGLAND, FRANCE AND JAPAN—HE CLAIMS COMMUNISM AS THE CENTRAL QUESTION OF CONTINENTAL EUROPEAN POLITICS—FANTASTIC PICTURES OF FOREIGN CONDITIONS PRESENTED TO SOVIET RUSSIA—THE BOLSHEVIST MONOPOLY OF PAPER AND PRINTED MATTER—CONTROLLING THE THOUGHT OF 100,000,000 PEOPLE.....	20-27

### CHAPTER III

#### **The Political Foundation—War against Democracy**

THE ORIGIN OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT AS A REVOLT AGAINST DEMOCRACY—ATTEMPTS TO INTERPRET THE WORD "DEMOCRACY" FOR BOLSHEVIST PURPOSES—THESE ATTEMPTS OPENLY ABANDONED—THE SOVIETS ALSO BECOME OBSOLETE—LENIN SHOWS IT IS NOT A LABOR STATE—THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OFFICIALLY PROCLAIMED—COMPOSITION OF COMMUNIST PARTY—THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION LAID ASIDE—WHO CONTROLS THE COMMUNIST PARTY?—COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP TO LAST TWENTY-FIVE TO FIFTY YEARS—THE COMMUNIST PARTY A SECT WAGING WAR ON THE UNCONQUERED AND UNCONVERTED.....	28-48
---	-------

### CHAPTER IV

#### **The Reign of Terror**

PRESIDENT WILSON'S SUCCESSFUL APPEAL TO THE CIVILIZED NATIONS TO OUTLAW THE SOVIETS—TERRORISM GROWN WORSE—EXTERMINATING	
---	--

THE MIDDLE CLASSES—TROTZKY ON BREAKING THE WILL OF THE INTELLECTUALS—RED TERROR URGED BY LENIN AGAINST RECALCITRANT SOCIALISTS—WHOLESALE EXECUTIONS OF HOSTAGES OFFICIALLY ADMITTED—MEMBERSHIP OF ALL NON-BOLSHEVIST PARTIES A CRIME AGAINST THE SOVIET STATE—THE ALL-EMBRACING ACTIVITIES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY COMMISSION FOR ADMINISTERING THE RED TERROR—TERRORISM AGAINST AGRICULTURAL REBELS—TERROR AGAINST THE RED ARMY?—TERRORISM AGAINST LABOR AND TRADES UNIONS—THE EXTRAORDINARY COMMISSION IN ACTION AGAINST THE LEADERS OF THE AGRARIAN PARTY—THE RED TERROR THE MEASURE OF DESPERATION OF A DWINDLING MINORITY..... 49-71

CHAPTER V

**Slavery and Compulsory Labor**

SYNDICALISM ABANDONED—THE CODE FOR SLAVE LABOR—MILITARIZATION OF LABOR—FACTORY DICTATORS—LENIN DEFENDS INDUSTRIAL AUTOCRACY—COMPULSORY LABOR THE FOUNDATION OF THE SOVIET STRUCTURE (TROTZKY)—LABOR ARMIES—COMPULSORY LABOR TO LAST A GENERATION—COMPULSORY OVER-TIME—COMMUNIST LABOR ACCORDING TO LENIN—AN AMERICAN WITNESS—DIFFICULTIES OF LABOR REVOLT..... 72-87

CHAPTER VI

**Persecution of Organized Labor—Trade Unions**

FREE TRADE UNIONS ABOLISHED—COMPULSORY OR GOVERNMENTAL TRADE UNIONS—FICTITIOUS MEMBERSHIP—THE TRADES UNIONS SUBORDI-

	PAGE
NATED TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY—COLLAPSE OF THE UNIONS ADMITTED BY TROTZKY—THE PRINTERS' UNION DESCRIBES BOLSHEVIST LABOR UNION PRACTICES—TROTZKY'S PLAN OF APPOINTING TRADE UNION OFFICIALS—LENIN VS. TROTZKY—THE REVOLT WITHIN THE UNIONS—THE CHIEF TERRORIST TAKES TROTZKY'S PLACE AS COMMISSARY OF TRANSPORT—APPEAL OF THE PRINTERS' UNION AGAINST THE COMMUNIST PARTY.....	88-103

## CHAPTER VII

### **Oppression of the Agricultural Population**

THE AGRICULTURAL POPULATION CONQUERED AND SUBJECTED—THE "CLASS WAR" CONTINUED AGAINST THE AGRICULTURISTS (PEASANTS)—THE "DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT" AS THE RULE OF AN INDUSTRIAL MINORITY OVER AN AGRICULTURAL MAJORITY—VILIFICATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL POPULATION BY RUSSIAN BOLSHEVISTS AND FOREIGN "LIBERALS"—THE AGRICULTURISTS AS THE INTERNAL ENEMY—LOOTING THE COUNTRYSIDE—THE WAR AGAINST THE VILLAGES—LENIN'S COVERING PHRASES—THE GREAT "REFORM" IN BOLSHEVIST AGRARIAN POLICY—COMPULSORY CO-OPERATION—THE "RETURN TO CAPITALISM" IN AGRARIAN POLICY—FOUNDATIONS OF LENIN'S AGRARIAN POLICY.....	104-124
---	---------

## CHAPTER VIII

### **The Economic Collapse—Fictitious Reforms**

THE ECONOMIC COLLAPSE DUE PARTLY TO BOLSHEVISM—DISORGANIZATION ADMITTED—AGRICULTUR-
---

	PAGE
ISTS IN REVOLT—BUREAUCRACY ABSORBING TOWN POPULATION—PERSECUTION OF BRAINS—GOVERNMENT BY PAPER DECREES—UNEXAMPLED INEFFICIENCY—ACCELERATED DEGENERATION OF INDUSTRY—IMPOSSIBILITY OF SOCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL REFORM UNDER EXISTING CONDITIONS—MYTHICAL REFORMS—AN EXAMPLE, THE SUPPOSED REGARD FOR CHILDREN AND EDUCATION—DREADFUL CONDITION OF SO-CALLED “ CHILDREN’S HOMES ”—ATTEMPTED COMMUNIST MONOPOLY OF SCHOOLS—THE WAR OF THE COMMUNISTS AGAINST THE SCHOOL TEACHERS—LESS THAN ONE-FOURTH OF THE CHILDREN IN SCHOOL—LITERACY DESIRED BY BOLSHEVISTS IN ORDER TO SPREAD EFFECT OF PRINTED PROPAGANDA—EDUCATION A BRANCH OF PROPAGANDA—SEPARATING CHILDREN FROM HOME AND FAMILY—CULTURE AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION TO WAIT UNTIL DESTRUCTION OF EXISTING SOCIETY IS COMPLETED . . . . .	125-141

CHAPTER IX

**World Revolution—The Attempt to Overthrow Democratic Governments**

WORLD REVOLUTION REMAINS THE CHIEF AIM—WARS AND REVOLUTIONS REGARDED AS INTERDEPENDENT—CIVIL WAR HELD AS THE NORMAL AFTERMATH OF REVOLUTION—MILITARY AID FOR FOREIGN REVOLUTIONS—REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS USEFUL TO THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY CAUSE EVEN WHEN THERE ARE NO REVOLUTIONS—DENIAL OF WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PLANS BY BOLSHEVIST REPRESENTATIVES ABROAD—BAD FAITH A FUNDA-

MENTAL PRINCIPLE OF BOLSHEVISM—WORLD REVOLUTION IN SOVIET AND COMMUNIST PARTY CONSTITUTIONS—REVOLUTION THE AIM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALE—SUCCESSSES OF MOVEMENT IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE—WORLD REVOLUTIONARY AIM NOT ABANDONED—UTILITY OF FOREIGN REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS TO SOVIET GOVERNMENT—SUCCESS OF BOLSHEVIST PROPAGANDA AMONG FOREIGN MIDDLE-CLASSES—LENIN'S PRESENT THEORY ON WORLD REVOLUTION—BOLSHEVIST HOPES FOR WORLD WARS—THE HOPED-FOR WAR BETWEEN EUROPE AND ASIA—PRO-GERMAN TENDENCIES—PLAN TO ATTACK THE ENTENTE	142-158
---	---------

## CHAPTER X

**The Communist Internationale**

RUSSIAN SOVIET CONTROL OF THE COMMUNIST (OR THIRD) INTERNATIONALE—RUSSIAN ORDERS TO BRITISH COMMUNISTS—SPLIT BETWEEN RUSSIAN COMMUNISTS AND OTHER EXTREME REVOLUTIONISTS—RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY CHAUVINISM—WAR ON AMERICAN TRADE UNIONS—COMMUNIST SUBSIDIES FOR FOREIGN LABOR PUBLICATIONS—HOW SOVIET PROPAGANDA FORCED THE BRITISH TRADE TREATY.....	159-168
--	---------

## CHAPTER XI

**The Red Labor Union Internationale**

LENIN RECOGNIZES THE TRADE UNIONS AS THE MAIN ENEMY—BOLSHEVIST ATTACK ON THE REVOLUTIONARY AND PRO-SOVIET INTERNATIONAL FEDER-	
--	--



	PAGE
ATION OF TRADE UNIONS—ORGANIZATION OF THE RED LABOR UNION INTERNATIONALE—MEMBERSHIP OF THE NEW BODY—STRENGTH OF RED UNION MOVEMENT IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE—STATE SOCIALIST TENDENCY OF RUSSIAN EXTREMISTS VS. SYNDICALIST TENDENCY OF NON-RUSSIANS—ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION (THE UNIONS) SUBORDINATED TO POLITICAL (THE COMMUNIST PARTY)—LOSOVSKY, SOVIET LABOR UNION AUTHORITY, ACKNOWLEDGES SPLIT WITH REVOLUTIONARY SYNDICALISTS—ACTIVITIES IN AMERICA—COUNTER-ATTACK BY THE SOCIALIST (OR SECOND) INTERNATIONALE . . . . .	169-187

CHAPTER XII

**European Labor Disillusioned**

REVOLUTIONARY EUROPEAN LABOR DELEGATIONS TO SOVIET RUSSIA REPORT AGAINST BOLSHEVISM—THE ULTIMATUM OF TWENTY-ONE POINTS SENT TO THE SOCIALIST AND LABOR PARTIES OF THE WORLD—EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS FAVOR ENTENTE MILITARY ACTION IN GEORGIA AGAINST THE SOVIETS—THE FRENCH LABOR UNIONS REPUDIATE MOSCOW—ADVERSE REPORT OF SPANISH SOCIALIST DELEGATE—COUNTER-ATTACK OF THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS—SOVIET REPLY TO THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY—THE VOICE OF THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE—THE INDICTMENT BY THE RUSSIAN AGRARIANS (THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONARY PARTY)—THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONARY PARTY PROTESTS AGAINST PRO-SOVIET ATTITUDE OF THE WORLD'S SOCIALISTS . . . . .	188-202
--	---------

## CHAPTER XIII

**The Camouflaged Trade Agitation**

	PAGE
<i>De Facto</i> RECOGNITION OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT THE PRIME OBJECT OF THE AGITATION FOR TRADE TREATIES—THE CLAIM THAT THESE TREATIES MEAN THE ABANDONMENT OF COMMUNISM— THE SOVIETS REGARD THE TREATIES AS A VICTORY FOR INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM—CONTINUED COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA IN GREAT BRITAIN IN SPITE OF TREATY—TRADE TREATIES A PART OF THE BOLSHEVISTS' REVOLUTIONARY TACTICS—THE BOLSHEVISTS AVOW THEIR PURPOSES IN GRANTING COMMERCIAL CONCESSIONS—COMMUNISTS NOT ABANDONING COMMUNISM—THE TREATIES RE- GARDED AS MERE ARMED TRUCES—PRESIDENT GOMPERS' LETTER ON THE SOVIET TRADE AGITA- TION—SECRETARY HUGHES' REPLY—THE SOVIETS TWICE REFUSE INTERNATIONAL AID FOR THE SUF- FERING RUSSIAN PEOPLE—THE OBJECTS OF THE BRITISH TREATY—AMERICA FREE FROM THESE OBJECTIVES—THE PRO-SOVIET AGITATION OF PSEUDO LIBERALS—SUFFICIENT INFORMATION NOW AT HAND . . . . .	203-227

## APPENDIX I

**American Labor and Russia**

CABLEGRAMS—PRESIDENT GOMPERS TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE WORKMEN'S AND SOLDIERS' COUNCIL, APRIL 2, 1917 . . . . .	228-229
—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR TO THE PRESI-	



# CONTENTS

xix

	PAGE
DENT OF THE WORKMEN'S AND SOLDIERS' COUNCIL, APRIL 23, 1917 . . . . .	229-230
—PRESIDENT GOMPERS TO THE COUNCIL OF WORKMEN AND SOLDIERS, MAY 6, 1917 . . . . .	230-232
—PRESIDENT GOMPERS TO KERENSKY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1917 . . . . .	233-234
—PRESIDENT GOMPERS, FOR THE ALLIANCE FOR LABOR AND DEMOCRACY, TO THE ALL-RUSSIAN SOVIET, MARCH 12, 1918 . . . . .	234

## APPENDIX II

<b>The Soviet Administration of Justice</b>	235-236
---	---------

## APPENDIX III

<b>The Turko-Bolshevist Attack on the Labor Government of Georgia</b>	237-239
---	---------

## APPENDIX IV

### Lenin's "Conversion"

THE WORLD REVOLUTION STILL THE MAIN CONSIDERATION—LENIN SAYS THAT PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND AND FREE TRADE IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ARE NOT TO BE RESTORED—GOVERNING OF THE PEASANTS WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT TO CONTINUE FOR GENERATIONS—LOCAL AND NARROWLY RESTRICTED PRIVATE TRADING ESTABLISHED—THE AIM REMAINS TO MAINTAIN THE POWER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY . . . . .	240-244
--	---------

## APPENDIX V

**Can the Soviets be Saved by Capital?**

	PAGE
THE BRITISH WHITE PAPER SUMMARIZED—NO POSSIBILITY THAT RUSSIA WILL BE ABLE TO RELIEVE EUROPE FOR A CONSIDERABLE PERIOD—RUSSIA DEPENDENT ON FOREIGN CAPITAL (OR CREDIT)—CAN FOREIGN CAPITAL SAVE RUSSIA IF THE SOVIET POWER REMAINS?—THE ECONOMIC FAILURE OF BOLSHEVISM—INVERTED INTERPRETATIONS OF THE WHITE PAPER.....	245-253

**OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS**

This page in the original text is blank.

# OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

---

## I

### AMERICA AND THE SOVIETS

THE American Federation of Labor, at its 1920 convention, resolved:

That the American Federation of Labor is not justified in taking any action which could be construed as an assistance to or approval of, the Soviet Government of Russia as long as that government is based upon authority which has not been vested in it by a popular representative national assemblage of the Russian people; or so long as it endeavors to create revolutions in the well-established, civilized nations of the world; or so long as it advocates and applies the militarization of labor and prevents the organizing and functioning of trade unions and the maintenance of a free press and free public assemblage.

This resolution contains a very conservative statement of the anti-labor and anti-democratic nature of the Soviet dictatorship and the reasons of organized labor for repudiating it.

In response to the overwhelming pressure of public opinion, including not only organized labor but all elements of the American people, Secretary of State Colby,

on the tenth of August, 1920, a few weeks following the convention, addressed a powerful note to the Italian Government giving reasons why America refused to have anything to do with the Soviet dictatorship. The chief reasons given by Mr. Colby were (1) the unrepresentative and anti-democratic character of the so-called Soviet Government and (2) the utter unreliability it had shown in all international relations, including statements by its leading officials that they did not intend to be bound by their own pledges to "bourgeois" governments.

The Bolsheviks' answer was to increase their public and underground labors in this country. In the United States as in all European countries, as well as China, Persia, India, Turkey, Mexico and even in South America, Soviet agents have been repeatedly caught carrying vast sums for the purposes of propaganda. While Russian agriculture is degenerating for the lack of plows and even of sickles and scythes; while the laboring class is starving from the degeneration of agriculture; while the railroads are falling to pieces and three-fourths of the children are out of school, the Soviet finds ample means for vast expenditures not only for propaganda but for military attacks, such as those recently made on the democratic labor government of Georgia and her neighbors. This money has been taken from Russia's dwindling gold reserve and the few other mobile assets such as jewels, art treasures, platinum and foreign securities, which might have been used as a basis for restoring her credit and setting up a currency system at such time as the government became civilized.

Democratic governments, no matter how large and powerful, have no propaganda funds. Hence the undeniable and considerable effect of the Bolshevist agitation in America as well as other countries. Though the evidence coming from Russia, consisting in large part of Bolshevist documents, is vast and overwhelming, it has secured less circulation than the audacious falsifications and inventions of the Bolshevists and their sympathizers—disproven one day only to be repeated in some new form on the next.

The Soviets and their supporters threw themselves into the Presidential election campaign last autumn with the avowed hope of securing recognition from the present Executive and State Departments of the United States. But in spite of the huge bulk of the pro-Bolshevist matter put out—by thousands of publications, the practical results achieved were equal to zero. The great majority of American people read it, pondered upon it and—threw it into the waste basket.

The new administration did not have to hesitate a moment in deciding what to do. President Harding and Secretary Hughes had not been in office more than a few days when, Great Britain having signed her trade agreement (on March 18th), the Soviets immediately played their long expected card in the shape of a note asking that the United States Government officially receive a so-called trade delegation from Soviet Russia. Doubtless one consideration affecting the new administration in its prompt reply was the fact that all such trade delegations throughout Europe had been employed by the Soviets for the purpose of revolutionary agitation to overthrow the gov-



ernments to which they were accredited. The offer of three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars to the *London Daily Herald*, the willingness of the Lansbury semi-Communist organ to accept it—a publication which, unfortunately, is also the chief organ of the British Labor Party—and the proof given by the British Government that Kameneff, the Soviet “trade” emissary, was privy to the offer, are fresh in the mind of the American public. Similar instances occurred in Germany, Italy, Switzerland and other countries.

But the grounds given by Secretary Hughes, in his Note refusing to consider the Soviet overture, were different. Without either re-affirming or amending the conclusive arguments offered by President Wilson and Secretary Colby, without considering the non-representative character of the Russian Government or its instability, Secretary Hughes brought forward additional considerations which have met the almost unanimous approval of the common sense of the American people:

**Text of Hughes's Statement Rejecting Soviet's Proposal for a Governmental Trade Agreement**

(March 25th, 1921)

The Government of the United States views with deep sympathy and grave concern the plight of the people of Russia and desires to aid by every appropriate means in promoting proper opportunities through which commerce can be established upon a sound basis. It is manifest to this Government that in existing circumstances there is no assurance for the development of trade, as the supplies which Russia might now be able to obtain would be wholly inadequate to meet her needs, and no



lasting good can result so long as the *present causes* of *progressive impoverishment* continue to operate. It is only in the productivity of Russia that there is any hope for the Russian people and it is idle to expect resumption of trade until the economic bases of production are securely established. Production is conditioned upon the safety of life, the recognition by firm guarantees of private property, the sanctity of contract and *the rights of free labor*.

If fundamental changes are contemplated, involving due regard for the protection of persons and property and the establishment of conditions essential to the maintenance of commerce, this Government will be glad to have *convincing evidence of the consummation of such changes*, and until this evidence is supplied this Government is unable to perceive that there is any proper basis for considering trade relations.

A few words have been italicized as indicating either features of the Note that were relatively unnoticed or features of especial importance in connection with the data presented in the present volume.

Disturbed by the vast pro-Soviet agitation, falsely labeled "campaign for the restoration of trade relations" which was being carried on in the labor unions—in spite of Secretary Hughes' Note—President Gompers then addressed a letter to the Secretary asking for full information as to the facts in the case. The Secretary's answer to this letter, together with his Note written a few weeks earlier, when taken together, give a clear and positive statement of the American policy. (We quote the two letters at length in a later chapter in discussing the Russian trade question.) In his letter to President Gompers, Mr. Hughes points out the impossibility of aiding the Russian people or of

improving American trade with that country or of restoring Russian credit "so long as the present political and economic system continues." Issued at that moment, April 18th, 1921, it had a special significance. It indicated that the American Government attached no importance whatever to the so-called "reforms" and the pretended abandonment of communism by the Soviet Government early in March. For not only the pro-Bolshevists but numerous groups of greedy capitalists and their newspapers as well as a number of well meaning but uninformed or superficial editors and correspondents had swallowed Lenin's bait, that is, his pretense that he had reformed and had compromised fundamentally with "capitalism."

In this letter Mr. Hughes did not limit himself to pointing out the incapacity of the Soviet Government to organize production. Even should it be able to do so successfully, he pointed out that "the attitude and action of the present authorities of Russia have tended to undermine its political and economic relations with other countries."

In the Note above quoted, in refusing to receive a Soviet trade delegation Mr. Hughes had stated that among the fundamental institutions of modern civilization which were indispensable if Russian production was to be restored was the establishment of "freedom of labor." Evidence given below will show that the enslavement of labor is indeed the chief underlying cause of the entire collapse of the Bolshevist system and of the frightful suffering it has inflicted not only upon labor but upon the entire population of the country.

America, then, has fully endorsed the stand of the American Federation of Labor at its 1920 convention. As further evidence of the complete harmony between American labor and the rest of the nation upon this subject, we may point to the able statement of that eminent representative of labor, former Secretary of Labor, William B. Wilson, in his decisions in the Martens deportation case. The decision itself is a highly important state document. Its principles were more briefly summarized in a letter written by Mr. Wilson a few weeks later (January 3, 1921) to Charles Recht, then Counsellor of the Soviet "Embassy" and now in charge of Soviet affairs in this country. In this letter Secretary Wilson, basing his statements upon a vast number of documents in his hands and upon the testimony of Mr. Martens, the Soviet "Ambassador," reached the following conclusions as to the character of the Soviet régime and the American attitude towards it:

In the evidence presented to me in the Martens case it was clearly shown that a group of men calling themselves Communists had set up a military dictatorship in Russia; that they had camouflaged it under the name of a dictatorship of the proletariat, seeking to convey the impression that it was a dictatorship by the proletariat; that it had by force of arms introduced compulsory labor, in other words, slavery, into Russia; that the proletariat were compelled to work at occupations selected for them at meager wages and long hours imposed under the direction of the military masters. Naturally the sympathy of the Administration and of the American people, including the workers, goes out to the Russian people, under such circumstances, just

as our sympathies go out to the oppressed of all lands no matter who or what the oppressor may be. . . .

The evidence was cumulative and conclusive that the military dictatorship of Russia, calling itself the Soviet Government, was appropriating large sums of money to stir up insurrection by force of arms against the United States Government. It is a novel principle in international law and one that is not likely to be generally accepted, that a newly established military dictatorship in one country may capitalize the traditional friendship of another country for its people by making a pretense of wanting to establish friendly relations with the government at the same time that it is seeking to destroy it by stirring up insurrection.

Finally we may quote a few words from Mr. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, the world's highest authority on European relief. Mr. Hoover believes that nothing of any consequence can be done for the Russian people as long as the Bolshevists remain on their necks and these are the reasons he gives for this position (in his letter of March 21st, 1921) :

*So long as Russia is controlled by the Bolsheviki. . . . the question of trade is far more political than economic.*

There are no export commodities in Russia worth consideration except gold, platinum and jewelry in the hands of the Bolsheviki Government. The people are starving, cold, under-clad. If they had any consumable commodities they would have used them long since.

There has been no prohibition on trade. The real blockade has been the failure of the Russians to produce anything to trade with.

Trading for this parcel of gold would not effect this remedy—nor would the goods obtained by the Bolsheviki restore their production. That requires the *abandonment of the present economic system.*



On the day of the issuance of Mr. Hughes' Note (March 25th) Mr. Hoover further declared:

Secretary Hughes's statement on the Russian trade situation this afternoon shows *the complete agreement in the views of the whole administration.*

The first thing to be determined about Russia is if, and when, they change *their economic system.* (Our italics.)

If they so change its *basis* as to accept the right of private property, freedom of labor, provide for the safety of human life, there is hope of their recovery from the miseries of famine. There is hope also of a slow recovery in production and the upbuilding of trade.

Nothing is more important to the whole commercial world than the recovery of productivity in Russia.

These very explicit and positive statements of Messrs. Hughes and Hoover might well have disposed of the question of the American Government's position. But so powerful is the pro-Soviet propaganda and so strong is the purpose to befriend the Bolshevist Government at any cost that a widespread effort was made to explain away the Note as being friendly to the Soviets! The Hearst papers and their Universal Press Service boldly claimed that "not one word of the statement was directed at the Russian Government, and no objection to the form of the Soviet Government was voiced"(!) They then declared, *on the very day of the note*, that "it is recognized that some of the guarantees demanded by this Government as a preliminary to the establishment of trade relations already have been announced by Lenin."

The newspapers mentioned are ardent defenders of the Soviets. But certain more conservative organs, wholly opposed to Bolshevism, also found some way to take a position favorable to the Soviets. One of the leading Democratic newspapers of the country, reversing the view expressed by the above mentioned journals that the Hughes Note was to be praised because it was friendly to the Soviets, argued that it was to be blamed because it was too hostile. Wilson and Colby were hostile enough; Harding and Hughes go too far when they are more hostile still:

Insisting that "production is conditioned upon the safety of life, the recognition by firm guarantees of private property, the sanctity of contract and the rights of free labor," they, Harding and Hughes, demand in effect an economic revolution in Russia, and it is a demand that cannot very well be substantiated as a basis for commerce.

This conservative paper then proceeded to endorse the entire argument upon which the pro-Bolshevists now stake their agitation: Lenin, it appears, has surrendered to "peasant individualism." "The Communist autocracy has had to yield to rural public opinion backed by the physical power of the peasant. . . . What was called in the beginning a necessary but temporary dictatorship of the proletariat ran its course much more quickly than in the French Revolution." What truth there is in all this—if any—we shall show in later chapters. Undoubtedly something of this kind may happen *if the Soviets are not further bolstered up by political recognition and financial aid from*

*other countries.* But nothing could delay the desirable event more effectively than to assume it has occurred when it has not. This newspaper continues:

Now Lenin "solves" the peasant problem, as he is said to be solving the problem of capitalism by giving it up. In what is incomparably the largest field of Russian industry, he drops Communism.

Again the time element is all important. If it is wholly misleading to assume a momentous event that has not yet taken place, it is equally misleading to date in the present an event that has occurred long ago and so to attribute it to present causes—in this instance the yielding of the Soviets to the pressure of the peasants or of foreign capitalists. We shall show that the impossibility of applying communism to agriculture, far from being in Bolshevist minds (as it would be in the minds of the rest of humanity) an argument for abolishing the communist dictatorship, is precisely the one reason they have given *from the first* for establishing that dictatorship and the one reason why they urge that—in the face of rising peasant discontent—it is more than ever essential for them to maintain it now.

Such views as those just quoted are not confined to the conservative organs of the opposition party. One of the leading Republican papers, which had favored the trade agreement, continued to insist editorially that the question was whether "Lenin and Trotzky mean it when they say Bolshevism is dead"—though this imaginary statement is the very reverse of everything

Trotsky and Lenin have been saying. The Washington correspondent of another leading Republican organ declared that "the Russian Bolsheviki are ready to abandon the last vestiges of their program and to return to capitalism in industry as well as agriculture"—a statement for which he could produce no substantiation whatever from any quarter.

Several Republican and Democratic Senators were quoted in the press to similar effect. One well-known Senator is reported as having said:

The danger that existed of political propaganda inspired and paid for by the Russian Government, has practically disappeared. I think it may be said that the Lenin-Trotsky Government has *abandoned the effort to convert the world* and is modifying its own Government into a *much more conservative* form than it started with.

The word "conservative" as well as the word "moderate" is thus being freely applied to those advanced extremists and revolutionaries who are a shade or two less red than others in a scale of violent revolution that now shows half a hundred varieties! The statement here made that Lenin and Trotsky are abandoning their propaganda for world revolt, as we shall show, is negated by the entire structure and functioning of the Communist-Soviet machine. In the meanwhile we may quote at this point—as fairly conclusive evidence—the official Soviet wireless reply to the Hughes Note, which contains also a smashing rejoinder to the gratuitous newspaper assumptions we have referred to:

The American Consul in Reval has given our plenipotentiary representative the reply sent by his Govern-



ment to the last communication of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. The Note of the American Government points out that trade between Russia and America can only be resumed when the former recognizes private property, guarantees "free labor" and personal inviolability and has a market large enough for the export of stores of raw material. At the same time the American press states that hopes of trade with Russia are not lost, as Lenin will rapidly change from Communism to capitalism and all the hopes of the Americans will speedily be brought about by the Bolsheviks themselves. The shortsightedness of the tools of world capital is extraordinary. . . .

The hopes of world capital in the fall of Communism have not been fulfilled. And now that we have reverted to peaceful reconstruction and are introducing a practical policy in order to alleviate conditions for the peasants who have suffered from failure of the harvest, they regard this as a sign that we are reverting from Communism to capitalism. It goes without saying that all the hopes of the capitalists are doomed to failure.

Later the official organ of the Moscow Government, *Izvestia*, made still more clear the underlying idea of all Bolshevistic diplomatic negotiations, namely that the world of capitalistic governments is being forced to recognize and to compromise with Communism as embodied in the government of Soviet Russia. The mouthpiece of the Soviets repudiates as pure nonsense the supposition that they are surrendering any Communist principles whatever. At the same time it may be noted that the Soviets have reached a perfectly clear comprehension of the nature of the American reply—even if a number of American newspapers have attempted to disguise it. The *Izvestia* declares:

The essence of the Washington answer is that the resumption of commerce with Russia will be possible only after we have returned to a bourgeois régime. This is pure nonsense. The English bourgeoisie who have signed a trade agreement with us did not consider this change necessary. We did not propose to the Americans to change their capitalistic régime for a communistic one.

But neither this provocative response nor anything the Bolsheviks can say or do—no matter how aggressively revolutionary—can put a stop to the claims made almost daily by their diplomatic agents, foreign propagandists and “liberal” admirers that they have reformed. Each minor change in their policy is held to demonstrate once more that now at last they have not only thrown the entire Bolshevik system overboard but have become “moderates” and adopted capitalism and democracy. During recent months hardly a day has passed without some Russian dispatch that the final step has been taken and Communism abandoned. Here is the crux of a typical dispatch (dated Riga, May 2, 1921):

Following the restoration of free trade to cooperative societies, the establishment of a system of taxation in kind, and other recent concessions, the decision to restore the coinage of silver marks, is according to recent arrivals from Moscow, Premier Lenin’s final admission of the impossibility of the original Communistic theories at this time.

Now the original theory of the Russian Communist or Bolshevik Party was precisely that it is impossible to apply Communism to the dominating industry of Russia

(agriculture) at the present time. This theory is not only the one reason for the dictatorship of the proletariat, as we have pointed out, but it is also the sole reason for the establishment of the Soviet form of government as opposed to the democratic Constitutional Assembly.

The advocates of friendly relations with the Soviets, approaching or actually amounting to their official recognition, have not been satisfied with hailing every petty advance of Bolshevism in the direction of more practical methods of oppression as a final abandonment of Communism. They have also seized upon every new theoretical formulation by Lenin as a surrender to capitalism—in spite of the fact that new encyclicals by the Bolshevik high priest have been handed down to his disciples several times each year ever since 1917. No close or persistent student of these pronouncements has missed or could miss the fact that all the essential foundations of Soviet rule, as interpreted by Lenin, remain now what they were in 1917. But journalists and others who are either totally ignorant of the Soviet leader's thought or know it only at second hand easily find in each new formulation phrases with which they are unfamiliar or expressions they do not understand. This is why it happens so frequently that some theory which is the strongest possible reaffirmation of Bolshevism is interpreted as a compromise or surrender.

An excellent illustration is the long article in the *Pravda* of May 3d, in which Lenin explains to his followers the theoretical foundation of those widely discussed tactical changes made by the Bolsheviks—for the purpose of strengthening their despotic power—at the

time of the Communist Party Congress held in March, 1921.

Lenin says in this article that it is nonsense to speak of these changes as "a renunciation of the proletarian dictatorship" and proves his point. But correspondents continue to insist upon the contrary interpretation, caught by Lenin's use of the expression "state capitalism" as applied to the present Soviet policy. Now moderate Socialists have always referred to this intermediate phase between capitalism and socialism by the apologetic term "state socialism," while ultra-revolutionists have known this identical thing under the derisive term "state-capitalism." To the latter this expression is derogatory, though non-socialists take it to represent a policy more friendly to capitalism, more reasonable than "state socialism," and a totally different thing. To every Bolshevist the expression, "state capitalism," means that the present policy, revolutionary and extreme as it may still seem to the rest of the world, is but the merest beginning of the thoroughgoing communism they have in view and is introduced solely as a means to further steps in the communist direction. Yet Lenin's clear statement on this point is interpreted by certain correspondents as a concession to capitalism.

Lenin's article above referred to is quoted by Michael Farbman in the *New York World* as follows:

"The way to State-socialism," he says, "lies through state capitalism. (German state capitalism.) We are unable and long will be unable to supply the peasants with all they need. This will be possible only after electrification of the whole country (!) has been accomplished.



“At the present stage we must choose from two alternatives. Either we must prohibit every kind of private exchange of goods, otherwise capitalism. Such a policy is idiotic and would mean suicide for the party attempting to introduce it, for such policy is economically impossible. The other alternative is to aid the development of capitalism in Russia, while we are trying to transform it into state capitalism. This is economically possible and does not contradict the proletarian dictatorship. On the contrary state capitalism is one stage in the advance of free capitalism.”

The pessimism prevailing in Communist circles Lenine explains by the mistake in comparing how much state capitalism is behind Socialism. One should compare how much state capitalism is in advance of petty bourgeois economy. “Only then,” concludes the dictator, “will we see how great the progress is we have made. The chief problem now is to find the proper methods of how to turn the inevitable growth of capitalism in Russia into the form of state capitalism now and assist in securing speedy conversion of state capitalism into Socialism.”

Another passage from the same speech (taken from the Bolshevik organ, *Pravda*, and reproduced in the German Socialist Press) explains even more clearly Lenin's motive in advocating the policy of state capitalism. As Lenin said, “the Communists did not need to fear the development of state capitalism as they can fix limits for it to suit themselves. Capitalism under the control of a state in which the proletariat held all the power in its hands, was not contradictory to the ideas of Communism.”

Changes are taking place in Soviet Russia. But what is the nature of these changes? That is the question. It cannot be answered either by the Bolsheviks

or by their friends and apologists. Only a careful examination of their own publications can afford an answer. Fortunately these are now at hand—in abundance. They bring the whole movement into the light, and answer every reasonable question.

In addition to the vast accumulation of documentary evidence from Russia and the weighty decisions of two American administrations, we have had adverse comment on Soviet Russia from practically every labor delegation that has visited that country in the last twelve months—from Germany, Italy, Sweden, Spain and other countries. Only the British report was ambiguous on certain points, but a large part of the delegation, including Turner, Shaw, Mrs. Snowden, Dr. Guest and Bertrand Russell, who accompanied the delegation, was overwhelmingly adverse—after having seen the Bolshevist régime with their own eyes. Influenced by the reports of Dittmann and Crispin, both of them radical Socialists, the German labor union movement is now lined up almost solidly against the Soviets.

What has been the effect of this avalanche of evidence and testimony on the pro-Bolshevist agitation in this country? Practically none at all. In May, 1921, the propaganda of falsification continues unabated. The position of the writers and speakers who are active in this campaign is similar to that of the American Socialist Party, which still remains with one foot in and one foot out of the Third Internationale. The Executive Committee of that body reports that the "Socialist Party of America has always given its unwavering support to the Soviet Government of Russia,"



while the resolution carried by the convention in September, 1920, and later by referendum reads in part as follows:

Socialism is in complete control of the great country of Russia. . . . It should be the task of the Socialist Internationale to aid our comrades in Russia to maintain and fortify their political control.

So also the pro-Bolshevist "liberals" in America, as well as their counterparts in Europe, and all the Socialist parties belonging to the Second Internationale, including the British Labor Party, have done everything in their power to aid the Soviet Government and recognize the Bolshevists either as "comrades" or—in the case of the so-called liberals—as democrats deserving support.

The American Socialist Party refuses to accept the principle of "the dictatorship of the Proletariat in the form of Soviets." It also refuses to conduct a revolution through orders issued from Moscow, but it has done and pledged itself to do everything in its power to aid that régime in Russia—and in so doing, it also aids the Soviet Government and the Third Internationale in their agitation in all countries—except the United States. So also the European Socialists in many countries of Europe are aiding the Soviet agitation in all countries except their own. Not only this but these same organizations, while refusing to accept Moscow rule, are supporting the Soviet agitation in their own countries in many points.

## II

### THE PRACTICAL FOUNDATION OF BOLSHEVISM —MENDACIOUS PROPAGANDA

THE Bolsheviks have frequently declared that the foundation of their whole movement is propaganda. This, in itself, is an amazing confession, but more amazing still is their frank avowal of the character of this propaganda. The ninth Communist Congress (March-April, 1920) says on this subject:

The first condition of the success of the Soviet Republic in all departments, including the economic, is chiefly systematic printed agitation.

As to the nature of the propaganda, we have the following historic utterance of the Bolshevik high priest himself in regard to the methods to be used in order to destroy the labor unions:

We must know how to apply at need, knavery, deceit, illegal methods, hiding truth by silence, in order to penetrate to the very heart of the trade unions, to remain there and to accomplish there the Communist task.—Lenin, in “Radicalism, the Infantile Malady of Communism!”

It must not be supposed for one moment that the childlike stupidity involved in this public pronouncement of the intent to deceive is exceptional for the

great Bolshevist "master mind." In his letter of last November to British labor he shows the same mixture of simplicity and arrogance. The substance of that letter was summed up last November by the pro-Soviet *London Daily News* as follows:

The true British Communist is told that it is his duty to cooperate with Mr. Henderson, Mr. Snowden and other degraded "bourgeois," in order to return members to Parliament pledged to destroy from within that institution, and incidentally to expose and ruin Mr. Henderson, Mr. Snowden and the colleagues who are to assist unwittingly in the operation. And this is said openly in the hearing of the intended victims and of the millions who are yet unconverted to the Gospel of Communist "hate." No one that we remember, except some of the German war lords towards the end of the great struggle, has ever thought aloud in public in this semi-insane manner. The parallel is ominous.

This letter was such an exhibition of incredible ignorance regarding Great Britain, combined with incapacity for the simplest logical reasoning, that even the friendly British Labor Party lost its patience while *The Daily News*, unable to restrain its wrath, thus characterized the Bolshevist "Czar":

Mad Kings, Tzars and Kaisers ruin, as a rule, only themselves and their subjects; a *mad demagogue* provides every half-witted enemy of liberty with a moral to his servile tale. . . .

Bolshevism has many enemies, but it has none so formidable as its foremost figure. We can imagine a man thinking in the sort of way in which Lenin talks to his British Communist "Comrades" in the extracts from his new book printed elsewhere in our columns

to-day. We can imagine a man unfolding to like-minded friends in the privacy of his own house some such plan of campaign as he suggests to them. But that anyone having conceived such a design should proceed to proclaim it from the housetops is a thing almost incredible. It argues an arrogant contempt for all possible opposition which, to those who know the real strength of "Communism" in this country, seems not far removed from insanity.

The workings of the mind of this half-crazed and inflated fanatic are important not only as largely dominating the movement but because they are typical of his even less gifted Bolshevists. Perhaps the greatest oratorical effort of his life was at the Second Congress of the Communist Internationale held at Moscow in July, 1920. There, in rapid succession, he made a whole string of utterly ignorant or consciously false statements about Germany, America, Japan and France—making these propositions the very foundation of the world policy of the Internationale and foreign policy of the Soviets. Here are a few of his remarks:

You know that the Versailles Treaty forced Germany and a whole series of conquered States, into conditions of absolute impossibility of economic existence, into conditions of complete *absence of rights, of utter humiliation*. . . . America, which profited most of all from the war, being converted into a rich country from a country that had a mass of debts. . . . Japan, which profited much by remaining outside the actual conflict, seizing the Asiatic continent. . . .

France's assets are three and one-quarter billions, while her liabilities are ten and a half; that is three times more. . . . This is the country which has lived



as a progressive civilized country because its savings (*colonial thefts, called savings*), made it possible for her to lend billions to other countries, and particularly to Russia.

No more false, boastful, or deluded utterance was ever recorded from the lips of Kaiser or Czar than the following from Lenin's much advertised but little read "moderate" speech at the Congress of the Russian Communist Party in March, 1921; nor could any citation better illustrate the great hallucination upon which all present Bolshevik calculations are built:

Certainly the Communist International which at the time of last year's Congress existed only in the form of proclamations has now begun to act as an independent body in every country, and as more than merely a vanguard party. Communism has become the central question of the whole labor movement. In Germany, France, and Italy, the Communist International has become the center not only of the labor movement, but of *the whole political life of the country*. It was impossible to pick up a German or a French newspaper last autumn without seeing discussions on Moscow and the Bolsheviks, and how the twenty-one conditions of entry into the Third International had become *the central question of the political life of those countries*. This is our gain of which no one can deprive us. (*Russian Press Review*, March 15th, 1921.)

The complete falsity of the entire Bolshevik propaganda may be best understood by Americans from a few quotations suggesting the picture that is presented to the Russian people of America and of the rest of the world. As the Bolsheviks have a monopoly of the press and even of the paper of the country, thus

effectively precluding the expression of non-Bolshevist opinion, they are able to a considerable degree to impress these pictures upon the minds of the Russian people and to shape their attitude to America and other countries accordingly. According to Mrs. Snowden and other recent visitors, the Russian people have been persuaded by such methods to believe that Bolshevism is spreading all the world over and that many countries are on the verge of Bolshevist revolutions. We read frequently in the Bolshevist press also statements like the following: "If we compare the conditions of life in Russia with the conditions of life in the West, we have to state that our situation is a brilliant one." (From *Bojevaya Pravda*, May 19, 1920.)

Here are a few statements illustrating American news as it appears in the Soviet wireless:

Russian workmen, emigrants who have just returned from America and are now in Sormovo, state that the Russians in America are suffering great hardships. They experience there all the horrors of prison life. Workmen are arrested for participation in party conferences; torture is resorted to when they are being cross-examined. Many unions are obliged to work in secret. (From Moscow wireless, January 4, 1921.)

The workers say that the work of the American Bolshevik party is proceeding successfully and that *in New York alone there are 200,000 members in the party.* (From Moscow wireless message, via London, January 4, 1921.)

The American Government has asked Latvia to consent to allow 100,000 Russians to proceed to Soviet Russia through her territory. The American Government intends to deport these Russians in the near future. (From Moscow wireless, February 7, 1921.)



The head of the All Russian Soviet of Trade Unions, Tomsky, thus pictures the position of the President of the American Federation of Labor:

Gompers, when he starts out for conferences, surrounds himself with five experienced boxers. (From *Izvestia*, October 19, 1920.)

The Soviet régime is keeping a number of Americans as hostages in the hope that it will be able to use them to compel recognition by the American Government—a method which undoubtedly had considerable effect in Great Britain. Among these hostages is the well-known Red Cross worker, Kilpatrick. When first captured by the famous Bolshevist cavalry General, Budenny, Kilpatrick reported that the chief intelligence officer insisted “that the American working classes were starving and the whole country on the verge of revolution.” This was at the end of 1920! Yet, the Russian intelligence officer could have reached no other conclusion from the Bolshevist press.

If a government appeals to its own people largely on the basis of such falsehoods, we can imagine how much reliance is to be placed upon Soviet statements about their own performances especially issued for consumption abroad.

The character of the Soviet régime in Russia and of the Communist Internationale based upon it can be understood only if we grasp firmly and keep steadily in mind the utter and wholesale mendacity of the Bolshevist propaganda. Practically every statement that comes directly or indirectly from Bolshevist sources is vitiated, while statements emanating from the pro-

Bolshevists who, in addition to being indoctrinated with this Bolshevik contempt for truth are, almost without exception, wofully ignorant of Russia, are often still more fanciful.

It is the vast extent and persistence of this propaganda smoke-screen that has obscured Soviet Russia from our eyes, and not the lack of well authenticated facts or any incomprehensible mystery in Soviet Russia or in Bolshevism.

The enormous rôle played by mendacious propaganda in the Bolshevik political system arises only in part from the character of the propaganda and in part from the monopoly they have established in the control of education and the press (including the monopoly of paper) together with their prohibition of free speech and assemblage for all opposition parties.

It may be doubted if any State Socialist writer has hitherto even conceived an Utopian system under which all printed matter whatever is controlled by the State. Not only have the Communists set up such a State control but they have established at the same time a control over the state by the very small group which dominates the Communist Party, as we show in following chapters. We read in a recent despatch:

All payments for newspapers, books, magazines, pamphlets and pictures is abolished in a decree of the People's Commissaries. Printed matter may be distributed among organizations and institutions, but not sold to the public.

In other words a small group has undertaken to establish a complete monopoly over the intellectual output of

the country. This group has practically attempted to direct the entire intellectual intake of a hundred million people! Now let us recall once more the character of the Communist intellectual output—as already sketched—and we can begin to realize how monstrous is the crime that is being attempted against the soul and mind of the Russian people.

But this is only one aspect—though the most fundamental—of Bolshevist rule. We shall now take up some others.

### III

## THE POLITICAL FOUNDATION: WAR AGAINST DEMOCRACY

BOLSHEVISM arose as a repudiation of democracy, when Lenin employed a company of armed sailors to disperse the Constitutional Assembly—which had been deliberately and fairly elected by the entire Russian people. The Bolsheviks have never held one election under universal suffrage in Russia since that day. Far from apologizing, they have boasted of their action in overthrowing the constituent assembly. Their printing presses have been occupied not with apologies, but with seeking plausible phrases with which to cover their reactionary despotism, such as “dictatorship of the proletariat,” “Soviets,” “the rule of the workmen and peasants.”

At first Lenin endeavored also to distort and twist the word “democracy” to his purposes, but the Soviet régime was steadily becoming more and more anti-democratic and the effort was soon abandoned. It has been widely claimed that at the Soviet Congress in December, 1920, and in the Communist Party Congress in March, 1921, the Bolsheviks abandoned a large part of their practices and doctrines, threw communism overboard and adopted capitalism. The fact is that one steady and ceaseless change in the Bolshevik position has been to get farther and farther away from democracy

and nearer and nearer to the absolute dictatorship of Lenin and those about him.

At the outset Lenin made a strained effort to claim that the Bolshevik régime was democratic. In order to do this he made use of the favorite Bolshevik propaganda trick of employing a word to mean the very opposite of what it does mean. Nevertheless at that time he did *wish the world to believe* that the Bolsheviks, in some sense, represented the Russian people.

The Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates constitutes the form of government by the workers, and represents the interest of all the poorest of our people, of nine-tenths of the population, aiming to secure peace, bread and liberty. . . . (Nicolai Lenin in a book entitled "The Proletarian Revolution in Russia," edited by Louis C. Fraina, pp. 24-25).

In the *Die Kommunistische Internationale* in 1919 Lenin similarly wrote:

So Soviet or proletarian democracy has its birthplace in Russia. It represents another stage in evolution following upon the Paris Commune. . . . For the first time in the history of the world a Soviet or proletarian democracy has created a democracy of the masses of the working people, of the laborers and the small peasantry.

Never before in history has there been a government truly representing the majority of the people and rendering effective the actual power of this majority except the Soviet.

So anxious was the Bolshevik dictator to claim that he had the support of the Russian people and so con-



fidant was he of his capacity to win that support that he even had the courage to make democracy fundamental in the Communist doctrine as he formulated it at that time. This may be seen in his report to the Communist Congress in March, 1919—a report accepted, like all of Lenin's, by the Congress. In this report, reproduced in the *Petrograd Pravda* of March 8, 1919, we read:

That which definitely distinguishes a dictatorship of the proletariat from a dictatorship of other classes, from a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in all the civilized capitalist countries, is that the dictatorship of the landlords and of the bourgeoisie was the forcible suppression of the resistance of the overwhelming majority of the population, namely, the toilers. On the other hand, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the forcible suppression of the resistance of the exploiters, that is, of an insignificant minority of the population—of landlords and capitalists.

It therefore follows that a dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily carry with it not only changes in the form and institutions of democracy, speaking in general terms, but specifically such a change as would secure an extension such as has never been seen in the history of the world of the actual use of democratism by the toiling classes.

And in actual fact the form of dictatorship of the proletariat which has already been worked out in practice, that is, the Soviet authority in Russia, the Räte system in Germany, the shop stewards' committees, and other similar Soviet institutions in other countries, all represent and realize for the toiling classes, that is, for the overwhelming majority of the population, this actual possibility to use democratic rights and freedoms, which possibility never existed, even approximately, in the very best and most democratic bourgeois republics.



Of course, there was never any foundation in fact for these statements any more than there is any truth in most of the other assertions of this Communist Marx. The Reign of Terror and the dictatorship of the Communist Party held in Soviet Russia then as now. Moreover Lenin himself was forced to state repeatedly that in using the word "democracy" he did not mean to suggest anything at all similar to any democracy that had ever existed anywhere in the world before, until, finally, he was forced to give such strange interpretations to the word as to make it mean its very opposite.

On the 8th of April, 1920, he said at the Russian Labor Union Congress that no state had shown such a democratic spirit as Soviet Russia and proceeded to show what he meant by democracy by demanding that the policy be continued of "making the laboring masses participate in politics under the direction of the Communist Party."

During the course of 1920 the anti-democratic course of the Soviet régime became more and more marked and its support among the population became narrower and narrower. In the opening speech of the Congress of the Communist Internationale, Zinoviev declared:

*The idea of democracy has faded away before our very eyes. When the American bourgeoisie before the eyes of the whole world suspended constitutional guarantees, when this much-praised democracy violated all the principles established by it—by this it itself determined its place. On this question there should not be two opinions. In noting the victory over the II Internationale it is necessary to emphasize the much-debated point, and finish once for all with democratic tendencies.*

A very clear statement of the steady intensification of the war against democracy that has been going on ceaselessly in Soviet Russia has been made by Isaac A. Hourwich, recently legal adviser for the Russian Soviet Bureau in America:

“All movements heretofore have been movements of minorities or in the interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is an independent movement of the enormous majority.” From the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. . . .

The Bolshevik revolution dealt a heavy blow to that theory. In Russia the proletariat is only a minority—this fact is not disputed by either the Bolsheviki or the anti-Bolsheviki, and it is this minority that seized the political power and established a dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . This is the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Communist Parties of all countries and even the Socialist Center [i.e., the Menshevists and other orthodox Marxists] have accepted the new formula—the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Soviets, and have renounced “democracy” in the sense in which that term had been understood in all socialist platforms prior to the Bolshevik revolution. At times the old word “democracy” is still used, but a new meaning is read into it. In the discussion of the 21 points many communist leaders have outspokenly declared against democracy and in favor of dictatorship.

The truth is that experience has demonstrated to the communists that even in the most highly developed capitalistic countries (except, perhaps England) the proletariat is as yet not the majority of the adult population. Therefore, the proletariat is as yet powerless to establish socialism through the machinery of democracy. The proletariat is accordingly faced with the alternative of postponing the establishment of

socialism until the course of capitalistic development will raise it to a majority of the population or of seizing the powers of government by an uprising of an armed minority, and establishing a dictatorship which does not need the support of the majority of the voters.

This quotation is from the *Socialist Review*, April, 1921.

Indeed a thoroughly anti-democratic conception ruled Soviet Russia from the beginning. Without quoting at length from the Soviet constitution on this point, we can with equal effect and more brevity cite the following from a resolution of the Eighth Communist Congress, held March 18-23, 1919:

The Russian Communist Party, developing the concrete aims of the dictatorship of the proletariat with reference to Russia, the chief characteristic of which is that the majority of the population consists of petty bourgeoisie, defines these aims as follows:

The urban proletariat . . . played the part of leader in the revolution. . . . *Our Soviet constitution* reflects that in certain privileges it confers upon the industrial proletariat in comparison with the more scattered petty-bourgeois mass in the village [i.e. the bulk of the agriculturists].

By the spring of 1920 Lenin had already thrown over the democratic idea, together with all hope of gaining the support of the peasants within the next twenty-five or fifty years, for he said at the Trade Union Congress in April:

The peasantry remained, in their production, as property owners and are creating new capitalistic relations. These are the fundamental traits of our economic

situation, and hence originates *the unwisdom of the talk of equality, freedom and democracy*, by those who do not understand the actual situation. (From *Soviet Russia*, December 25, 1920.)

So all the fraudulent pretenses of "democracy," even in the most strained interpretation of the word, have been abandoned. Let us now examine the pretense that there has been instituted a government of "Soviets." In Russian the word "Soviets" means simply "councils." And so it is used, even in Bolshevik Russia, in senses that vary almost from day to day. It is true they have a Soviet constitution but it is subject to unlimited interpretation and administration by the Communist Party—who constructed it, in the first place, for their own purposes. If, however, we turn to the Soviet constitution, on the momentary supposition that it means in practice what it says on paper, we find it full of anti-democratic clauses. Even in the very friendly report of the British Labor Party it is pointed out that clause 23 of the constitution reads:

In the general interest of the working-class, the Russian Soviet Republic deprives individuals and sections of the community of any privileges which may be used to the detriment of the Socialist Revolution.

The British Labor Party report also points out that the peasants have only one-third of the vote per capita of the town electors, that the system of voting is always open, there being no secret ballot, and that the elections are so indirect that the handful of Moscow Commissars



are in complete control, being only "theoretically" responsible to the Soviets.

Just as they have abandoned the pretense of democracy, so the Bolshevists have now given up the pretense of a "Soviet" government, whatever that may mean. Let us note the following from the proceedings of the Communist Internationale, July, 1920.

"All the Russian delegates," says Comrade Trotsky, "when they return from the Congress will have to face a whole series of questions; for example, the proposal of the Polish Government to conclude peace. Where shall we decide this question? In the trade unions? Of course, not there. It is true, we have a Soviet of People's Commissaries, but the Soviet of People's Commissaries also requires political control and definite political direction. We shall give it this political direction on the basis of the work of the party and the political control can be carried out only by the Communist Party."

In spite of the wholly despotic nature of their rule, the Bolshevists hold so-called Soviet elections and send broadcast over the world accounts of electoral victories as proof of the fact that they are a civilized and orderly government with popular support. It may be doubted if such "elections" have occurred in any country for a century or more. An excellent account of the latest Bolshevik electoral victory was given in the German Socialist Press in April, 1920, by the foreign delegation of the Socialist Democratic Labor Party of Russia.

The brilliant victory at elections to the Moscow Soviet as announced by the Communists will probably be able to deceive nobody either in Russia or abroad. After

recent events in Russia the whole world knows what is the true state of mind of the Russian masses and what kind of electoral freedom exists in the free Socialistic Soviet Republic of Russia. This freedom is as follows:

A complete suppression of all freedom of press and assemblage for all inhabitants except Communists.

The absolute prohibition of all other parties to conduct any kind of an electoral campaign.

The illegal Social Revolutionists are not permitted to go to the polls at all, so that this strong party cannot possess a single Soviet delegate (among tens of thousands) in all Russia.

The Socialist Democratic party is formally legal but in fact illegal since regularly before each election there are mass arrests, the victims of which are only allowed their liberty again after the elections.

Public voting by the raising of hands in the election of all officials.

Election geometry as follows: of 1100 delegates in Moscow, 600 were assigned to the army, moreover 200 were appointed by the executive staffs of the red labor unions. [We shall show below that these executives were in turn generally appointed by the choice of the Communist party.]

The above facts are taken from the official declaration of the electoral regulations.

In Bolshevik Russia, then, we do not have a democracy or a Soviet régime but a so-called "proletarian dictatorship." Is it a Labor State? Arguing against Trotzky at a meeting called to discuss the trade unions at the end of 1920, Lenin said:

If we in 1917 [before the Bolsheviks seized power] wrote about a Labor State that was quite clear. But at present, if we say: "Why and against whom is the labor class to be protected, as there is no bourgeoisie,



as the state is a labor state?" we must say "not quite a labor state." This is peculiar inasmuch as many of Trotsky's mistakes are based upon this point. In fact we have not a labor state, but a labor-peasant's state, first of all. Many things may be explained on this account. Already our party program shows that we have a labor state with bureaucratic perversions. That is the reality of the transitory period. Can you tell me whether in such a bureaucratic state, etc.

Also at the meeting of the Congress of Soviets, as reported in the *Petrograd Pravda* of December 23, 1920, Lenin made it clear that he was aware that the non-Communists—the Communist Party including only 600,000 members—did not support the leading policies of his government:

Are the members of the trades unions and most of the non-partisan elements convinced of the necessity of our new methods, of our great tasks of economic construction? Are they convinced of the necessity of giving everything for war, of sacrificing everything for a victory on the military front?

The answer is undoubtedly, No! They are not sufficiently convinced of that.

In Russia to-day we have neither a democracy, a Soviet régime nor a Labor State, but the dictatorship of the Communist Party. The only phrases by which the Communists now insist in disguising their rule are "the dictatorship of the proletariat" and the "Republic of the Workmen and Peasants." The fact that they continue to use these expressions while at the same time they confess it is the Communist Party that governs indicates the brazen deception that permeates their entire propaganda.

The official confession that the Communist Party rules may be seen in the resolution proposed by that Party at the 1920 Congress of the Communist Internationale and accepted unanimously by that body. We quote only a few of the most important expressions from this very interesting document. The meaning is so clear that comments are not called for.

The Communist Party is a part of the working class, precisely its most advanced, most conscious, and therefore most revolutionary part. The Communist Party springs into being through a natural selection of the best, the most conscious, the most self-sacrificing, and far-seeing workmen. The Communist Party has no interests different from the interests of the working class. . . .

The Communist Party is that lever of political organization by means of which the most advanced part of the working class directs the mass of the proletariat and semi-proletariat along the right road.

As long as the governmental authority has not been conquered by the proletariat, as long as the proletariat has not established its rule once for all and has not guaranteed the working class from the possibility of a bourgeois restoration, so long will the Communist Party by right have in its organized ranks only the minority of the workmen. Up to the time of the seizure of governmental authority and during the period of transition the Communist Party may, in favorable circumstances, exercise undivided ideological and political influence upon all the proletarian and semi-proletarian strata of a population, but it can not bring them together in its ranks in an organized manner. Only after the proletarian dictatorship will have deprived the bourgeois of such powerful weapons of effective influence as the press, the school, the parliament, the

church, the administrative apparatus, etc., only after the final defeat of the bourgeois social order will have become evident for everybody, only then will all or practically all the workmen begin to enter the ranks of the Communist Party. . . .

In Germany the Right Independents, whenever they make their halfway steps, allege that they represent the desires of the masses, not realizing that a party exists precisely for the purpose of marching in front of the mass and of showing the mass the road it is to follow.

The Proletarian Revolution, in Russia, has brought to the foreground the basic form of labor dictatorship, viz., the Soviet. In the very near future the following division will establish itself: First, the party; second, the Soviets; and third, the productive unions. But the work both in the Soviets and in the revolutionized productive unions must be *invariably and systematically directed* by the party of the proletariat, i.e., the Communist Party. The organized vanguard of the labor class, the Communist Party, serves equally the interests of the economical, the political, and the cultural struggle of the working class as a whole. The Communist Party must be the soul of the productive unions, of the Soviets of Workmen's Deputies, and of all the other forms of proletarian organization.

The appearance of the Soviets as the chief form of the dictatorship of the proletariat furnished by the history does not in any way diminish the directing rôle of the Communist Party in the Proletarian Revolution.

Again the monopoly of all governmental functions, and of nearly all the most vital economic functions, by the Communist Party was briefly stated by Lenin on November 5th, 1920 (before the Political Education Conference—quoted by *Soviet Russia*, April 30th, 1921). In this speech Lenin referred to that party as necessarily controlling “the mighty state apparatus”

and as "determining everything." His most significant sentences were the following:

*We must openly recognize the predominance of the Communist Party in our policy.*

The party may express the interests of its class more or less, may pass through alterations of one kind or another, but we do not yet know of a better form: no other form has as yet been found in any country. The entire juristic and practical constitution of the Soviet Republic is built upon the fact that it is *the party that is improving and determining everything, reconstructing everything* according to a single principle, in order that the Communist elements in close contact with the proletariat may permeate it with their spirit and liberate it from the heritage of capitalism, which we are so ardently striving to overcome.

Every propagandist belongs to the party, which is *guiding and directing the entire state*, the world struggle of Soviet Russia against capitalism. This propagandist is a representative of the fighting class and party *that controls and necessarily must control this mighty state apparatus.*

What now is this Communist Party which claims to represent the proletariat by divine right, not only in Russia but throughout the whole world—and by representing the world proletariat, proposes to take possession of the earth and all it contains?

Here are the official Soviet statistics of the Party membership of some 604,000 (we omit a few unimportant figures):

Government or town officials.	318,000—53	Per Cent.
Officers and Soldiers .....	162,000—27	“ “
Party Employees .....	36,000—6	“ “
Workingmen .....	70,000—11	“ “



But while the Communist Party represents a little more than one per cent. of the adult population of Russia, Zinoviev, in opening the congress of the Soviets last December (see *Pravda*, December 29, 1920) boastfully asserted that the percentage of Communists in the provincial executive commissions was ninety-nine! From these figures, we may see that in Soviet Russia each Communist counts for as much as ten thousand non-party members.

Yet the Soviet chiefs continue to make the most preposterous claims on behalf of the party. For example Lenin declared in his closing speech at the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party (see Moscow Wireless of March 20, 1921) that "there is no other power except the Communist Party that is capable of uniting millions of widely distributed small farmers." In view of the fact shown in the above statistics that the agriculturists do not include more than two or three per cent. of the membership of the Communist Party although they outnumber that party by more than fifty to one, we can get some notion of the extreme degree of untruthfulness which the Bolshevists, by long and strenuous practice, have finally attained. But all this flood of falsehood is proving useless for Bolshevik purposes, since the discussion within the Communist ranks itself is now disclosing the full truth. Late in 1920 Trotzky complained in the *Pravda*:

The people are now maintaining the same attitude toward the Soviet Régime which they maintained against capitalism, as a force exploiting it and robbing it of its toil. Our problem is to regain the support of the workers.



Ossinsky, a prominent Communist, sums up the anti-democratic retrogression of the Bolshevist régime in *Pravda*, December 20, 1920, as follows:

For three years the Soviet Government has seriously turned aside from the principles of proletarian democracy, and from the spirit of the Soviet Constitution. On the one hand, there have been created two legislative bodies, not provided by our constitution—the Council of Defense and the Military Revolutionary Council; on the other, all constitution organs (legislative as well as executive) have virtually disappeared.

The eclipse of the Central Executive Committee is generally known. But even the Council of People's Commissars and the Council of Defense, which have ostensibly replaced the Central Executive Committee, have been, in their turn, eclipsed by still another body.

In reality the centre of political leadership has been shifted to the Central Committee of the Communist party, and even here to a smaller body, the "Political Bureau" of this committee.

Legislative measures, diplomatic acts, and military plans decided by this "Politik-Bureau" are formally sanctioned and issued in the name either of the People's Commissars or the Council of Defense. Diplomatic notes and military plans do not need even such formal sanction of any of the existing legislative or executive organs of the State.

In describing the steady reactionary trend toward the dictatorship of a smaller and smaller number of men, we cannot stop with the assertion that it is the Communist Party that controls, for the question arises, who controls the Communist Party? This is easily answered. At a special meeting of the Soviet Economic Conference in January, 1920, Lenin said:

No matter what domain of Soviet activity we turn to, we see a small portion of the conscious proletariat, a still greater number of the less conscious, and then at the very foundation, an enormous mass of peasants who have all retained their individual economic habits of free commerce and speculation. Such are the conditions under which we must act and which determine appropriate methods of action. . . .

In the *autocracy of the chiefs of communism* and the *communist domination of the people* lies the pledge of our success.

What we really have in Soviet Russia is the rule of the chiefs of the Bolshevist Party, the congresses of that organization being cut and dried affairs. We must not forget that the Commissars in control of the Bolshevist Government are able to apply their dictatorial power over Communist party members, using not only rewards and punishments for their purposes but also the frightful "Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-Revolution." Furthermore the Executive of the Party reserves the right of purging it from time to time of unsatisfactory members and thousands upon thousands have been put out in this way. At the same time entrance is made extremely difficult and is controlled by the central committee. The excuse for all this centralization within the Party is, of course, the necessities of the revolutionary civil war that is still raging and, as we show below, is expected to continue to rage for the next twenty-five or fifty years.

The following paragraphs from the long resolution of the Second Congress of the Communist Internationale already quoted sufficiently indicate the power

placed in the hands of the Communist bosses by the constitution of their organization:

The 2nd Congress of the Communist Internationale should not only affirm the historic mission of the Communist Party in general, but should indicate to the International Proletariat, at least in its fundamental features, precisely what kind of a Communist Party we need.

The Communist Internationale considers that the Communist Party should be built up on the basis of iron proletarian centralism particularly in the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to be able to direct successfully the activities of the working class in the long and persistent civil war which impends, the Communist Party itself must operate within its own ranks in iron military order.

Under the "military order" of an "iron proletarian centralism" any practical person may easily grasp the futility of such reforms as are now proposed for "the ending of the dictatorship of the people's commissars" and "the taking over of actual control of the affairs of state by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets." (Resolution of the 1920 Soviet Congress.) Where is there any authority honestly to carry out this proposed change outside of the Communist Party? The resolution on February 9, 1921, by which the Central Executive Committee ordered the local Soviets convoked and given "full power," was also mere verbiage. As these local governing bodies consist to the extent of ninety-nine per cent (see Zinoviev's figures above quoted) of Communists under the dictatorial power of the Soviet Commissars as chiefs of the Party, what change has taken place?

But is this a merely transitional party dictatorship while the foreign wars continue and while the victory of the Communists is not yet assured? Not at all. In his speech before the Communist Internationale, as quoted in the *Moscow Pravda*, December 3, 1920, Zinoviev declared: "After the victory the role of the party does not decline but on the contrary increases." We have already quoted the resolution of that Congress referring to "the long and persistent civil war which impends." Again Lenin says in his "Theses," which were adopted by the Congress:

The conquest of political power by the proletariat does not bring about the cessation of class struggle against the bourgeoisie, but on the contrary, makes this struggle especially wide, sharp, and pitiless.

What before the victory of the proletariat appears theoretically as merely a difference of opinion on the question of "democracy," after the proletarian victory becomes inevitably a question to be decided by force of arms.

On January 30, 1921, Lenin said to the visiting delegation of Spanish Socialists:

We never speak about liberty. We practice the proletariat's dictatorship in the name of the minority because the peasant class has not yet become proletariat and are not with us. It will continue until they subject themselves. Presumably the dictatorship will last about forty years.

Similarly Lenin declared to Serrati, the Italian revolutionary leader, a few months earlier, that the



dictatorship would last twenty-five years to fifty years. The Second Communist Internationale concludes its discussion of the dictatorial rôle of the Communist Party (above quoted) as follows:

The aim of a political party of the proletariat disappears only with the complete destruction of classes. In the process of achieving this final victory of Communism it is possible that the specific gravity of the three fundamental proletarian organizations of our time, the party, the Soviet, and the productive unions, will undergo changes, and that eventually a unified type of labor organization will become crystallized. But the Communist Party will become dissolved completely in the working class at the time when Communism will cease to be the aim of the struggle, and *when the whole working class will become communistic.*

The fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not regarded as a rapidly passing phase was again brought out by Lenin at the Congress of the Communist Party in March, 1920—when the Bolshevist leader said:

We must base our activities with regard to class relations in our country *and in other countries, so as to retain the dictatorship of the proletariat for a prolonged period* and to extricate ourselves if only gradually from the misfortunes and crises which have come upon us.

Not only do the Bolsheviks promulgate for all countries a long period of dictatorship similar to what we now see in Russia, but they believe that this will be a period of civil war justifying all manner of terrorism, violence and extreme measures. As the resolution above cited frequently says, a long period of civil war



is before us. During this civil war no other parties have a right to represent the proletariat, no matter what their numerical support, except the Communist Party. The attitude of the Communists toward other political organizations of labor is shown by the following remarks of Lenin:

We see in practice that the unity of the proletariat during a social revolution may be achieved only by the extreme revolutionary party of Marxism, and only by means of a ruthless struggle against other parties—(Lenin at Transport Workers' Congress—*Economic Life*, December 3, 1920).

The Social Revolutionaries, the Menshevists and the Kerenskys? . . . Everyone who is at present acting against the Soviet Government and calls himself a non-party member lies—(Lenin at meeting of Central Executive Committee, Moscow Wireless, March 23, 1921).

Not only are all other labor parties and non-party members declared to be non-labor or bourgeois, but, whenever they assume any importance, they are definitely excluded from the Soviets, as we see from the following decree:

(All-Russian Central Executive Committee, June 14 (1), 1918.)

Whereas, The presence in the Soviet organization of representatives of parties that clearly strive to discredit and overthrow the authority of the Soviets is absolutely inadmissible:

Therefore, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Soviets resolves to exclude from its membership representatives of the parties of Socialist-Revolutionaries (Right and Center), Russian Social-Demo-

cratic Workmen's Party (Menshevists), and also to propose to all Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers', Peasants' and Cossacks' Deputies to remove the representatives of these fractions from their midst.

(Signed) PRESIDENT OF ALL-RUSSIAN CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
Y. SVERDLOV.  
Secretary—V. Avanesov.

Not only are leaders of all opposition parties excluded from the Soviet whenever they become powerful, but they are regarded as traitors and treated accordingly. The only opposition tolerated is obliged to call itself "non-partisan," and even the non-partisans are "suspect" and subject to sudden punishment.

[Lenin's speech above quoted is only one of many evidences of this attitude.]

## IV

### THE REIGN OF TERROR

As early as September, 1918, Mr. Wilson, then President, made an effective appeal to the civilized world against the crimes, the "barbarism," the "mass terrorism" and the "indiscriminate slaughter" of the Bolsheviks. He called for all civilized nations to withdraw their official representatives from Soviet Russia, and every civilized nation without exception responded to his call.

The reign of terror continues and in many respects has grown worse. Again and again the Bolshevik chiefs and assemblies have re-endorsed terrorism. At the second congress of the Communist Internationale, in the summer of 1920, Lenin declared that "no dictatorship of the proletariat is to be thought of without terror and violence against the bitter foes of the proletariat and the laboring masses." Let us remember that this international meeting is the highest Communist authority and the principles accepted there are binding until the next annual meeting, and that Lenin and his immediate associates reserve to themselves the right to define just who are to be regarded as "the bitter foes of the proletariat and the laboring masses."

Anybody Lenin and Trotzky desire to destroy they first label "bourgeois," but they are just as ready to apply this term to laboring men or their elected leaders

or to laboring agriculturists as they are to apply it to former employers. On October 5, 1920, Trotzky said:

The bourgeoisie must be torn off, cut off. The Red Terror is an instrument used against a class doomed to go under and which does not want to go under.

An even stronger expression was used at the beginning of the Bolshevik rule by Latsis, one of the chiefs of the Extraordinary Commission, which is charged with putting the Red Terror into effect. In the organ called the Red Terror (November 1, 1918) Latsis wrote:

We are no longer waging war against separate individuals. We are exterminating the bourgeoisie as a class.

Do not seek in the dossier of the accused for proofs as to whether he opposed the Soviet Government by word or deed. The first question that should be put is to what class he belongs, of what extraction, what education and profession. These questions should decide the fate of the accused. Herein lies the meaning and the essence of the Red Terror.

This description gives a good picture of the methods of the Red Terror, but the list of classes which were to be exterminated was soon extended to embrace all anti-Bolshevists, no matter whether they themselves were wage earners and no matter how many thousands or ten thousands of wage earners they represented. In a speech made on April 3, 1921, before the railway workers in Moscow Lenin stated that "the bourgeois class does not exist any more in Russia," and boasted

that it had been "completely destroyed" by the Bolsheviks. We may point out that this is merely a terrible boast, for it is well known that after slaughtering the "bourgeoisie" for a year or more Lenin publicly acknowledged that he not only needed the experts in this class but was ready to retain them at very high salaries. But in view of their previous treatment and the treatment of their relatives and friends we can be assured that these bourgeois, far from being good Bolsheviks, maintain their former views and are waiting for a chance at revenge.

Trotsky has tried to justify mass terror (from signed article in *Izvestia* of January 10, 1919, under title "Military Specialists and the Red Army"):

By its terror against saboteurs the proletariat does not at all say: "I shall wipe out all of you and get along without specialists." Such a program would be a program of hopelessness and ruin. While dispersing, arresting and shooting saboteurs and conspirators, the proletariat says: "I shall break your will, because my will is stronger than yours, and I shall force you to serve me." . . . Terror as the demonstration of the will and strength of the working class, is historically justified, precisely because the proletariat was able thereby to break the political will of the intelligentsia, pacify the professional men of various categories and work, and gradually subordinate them to its own aims within the fields of their specialties.

The conspirators referred to in this paragraph are all those who stand for the right of the Russian people to elect their own representative government in the place of the tyranny that is now imposed upon them; the



“saboteurs” are the professional men and experts whose wills could not be successfully forced.

In a letter to British labor dated May 30, 1920, Lenin, after denouncing the democracy of the British Labor Party, their pacifism, etc., says of its leaders: “The sooner they share the fate of Kerensky, the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists in Russia” the better. What this fate was we shall see below. Lenin then continues:

Some of the members of your delegation have asked me with surprise concerning Red Terror, about the lack of the freedom of the Press, about the lack of freedom of assembly, about our persecution of Mensheviks and Menshevik workers, etc. . . . Our Red Terror is a defense of the working class against the exploiters; it is the suppression of the resistance of the exploiters with whom the Social Revolutionists, the Mensheviks, and an insignificant number of Menshevik workers align themselves. . . . The same “leaders” of workers who are conducting a non-communist policy are 99 per cent. representatives of the bourgeoisie, of its deceit, of its prejudices.

Here is a definite official statement by the Bolshevik chief that a regularly elected labor leader may be regarded as 99 per cent. bourgeois—and he is often so regarded for purposes of imprisonment or execution.

The Bolshevik Czar recently issued a ukase saying that prisoners belonging to all active anti-Bolshevik groups would be held as all bound together as hostages for the lives of the Bolshevik chiefs—referring back to the butchery of hundreds of such hostages after the assassination of the bloody Uritzky and the attack

on Lenin in 1918. Here are the words of the decree as carried in the official *Izvestia* on November 30, 1920:

Confident of its impregnability, the Soviet Government is nevertheless very far from offering an opportunity to these counter-revolutionists and agents of the Allies for resuming again the methods of struggle used by them in 1918 and *resulting in a stern lesson in Red Terror in retaliation.*

The Workers' and Peasants' Government has in its hands quite a sufficient number of prominent and responsible counter-revolutionary leaders from the camp of all the above-mentioned groups, especially from among the Wrangel officers. *Regarding all of them as bound together in a mutual pledge to relentless struggle against the authority of the workers and peasants,* the Soviet Government declares the Socialists—Revolutionists of Savinkov's and Chernov's groups, the White Guards of the National and Tactical Centre, and Wrangel's officers—hostages. In the event of an attempt on the lives of the leaders of Soviet Russia the responsible partisans (literally in the Russian text—those who think likewise) of the organizers of an attempt will be exterminated without mercy.

In order fully to realize what this means let us quote from the appeal to the Socialists of the world by Martoff, leader of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party—an appeal that has been endorsed by the well-known syndicalist Merrheim, head of the French Metal Workers and one of the leaders of the *Confédération Générale du Travail*. Referring to the above ukase, Martoff, who is well and favorably known by the entire labor movement of Europe, writes:

Let all who would take this warning lightly remember the fatal experiment which has already been made

in Soviet Russia. In September, 1918, after the murder of Uritzky, Chief of the Petrograd police, and the attempt to shoot Lenin, the Soviet Government declared *all the anti-Bolsheviks* to be hostages in the event of further assassinations, and at the same time, as a reprisal for the acts of terrorism already committed, ordered a number of these "hostages" in several towns to be shot.

It is impossible to estimate the number of men and women killed at that time. The general public commotion forced the Government to conceal the true extent of the hideous massacre after the publication of the first lists of victims. But from these lists it is known that in Petrograd 512 people were shot, 152 in Penza, 41 in Nijni-Novgorod, 30 in Smolensk, 29 in Moscow, 6 in Mojaisk, 4 in Morshansk, 7 in Nijni-Lvoff, and 7 in Schemlara. The last echo of this madness was the proclamation of the Petrozavodsk (in Northern Russia) Extraordinary Commission that it shot 14 bourgeois hostages as a revenge for the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht!

Just after the above-mentioned attempts on the lives of Lenin and other Bolsheviks, the Social-Revolutionary party stated officially that it had nothing to do with these assassinations; but this statement did not prevent the Bolsheviks shooting down like dogs members of the Social-Revolutionary party. *The terrorist madness of the Bolsheviks, once let loose, ignored the difference between the different sections of their political opponents.* In Petrograd they shot the metal worker Krakovsky, a member of the Social-Democratic Labor Party; three members of the same party in Ribinsk, leaders of local trade unions (Ramin, Sokoloff and Levin); and in Nijni-Novgorod the secretary of the local party committee, Comrade Ridnik.

The great majority of the victims belonged to the bourgeois class, and were not mixed up with politics; they were arrested, not because of some crime com-

mitted, but as "suspicious persons" whom it was necessary to isolate. Men and women, boys and aged people—all were shot because two men, political fanatics, had plotted the murder of two leaders of the Communist party.

The official execution and wholesale butchery of hostages referred to by Martoff is boastfully avowed in the official Soviet pamphlet by which the Bolsheviks have sought to sum up and popularize the Red Terror and the Extraordinary Commission. This pamphlet, written by Latsis, is printed by the Soviet Printing Office in Moscow, 1920. As to the 1918 butchery, Latsis in Chapter 5 of the pamphlet declares:

But the murderess, the hysterical Kaplan, missed her aim. *The Extraordinary Commission exacted costly retribution for these murders. In Petrograd alone as many as 500 persons were shot as an answer to the shots fired at Comrades Lenin and Uritzky.*

Those who dreamed of killing the revolution by murdering the leaders severely wounded themselves, and the damages inflicted by the proletariat were a whole year in healing.

The Bolshevik remedy for insufficient productivity on the part of labor, known as sabotage, is thus summarized in Chapter 3 of this illuminating document:

Those who were practicing sabotage were (either) shot to death or imprisoned by us, but nevertheless up to this time they have eluded us in large numbers and destroyed our apparatus and transports. Such work is nothing else than the same counter-revolution. It was so regarded by the Extraordinary Commission,



and those guilty of sabotage were punished without mercy. The Extraordinary Commission threw its best forces into the fight against this manifestation, and is now working in various institutions. *There is but one way to get rid of this pestilence—burn it out with a hot iron. And that is what the Extraordinary Commission is doing.*

We now come to another class of crime punished by execution without trial or any other process of law, viz., the crime of affiliation with the socialist and labor parties which think they have a right to a voice in the government in proportion to their numerical support. This is not the Bolshevist view. And the punishment for the effort to institute either a democratic or a non-Bolshevist socialist government of any character is likely to be death. We quote the following from Chapter 4 of the above mentioned official pamphlet:

But there is still another kind of counter-revolutionists—those who are such because they do not think. These are people who not seldom desire the triumph of the working class, but do not understand how this is to be accomplished. This is the whole Socialist Party, entering into agreement with the enemies of the working class, the bourgeoisie. There are several such parties among us; Social-Revolutionists of the Right, Social-Revolutionists of the Left, and the Mensheviks.

They do not believe in the strength of the working class and therefore desire to trade with their class enemy, the bourgeoisie. *They forget that civil war is a war not for life but to the death; a war in which prisoners are not taken and no compromises made, but opponents are killed.* As there can be no amity between wolves and lambs, so there can be no conciliation between the bourgeoisie and the workmen. You may beat the wolf



as you will but he will still remain savage; so the bourgeoisie does not change his nature.

We must recall in this connection that the civil war is looked upon by the Bolshevists as likely to last a generation or more and that all non-Bolshevist working men are labelled "bourgeois."

Without counting irregular executions, assassinations, massacres and military killings of many different kinds, the Extraordinary Commission, in the pamphlet quoted, confesses that it executed 2,024 persons for the sole fact of belonging to an anti-Bolshevist organization—such organizations, as we have said, being always labelled for Bolshevist purposes as counter-revolutionary or bourgeoisie. This does not include 3,082 persons executed for insurrection and 455 for inciting insurrection. The immense scope of the Extraordinary Commission and the use of the death penalty for offenses for which it has not been used in civilized countries for centuries, is shown in Chapter 2 of the pamphlet quoted:

The sphere of the labors of the Extraordinary Commission was determined by the activities of the counter-revolutionary elements; but, as there was no domain of life into which the counter-revolutionists had not intruded themselves, and where their destructive work was not manifested, the Extraordinary Commission often had to enter quite positively into all phases of life: stores, transportation, Red army, navy, militia, schools, consulates, industry, assessments, etc.

But the Extraordinary Commission had to interest itself not only in direct counter-revolutionary work. There are acts committed by no means intended cer-

tainly to injure the Soviet authority, but simply for personal advantage without considering the consequences. Such are speculation, crimes in office (in part), banditry, and desertion.

But as such acts do no less harm to the Soviet authority than the open counter-revolutionary manifestations, they were followed up *in the same manner* as the rest.

For the sake of convenience in assimilating and mastering all the (details of the) immense work performed by the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission, we present it to the reader in the same category which in the main was pursued in the course of the work itself, and in the same order in which it developed, namely:

1. Sabotage.
2. Counter-revolution.
3. Speculation.
4. Crimes in office.
5. Banditry.
6. Uprisings of the rich peasants (land-grabbers).
7. Desertion.

The use of the expression "rich peasant" needs comment. The peasant who is resisting the Bolsheviks is called by them for the purposes of execution "rich." It is needless to say that there are no rich or well-to-do peasants in Russia after all the economic degeneration of the past ten years, and especially in view of four years of Bolshevik persecution and attack on all peasants who were well enough off to muster up any effective resistance.

The attitude to the peasantry is indicated in other Bolshevik documents as, for instance, the following

passage from an order directed against the Cossacks—a name applied to the agriculturists of a certain section:

To institute a mass terror against the well-to-do Cossacks and peasants, exterminating them wholesale, and to institute a ruthless mass terror against those Cossacks in general who have any direct or indirect part in the struggle against the Soviet power.

The Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

Chief of the Chancellery of the Political Section of the Southern Front.

(Signed) Cherniak,  
Secretary of the Political Section of the 8th Army.

Steklov, in the *Moscow Izvestia*, declares that civil war will continue until the Social Revolutionaries and the "koulaks" (the better-off agriculturists) who are hampering the work of construction, particularly that of revictualling, are completely exterminated.

Here is another example. The peasants have in many places organized armies for self-defense which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called Whites. These so-called "Green Armies" are defending the villages from the foraging and punishment expeditions of the Red armies. This is how a recent decree of the Extraordinary Commission in Southern Russia proposes to deal with them:

The majority of the Greens who are now in the mountains have their relatives in the villages. These have all been registered, and in case of an attack by these bands all adult relatives of those who are fighting against

us will be shot, while their minor relatives will be deported to Central Russia.

In the event of a mass rising of any village, *stanitza* or city, we shall apply mass terror against these localities; for every Soviet representative that will be killed hundreds of inhabitants of these villages and *stanitzas* will have to suffer.

The Bolshevik remedy for any and all opponents is to find some opprobrious epithet to apply to them, indicating treason to Bolshevism, and then to crush them with the Red Terror. This method is evidently to be used even against the valiant Red Army. The peasants who constituted ninety per cent. of the Army are being demobilized. The remainder, said to be some hundred thousand men, are either mercenary foreigners, Chinese, Hungarian, Letts, etc., under the name of the "international" army, or communist fanatics. The first step towards the persecution of the rank and file of the Red Army was to deprive them of all rights. Leon Trotzky in his Order of the Revolutionary Military Council, No. 296, dated November 10, 1920, declared:

The country is in danger. The false notion that the army has any civic rights threatens the existence of the free Russian people and the Revolution.

It may be recalled that the Bolsheviks came into power by standing for the rights of soldiers even to the point of the right to elect their own officers. But now, having deprived the peasant soldiers of all rights, Lenin is apparently upon the point of turning the Red Terror against them. To a meeting of the railway



workers in Moscow, reported in the Bolshevist Wireless of April 3 (1921) he said:

The soldiers do not wish to go back to cultivate their land and become peaceful workers. The demobilized soldiers are our greatest enemies. They have been accustomed to rob and pillage and murder. They have been accustomed to satisfy only their own needs and desires.

It is evident that a despot who feels he has the power to wage war against the personnel of his own army is liable to proceed against any other element of his subjects.

The use of the Extraordinary Commission and of terroristic methods against labor is shown in the following passages from the report drawn up on February 1 by the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party:

In Mohilev the entire membership of both the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party and the Bund were arrested during the night of the 1st of November. The Extraordinary Commission gave the following motives for the arrest: "*guilty of pernicious criticism of the Soviet power and its activities, thereby affecting very badly various measures taken by said power, and, since it occurred in the war zone it affects detrimentally the gallant Red Army.*" Among those sentenced (to forced labor in various concentration camps until the end of the civil war) were. . . .

Towards the close of the year the "verdict" (administrative order without trial) was handed down. Astrov, Korobkov, Grossmann, Babin, Tkatchenko, Kuchin-Oransky and others were sentenced "for belonging to the right wing of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party" to confinement in a concentration camp *throughout the duration of the civil war.*



In Yekaterinburg our attempt to take part in the election campaign for the Soviet was punished by the arrest of the local Committee of our Party (comrades Kliatchko, Ossovsky and others), together with the member of the Central Committee, D. Dalin and 6 workers of the Verkhne-Issetski Factory. At the home of N. N. Sukhanov a domiciliary search was made. A month later the prisoners were freed by a direct order from Moscow, as the purpose of the arrests had been accomplished, the elections to the Soviet having been most "successful" for the Bolsheviki.

In Tula the outrageous behavior of the factory Commissary caused an outburst among the workmen of the Arms Factory, which spread to all other establishments in that city. The protest took at first the form of a strike, but following the arrest of strikers it assumed the form of so-called "self-imprisonment," i.e., the workmen and their wives compelled the Bolsheviki to arrest them, thus expressing their solidarity with the prisoners. In this way several thousand workers were arrested in those days. The reprisals were severe, wholesale deportations to the front were resorted to and, as a climax, 12 of the strikers were turned over to a field court martial and sentenced to hard labor for life. And in reply to the attempt made by the Social-Democratic group of the local Soviet to have the trouble settled peaceably, the group was arrested during its session.

The Social Democratic Party (Menshevists) have also brought before the labor world a full report of the persecution of the Russian printers and of other Soviet atrocities against labor.

This party finally made a strong appeal to British Labor—prompted by the fact that the British Labor delegation to Russia had issued a report that was in

part mildly critical or ambiguous, but, on the whole, was distinctly friendly to the Bolshevik régime. Individual members of the delegation—practically half of it, including Tom Shaw, Ben Turner, Mrs. Philip Snowden, Dr. Haden Guest, as well as Bertrand Russell, who accompanied the delegation had issued the strongest adverse statements. But the report, as a whole, was friendly, doubtless owing to domestic politics and to diplomatic motives which do not appear. This was all the more shocking to the Russian Socialists and Trade Unionists since all other foreign labor delegations—Germans, Italians, Swedish and Spanish, had had the courage of their convictions. (See Chapter XII.) The Social Democratic appeal is therefore doubly important, serving not only as a picture of Russian labor persecution but as an indictment of the inexcusable failure of the British delegation even to touch on these vital matters in its one-sided report—from which was excluded also the valuable individual testimony of Mrs. Snowden and other delegates, while the pro-Bolshevik material of the extremists, Robert Williams, Purcell, and Margaret Bondfield, was reproduced.

The Social Democratic appeal secured the following endorsement from Merrheim, Secretary of the largest French labor union, the Metal Workers, a leader of the French Confederation of Labor, and an ultra-pacifist and syndicalist himself:

Such are the facts. . . . There should arise the vehement and indignant protest of all trade union members and socialists (throughout the world) who still have a sense of dignity and independence.

The principal paragraphs of this appeal are as follows:

**To the British Workmen and to the Members of the  
Labor Delegates to Russia**

DEAR COMRADES:

We, the undersigned, Russian socialists, have received from Russia the information stating that the visit of the British labour delegation to Russia last summer has resulted in severe reprisals and persecutions for all the socialists who were bold enough to criticize openly the soviet regime and the actions of the Russian communist party.

Well-known leaders of the labour movement in Russia, who for many years fought against Tsarism, who spent long and weary years in prison and in exile, and who hold prominent positions in the Russian trade union movement, have once more been severely sentenced, imprisoned and exiled by the soviet government.

We wish to repeat here a few facts mentioned in the above circulars:

1. Comrade F. Dan, a member of the central committee of the Russian socialist-democratic labour party, and one of the oldest members of the party, has been exiled from Moscow to Perm.

2. Two members of the central committee of the socialist-democratic party (Mensheviki), Comrades Dalin and Troyanovsky, are in prison in Moscow.

3. All the members of the executive committee of the Moscow printers' union, headed by Comrade Deviatkin, have been arrested; the printers' union is dispersed; workmen who came out on strike to express their protest against such actions of the soviet government have been searched and prosecuted.

4. Victor Chernov, a member of the central committee of the socialist-revolutionary party, spoke at the

printers' meeting in Moscow in the presence of several members of the British labour delegates; he was, however obliged to hide after this speech, as it has made the Extraordinary Commission (Cheka) very angry, and they wanted to arrest him. They could not find him, and arrested instead his wife and daughters, aged 10 and 17 years.

5. Comrade Abramovich, member of the central committee of the socialist-democratic party, welcomed the British labour delegation at a meeting of the Moscow Soviet. In his speech he pointed out the actual condition of the Russian labour classes under the bolshevik yoke, and was in consequence, through intrigues and pressure from the Russian communist party, expelled from the soviet.

We are in possession of many other similar facts, but it would take too long to state them all here. We think that the above facts are quite sufficient proof that there is no freedom in soviet Russia, and that even the socialist parties can not propagate their ideas legally and unrestrictedly.

We feel we must put the following questions to the British workmen and to you, members of the British labour delegation. Do you know these facts? *If you do, what do you intend to do in order to alleviate the sufferings of these Russian socialists who were bold enough to tell you the entire truth about Russia? Don't you consider that you are also responsible for their misfortunes and sufferings?*

We, the adherents of the socialists who are being so severely persecuted by the Russian communist party ruling in Russia under the disguise of the soviet government, think you can not and must not be indifferent to the actual results of your policy.

We are deeply convinced that in protesting against the blockade and intervention the British proletariat was prompted by noble motives—the British workmen meant to support the cause of the Russian democracy, the cause



of the great Russian revolution. If they did mean so, they must understand that the struggle against the world's reactionaries must go hand in hand with the struggle for the principles of the Russian democracy.

*You denounce the blockade, the intervention and the counter-revolution. But you must also denounce the slavery that has been introduced into Russia by the Russian communist party. Only then will the Russian working classes consider you their real friends. . . .*

You have interfered in Russian domestic affairs by your struggle against the blockade, against support of the counter-revolution, and for the recognition of the soviet government. Your intervention was and is one-sided. You supported the soviet government, but you did not support the Russian proletariat and peasantry who fought against the despotism of the soviet government during all these terrible years. . . .

Some thirty days after this original appeal was issued the Social Democratic Party followed it up with a second appeal showing that the persecutions, instead of becoming milder, had become worse, especially under the Soviet Government set up by Moscow in the Ukraine under the leadership of Lenin's right bower, Rakovsky. This Ukraine persecution seems to have been aimed mainly and almost exclusively at the labor unions. The Social-Democratic Labor Party portrays it in the following convincing paragraphs:

With the object of the suppression of the social-democratic labor party, the bolsheviks have invented a new weapon, which was used for the first time by H. T. Rakovsky. The so-called Ukrainian government ordered the exile to the Georgian borders, without any trial, of seventeen of the most energetic leaders of the Russian social-democratic labor party in the Ukraine. Amongst



them are the members of the central Ukrainian committees of the social-democratic party—comrades I. Bar (former editor of the internationalist journal, “*Golos*,” in Paris during the war), Zorohovitch, Shtern, A. Roubt-zoff (a well-known leader of the trade union movement amongst the metal workers), Schoulpin (leader of the Miners’ trade union), and a member of the Kharkoff party committee, Boris Malkin. Ten other comrades were sentenced at the same time, also without any trial, to forced labor in the concentration camps, until “the end of the civil war” (i.e., indefinitely). Among them are the well-known social-democratic leader and trade unionist, Astroff, the trade unionist, Korobkoff from Odessa, members of the Kieff party committee, Tchijevsky and Kouchin-Oransky (the latter, a well-known socialist author, had voluntarily joined the ranks of the “Red” army as an officer at the beginning of the Polish war), and the distinguished leaders of the Kharkoff shop assistants’ union of Babin and Grossman.

Most of the above mentioned comrades were arrested in Kharkoff on August 19, during the provincial conference of the Russian social-democratic labor party.

Several social-democrats, leaders of the trade union movement in Kremenchug, were also exiled to Georgia. The boards elected by the Kremenchug trade unions have been dissolved and replaced by persons appointed by local organizations of the communist party.

By such measures H. T. Rakovsky, who plays the hideous part of a menshevist renegade, hopes to destroy the influence of the well-organized social-democrats upon the Ukrainian working classes.

The fate of the other popular party (the Social-Revolutionists) has been even more horrible—for they composed the majority of the constitutional assembly which the Bolsheviks dispersed by bayonets and are the sole party which can make any legitimate claim to represent the

masses of the Russian peasants. The Social Revolutionary Party has also addressed to world labor a vigorous protest outlining the refinement of physical and moral tortures introduced under Lenin through that revival of the Spanish inquisition, the Extraordinary Commission for Fighting the Counter Revolution, presided over by the world famed inquisitor and butcher, Djerzinsky.

The social revolutionists state that the wife of one of the prisoners, A. T. Kuznetzov, was flogged by the Bolshevik authorities for refusing to divulge her husband's whereabouts; that not only were the wife and daughters of Chernoff, Likhatch and the other leading social revolutionary prisoners arrested but that in some cases, their *distant relatives* were held as hostages; that the inquisition proposes to the wives of prisoners to enter into its services as spies, promising to free their husbands in return.

Here are the conditions of Russia's "political prisoners" and "conscientious objectors" as defined by the executive committee of Russia's largest political organization. The protest is addressed in the first instance to the Soviet authorities:

The refined cruelty of the all-Russian and provincial Extraordinary Commissions has reached such a stage as to drive insane some of the arrested socialists-revolutionists who can not endure the regime of confinement in the city of Yaroslav, in the so-called "soviet house of detention," over the entrance of which there is flaunting a sign reading: "Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic" and above which sign there is the old Tzarist inscription: "Yaroslav Central Hard Labor Prison." There are many tried and true champions of the workers' cause among

these persons to whom the March Revolution at last opened the doors of their prisons, only to find the bars, after a brief period of liberty, again closed on them, this time, however, by your hands.

The prison regime to which our comrades have been subjected in the Yaroslav soviet house of detention has outdone the regime of the Tzarist central prison, and even during the walks of the prisoners for their airings they have been forbidden on pain of the severest penalties to exchange ordinary greetings with each other. Confined to damp, cold solitary cells, left for a long time already without necessary repairs, with broken-down heating, water and drainage systems, the prisoners have been deprived of sunshine, light and air, and compelled to live amidst filth and pestilential stench; and if some of them dared approach a window for a moment, the prison guards would open fire at the window, acting in accordance with instructions given them.

But if the outrages and brutalities, the denial of light and air, and the shooting at the windows only repeat and, perhaps, augment the methods used by the Tzarist jailkeepers, *torture by hunger is a new invention of the "socialistic" prison regime.*

The form of feeding the prisoners at Yaroslav falls even far below the rations officially acknowledged by you as hunger rations. The prisoners receive one pound of raw, half-baked bread, and soup with some beet leaves or herring bones for dinner, and three or four spoonfuls of gruel for supper. But then, this gruel is no longer given, and they are trying to make the dinner soup last for both dinner and supper. This is all the nourishment there is. *Such is the regime of gradual death by starvation established by you for your prisoners.*

You will perhaps point to the critical food situation all over soviet Russia, and you might say that the food committees are not in a position to allot from their supplies any more for the feeding of socialists languishing in communist prisons.

But it is not for the food shortage of soviet Russia that the Yaroslav hunger torture can be explained away. Were that the case, the organs of your political police would not interfere with the food assistance that we are willing to render the prisoners from the outside. At the cost of tremendous efforts and immense sacrifices the relatives of the prisoners have organized food assistance to be sent to the prison. But permission for these gifts has been hedged in by the special section of your extraordinary commission with all kinds of conditions which made it impossible during two months to send more than two relief shipments. An attempt was made to supply the prisoners with money, so as to enable them to order some products permitted in the open market, but the prison authorities accepted only a certain amount which they deemed proper to confiscate right there and then in payment of the damage caused to the prison department ostensibly by the demonstration of the prisoners at the Butyrski prison. (Although it was proved that none of these prisoners had participated in that outbreak at the Moscow prison.)

Under these circumstances all efforts to fight the hunger torture have proved futile.

Now, what is your object in this?

Do not excuse yourself by claiming ignorance. You know, you can not help knowing, what is going on, to the glory of your name, in Yaroslav. It has been discussed with the president of the council of people's commissaries, Lenin himself, with the chairman of the central executive committee, Kalinin. and with many others of you.

By the hands of your henchmen, in your communistic torture-chamber of the Yaroslav central prison, you want to finish secretly and unobserved that which the Tzarist jailers did not manage to complete: in the tortures of death by starvation you want to kill these old champions of socialism and the revolution!



What is the cause of all these persecutions? The answer is simple: the continued strength and popularity of the Social-Democratic Party and labor unionists in the cities and of the Social Revolutionary Party of the country. At a recent conference in Moscow, the Soviets' leading authority, Rykov, according to the *Krasnaya Gazeta*, made the following declaration:

*The workers are discontented with power, for they are hungry and lack clothing. In many of the large factories there are no communists. There results a political weakening of Bolshevism, notwithstanding its strategic successes. It is not possible to create a single economic plan when 80 per cent of the population are peasants who will not allow themselves to be regulated.*

The Social-Democrats elected a majority in the Soviets in many parts of the country and recently secured two-thirds in certain elections in Petrograd. It was this that led Lenin to an even stronger expression than Rykov, when (early in this month of February), he declared, in the *Petrograd Pravda*, that "*the fight between the labor unionists and the soviets for supremacy will break up the bolshevist state system unless a settlement is soon reached.*" The offense of the labor unionists is very clear. They are fundamentally opposed to the so-called government set up by Lenin and his handful of associate dictators. Lenin declares, "they are out for material benefit for themselves at the expense of the general welfare of the communist state." Lenin is the sole interpreter of the welfare of this "proletarian" state; the organized proletariat has no voice.



## SLAVERY AND COMPULSORY LABOR

WORKING men and their organizations suffer not only from the lack of any form of representative government or freedom of press or assemblage, and not only from the persecutions of the Extraordinary Commission, but also from Soviet legislation aimed directly at Labor.

After a year of syndicalism, factory Soviets and anarchy—during which production was reduced to less than one-seventh of its previous level—the Soviet “Government” in 1919 reversed its industrial policy and began to have recourse to one form after another of labor compulsion or enslavement. Compulsion has never, throughout history, produced the same degree of efficiency as freedom, but some of the most extreme disorder was cured and the Bolshevists gave figures to prove that the output of Russian industry had now “risen,” though in a few cases only, to as high as two-thirds of its pre-war level—a level which was very low indeed in comparison to that of more advanced countries.

The first completed plan of labor compulsion was that devised by the “Code of Labor Laws.” Some of the principal clauses of this slave code, as it was published in the official organ of the Soviet “Embassy” in America, called *Soviet Russia*, on February 21, 1920, were as follows:

The assignment of wage earners to work shall be carried out through the Departments of Labor Distribution.

In case of urgent public work the District Department of Labor may, in agreement with the respective professional unions and with the approval of the People's Commissariat of Labor, order the transfer of a whole group of wage earners from the organization where they are employed to another situated in the same or in a different locality, provided a sufficient number of volunteers for such work cannot be found.

The production standards of output adopted by the valuation commission must be approved by the proper Department of Labor jointly with the Council of National Economy.

The Supreme Council of National Economy jointly with the People's Commissariat of Labor may direct a general increase or decrease of the standards of efficiency and output for all wage earners and for all enterprises, establishments and institutions of a given district.

The Ninth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, the real Soviet Government, which took place a few weeks later (in April, 1920), attempted to give reasons for the new coercion plans. The chief arguments used were these:

The Ninth Congress approves of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party on the mobilization of industrial proletariat, compulsory labour service, militarisation of production and the application of military detachments to economic needs.

In connection with the above, the Congress decrees that the Party organisation should in every way assist the Trade Unions and the Labour Sections in registering

all skilled workers with a view of employing them in the various branches of the production with the same consistency and strictness as was done, and is being carried out to the present time, with regard to the commanding staff for army needs. . . .

Every social system, whether based on slavery, feudalism, or capitalism, had its ways and means of labour compulsion and labour education in the interests of the exploiters.

The Soviet system is faced with the task of developing its own methods of labour compulsion to attain an increase of the intensity and wholesomeness of labour; this method is to be based on the socialisation of public economy in the interests of the whole nation.

In addition to the propaganda by which the people are to be influenced and the repressions which are to be applied to all idlers, parasites, and disorganisers who strive to undermine public zeal—the principal method for the increase of production will become the introduction of the system of labour. . . .

Owing to the fact that a considerable part of the workers, either in search of better food conditions or often for purposes of speculation, voluntarily leave their places of employment or change from place to place, which inevitably harms production and deteriorates the general position of the working class, the Congress considers one of the most important problems of Soviet Government and of the Trade Union organisation to be established is the firm, systematic, and insistent struggle with labour desertion. The way to fight this is to publish a list of desertion fines, the creation of a Labour Detachment of Deserters under fine, and, finally, internment in concentration camps.

A resolution was also adopted which still more clearly defined the nature of the new enslavement and pointed out the “necessity” for using the same punishments for

labor desertion as those employed in cases of military desertion:

The organisations of the Party must assist in every way the Trade Unions and labour departments in registering skilled workers for the purpose of employing them in productive labour on the same principles and with the same severity as are adopted with regard to officers mobilized for the requirements of the army.

The officers' families, it may be recalled, are held as hostages for their good behavior.

If we wish to get a picture of how this industrial mobilization or militarisation works out in practice we can refer to the report presented to the International Federation of Trade Unions late in 1920 by representatives of the Russian Metal Workers Union.

Militarisation means a complete and absolute subjection of the workmen to the work's management. It embodies a number of stern measures, also restriction of leaves and cruel suppression of strikes.

In order to show to what extent militarisation is carried out in the metal industry we quote below an extract from an article, which appeared in the XIII issue of the journal "Metallist" in August, 1920, and was contributed by a Communist worker, Khronin: "Absolute submission to the director has been introduced at these works (Plow works of Kostroma); neither interference nor contradiction on the part of the workmen are tolerated. The instructions given by the works committee are in accordance with the instructions of the Works' Management. At our works absence without permission of the foreman means suspension of the extra ration. Refusal to work overtime also means suspension of ration. Whereas an obstinate refusal means arrest.



For being late at work a fine of two weeks' wages is imposed."

When the Bolsheviks came into power they abolished overtime work in all branches of industry. But as the output was decreasing in an alarming way and as many skilled workmen went to the villages the Soviet Government, as far back as the beginning of 1920, reintroduced overtime work. At first it was optional, but in the summer of this year it was announced that overtime is compulsory.

At a secret meeting on the 5th of September, 1920, the representatives of the Petrograd Labour Organizations adopted the following resolution: "Never before has overtime work been practised so widely as now; the worst of it is that more than 80% of the overtime is compulsory and any refusal on the part of the workmen is severely punished."

Overtime work is remunerated as follows: for the first two hours—double pay; for the second two hours—time and a half.

The normal working day is 8 hours and 44 hours per week, but owing to compulsory overtime the Russian metal worker works now 12 hours a day, and 72 hours a week. Sometimes compulsory work is performed on Sundays, which makes 80 hours per week.

The workmen, far from being pleased with these methods, resist them, and as a result a wave of strikes passed all over Soviet Russia in 1920.

There is little known in Europe about these strikes or the measures taken to suppress them, as the Bolshevik Government which controls all papers and journals, does not allow this information to appear in the press. But in official documents we find the following information (Central Committee of Statistics of the Commissariat of Labour).

During the first six months of 1920:

1. Strikes have been called in 77% of the large and middle sized works.



2. In nationalized undertakings strikes are continuous and 90% of them are called at such factories and works.

As a part of the system of Labor compulsion absolute dictators have been placed over the factories with the power of life and death. Schliapnikoff, Chief Commissar of Labor, printed the following explanation in the Russian Bolshevist press on November 13, 1919:

All those circumstances (a total absence of order and discipline in the factories) put together have compelled us to abolish the Working Men's Councils and to place at the head of the most important concerns special "dictators," with unlimited powers and entitled to dispose of the life and death of the workmen.

The "Code of Labor Laws" was by no means the last experiment in methods of enslavement, Trotzky following this up with the plan for utilizing the thousands of conscripts of the Red Army for purposes of labor, thus going back to the military slavery of ancient Egypt and Peru.

Lenin and Trotzky have freely expended their rhetorical and propaganda talents to justify the new slavery, not as a temporary expedient but as resting upon the permanent principles of Sovietism. In his booklet "The State and the Revolution" (pages 51 and 67) Lenin says:

We want the Socialist revolution with human nature as it is now; human nature itself cannot do without subordination. There must be submission to the armed vanguard of the proletariat.

Until people grow accustomed to observing the elementary conditions of social existence without force and

without subjection there must be suppression, and it is clear that where there is suppression there must also be violence and there cannot be liberty or democracy.

This reasoning on the surface means that no peoples are ready for liberty or democracy, and as there must be some form of dictatorship, why not the dictatorship of Lenin and his Party? But under the surface is also the shrewd calculation, evident throughout the Soviet leader's statements, that the Russian masses, being accustomed to merciless repression and subjection will finally give up hope of self-government and submit to the Soviet's rule if the Bolsheviks can remain a few years longer in the saddle.

In his official report to the Soviet Economic Conference in January, 1920, Lenin frankly justified the rule of a minority of the city workers, which he calls the conscious "vanguard," over the majority of the city workers as well as the peasants who constitute 90 per cent of the population—and it is to be an arbitrary personal rule like that of the army. Here is what he said:

In the organization of the army we have passed from the principle of command by committee to the direct command of the chiefs. We must do the same in the organization of Government and industry.

Through committee power and its development we have arrived at autocracy, but it does not give that rapidity to our work which is required by the situation. In the autocracy of the chiefs of Communism and the Communist domination of the people lies the pledge of our success.

So in speaking of the new compulsory labor armies under military discipline Trotzky said at the same congress:

This is but the beginning of our work. There will be many drawbacks at first, much will have to be altered, but the basis itself cannot be unsound, as it is the same as that on which our entire Soviet structure is founded (i.e., this is not a temporary military expedient).

As to the workmen, Trotzky said:

All artisans will be sent into the works and transferred from one place to another, according to the indications of the Government. We will have no pity for the peasants; we will make labor armies of them, with military discipline and Communists as their chiefs. These armies will go forth among the peasants to gather corn, meat and fish that the work of the workmen may be assured.

The Soviet scheme of compulsory labor is being applied on such a broad scale and is so boldly presented as a "proletarian" scheme that it constitutes the gravest danger that has confronted labor for centuries. It is undoubtedly destined to become historic. It is therefore well worth while to present at somewhat greater length the extraordinary reasoning by which Trotzky and Lenin seek to defend it. The first full justification was presented by Trotzky to the Communist Party Congress in March, 1920, and was published in the official Soviet organ of Moscow on the 21st. Its most important points are perhaps the following:

At the present time the militarization of labor is all the more needed in that we have now come to the

mobilization of peasants as the means of solving the problems requiring mass action. We are mobilizing the peasants and forming them into labor detachments which very closely resemble military detachments.

Some of our comrades say, however, that even though in the case of the working power of mobilized peasantry it is necessary to apply militarization, a military apparatus need not be created when the question involves skilled labor and industry because there we have professional (labor) unions performing the function of organizing labor. This opinion, however, is erroneous. . . .

We have in the most important branches of our industry more than a million workmen on the lists, but not more than eight hundred thousand of them are actually working, and where are the remainder? They have gone to the villages or to other divisions of industry or into speculation. Among soldiers this is called desertion, and, in one form or another, the measures used to compel soldiers to do their duty should be applied in the field of labor.

Under a unified system of economy the masses of workmen should be moved about, ordered and sent from place to place in exactly the same manner as soldiers. This is the foundation of the militarization of labor, and without this we are unable to speak seriously of any organization of industry on a new basis in the conditions of starvation and disorganization existing today.

In the period of transition in the organization of labor compulsion plays a very important part. The statement that free labor, namely, freely employed labor, produces more than labor under compulsion is correct only when applied to feudalistic and bourgeois orders of society.

Later in the year in an article republished by the official Bolshevik organ in America, *Soviet Russia*, Trotzky explains at length that compulsory labor is the backbone of Soviet communism. According to Trotzky



Russia is in a period of transition to communist socialism which must last many years. He says:

The transition to socialism means the transition from a rudimentary distribution of labor power (by the play of purchase and sale, by movement of market and labor wages) to a planful distribution of workers through the economic organs of the district, of the province, of the entire country. Such a planful distribution presupposes the subordination of those to be distributed to the economic plan of the state. This is the essence of labor duty, which unquestionably is contained as a fundamental element in the program of the socialist organization of labor.

The carrying out of obligatory labor is inconceivable without an application of the methods of the militarization of labor in greater or less measure.

Why do we speak of a militarization? Of course this is only an analogy. But it is a very pregnant analogy. *No other social organization, with the exception of the army, has ever considered itself justified to subordinate citizens to such an extent, to develop them on all sides by the application of its will as the state of the proletarian dictatorship is doing and considers itself justified in doing.*

Trotsky asserts that compulsory labor is the very foundation of the Soviet State and that it will have to remain the basis until the coming generation through compulsion, terror, and the Bolshevist press and school monopoly (which Trotsky calls education) has converted the population into communism. This is the view expressed in the "theses" which he presented to the Economic Congress on January 24, 1920. One of these "theses" is the following:



In building up a society upon the remains of a very much confused and disorganized industry, transition to a systematic basis is inconceivable without the application of compulsory measures relating to the backward elements of the peasantry *and working class*. The means of compulsion at the disposal of the state form its military power. Consequently, the organization of work on a military basis, in some form or other, is an unconditional necessity for *every society which is built upon the principle of compulsory labor*.

Compulsory measures will be less and less needed as the system of socialization of industry develops, and the conditions of labor become more favorable, and as the educational level of *the coming generation* is raised.

Noteworthy in this "thesis" is the fact that any element of the working class which the communists may be pleased to designate as "backward" is to be treated the same as the Russian agriculturists or peasants, i.e., the same as the outlawed "bourgeois."

By such arguments Trotzky defends also the introduction of the Taylor system, bonuses, etc.:

"Therefore wages for labor," he continues, "both in the form of money and in that of commodities, must be made to coincide as far as possible with the productivity of the individual laborer. Under capitalism, piece work and agreements for pay, application of the Taylor methods, etc., had the object of increasing the exploitation of the workers by squeezing out a surplus profit. In socialist production, pay for piece work, premiums, have the object of increasing the social production and with it also the general well-being."

Yet one of the slogans by which the Bolshevists tricked labor into that measure of support they needed to get

themselves into power was precisely the abolition of the bonus system. In November, 1917, Lenin said: "The bonus system is a heritage of the capitalistic regime and we repudiate it." And now we see the bonus system not only restored but established in places where it did not exist before.

Another promise to labor by which the Bolsheviks were helped into power was a shorter working day. Now they have made long hours and Sunday work compulsory:

Our workday lasts twelve hours. We are compelled to work in two shifts in the paper department of our factory, and we are forced to work both Saturdays and Sundays. No exception is made with regard to women. Since August 15, overtime work has become compulsory. (Resolution of Petrograd government printing office workers.)

No leave of absence is to be granted to the workers. Failure to do overtime work is punishable, the first time by forfeiture of food allowance, and the second time by court action. Lateness of ten minutes on the job will be fined with loss of a day's pay. (From an order of the Petrograd government printing office, signed by Manager Forst, August, 1920.)

A report at the Russian Trade Union Congress of 1920 declared that the flight to the villages was so great that the proletariat was disappearing, melting away. Surely a rather serious state of affairs under the "dictatorship of the proletariat!" The official representative of the Petrograd labor unions in one of their resolutions declared;

We feel as if we were hard labor convicts, where everything but our feeding has been made subject to iron rules. We have become lost as human beings, and have been turned into slaves. (Resolution of Petrograd workers of September 5, 1920.)

It must not be supposed that the arguments of Lenin differ from those of Trotzky on this fundamental point. The American organ *Soviet Russia* declares that Soviet Russia is "the property of the producers" and "every worker belongs to Soviet Russia." No more absolute abandonment of individual liberty has ever been seen in print. *Soviet Russia* then proceeds to justify itself by reproducing the following article from the pen of Lenin, who differs from Trotzky only in the proposition that methods of compulsion will have to be continued not for one but for many generations:

Communist labor, in the strictest sense of the word, is the voluntary labor of future society, performed without pay, not as a definite duty, not in order to obtain the right to a share of production, and not according to rigid rules. It is labor performed freely, bound by no rule, without regard to compensation, and not with an eye to any reward. It is labor performed as a habit, for the common good, and with the realization of its necessity (which will also become a habit), in order to provide for the needs of society.

It is clear to every one that we, and this means our society, must advance very far indeed before labor of this kind can be realized in our social order.

To build up a new labor discipline, to create new forms of social relations, to find new methods of drawing people to work—this is a task of many generations. It is the supreme task. . . .

To succeed in great things, we must begin in little things. And even after the "great" thing—the overthrow of the state, whereby capitalism is destroyed and power is transferred to the proletariat—the formation of industrial life on a new basis must start with the little things. Communist Saturdays, industrial armies, compulsory labor—these are various forms of the practical working out of Socialist labor.

A radical American Socialist, Albert Boni (formerly of the publishing firm of Boni and Liveright) who has just returned from several months in Soviet Russia has given us, in the *New York Globe*, a pro-Soviet newspaper, the following unforgettable picture of the new slavery.

The industrial collapse of Russia brings not merely a problem of technical reorganization, replacement of machinery and supplying raw materials and motive power. The Communist party is facing a situation in which the laboring classes, in whose behalf, supposedly, the Communist party is working, are proving themselves not only unwilling, but unable to endure the hardships and suffering that industrial disorganization has imposed upon them. In the face of impossible living conditions, the workers are abandoning the cities for the country and its more certain existence.

To meet the dearth of man-power, the Russian government decreed that every male over sixteen years of age must labor at such tasks as the state may assign. Labor books, showing that this obligation is being fulfilled, have been issued to all citizens, replacing passports and all other identification papers.

Wherever plans of the central government meet with opposition they have one resort that never fails—military force and the terror imposed by the extraordinary commission. But the peasants are already in a state of too



great restlessness to permit of forcible measures over wide stretches of territory without great risks of serious consequences. Conscription of labor is going forward very slowly, and only where the Communist forces are gathered in such strength that resistance is rendered impossible.

*The Russian laborer is held tied to his shop as closely as any feudal serf was bound to the land of his lord.* Transfer of employees from one factory to another is possible only with the consent of the shop directorate. Travel beyond a radius of twenty-five miles is possible only with the consent of the local representatives of the extraordinary commission, which permission is granted only upon the request of the factory executive. Desertion from factories is punishable by reduction of food ration, and, if repeated, by arrest and internment in concentration camps. Some of the most important plants are being operated like military encampments, workers' quarters having been erected upon the grounds. There the employees are held under armed guards and require special passes to enter and to leave.

Military discipline has been introduced in all works. Fines are imposed for workers arriving late, heavy punishments are exacted from those failing to appear unless satisfactory justification of their absence is forthcoming. Factories are again placed under individual control with dictatorial power in directorates' hands over conditions of work. Overtime is demanded as required. Piece work, premiums, the Taylor system, all possible methods are introduced to speed up the exhausted worker. In each factory are representatives of the extraordinary commission reporting all cases of discontent and mischief makers are dealt with severely. *Strikes are absolutely forbidden, and any attempts to organize the workers to resist the imposition of new demands are called counter-revolutionary activities for which long-term imprisonment is the lightest possible punishment.*



As far as is possible under that ruthless tyranny the organized labor of Russia is everywhere in a state of full revolt. The organized workers are doing what they can to reach the hearts and minds of laboring humanity in all countries, but they are working against overwhelming obstacles—the refusal of the bread card, which means immediate starvation for their families, the firing squad, death by torture in prisons. It is difficult for them even to speak, and a decree especially forbidding speeches at labor union meetings has been issued. Martoff, the world-renowned leader of the Social-Democratic Party, has described a special decree prohibiting—under threat of the revolutionary tribunal—speeches at workmen's meetings without special permission from the Moscow authorities. Martoff says that since the decree was issued not a single social-democrat has obtained this permission. Another decree calls for the compulsory attendance of workmen at meetings at which the benefits of Soviet rule are expounded, time being paid for attendance!

## VI

### THE PERSECUTION OF ORGANIZED LABOR: TRADE UNIONS

IN Soviet Russia the Bolshevists are using many words with a new meaning. It has been shown how they sometimes employ the word "democracy" to mean the reverse of what all civilized peoples and all the labor movements of the world have hitherto meant by the word. So also, after abolishing all the rights of labor and labor organizations and of cooperatives the Bolshevists, nevertheless, continue to apply the terms "trade unions" and "cooperatives" to the empty shells that remain.

In *Soviet Russia* (April 2, 1921) we read: "The trade unions have been practically transformed into organs of the Soviet Government. Membership in the trade unions is now compulsory for Russian workers." Never before has the term "trade union" been applied to a compulsory state organization. We shall show below that even the Bolshevists themselves are divided as to whether they shall now regard all the seven million industrial, governmental and agricultural workers whom they seek to classify as the "proletariat" as being members of the trade unions or not. It is conceded that a large part of these people do not realize that they are members of trade unions and do not even pay dues. In fact, the dues seem to be paid by the Government, as we

may see from the following Moscow wireless sent out in December, 1920, to trade union officials throughout Russia:

In compliance with the decision of the 8th Congress financial accounts must be rendered every month. The majority of Government Trade Union Soviets at present do not render any such accounts. The Central Soviet of Trade Unions begs to inform all Government Soviets of trade unions that unless they send in monthly accounts dating from October 30th in compliance with regulations, they will receive no funds. The decision of the People's Commissariat.

Also these "trade unions" do not have the right to strike or to propose a change in the form of government. They may elect their own officials if the officials elected meet the approval of the Communist Party, otherwise the officials are "appointed."

In his report to the party printed (See *Krasnaya Gazeta*) January 11, 1921, Zinoviev declared:

At the present moment we have 24 trade unions, counting in their ranks 6,970,000 members. But the larger portion of these members have been ascribed to the unions mechanically.

Only a minority, at the very best, half a million, are members of the party.

If we recall the fact that only 70,000 industrial workers are listed by the Communist Party itself as party members, we see that Zinoviev's estimate of communist trade unionists is indeed high—as he confesses. The British Labor Delegation to Soviet Russia reports

an entirely different number even of "mechanically ascribed" so-called "trade unionists." They say:

It was put to us that the Communist Party, numbering 600,000 members, could be likened to a small cog-wheel which turns a larger cog-wheel representing the Trade Union movement numbering 4,500,000 members. This in turn revolves the great wheel of Russia's industrial and agricultural system.

Whether the number of workers labeled "trade unionists" by the Soviet Government is 4,500,000 or 7,000,000, whether the number of party members among them is 100,000 or 500,000, it may be seen that the proportion of Communists is not higher than one-ninth, and probably very much less.

According to Zorin's official report, on June 1, 1920, out of the 29,000 railroad workers of the Petrograd district only 895 were Communists, while of 5,000 employed in the water, gas and electric works only 145 were Communists—that is three per cent in each instance.

The decisions of the Communist Party do not leave any doubt about the place of these so-called "trade unions" in the Soviet State. The party congress in April, 1920, was very explicit on the subject, as we may see from the following decisions:

#### The Trade Unions and the Soviet State.

The Soviet State is the widest imaginable form of Labour Organisation which is actually realising the construction of Communism, constantly attracting to this work ever-growing masses of the peasantry. On the other hand, the Soviet State represents Labour Organisation which has at its disposal all the material means of com-

pulsion. In the present form of Proletarian Dictatorship, the Soviet State is the lever of the economic coup d'état. There is, therefore, no question of opposing the organs of the Soviet Government.

Politics may be said to be the most concentrated expression of the generalisation and completion of economics. Therefore, any antagonism of the economic organisation of the working-class known as the Trade Unions towards its political organisation—i.e., the Soviets—is an absurdity and is deviating from Marxism towards bourgeois ideas and particularly towards bourgeois Trade Union prejudices. This kind of antagonism is still more harmful and absurd during the epoch of Proletarian Dictatorship when all the struggle of the proletariat and the whole of its political and economical activity should more than ever be concentrated, united and directed by one single will and bound by an iron unity.

#### The Trade Unions and the Communist Party.

The Communist Party is the leading organisation of the working-class, the guide of the Proletarian Movement and of the struggle for the establishment of the Communist system.

It is therefore necessary that every Trade Union should possess a strictly disciplined organised fraction of the Communist Party. Every fraction of the Party represents a section of the local organisation which is under the control of the Party Committee, whilst fractions of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions are under the control of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

Under such a regulation it was natural that even the hollow shells of "trade unions" should almost cease to exist, and it seems that an accusation to this effect was actually made by Trotzky at a meeting reported in



*Izvestia* January 1, 1921, as we may see from the following remarks by Zinoviev:

Many people say that the Professional Unions just at present are suffering a grave crisis, and even that our Unions are on the brink of ruin. Comrade Trotzky began with this point. No one can say that our Unions are in a satisfying shape. On the contrary the apparatus of the Unions is very weak, and will remain weak as long as their financial support is as small as at present.

And is it true in fact, what comrade Trotzky said: "Where are the Professional Unions, they are doing nothing, they have no foundation." The Professional Unions are weak owing to the civil war and to lack of attention, but is it really true, that they do not exist?

For such "trade unions" to strike is not only against the law; it is regarded as treason or desertion, and it may be punished as such. For example, the Moscow Soviet, as reported in *Izvestia* of July 2, 1918, resolved:

As from now, the organised forces of the proletariat, the trades unions (professional associations) will be under the management of the Council of National Economy, which will organise the management and production of industrial enterprises. Under these new methods of management, the workers will see to discipline and the increase of productivity, and will end the economic disorganisation. Under these conditions every stoppage of work and all strikes will be an act of treason to the proletarian revolution.

A picture of the practical workings of this kind of "trade unionism" was given to the British Labor Delegation in Moscow by one of the officers of the Printers' Union, A. Kefali, on May 23, 1920. We quote a few

sentences only from this extremely interesting and important speech—which the printers assert led to the imprisonment of all the chief officers of the union:

One may exhibit a sitting of the Moscow Soviet, consisting exclusively of Communists; one may show a sitting of the Russian Central Board of Trade Unions, consisting exclusively of Communists, but one cannot show a single free workmen's meeting that will have a Communist majority.

Here are thousands of Moscow printers, behind whom stand scores of thousands of Moscow and other Russian workmen who, at the epoch of the Russian Revolution, under a government that calls itself a workmen's government—a government realising its socialistic programme, a government calling Socialism to life, a government annihilating the parasitic classes—those thousands of Moscow printers, I say, and behind them scores and hundreds of thousands of Russian workmen, have all of them under this government no right to vote, no right to assemble, no right to print. As in the time of the Czar's government, the printers are forced to print, not their own thoughts, but calumnies against themselves.

Communists sometimes use menaces of arrests against the workers to oblige them to leave their posts in the board of the Union voluntarily, and in practice this often happens. Sometimes they do it otherwise; they say that if a Communist is not elected to the Board or Factory Workers' Committee, they, the Communists, will arrange things so that their workers will receive less food and other necessary things. And sometimes this produces its effect. This affirmation can be verified in a series of factories in Moscow.

When such means have no result, the Communists let the local Soviets or the Central Council of Trade Unions dissolve the Board of the Trade Unions; such was the case with the first Central Board of the Printers' Union.

The militarization and coercion of labor has proceeded so far as to lead to a movement of revolt even within these governmental "trade unions" and within the Communist Party itself. The revolt began as a reaction against the extreme violence of the head of the Red Army, Trotsky. We take the following from the friendly *New Statesman* of London; it is amply supported by Soviet documents:

It is well known that early in 1920 Trotsky made an attempt to militarise industry by transforming a few of the Red armies into labor battalions.

At first these "Labor armies" aroused much hope and were greatly advertised by the Communists as the last word in a reconstruction crusade, but they soon proved an utter failure.

Only 20-24 per cent. of the soldiers actually did any work—and that in a wasteful and grossly unproductive way. The rest were occupied in supplying them and in preserving the military character of the institution.

After a short period of enthusiasm and exaltation, the experiment was recognized as a wasteful delusion, and the Polish attack made an end of it before its folly became too obvious.

Trotsky, however, did not give up the idea of applying military methods to industry. As the Acting Commissar for Transport, in the absence of Krassin, he introduced military discipline on the railways.

Commissars, revolutionary tribunals, political intelligence and supervision replaced ordinary methods of management.

Elections, even of a limited scope and under pressure, which are still tolerated in other unions, were completely abolished, all officers of the Railway Union being appointed by the Chief Commissar.

All this could be tolerated during the war, because the railways were justly considered a part of the war

machine, but with the war over, the railwaymen began to protest against military management.

Other unions, too, raised their voice against the permanent militarization of the railways.

At the beginning of November (1920) the Conference of Trade Unions passed a resolution which recommended "the most energetic and systematic struggle against centralism, militarization, bureaucratism as well as autocratic and minute tutelage of the workers' unions."

The conference expressed also its conviction that "it is high time for the Railway Union to abolish military methods and return to ordinary proletarian democracy within the union."

But Trotsky—the head of the union—ignored the decision of the conference. Pointing out the manifest improvement of the transport under his management, he started a campaign for the adoption of military methods all round as the basis for a new efficiency in industry.

Far from denying his action in appointing the chiefs of the railway unions, Trotzky defended it at the congress of the transport workers. His speech is quoted in the *New York Call* of January 14, 1921, as follows:

Now as to the question of appointees. Is it right, as the State has said, that it was necessary to change the head official of the union? Rightly or wrongly we have intervened. . . .

The union was not suited to the revolutionary demands of the working-class, and our faction waged a merciless internal struggle and put its own men everywhere. . . .

And so the working-class, in the persons of its political representatives, says: Here we interfere; we are going to narrow this period of struggle between the two groups; we economize; we diminish; we order. To deny the principle of intervention is to deny that we live in a workers' state.



At the congress of the trade unions held early in 1921, Trotzky declared: "It will be necessary to reorganize the unions without delay, that is, first of all to shift the personnel of the more responsible positions." In other words, he proposed to apply generally the system of appointment of labor union officials by the Communist Party—which he had already instituted on the railways. The name he gave to this policy was: "democracy in the matter of production." Even Lenin himself at this meeting made fun of this strange perversion of language—although it is entirely typical of the usual Bolshevik inversions in the use of words. Lenin declared that Trotzky's plan was merely an increase of "bureaucratism." (From report of the All-Russian Conference of Professional or Labor Unions, *Pravda*, January 13, 1921.)

Lenin accused Trotzky of lack of tact in discussing these matters in public. Lenin's own methods are more secretive. He believes that the all-powerful Communist Party, aided by the Red Terror and the Extraordinary Commission, can secure the "election" of "trade union" officials by the methods hitherto employed. What these methods are we can see from a passage already quoted:

We must know how to apply, at need, knavery, deceit, illegal methods, hiding truth by silence, in order to penetrate the very heart of the trade unions, to remain there and to accomplish there the Communist task. (Lenin, in "Radicalism, the Infantile Malady of Communism.")

Lenin's "trade union" program, as he declared at the above meeting, is that the unions should be "per-



suaded" to institute tribunals in order to increase production for the Soviet Government and punish "labor desertion." (See the previous chapter.)

Of course, the "trade union" revolt could not amount to much under the Bolshevist rule. Two factions, however, offered a very vigorous resistance and under the Soviet tyranny it is significant that they did manage, after all, to obtain a certain number of votes. This opposition is divided between the faction which proposed to restore the Soviet rule and a so-called Syndicalist faction. *Neither of them suggests any concession whatever to the peasant majority of Russia*, but both seem fairly strongly opposed to a continuation of the present Communist Party rule. The *New Statesman* correctly sums up the opposition of these factions as follows:

If we consider Trotzky's militarist-bureaucratic proposals as the extreme left, then the extreme right is taken up by the group of the "Labor Opposition," headed by Shliapnikov—chairman of the Metal Workers' Union—the strongest Russian union.

The "Labor Opposition" demands that the entire economy of the Republic should be taken over by a congress of producers, organized in producers' unions. This is a consistent syndicalist conception, based on the belief that economic matters should be left entirely to labor organizations.

Bitterly criticizing the bureaucratic tutelage over the unions by the Communist party, the "Labor Opposition" advocates complete self-government in the factories.

Another faction, headed by Ossinsky and Saprionov, calls itself the group of "Democratic Centralism." This group is one with the "Labor Opposition" in demanding democratic reforms and active participation of the

unions in the management of industry, but is dead against the syndicalist conception of the Metal Workers' Union. Their chief demand is for the re-establishment of the Soviet Constitution.

The official Lenin resolution received 336 votes at the conference, Trotsky's resolution 50, and that of the Labor Opposition 18.

What was the result of this conference? Far from bringing any relaxation of the Communist dictatorship it resulted in putting at the head of the railroads the one man in Russia who is noted as more violent than Trotsky himself, namely, Lenin's right arm, Djerjinsky, chief of the frightful Extraordinary Commission. Such is labor reform and "democratization" in Soviet Russia! As we read in a dispatch of April 19, 1920:

President Djerjinsky of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission of the People's Commissary of the Interior, who is also Chairman of the Extraordinary Commission for the Improvement of Conditions of Life of the Workers, Chairman of the Extraordinary Commission for the Care of Children and of several other extraordinary commissions, has been appointed People's Commissary of Transport and Communications. The present Commissary, M. Emshanoff, becomes Under Secretary.

The decree of the Central Executive Committee explicitly announces that Djerjinsky will maintain all his other positions, thus becoming still more powerful. During the recent animated discussion of the position of the trade unions, Trotsky was severely criticized for introducing military methods into the management of the railways. Trotsky was obliged to retire as Commissary of Transport and Emshanoff returned to the normal methods of management only to give way in a

few weeks to Djerjinsky, who will introduce on the railways the methods of the Extraordinary Commission.

No better illustration of the Bolshevist policy towards labor unions could be offered than the picture given in the appeal to the labor world sent out towards the end of 1920 by the Moscow Printers' Union. We reproduce it here in full, with the exception of a few irrelevant sentences:

### **Appeal of Moscow Printers' Union**

The Printers' Union of Moscow is the last trade union organization that has remained faithful to the principles of the independence of the trade unions and their separate existence as a class organization.

The Moscow Printers' Union defends these principles because a trade union organization can neither subject itself to nor permit itself to be absorbed by the organs of the government under the conditions now existing when private property is not abolished, when the state is the largest if not the only *entrepreneur*, when the purchase and sale of labor power is completely conserved—in a word, when labor's independent and free organs of defense and protection from the pressure of the other classes are indispensable.

In the domain of labor policy the practice of the Soviet government during the three years of its existence presents a striking example of this idea.

The Moscow Printers' Union believes that it is absolutely necessary to carry on a campaign of discussion amongst the proletariat against the political, economic, and administrative monstrosities practiced by the party in power.

For taking this position, for conducting this battle of principles, the Communists hate the printers in a manner surpassing even their hatred for the bourgeoisie and the landlords, at present non-existent in Russia.

The Communists extend one hand to such counter-revolutionary leaders as Broussiloff and Goutor, the Czar's chief generals, and with the other hand, loaded with all sorts of extraordinary laws against the socialists, they oppress with all their power a group of proletarians whose sole crime is that they have had the hardihood to refuse to accept the Communist maxims, presented to them ready-made by the party in power.

The fearlessness of this group of proletarians reached an insupportable point for the masters of the situation when the representatives of the English workers came to Russia. On this occasion the printers organized a meeting in which hymns of praise in honor of the Communist party were not heard but where, on the other hand, the truth respecting actual conditions in Soviet Russia was openly proclaimed.

The Communists, outraged by this meeting, immediately began to persecute the printers. They shrank from no lie and no calumny in the attainment of their purpose, which was to manufacture a false public opinion preparatory to the vigorous punishment they had determined to inflict on the Printers' Union.

It was not difficult for the Communists to administer this punishment, for the printers, like all the other Russian workers, are deprived of the possibility of printing everything that displeases the Communists. For having printed the resolution adopted by the mass meeting in honor of the English comrades, Comrade Zavaroff was arrested. The Printers' Union was interdicted from printing the stenographic report of the meeting. The independent unions were also deprived of their own papers.

The Communists decided to punish the printers severely, especially because it was impossible for them to oppose the opinion of the workers in other industrial branches to the opinions held by the printers. The party in power would without doubt have met with defeat in a free assembly where the two points of view—that



of the Communists and that of the opposition—were given a fair field of contest. It was for this reason that the party in power was compelled to have recourse to meetings under the auspices of dissimilar organizations which were nothing but self-styled representatives of the proletariat; real representation has not existed in Russia for a long time. At these meetings the speakers fulminated against the printers. In this manner the "General conference" of the printers of Petrograd was organized and "unanimously" adopted a withering resolution against the Muscovite printers.

The value of the "unanimity" of the organized conferences, during which, under the menace of terrible reprisals, the representatives of the proletarian opposition are deprived of the possibility of telling the truth, is well known to every Russian worker. For this reason the government journals lodged the senseless and stupid charge of fomenting strikes against the Printers' Union. The printers have struck less than any other group of workers in Russia, thanks to their firm and solid organization. The workers in many other branches of industry, on the contrary, driven by despair, have declared numerous strikes. They saw no other way to improve their conditions. These conditions drove the majority of the Muscovite printers to the same extremity, but the movement was usually arrested by the officials of the Printers' Union.

For more than a month the Communists fashioned public opinion with the aid of their monopoly. They lied and calumniated without shame. Finally during the night of June 17, they arrested all the members of the administrative committee of the Printers' Union and all other officials of the union holding important positions with the exception of those who had the time to hide themselves. On the morning of June 18 the offices of the union were occupied by a detachment of government troops, and everyone who for any reason whatsoever had displeased the Communists was arrested.

In the meantime the private lodgings of the employees of the union were searched.

This new act of violence against the working class aroused the indignation of all the printers in Moscow. They understood perfectly that the administrative council represented the executive organ of all the members of the union, especially because it was elected, contrary to the councils of all the other trade unions and the organs of the government, by universal suffrage.

Some of the workers struck and demanded the release of the imprisoned trade unionists. The masters of the situation employed against the strikers the same measures that the bourgeoisie in every country would like to apply but have never dared to. The strikers were deprived of food. Under present conditions, when the workers are underfed, this was the most rigorous weapon that could be used. At the same time the government placed under arrest the alleged strike leaders. These two measures attained the end desired by the government: the strikers went back to work, and perhaps, under the pressure of similar measures, they will soon be even forced to vote resolutions condemning the men who up to the present have been their leaders. But the hatred of the Moscow printers for the authors of this shameless punishment will not be lessened thereby; on the contrary, it will increase day by day, and a small amount of free atmosphere would suffice to chase the inquisitors away from the printers.

In addressing themselves to the international labor movement, the striking printers declare that, crushed by brutal physical force, they appeal to the only force which still preserves for them a moral significance, the moral power of the international labor movement. The striking printers assert that they can demonstrate to the international labor movement that they are right and not the Communists.

The striking printers declare that the new administrative council of the Printers' Union, which has been

superimposed upon them by force, has no influence and no authority over the great mass of the workers, whose entire sympathy and friendship, on the contrary, are with those who are in prison, the former officials of the Printers' Union of Moscow.

Perhaps the Bolshevist government will institute a prosecution similar to the Beillis prosecution so notorious under the Czarist regime, but the only possible judges at present are the Moscow printers and the international socialist movement.

A judgment rendered by the Communist party would be nothing but a judgment of an interested party, of an adversary who plays the role of a judge in a case involving his political enemies.

So much the worse for them.

But the socialist and labor international will understand!

The entire working class of Russia believes in the Moscow printers!

(Signed) THE MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL OF THE PRINTERS' UNION OF MOSCOW. (ELECTED BY UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.)

## VII

### THE OPPRESSION OF THE AGRICULTURAL POPULATION

Now that Soviet Russia has been cut off from Poland and other industrial districts fully 90 per cent of the population is agricultural. The oppression of the agricultural population by the Communists and the Red Army has been even more frightful than the persecution of labor and its political and economic organizations. The Bolsheviks have acted towards the agriculturist majority in Russia as towards a conquered people, and expressions acknowledging this relation are frequent throughout Bolshevik official publications. For example, in Losovsky's official pamphlet on the new Red Trade Union Internationale (the so-called International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions) he refers to the establishment of the Bolshevik rule as "the subjection of the peasants and petty bourgeoisie by the proletariat." In a speech quoted in *Soviet Russia* in 1920 Lenin says:

The petty bourgeois class in Russia was undoubtedly in the majority. The peasantry remained in their production as property owners and are creating new capitalistic relations. These are the fundamental traits of our economic situation, and hence originates the unwise talk of equality, freedom and democracy by those who do not understand the actual situation.



There is no harmony between the interests of the proletariat and the peasantry. Here the difficulty starts for us.

Already then there was apparent the necessity of individual administration, of recognition of the dictatorial plenary powers of one person for the carrying out of the Soviet idea; therefore all manner of talk about equal rights is nonsense. We conduct the class struggle not on the basis of equal rights. The proletariat wins because it consists of hundreds of thousands of disciplined men, who are animated by a uniform will.

The exact meaning of "the dictatorship of the proletariat" was never stated in a more uncompromising form than in Lenin's celebrated speech at the Communist Party Congress (March, 1921)—a speech heralded throughout the world by all advocates of friendly relations with the Soviets, as the supreme evidence of compromise with capitalism and surrender to the peasantry! We quote a few sentences as given by the official *Russian Press Review* of March 15th.

We regard all these events from the point of view of *the class struggle*. We are not mistaken with regard to the relations *between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie*—a most difficult question, which demands complicated measures in order to secure *the victory of the proletariat*, or to be more correct, a whole system of complicated transitional measures. . . .

What is the meaning of the slogan of "free trade" advanced by the petty-bourgeois elements? It shows that there are some difficulties in the relations between the proletariat and the small farmer which we have not yet overcome. I refer to the attitude of the proletariat to the small property-holders in a country where the proletariat has been victorious and the proletarian revolu-

tion is developing but where the proletariat makes up the minority of the population and the majority is made up of petty-bourgeois elements. In such a country the proletariat must lead the transition of these petty property holders into collective and communist labor. This is theoretically beyond any dispute, and on this we based a number of our legislative acts.

The feature which is peculiar to Russia in the highest degree is that we have here a proletariat making up the minority and a considerable minority at that, of the population, while the overwhelming majority consists of the peasantry.

That is, the class-struggle still continues in the shape of a class-war between the industrial proletariat and the agricultural population or peasants, regarded as petty bourgeois. The proletariat are the victors in this war in so far as they have conquered the peasants and captured the government. But the war continues because the peasant subjects of the proletariat are the overwhelming majority. These peasants must continue to be excluded from all power, but they must be handed down such economic advantages as are consistent with a continued proletarian dictatorship. And in the meanwhile they must be terrorized by frightful punishments against attempting to set up a régime of self-government—as Chapter IV amply demonstrates.

The agriculturists are so few in the Communist Party that they are not usually even listed in the Party statistics. The figures quoted above will show that they do not number more than two or three per cent of that party, that is, not one agriculturist in 10,000 is represented in the organization that governs Russia!

Having counted out the agriculturist majority com-

pletely as factors in the Government and having assigned certain theoretical and "proletarian" reasons for this policy the Communists and Bolshevists in all countries have proceeded to justify themselves by the worst campaign of vilification that has ever been directed against any great people. The Russian agriculturists or peasants are described by the Bolshevists and pro-Bolshevist "liberals," such as H. G. Wells, Brailsford, and Bertrand Russell, as if they were almost savages, preferring retrogression to progress in their own business of agriculture, illiterate, violent, repudiating all urban industry and all government. There is no foundation whatever for these malicious slanders against this great people. The Russian peasants agriculturally are more advanced than the majority of the agriculturists of southern and eastern Europe. Far from being totally illiterate a large proportion of the male population, often estimated at one-half, are literate. Their great desire, like that of other agriculturists, is for better tools, better stock, more farm machinery and better transportation facilities, and they have shown themselves willing and anxious to make heavy sacrifice for these objects. They proved their political intelligence by electing a solid delegation of intelligent progressives to all the Dumas under the Czar and to the Constitutional Assembly forcibly dissolved by the Bolshevists. Far from displaying hostility to the town population they even have adopted in a vague way in the latter's aspirations towards a moderate form of state socialism. But during the Bolshevist régime they have got nothing from the cities except Red Army detachments which have robbed them of everything loose on their little farms, killed them in large numbers and

carried away their men as conscripts for the Bolshevik military adventures in Poland, Siberia, the Caucasus and other far away sections.

To Bertrand Russell Lenin said: "Nothing will do any good except arming the proletariat (that is, that part of the proletariat considered reliable by the Communists). Those who believe anything else are social traitors or deluded fools." Asked by the Norwegian Socialist visitor, Friss, "Do you intend then to use the Red Army against the internal enemy?" Lenin replied: "Yes, of course. What the peasants call a divine right we call high treason."

Again when referring to the plunder of the peasantry before the British Labor Delegation Lenin laughingly replied that they were being paid for what was being taken in worthless paper money. As quoted by Haden Guest of that delegation Lenin was not ashamed: "The peasant," he explained, "is a small capitalist. Therefore, the dictatorship of the proletariat means the government of Russia by the towns. We do not recognize equality between the peasant (that is, the agriculturist) and the town worker."

The Bolsheviks have given various names from time to time for this looting of the countryside by the Red Army. The usual name has been "taxation in kind." As Trotzky declared in certain of his "theses" (*Pravda*, December 17, 1919): "the obtaining of goods from the country will inevitably be considered by the more prosperous elements of the peasant class as a State tax in kind. The methodical and regular payment of such a tax can be assured only by coercion on the part of the State." Not only did the peasants so regard these



requisitions but the Soviet Government itself at first gave them this name, as we may see from a passage in *Soviet Russia* of February 28, 1920:

Beginning with November, 1918, to this old system there were added on two taxes of a purely revolutionary character which stand out apart within the partly out-grown system "taxes in kind" (decree of October 30, 1918), and "extraordinary taxes" (November 2, 1918).

Both decrees have been described as follows by Comrade Krestinsky, Commissary of the Finance, at the May session of the financial sub-divisions:

"These are decrees of a different order, the only thing they have in common is that they both bear a class character and that each provides for the tax to increase in direct proportion with the amount of property which the taxpayer possesses, that the poor are completely free from both taxes, and the lower middle class pays them in a smaller proportion.

"The extraordinary tax aims at the savings which remained in the hands of the urban and larger rural bourgeoisie, from former times. Insofar as it is directed at non-labor savings it cannot be levied more than once.

"As regards the taxes in kind, borrowing Comrade Krestinsky's expression, 'it will remain in force during the period of transition to the Communist order until the village will from practical experience realize the advantage of rural economy on a large scale compared with the small farming estate, and will of its own accord, without compulsion, en masse adopt the communist method of land cultivation.' "

Krestinsky's claim that this intended gradual transition to agricultural communism is not to be compulsory will deceive no one. He himself classes it with the other revolutionary tax which is specifically designed to de-

stroy the larger bourgeois of both town and country so completely that it can be levied only once.

Trotsky is also right about the coercion. There has certainly been nothing voluntary about the payment of this "tax in kind."

Up to April 1, 1919, the Military Supply Bureau (from Petrograd alone) sent 255 military requisitioning detachments to various provinces. (The *Northern Commune*, No. 73, September 4, 1919.)

According to the report presented to the Moscow Conference of Soviets 30,000 men had been sent in the course of a short period, but the majority of them were incapable of performing their task, while others were themselves gross speculators. (The *Moscow Pravda*, No. 105, July 4, 1919.)

An atmosphere of aggression, espionage and bloody strife permeated the villages, coupled with an uncertainty as to the results of agricultural labor. The situation is best illustrated by the fact that out of the 36,500 men forming the total of the food requisitioning detachments during the period from June to December, 1918, 7,309, i.e., 20 per cent., were killed and wounded by the peasants while "collecting the grain." (*Izvestia of the Food Commissariat for December, 1918.*)

From the very first and while all of these activities were going on, Lenin continued his usual policy of applying plausible phrases to the Bolshevist practices. At the Communist Party Congress in March, 1919, he declared:

From the task of suppressing the bourgeoisie we must now transfer our attention to the task of building up the life of the middle peasantry. We must live with the middle peasantry in peace. The middle peasantry

in a communistic society will be on our side only if we lighten and improve its economic conditions. . . .

The middle peasant is very practical and values only actual assistance, quite carelessly thrusting aside all commands and instructions from above.

First help him and then you will secure his confidence. If this matter is handled correctly, if each step taken by our group in the village, in the canton, in the food-supply detachment, or in any organization, is carefully made, is carefully verified from this point of view, then we shall win the confidence of the peasant, and only then shall we be able to move forward. Now we must give him assistance. We must give him advice and this must not be the order of a commanding officer, but the advice of a comrade. The peasant then will be absolutely for us.

The measures previously described are, evidently, examples of "comradely advice" and "actual assistance."

Under these methods the peasants hid their products and sowed less grain in order that there should be nothing left for the plunderers. It was then that the Soviets decided to put still more terror into their actions and to give their requisitions a new name. In order to be able to seize plausibly all grain under all circumstances they declared grain and certain other food products the monopoly of the state. They decreed that the peasants should be left only enough to supply their own families with food and that all the "surplus" should go to the Soviet Government.

Instead of making things better the new method made matters worse. Bolshevist statistics in 1920 admitted that the agricultural productivity of the country had fallen to fifty per cent or less. The area under cultivation had fallen to about seventy per cent. The yield as

the result of bad seeds, the lack of manure, agricultural implements and horses (taken by the Soviet armies), as well as poor and negligent methods of cultivation (partly voluntary) had also fallen so as to reduce the crop to less than fifty per cent.

The following description of the agricultural position in Russia was given in one of the reports read at a meeting in Moscow on February 22, and printed in the *Economic Life* of February 24 (1921):

The present position of agriculture is such that the sowing area is one-third less than in pre-war years. The yield has decreased by 45 per cent. In former years the export of grain amounted to 700,000,000 poods, but in 1918 there was already a deficit in the crops amounting to about 1,000,000,000 poods. The peasantry, constituting 85 per cent. of the population, is no longer a producer, but a consumer. Not finding the necessary commodities he wants on the markets, the peasant reduced his produce to the minimum of his personal needs.

Alarmed at such figures and at the prospect of a greater and more rapid agricultural decay and food shortage the Soviet Congress in December, 1920, decided upon still more violent persecution of the peasantry. The new situation is thus summed up by a friendly correspondent, Michael Farbman:

The threatening famine and its causes should obviously have led to an immediate loosening of the screws and a change of policy, yet the opposite took place. In fact, the Food Department published a programme of grain requisitions almost twice as big as that obtained in the previous year, while Ossinsky, who frankly admitted the peasants' refusal to cultivate their land, outlined a most



fantastic scheme of compelling them to do so. He was not in the least alarmed by the crisis, but frankly expressed satisfaction that the terrible miscarriage of previous schemes for socializing agriculture and the obstinate refusal of the peasants to fall into line justified the state in intervening.

Unfortunately, Ossinsky's ideas aroused the sympathy of the heads of the Food Administration, who were sure their enormous programme of food requisitioning during this famine year would fail unless they were permitted to apply more force than usual. In a few weeks Ossinsky and the Food Administration were able to convince the Communist Party that this new scheme was a necessity. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets last December sanctioned Ossinsky's ideas, adopting a decree "In Aid of Agriculture." The main provisions of this embodied the scheme of compulsory sowing of the fields and established seed funds.

The giving to this decree the title "In Aid of Agriculture" is typical. Lenin also repeated his beneficent phrases at this Congress: "We shall not advance a step in our program without the peasants," and he again said that the law should "assist" peasant farming.

By March the food reserve was almost completely exhausted, the prospects for agriculture were still worse, and the peasant revolts, especially in the grain producing districts, South Russia, Siberia and the Caucasus, were more frequent and menacing than ever before. The Communists, led by Lenin, now decided once more to change the name of their requisitions, reverting from the "grain monopoly" back to "taxation in kind." The Moscow wireless of March 16, 1921, thus reports Lenin's speech indicating this second change in method:

We can satisfy the small farmer in two ways. He must first of all be allowed a certain liberty in effecting exchange, and secondly, we must obtain goods and supplies. Should we be able to obtain a certain amount of goods which the State could use for purposes of exchange, we [i.e. the Communist Party] as a State would add economic power to our political power. Experience will show us how a certain freedom in local exchange is possible, not only without destroying, but in fact strengthening the political power of the proletariat.

We shall be able to obtain a certain part of the goods we require from abroad. If the goods are in the possession of the State then the power of the latter increases. Economically we must satisfy the middle peasant and agree to the freedom [!] of exchange in order to keep power more firmly in the hands of the proletariat.

It will be noted that Lenin reassured the Communists that no concession whatever was to be made in the direction of democracy or towards giving the peasant majority any voice whatever over their own affairs. Indeed in a speech which was made to the railway men at Moscow after the enactment of the new legislation, reported by the wireless on April 3, Lenin made this doubly clear:

As far as I personally am concerned, I know only too well how badly organized are the Russian peasants, how little class consciousness they have. In such circumstances they do not represent a serious menace to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, we must by all means strive to attain union with the peasantry and meet them half with regard to their justifiable demands.

Again we have fair phrases with no real change in the peasants' economic condition:

After hearing Lenin's report, the March Congress passed the following resolution:

(1) In order to ensure the correct and unhindered working of farms on a basis of allowing the owner greater liberty in the use of his economic resources, in order to strengthen peasant farms and increase their output and also in order to accurately estimate the duties towards the State which must be carried out by the landowners, the levy as a means of supplying the State with food stuffs, raw materials and fodder is replaced by taxation in kind.

(2) This tax must be less than the quantity at present demanded in accordance with the State levy. The amount of the tax must be estimated to cover the minimum requirements of the Army, the town workers and the agricultural workers. The total amount of the tax must be gradually decreased as the restoration of transport and industry enables Soviet authority to obtain agricultural products by normal means by exchanging articles produced by factories, works and peasant craft industries for same.

(3) The tax will be levied in the form of a percentage of the produce of the farms, taking into consideration the harvest, the number of consumers on the farm and the actual quantities of live stock.

(5) The law regarding taxation in kind must be drawn up in such a way and published by such a time as will enable farmers to accurately ascertain the amount of taxation which will fall to their share before the beginning of spring work in the fields.

When this law was being put into effect by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets the Moscow wireless of March 23 reported a remark of the president, Kalinin, as follows:

The peasant may exchange his surplus supplies, in excess of the tax, for manufactured articles either at the local market place or through the co-operative societies.

What now had changed besides the reversion to the old name for the forced requisitions? What grain had the Soviets taken before? There can only be one answer—all they could practically obtain. For many reasons it was desirable to leave the peasants enough food so that they could live until the next season and produce a new crop. More than that was not left to them because of the terrible shortage in the cities. Now that the crops are less than ever and the city shortage greater will they revert to any other division of the product? The question only needs to be asked to see what the answer must be.

An effort is to be made, however, to state in advance how much each peasant must pay. In those rare cases where this estimate is for any reason low the peasant may be able to produce a slight surplus for trading purposes. He will then be at the mercy of the Soviets, which have a monopoly of all Russia's imports and most of her home products. The peasant may be able to make some slight exchanges with village workshops, but in the first place this has always been permitted and besides, being without iron or other raw materials and without tools or machinery the village workers can produce little of value. For the rest this limited "free trade" must be with the so-called "co-operatives" which—since the law abolishing co-operatives—have become nothing but local branches of the Soviet Administration. These institutions have a monopoly of all tools and



machinery, boots, clothing, and everything in which the British Labor Delegation found the peasants so deplorably lacking—so far as these things exist at all in the country.

From the side of the population of the small towns there will be a certain amount of "free trade" with these few lucky peasants who have a surplus above the "taxation in kind." This trade has also gone on steadily, though the Soviets have hitherto branded it as criminal "speculation" and executed many persons accordingly.

Already the so-called "co-operatives" are setting their own prices for the scythes, sickles, and other imported tools which have obtained such a high value in the country-side because of their scarcity. There is no competition, the Government has a monopoly, and can set its own prices.

To call the local governmental trading posts "co-operatives" because they consist of remnants of the organization of the co-operatives of the past is the grossest deception. At one time, and until a year or so ago, the co-operatives were the most remarkable native product of the genius of the Russian people. Not only has the Soviet Government destroyed them but it has given no indication whatever of reviving them in the shape of what the rest of the world calls "co-operatives." It will be recalled that the Soviets refused a large relief expedition by the Entente powers for the sole reason that it was proposed to put these supplies in the hands of the real co-operatives. It was then—March 20, 1920—that the Soviets dissolved that organization. How complete the work of dissolution was we may see from the

following resolution of the Communist Party, and such resolutions invariably become the law of the land:

To complete the work which has been begun by the decree of March 20, and the subsequent activity of the Party in connection with obtaining a dominating influence for the Party in every section of the organisation of Consumers' Co-operatives.

For the purpose of obviating parallel activity of both Co-operative and Soviet Organs to establish a gradual abolition of Local Co-operative Societies and Provincial and Central Unions of all those Sections which are of a parallel and competitive nature with Soviet Sections. Such Sections—namely, Industrial, Timber, Agricultural, Co-operative, Educational—and others are to be transferred to the corresponding Government Departments, such as the Supreme Council of Public Economy, the People's Commissariat for Agriculture and so forth.

As regards the Agricultural and Trading Co-operatives, the Congress completely approves of the first step taken on the basis of the decree of January 27, that is to say, the complete abolition of the existence of the All-Russian Agricultural and Industrial Co-operatives and their amalgamation with the Central Union of which they are to become Sections.

The pro-Bolshevist British delegate, Margaret Bondfield, in the report of the British Labor Party, admitted that every voluntary element in the co-operatives had been abolished and that all citizens had been "decreed" as members. The crime of the real co-operatives was that they believed in the exchange of commodities which the Bolsheviks themselves now call "free trade" but which they formerly called "criminal speculation and profiteering." Here is a paragraph from Miss Bondfield's report:

When the Revolution first broke out, the Soviet Government recognized the importance to their economic policy of the co-operative movement. They nursed it in every possible way, and treated it as a pet child. But the co-operators, who were Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, could not or would not grasp the great conception of economic change. They were also political enemies of the Government. For two and a half years it has had the passive and sometimes active opposition of some of the co-operative leaders. Earlier still, in the first year of war, many co-operative Societies became a bunch of speculators and profiteers just like the capitalists.

The "speculators and profiteers" then subject to the firing squad are now to be known as "free traders."

It is illuminating to examine the new decree on co-operatives which is advertised by pro-Soviet propagandists abroad (though not in Russia!) as one of the most solid proofs of Lenin's "abandonment of communism." Here is a good press summary:

*The decree makes all citizens of Russia automatically members of the co-operative system. It prescribes that there can be only one co-operative in each town, village, or factory. Freedom of trading for individuals is embodied in the provision permitting members to buy commodities through the co-operatives, paying in money or products, and to exchange among themselves goods received through their co-operatives. To the societies within Russia is granted the right to buy surplus agricultural products or products of national industries and to sell them to their members; to conclude contracts under Soviet law with peasants' and workers' organizations, and to arrange for furnishing agricultural machinery, threshing grain, and storing and delivering products.*

The co-operative societies are also given the right to organize enterprises for production or working over raw products, and also to organize truck gardening and dairies on a large scale. *To the co-operative societies are assigned the sole right to organise distribution and exchange of products throughout the country.* They are to be directed by administrators elected in general conventions at which all citizens have the right to vote except those excluded from suffrage by the Soviet Constitution.

The sentences underlined when taken together show what it all amounts to. The co-operatives remain a compulsory governmental monopoly. They trade in what agricultural products the Soviets are pleased to leave to the peasant and in the products of the Soviet's nationalized industries at prices fixed by the Soviets. The "conventions" that are to govern the co-operatives are official, are conducted under Soviet "law" and supervision and, the voting being public, opposition voters will be men marked for discrimination by the Soviet Government and, if too assertive, for prosecution by the lawless Extraordinary Commission. A régime which has not permitted majority control even in the Soviets will scarcely permit any but Communist control of the co-operatives.

An almost exact parallel may be noted between the Bolshevist treatment of the co-operatives and their treatment of the trade unions. (See previous chapter.)

In spite of all these undeniable facts the American pro-Bolshevist press, Red, Yellow, and "liberal," as well as the press representing reactionary capitalistic groups who hope to make a profitable deal with Lenin, have hailed the restoration of "taxation in kind" as the end



of Bolshevism in agricultural Russia and the restoration of capitalism. Lenin, as usual has furnished phrases for his friends—but it is to be noted that these phrases are very similar to those he employed before his supposed reforms. The following expressions in his speech at the Communist Congress in March (1921) must be interpreted in the double light of his previous speeches—above quoted—and of the relatively insignificant action actually taken as a result of all this verbiage. Lenin said:

It is impossible to deceive a class of the population, and it is dangerous to go on deceiving one's self. It is time to admit frankly that the peasants manifestly refuse to accept any longer proletarian dictatorship.

The right of the free disposal of their surplus products must be the necessary incentive for the peasants, and I invite the party to acknowledge its grave blunder in attempting to deprive the producers of this right, the most elemental of the peasants' instincts.

We must grant freer economic relations between workers and peasants. As a matter of fact, we hitherto have acted in a too military manner, and in some cases have gone too far in nationalizing trade. If some Communists thought the organization of a socialistic state was possible in three years, they were dreamers. Freedom of economic relations means free trade, and free trade signifies a return to capitalism.

Those who believe that in this Russia of peasants Socialism can be realized, simply believe in Utopia.

Let us see what all this means. In spite of Lenin's statement that the peasants can no longer be deceived he is attempting to deceive them with the long tried

phrase, "taxation in kind." The peasants, he recognizes, do not accept the proletarian dictatorship; still Lenin proposes to give them no voice whatever in the Communist Government. Undoubtedly such very restricted free trade as has been established means, to that small degree, a return to capitalism. By admitting the fact Lenin puts his critics off their guard. His defense of this decree before his own followers (above quoted) is that the remaining parts of the Communist system will be strengthened by this slight economic concession, since it is unaccompanied by any surrender of actual political power. As to his supposed concession about the impossibility of realizing Socialism in Russia *now*, the whole reason for the proletarian dictatorship, as we have pointed out, is precisely that violence will be needed to hold the power over the peasant majority—until in a generation or two, Socialism does become feasible. Not only have the Communists always used this argument but they have never used any other. *Because* the country is not ready for Communism, the dictatorship of the Communists must be prolonged indefinitely—until it is ready.

In his closing speech at the March (1921) Congress of the Russian Communist Party—reproduced in *Soviet Russia*, May 14th, 1921—Lenin again laid bare in a few words his entire policy towards the agricultural population (peasants) who compose the overwhelming majority of the nation. The inauguration of the law of "taxation in kind," or, rather, the reversion to that law, it will be observed, had made no change whatever in the Bolshevist attitude towards the subjected peasantry. Lenin said:

The work of our congress will be the more successful that we have achieved absolute agreement from the very beginning on two fundamental questions; the relations of the vanguard of the proletariat with the proletarian masses and its relations with the peasants.

We may stop the citation here to point out once more that the Bolshevik attitude towards the proletarian or industrial masses is almost the same as their attitude towards the peasants or agricultural masses. Lenin continues:

We know that the only force able to unite millions of scattered small proprietors who are constantly enduring great hardships, the only force able to unite them economically and politically against the exploiters, is the class-conscious proletariat.

Here is the same claim of the little group that controls the Communist Party that they are divinely or otherwise called to rule the masses without their consent. And, finally, Lenin proceeds to disclose the very foundations of Bolshevik policy. An alliance or partnership with foreign capital is absolutely indispensable because there must be at least a minimum of "benevolence" in the tyranny of the Soviets or the peasants by continued passive resistance and violence will not permit them to work. These political serfs cannot be permanently held in subjection unless something is done towards ameliorating the misery into which they have fallen through Czarist and Bolshevik rule. On this point Lenin declares:

Relations will be normal then, and only then, when the proletariat is in possession of a large scale industry

with its products, and when it not only meets the needs of the peasant but, besides furnishing him with the necessities of life, so improves his position that its superiority over the capitalistic system will be evident and palpable. This, and nothing else, would constitute the basis of normal Socialistic society. We cannot bring this about immediately—so harassed are we by ruin, need and impoverishment.

It is, indeed, a large-sized task for an utterly bankrupt and incredibly inefficient bureaucracy to lift up materially the level of 100,000,000 wretched and embittered agriculturists. To accomplish this the Bolshevists' grandiose and original idea is to sell all that is most valuable in Russia, industrially, to foreign capitalists. This plan, in turn, is based upon the expectation of a world revolution which, within a few months or a few years, will make it unnecessary to pay the foreign capitalists for the new plants and machinery that will have been set up. Even if this plan is not unanimously held by every one of the negotiators, the fact that it is openly preached to the entire Russian nation proves that any such concessions are likely to be the source of endless international friction and possibly of wars, whatever the future government of Russia may be. If that government is Bolshevik the agitation for world revolution will continue, revived whenever any foreign upheaval threatens. If the future government is non-Bolshevist it will certainly repudiate the transaction that led to the delivery of these vast sums into the hands of the Bolshevik enemy, and to this attempted wholesale alienation of the patrimony of generations yet unborn. (See Chapter XIII.)



## VIII

### THE ECONOMIC COLLAPSE; FICTITIOUS REFORMS

WHILE industry was somewhat backward in Russia under the Czars there was already a considerable development. The country had risen to an economic level far in advance of Asia or even of the other outlying parts of Europe. Several millions of working men were employed in modern industries and 40,000 miles of railroad were being operated under modern methods and with modern equipment, as good as that of a number of other European countries. In a country in this semi-developed condition and with a backward political government the war did more damage than elsewhere and the civil war that followed greatly increased the work of destruction. We do not quote any figures as to the economic collapse, since it is impossible to say what part of the existing condition is due to the present government and what part is due to previous causes. Without, however, quoting any figures Bolshevist authorities show that no effective effort is being made to fight the constantly increasing economic disintegration—in spite of the fact that such efforts are more needed in Russia than in any other part of the world today.

In the report of the Central Soviet Executive Committee (Moscow wireless March 23, 1921) Kalinin said:

We are confronted by a number of obstacles. The main obstacle is disorganization. In order to improve the condition of the workmen and peasants *not in words but in deeds*, it is necessary to deliver a decisive blow to disorganization. At present, however, there are a great many obstacles in the way of a successful struggle against disorganization. One of these obstacles is banditism, which is greatly developed in some provinces. Bandits, who have been created by wealthy peasants who cannot reconcile themselves to Soviet authority, masquerade as the protectors of the interests of the peasants.

Here we have a confession as to the state of disorganization and the chief obstacles, namely, the revolts of the agricultural population—which Kalinin designates as a revolt of bandits and wealthy peasants, although the latter class, as recently stated by Lenin is now non-existent, and no bodies can better deserve the title of “bandits” than the expeditions sent out by the Soviets to plunder the countryside.

The Bolshevists give additional causes for the economic degeneration:

For 3,150,000 workmen there are in Russia 2,000,000 officials—1,500,000 belonging to the staffs of controlling organizations. (Official statistical data quoted in the official *Economic Life*, Dec. 9, 1920.)

One of the best descriptions of the results of this sort of thing is given by Prince Kropotkin, the eminent philosophical anarchist, just deceased in Soviet Russia. In a letter to the British workers, very similar to that printed in the report of the British labor delegation, Kropotkin declares:

The ways to be followed for overthrowing an already weakened Government and taking its place are well known from history, old and modern. But when it comes to building up quite new forms of life, especially new forms of production and exchange, without having any examples to imitate, when everything has to be worked out by men on the spot, then an all powerful centralised Government which undertakes to supply every inhabitant with every lamp glass and every match to light the lamp, proves absolutely incapable of doing that through its functionaries, no matter how countless they may be. It becomes a nuisance.

It develops such a formidable bureaucracy that the French bureaucratic system, which requires the intervention of 40 functionaries to sell a tree felled by a storm on a route nationale, becomes a trifle in comparison. This is what we now learn in Russia. And this is what you, the working men of the West, can and must avoid by all means, since you care for the success of social reconstruction, and sent here your delegates to see how a social revolution works in real life.

To sweep away that collaboration and to trust to the genius of party dictators is to destroy all the independent nuclei, such as "trade unions" and the local distributive co-operative organization, turning them into bureaucratic organs of the party—as is being done now.

A correspondent of a European socialist paper now living in Soviet Russia writes in a similar vein:

All the new organisations can do nothing with the general ruin. We possess enormous riches, but cannot raise them. We have no men, no tools, no transport, no dress, nor boots. But we have a Provincial Labour Committee, a Provincial Metallic Industry Committee, a Provincial Dress Committee (one suit for 10 years), a Provincial Leather Committee (only for the army; the civilians receive no leather), and so on.

Another reason for the additional decay which the Soviets have superimposed upon the degenerated industry that they inherited has been their deplorable policy of exterminating the professional classes—a policy which is summed up in a letter written by the famous Bolshevist writer, Maxim Gorky, to Lenin and printed in the *Volya Rossii* on October 2, 1920. In this letter Gorky refers to “the extermination of the cultural resources of the country”:

While saving our own hides we are cutting off the head of the nation, destroying its brain.

Vladimir Ilitch, I take my stand on their side, and I prefer arrest and imprisonment to complicity, even though it be only silent, in the extermination of the best and most invaluable forces of the Russian people. To me it has become evident that the “Reds” are just such enemies of the people as are the “Whites.”

A fourth vice of the Soviet system which is burdening industrial administration is the passing of endless, impractical and unenforceable decrees. Lenin himself refers to certain agricultural decrees as intended primarily for propaganda. And at a meeting reported in *Izvestia*, Moscow, January 1, 1921, he declared:

In Smolny we have talked more than enough about general principles. Now after three years we have decrees on many points of this question [the trade union question] concerning many of its integral parts. But it is the sad fate of the decrees that they are signed in order to be forgotten and to go unfulfilled by us.

We are able to study differences of opinion in principle and even then make mistakes, we are masters at



this, but to study practical things, and to verify them, we are unable to do.

What is most amusing is that Lenin himself soon gave an illustration of the truth of his accusations. The all-important problem for the Soviets is to get the persecuted workers to work. The supposed means of accomplishing this at present are so-called disciplinary courts. Yet Lenin and other Bolshevist chiefs had apparently forgotten the very existence of these courts or of the decree promulgating them. In *Pravda* (January 13, 1921) in an account of the All-Russian Conference of Professional Unions he is quoted as follows:

When I read Rudzutuk's theses about disciplinary courts, I thought there certainly must be a decree about this. And, indeed there was. A regulation concerning Disciplinary Labor juries, was promulgated on November 14th, 1919 (Statute-Book No. 537).

As this decree had been on the statute books over a year no wonder Lenin had forgotten its existence—in view of the numbers of the decrees issued since that time.

In this matter of paper decrees as in the matter of the issuance of paper money and of Bolshevist propaganda generally there is one hope. The paper supply is very short. The type is being rapidly used up. The production of type-making factories is one-twentieth that of peace times. Then the number of workmen in the printing industry, doubtless for reasons we have already pointed out, has been reduced to one-half.

We cannot better sum up the total failure of the

economic and industrial policy of the Soviets than in the words of Maxim Gorky in the *Moscow Pravda*:

Revolutionary Socialist policy is assuredly a very beautiful thing, but we must work. We have created an atmosphere of general idleness and criminal negligence. We have never worked so ill or so dishonestly as at present. To be sure, this is in part the result of malnutrition and consequent bodily weakness, but in the main it proceeds from a lack of sense of responsibility.

Again if we wish a detailed picture of the working out of the system we cannot do better than to quote from another article of Gorky's in the same journal. The description of this master writer and Bolshevik is so able and conclusive that we quote it at some length:

In another place a car is being loaded. On one axle are piled heavy barrels of cement, cases of lead, pieces of machinery, &c. On the other, rocking chairs, household goods, a perambulator—things that are quite light. The overloaded axle will of course become heated and the car will not reach its destination. I have been a porter myself. I know that had I tried to load a wagon in that way my boss would have boxed my ears and told me to go to the devil. And I should have deserved it, for I should have been injuring the rolling stock.

In another place a mechanical saw is being used to cut rafters and planks from a house which has been torn down. The wood is full of nails and the saw groans painfully. It is quickly spoiled and its teeth broken, yet it is common knowledge that we have no saws and that the price is so high that for one saw we have to give many bushels of wheat, and wheat itself is scarce.

Houses are being destroyed in a most revolting fashion. The windows are all broken, though we have no glass,

and it would be so easy to take out the panes without breaking them. In the barracks transparent paper takes the place of window glass, letting in no light and keeping in no heat, therefore more furniture is burnt to warm the barracks.

Metal roofing is allowed to lie for months in the midst of the wreckage of destroyed houses. It rusts and becomes absolutely useless. The roofs of the inhabited houses are also rusted and the rain comes through, but nothing is done to mend them. Walls and ceilings fall in and well built houses rapidly become uninhabitable.

And this is how by sheer stupidity, by lack of regard for their own labor, our people destroy the valuable assets of the nation and ruin the patrimony of the public.

Our streets are littered with pieces of iron and the moujik (peasant) in his village has nothing wherewith to repair his wheels and axles, and cannot even forge shoes or nails for his horses or teeth for his rakes. That is why he goes out to the railway bridges and tries to saw off a piece of iron, or to loosen the rivets of the sleepers, or attempts to steal from the station the piece of metal that he needs. For a carload of iron the moujik would gladly barter a carload of wheat. Yet the hundreds of thousands of old saucepans that are scattered among the ruins of the houses would suit him very well and he could put to good use the window sashes and doors that are burned in the cities for heating purposes.

Doubtless these are all very minor matters, and particularly unimportant to us whose object is to teach the whole world a new order of things and a new manner of life. But can one learn conscientiously from masters who themselves either do not know how to work or will not work, and who will soon have no clothes to put on their backs? I do not think the European workman can have any great respect for comrades who do not know how to organize their own labor. The politics of social revolution doubtless is very fine, but work comes first.

All these little things of which I have spoken are repeated by thousands, by tens of thousands, and they create an atmosphere of scandalous unrest, of laziness and of criminal carelessness, for all that goes to make up the patrimony of the public.

In lieu of a conclusion to the above we may quote the expression of that Socialistic progressive who is President of Czecho-Slovakia, Professor Masaryk—an ardent admirer of the Russian people and a life long student at first hand of Russian affairs. President Masaryk says:

The trouble with the Bolsheviks is they do not know, and never have known, how to work. They know how to make slaves, fight, and murder, but they are unable to work with application and continuity.

The economic conditions are getting rapidly worse. The leading Soviet railway expert calculates that it will take 25 years to put the Russian railways back into shape. But to accomplish regeneration even in this period would require A1 credit abroad and a high degree of efficiency at home. As long as efficiency, according to Bolshevik reports, ranges from 20 to 70 per cent of the low pre-war level and credit approaches zero, regeneration is impossible and progressive degeneration—as Hughes and Hoover state—must continue. According to official Bolshevik reports mines are in a worse state than the railways and the basic iron and steel industries are in a still more complete condition of collapse. Under these conditions the few hundred foreign locomotives that can be paid for are but a drop in the bucket. The slight improvements reported amount to nothing in com-



parison to the wholesale deterioration of 40,000 miles of roadbed and the rotting away of the machinery in thousands of mines.

It is obvious that all social reforms on a national scale are wholly impossible under economic conditions like these, where the industrial population has been reduced to a third or fourth of what it was and where the wage-earners that remain are wretchedly clothed and are happy when they have a starvation ration of black bread—to say nothing of any other food. Reforms of any substantial kind whatever for 100,000,000 people cost colossal sums of money, and occasional “model” institutions in a vast country are but a mockery serving to demonstrate the utter inadequacy and futility of what is being accomplished.

Far from moving forward we can be mathematically certain that every fundamental institution is falling back in Russia today—especially when we remember that the liberal Zemstvos, or provincial councils, under the old régime, had made a considerable beginning in certain directions.

Yet the Bolshevist propagandists and their “liberal” accomplices have the audacity to assert that vast and substantial reforms are being carried out in “art,” “science,” “education” and “culture.” Though no foundation whatever for any of these assertions has been produced they have been so often repeated that the impression has become widespread that there must be “something” in them.

The most notorious of the mythical “reforms” being reported by the Bolshevists and their friends is the reform of the schools and the supposed good treatment

of children by the Soviets. Yet it is precisely the rising generation that always suffers most from such moral and intellectual chaos and physical suffering as prevail for men, women and children in Russia today. Far from putting the children first, the Soviets have put them almost last. First comes the Red Army—used not only for defense but for aggression and to put down peasant attempts at self-government with sufficient bloodshed to terrorize the survivors. Then comes the propaganda, squandering millions of dollars from South America to China—and in every village of Russia. Next comes the Soviet bureaucracy—usually given food privileges on the plausible ground that they need them in the strenuous work of keeping their hold on the government. Besides these two classes the army of spies, food seizing detachments, etc., can obviously get and demand preferred treatment. After all these, no doubt, the children are given a preference over the remainder of the population. And our wretched sentimentalists call this “looking out for the children!”

The Communists always assert and never deny that they are deliberately sacrificing the *entire* population for the present—in the belief that they are thus introducing the form of future society that they prefer. They acknowledge they are largely responsible for the bureaucracy, disorganization, etc., that are among the chief causes of the suffering. Here is how this affects the children:

Frederick J. Libby, commissioner of the American Friends' Service Committee (Quakers), who recently returned from Reval, brought back information that many children are starving in Russia.

Mr. Libby obtained his information from Arthur J. Watts, an English Friend, who has been engaged in relief work in Russia. Mr. Watts gave Mr. Libby a translation of the reports of Russian commissars from various cities.

It appears from the commissars' report that the situation of the children varies greatly in the different centres. In some cities, such as Vitebsk, it is reported that whole families are perishing from starvation. In others, such as Smolensk, Yaroslav, the children are reported to be obtaining sufficient nourishment. The report from Vitebsk stated that the bread substitutes give the children dysentery which it is impossible to cure.

The commissars report that in several centres the children had been unable to obtain bread for a long time and that in others no kind of fats or meats were obtainable and that milk was received rarely.

The children of Moscow were declared to have no sugar nor fats, and to be either starving or falling ill through under-nourishment. Inmates of the *children's homes* in Novgorod are starving, the reports stated. They receive no meat, butter, potatoes, milk or salt, but live on a daily portion of sour cabbage soup, millet cooked in water, and black bread made from bad flour. They are suffering from scurvy as a result of under-nourishment.

For all this the Bolsheviks are largely—though, of course, not wholly—responsible. Whatever the degree of their responsibility may be, it is an outrageous falsehood to talk of great educational advances under such conditions—which are admitted as being far worse than anything Russia has hitherto experienced.

Yet the Soviets have never ceased to put forth inflated and grandiose paper schemes as if certain of accomplish-

ment, to take credit to themselves for the reopening of old institutions under new names, such as "children's palaces," to show off a handful of favored schools as typical of thousands, to talk of new methods while admitting the wholesale lack not only of new teachers but of teachers generally, and—while foisting upon the children their crude, ignorant, violent and petty dogmas in the place of the culture of the ages—to claim that they are giving them a new and superior education. We have Russian Communists in America. Let anybody who knows them think of what is happening to the starving and helpless children of Russia in the light of this Moscow wireless of February 6th, 1921:

Instructions of the General Committee of the Russian Communist Party of Communist Workers of the People's Commissariat for Education:

The fundamental direction must remain in the hands of the Communists, while the specialists are to be their assistants. The curriculum of general education is to be decided upon by the Communists alone.

Recalling the fact that only the most violent and narrow-minded one per cent of Russia are members of the Communist Party, and remembering that the 200,000 teachers who, it is said, are needed will absorb a large part of that organization, leaving no possibility of discrimination in appointments, consider the statement of the Communist Party Congress in March, 1919, that one "basis of educational work already established by the Soviet Government is the preparation of a new class of teachers who are imbued with Communism."

Lenin explained the Bolshevist conception of public



education in the most explicit manner at the All-Russian Political Education Conference on the 5th of November, 1920. (See *Soviet Russia*, April 30th, 1921.) He explained that the teachers must be, first of all, political propagandists and humble followers of the Communist Party:

We must treat this question frankly and in complete opposition to tradition, must combat the erroneous conception that education may under no circumstances be combined with politics. We are living in a historic period, in the period of struggle against the world bourgeoisie, which is still very much stronger than we are. In such a moment of struggle we must defend our Socialist work of construction and wage a conflict with this bourgeoisie, both in a military and—what is more important—in a spiritual sense, in the way of education.

The teaching staff must itself attract the working classes, fill them with the Communist spirit, interest them in what the Communists are doing and win them over to the Communist standpoint.

But the school teacher the world over has a certain minimum respect for his calling. Though the overwhelming majority of the teachers under Kerensky were Social Revolutionists or Social Democrats, they were teachers, and not propagandists. Dismissed by the wholesale, the majority of the new teachers are scarcely more amenable. Lenin and Lunacharsky, Commissary for Education, complain bitterly of this difficulty and pursue their usual method of vilifying their victims. Lenin says, in the speech just quoted:

Already for a long time the teachers' organization has been fighting against the socialist transformation. In

pedagogical circles the bourgeois prejudices have taken particularly firm root, and we are compelled to conquer our Communist position slowly, step by step. The teaching staff, which grew up in bourgeois prejudices, was at the bottom of its heart hostile to the proletariat and had no contact with it. We must now raise a new army of pedagogical workers, which must be more closely connected with the party, more intimately acquainted with its ideals, more fully impressed with the spirit of those ideas.

Far from any advance less than 27 per cent of the children are receiving any instruction whatever. *Humanité*, the leading Communist organ of France, on January 3, 1920, in summing up the official report of Lunacharsky, Chief Soviet Commissar for Education, gives this figure and the British Labor Party's Russian delegation reports:

The Russian educational authorities estimate that 25 per cent of the child population are now in receipt of a normal education of the elementary type. This is probably an overestimate, as in some places visited accommodation for only 10 per cent of the children existed; and also there is no method of insuring compulsory attendance as in England, and children who do not wish to attend simply remain away. In some of the villages any education is of a very primitive description and confined to the winter months and to children between 8 and 13. It is estimated that 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the children are receiving *some form* of effective elementary education.

It may, therefore, be questioned if the proportion of children attending school is greater than under the Czars!

The Bolshevists have repeatedly stated that the people must be made literate if they are to become useful subjects for Communist rule; this was also the Prussian idea of education. But the Communists, not to mention their personal incapacity, have a system that produces neither the personnel nor the material for educational institutions of any kind. Far from any sacrifice being made for the children, education, literature, science, or art, all these are deliberately, daily and unremittingly sacrificed in order to maintain and, if possible, to increase the power of the Communist Party.

Education is, first of all, the pre-requisite for propaganda. Second, after the individual has learned to read and write, education becomes propaganda—as we may see from Lenin's speech already quoted:

The most important point at present for the comrades in the work of culture and education is that of the relation between education and our political aim. In bourgeois society it has always been, and still is maintained, that the spirit of knowledge is apolitical, or unpolitical. This is a piece of hypocrisy on the part of the bourgeoisie, nothing more nor less than a refined method of deceiving the masses, 99 per cent of whom are oppressed by the domination of the church, of private property, etc.

One of our chief tasks is that of opposing to bourgeois deception and hypocrisy *our truth*, and of obliging the bourgeoisie to recognize *our truth*.

In regard to family life there is the most rapid and demoralizing retrogression. Homes are being broken up and children, as far as practicable, separated from parental influence and placed in a sort of orphan asylum

called "children's homes" or "boarding schools." The children are not quite so wretchedly fed in these institutions as when with their families (though the reports above quoted show they are often starving even in the Soviet "homes")—a fact which naturally makes fond parents surrender them—"voluntarily" according to the Bolsheviks and their cold-blooded "liberal" supporters. But besides this "the theory of the Communist Party that every soul must give a labor contribution to the community carries with it the implication that the individual must be freed from the economic burden of the family. Both men and women are paid on the basis of the individual wage." (British Labor Delegation report.)

So with other "reforms." All vital and national improvements are costly. Therefore none have been made, and all changes are either of secondary importance—such as new "movies"—or on an utterly insignificant scale for a country of the first magnitude. All claims to the contrary are among the clearest proofs of the bold and unscrupulous character of the Bolshevik propaganda.

The Bolshevik leader himself does not make any claim of construction worth boasting about. He is proud of his work of destruction and has said so again and again. All pre-existing civilization is to be destroyed. As for the rest he is proud of his resistance to those who would destroy him. Reconstruction can and must wait. He is very patient, as to construction, as long as he believes the fighting is going his way:

In our struggle two main factors are apparent. On the one hand there is the task of destroying, of an-



nihilating the heritage received from the bourgeois regime, of suppressing the ceaselessly repeated attempts of the bourgeoisie to destroy the Soviet power. This task has hitherto taken up most of our attention and prevented us from going about the other task, that of reconstruction.

(Speech at Political Education Conference November 5, 1920—from *Soviet Russia*, April 30, 1921.)

## IX

### WORLD REVOLUTION; THE ATTEMPT TO OVERTHROW DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENTS

THE foundation of the entire Bolshevik movement as well as the foreign policy of the Soviet Government is world revolution, the overthrow of all existing governments—even the most democratic—all being regarded as equally “capitalistic.” This is the aim of the Russian Communist Party, which is the Soviet Government, and also of the Communist Internationale which shapes the Soviet foreign policy. No compromise of this aim has been adopted or is even projected.

In the Bolshevik view the present is a period of closely connected wars and revolutions, all having a common capitalistic cause, and all working towards the same end, a communist world state.

The increasing pressure of the proletariat, particularly its victories in some countries, strengthens the resistance of the exploiters and compels them to create new forms of international capitalist solidarity (League of Nations, etc.) which, organizing the systematic exploitation of all nations on a world scale, directs all its efforts to the immediate suppression of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat of all countries.

All this inevitably leads to the blending of civil war within various countries with the defensive wars of revolutionary countries, and the struggles of oppressed nations against the yoke of imperialist states. (From

Programme of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Adopted at the VIIIth conference of the Party, Moscow, 18-23rd March, 1919, English Translation Published by the Executive Committee of the Communist International.)

The same thought has been recently expressed by Trotsky as follows (see *Soviet Russia*, April 2, 1921) :

**The international proletariat has set out to seize the power. Whether civil war is or is not "in general" one of the indispensable attributes of revolution "in general" it is nevertheless incontestable that the forward movement of the proletariat, in Russia, in Germany, and in certain parts of what was once Austria-Hungary, has taken on the form of civil war to the bitter end. And that not only on internal fronts but also on external fronts.**

The military part of this program is in abeyance because of the failure of attempted Bolshevik revolutions in neighboring countries such as Hungary, Bavaria, etc., and also because of the economic and military weakness of the Soviets, but the Soviet régime has not overlooked a single opportunity to assault a weakened neighbor, as we see from the attack on Poland August, 1920, and the recent conquest of Georgia and neighboring territories. The very oath of the Red Army shows it is regarded as a force for "liberating" the world proletariat. The following clauses of the oath are quoted from the report of the Russian delegation of the British Labor Party:

Before the working classes of Russia and *the whole world*, I undertake to carry this name with honour, to follow the military calling with conscience and to pre-

serve from damage and robbery the national and military possessions as the hair of my head.

I undertake to abstain from and to deter any act liable to dishonour the name of citizens of the Soviet Republic; *moreover to direct all my deeds and thoughts to the Great Aim of Liberation of all Workers.*

The effort of the Soviet "Government" through its Third Internationale to foment revolutions throughout the world continues. Its first aim is revolution now. Where this is impracticable the aim becomes to build up a revolutionary movement prepared to attempt a revolution within a very few years. The immediate purpose, in that case, is to undermine all governments, destroy all non-Bolshevist labor organizations, and to make converts who may be relied upon not only to give the Russian Soviet Government moral support but to obey all the revolutionary orders it issues. While the world revolution policy has failed to create revolutions, it has succeeded in very large measure in all these secondary objects. It has therefore been a great success from the Bolshevik standpoint, and this is the view of all the Bolshevik leaders.

In making trade agreements and other treaties the Bolshevik diplomats find it suits their purpose to make a wholesale denial of the entire world revolution policy, and they have made these denials very frequently from the beginning. A few weeks before the Second Congress of the Third Internationale, where the policy of world revolution was brought into its most complete form, Kalinin, President of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, issued a statement to Poland in which he claimed that the Russian Communists "never attempted



and are not going to attempt to bring in Communism in foreign countries." Within ninety days of this statement the Bolshevik authorities made repeated declarations of their purpose to set up a Soviet government in Poland by force of arms. And when Trotzky, as War Lord, was in Bialystock, in northeastern Poland, he even assumed that Sovietism would rapidly spread from Poland to the entire world. "Bolshevism," he said, "was more powerful than ever and would soon spread to other countries." "In a year," he continued, "all Europe will be bolshevist."

When we see how totally false was the statement of the President of the Soviets we may begin to realize the complete worthlessness of other statements of the Bolshevik diplomats and, in fact, of all their public declarations issued for foreign consumption. The Communist Government of Russia has now entered into solemn agreement with Great Britain not to carry on revolutionary propoganda in British territory. Any such agreement, along with all other promises of the Soviets, was denounced by Secretary Colby as wholly worthless in view of their faithless record and their revolutionary operations through the Third Internationale. Secretary Colby said (in his note of August 10, 1920) :

The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements.

Moreover, it is within the knowledge of the Government of the United States that the Bolshevik Govern-

ment is itself subject to the control of a political faction with extensive international ramifications through the Third Internationale, and that this body, which is heavily subsidized by the Bolshevist Government from the public revenues of Russia, has for its openly avowed aim the promotion of Bolshevist revolutions throughout the world. *The leaders of the Bolsheviki have boasted that their promises of non-interference with other nations would in nowise bind the agents of this body.*

The preamble to the Soviet constitution declares that one of the main objects in forming a Soviet government is to use it "for the victory of socialism in all lands." In the preamble of the constitution of the Communist Internationale we find the following:

The object of the Communist International is a struggle with force of arms for the suppression of the international bourgeoisie, and the creation of an International Soviet Republic, as a transitional stage for the complete suppression of the State.

At its Second Congress, July, 1920, this Internationale expressed itself even more strongly:

The Communist International fully and unreservedly upholds the gains of the great proletarian revolution in Russia, the first victorious socialist revolution in the world's history, and calls upon all workers to follow the same road. The Communist International makes it its duty to support by all the power at its disposal every Soviet Republic wherever it may be formed.

Among the "slogans" of the dominating Russian Communist Party presented at that gathering were these:

Through the III International to the world dictatorship of the proletariat, and through the dictatorship of the proletariat to the abolition of classes and the most complete liberation of mankind.

Long live the III International, which is fighting to establish an International Soviet of Workmen's Deputies.

The most important action taken at this congress was the formulation of the "twenty-one points." The sending of these points as an ultimatum to all the socialist parties of Europe had the following results:

First, the powerful Independent Socialist Party in Germany was split and the majority faction entered the Third Internationale, accepting the domination of Moscow and all the twenty-one points.

Second, the same result occurred in the congress of the French Socialist Party in December, 1920.

Third, a powerful element in the Italian Socialist Party took the same action in the middle of February, the remainder of the party also adhering to the Third Internationale but demanding a certain measure of autonomy. Similar results occurred in other European countries. A powerful group of socialist and labor organizations, refusing to repudiate or condemn the Communist Internationale, also decided not to enter into it at the present moment but to attempt to form a new international organization in which the communist parties are to be an important part.

Thus the effort of the communists to control the socialist parties of Europe has made considerable progress within the last year, though failing to capture the movement as a whole and failing also to convert the

majority of labor unionists, with the possible exception of Italy.

The revolutionary communist movement directed from Moscow is, then, a formidable force on the continent of Europe. Let us now recall that among the most important of the twenty-one revolutionary points accepted by all adhering organizations are the following:

In almost all the countries of Europe and America the class war is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois legality. They are bound to create everywhere a parallel illegal organization, which at the decisive moment will help the party to fulfil its duty towards the Revolution. . . .

All decisions of the Congress of the Communist International, as also the decisions of its Executive Committee, are binding for all parties belonging to the Communist International.

When in the Martens case ex-Secretary of Labor, W. B. Wilson, decided that the Russian Communist Party was an organization that "advocates the overthrow by violence of the Government of the United States," the Administration had every possible documentary evidence to prove its case.

Naturally the belief of the Bolshevists in impending revolt fluctuates with their victories and defeats. But the utility to the Soviet Government of revolutionary agitation and revolutionary propaganda and violence in all countries continues regardless of such contingencies. We have noted Trotzky's optimism when his armies were in Poland. Again, when the armies of General Wrangel were overthrown in November, 1920, Lenin declared:



This triumph of bolshevism is the most gigantic ever dreamed of, but the victory is incomplete until every part of Europe has been revolutionized.

A month later, in an open letter to the Italian socialists quoted in *Pravda*, December 10, 1920, Lenin fearing that the revolutionary movement which began in the seizure of factories by the Italian metal workers might be checked by the refusal of foreign capitalists to furnish the indispensable coal and iron, gave this advice:

Hasten the revolution in England, in France, in America if these countries decide to blockade the proletariat of the Italian Proletarian Republic.

At the National Congress of the Soviets on December 23, the leading economic authority among the Commissaries, Rykoff, said (See *Pravda*, December 25):

With the possibility of international relations and the coming communistic revolution in western Europe, and since we are nearing our chief aim, the European congress of soviets, we have to direct our attention to the development of those branches of our economic life which will come to our lot in the case of distribution of work among ourselves and western soviet Europe.

We must note in these expressions that the Bolsheviks find no contradiction between the movement for a trade agreement and the continued movement for world revolt. Indeed, Lenin has advocated arrangements with foreign capitalists from the very beginning of the Bolshevik régime, during the period of the revolutions in Hungary and Bavaria, as well as the wars of conquest against

the border states, and during all the revolutionary plots set on foot by the Third Internationale.

In a speech (quoted in *Pravda*, November 30, 1920) Lenin explains:

We have found the right way to revolution, but this way is not a direct one; it runs in zig zags.

In the letter to the Italian communists already quoted Lenin advises them that in order to bring the country to revolution at the earliest possible moment—which he believes will be very soon in Italy—it is necessary to move first to the right and then to the left. The failure of the Italian revolutionary movement in October and of the German revolutionary movement in March led Lenin to propose one of his momentary zig zags or movements to the right. The date for the big revolutionary movements in Europe has been postponed for a year or two. As Trotzky is reported recently to have declared:

The proletarian revolution in America and Europe will be found if not in the approaching months then in the approaching years.

Touching upon the same subject at the International Communist Congress in July, 1920, Zinovieff truculently exclaimed:

“Well, what about it?” we shall say to every bourgeois: “Yes, perhaps we were wrong; not one year, but two or three will be necessary for all Europe to become Soviet. You still have a short period of grace before you will be destroyed. But if you have now become so modest that you rejoice at these few months of grace,

or a few years, then we, in any case, congratulate you on your unusual modesty.”

It is the belief, however, of Zinovieff and of all the Bolshevist leaders that even if revolutions are not materializing very rapidly or as speedily as expected that the revolutionary movement which is so valuable to the communists in other particulars is continuing to spread and that because of it they can rely more and more upon support and aid in one form or another from the entire labor movement of Europe. In other words, they believe that their propaganda is bearing more and more fruit—and there is much to support their view. In an article in the *Petrograd Pravda*, November 7, 1920, Zinovieff wrote:

Three years ago, we were absolutely alone on the international arena. We know and believed that the international proletariat would understand and appreciate our movements, and would be with us. But at the same time we could not fail to see that at that time the international proletariat as yet was not with us.

And how all this has now been radically changed! Yes, the International Proletarian Revolution is developing much less rapidly than we had wished. But never-the-less it moves forward.

Why have the Imperialist giants, the robber League of Nations, and the very rich and blood-thirsty bourgeoisie of England, France, and America failed to date to destroy the single proletarian Republic—Soviet Russia? But they did not do this solely because the working class of Europe and America is in its heart behind us.

The Bolshevist leaders realize and confess that the strength of their movement in Russia is very largely

due to the support they have obtained from certain elements of labor outside of Russia. For in addition to the European revolutionary parties and factions already referred to other more or less neutral labor bodies have undoubtedly given them very valuable *moral* and *defensive* support.

All the successes of Soviet policy, to whatever extraneous causes they may be due, are attributed by the Bolsheviks to the merit of their foreign propaganda and the invincibility of their international movement. This may be seen from a speech delivered by Lenin at a convention of the Communist Party in Moscow (*Krasnaya Gazetta*, November 23, 1920) :

The world revolution, by whose aid alone we can win, does not mature at the speed with which we hoped for in the beginning.

But we have obtained not merely a breathing spell, but the possibility of existing amidst bourgeois countries. This means that the revolution has already matured within those countries.

After a period of three years, the Imperialists are compelled to give up their struggle against Russia which has, in comparison with their own military resources, practically none.

Our foes, burning with desire to crush us by armed force, are now compelled to conclude agreements with us, and to contribute to our consolidation and strengthening.

At the Communist Congress earlier in the year Lenin had said (see *Soviet Russia*, August 23, 1920) :

We not only won over to our side the workers of all countries, but also succeeded in winning the bourgeoisie



of the small countries, for the imperialists oppress not only the workers of their countries but also the bourgeoisie of the small nations. You know how we won over the wavering middle class within the advanced countries.

This absolute disintegration of our adversaries who were sure of their power, shows that they are but a handful of capitalist beasts at odds among themselves and absolutely powerless to fight us.

Here the Bolshevik chief discloses the secret of such "success" as he has been able to attain throughout the world: his propaganda has succeeded in deceiving not only a large number of workingmen but also considerable elements of the middle classes.

Taking up some remarks of Lenin's at the Tenth Congress of the Socialist Russian Party in March, 1921, the Bolshevik press of America, assisted by pro-Bolshevik "liberal" publications, by the yellow press, and by commercially directed newspapers blinded by short-sighted greed, all joined together to claim that he had abandoned world revolution together with communism and all the other foundations of Bolshevism. What Lenin actually said was: "Were we to suppose that presently we would get help in the form of a firmly established proletarian revolution, we would be lunatics," this speech being made in answer to a very small group of ultra-extremists who opposed trade agreements, not realizing that they were entirely consistent with the policy of world revolution. Lenin's words are very carefully chosen. He does not say that help from a proletarian revolution is not to be expected; he says only that early help from "a firmly established" proletarian revolution cannot be counted upon. In other

words, he still expects the revolutionary movement to develop with steadily increasing intensity and to reach such a point that it will be helpful to the Soviets, even economically, before the lapse of many years.

Referring to the question of world revolution, Lenin said:

Aid is coming from the Western European countries. It is not coming as fast as we should like it, but it is coming nevertheless and gathering strength. *Of course, the world revolution has made a great step forward, in comparison with last year.* We have learned to understand during the last three years that basing ourselves on an international revolution does not mean calculating on a definite date, and that the *increasing* rapidity of development *may bring a revolution in the spring (1921) or it may not.* Of course, the Communist International which last year existed merely in the form of proclamations is now existing as an independent party in every country. . . . In Germany, France and Italy the Communist International has become not only the centre of the labor movement but the focus of attention for the whole political life of those countries. This is our conquest, and no one can deprive us of it. *The world revolution is growing stronger, while the economic crisis in Europe is getting worse at the same time.*

But, at any rate, were we to draw from this the conclusion that help would come from there within a brief period in the shape of a solid proletarian revolution, we would be simply lunatics; but in this hall, I feel certain, there are none such. We must, therefore, know how to adapt our activity to the mutual class relations existing within our own and other countries, that we may be able for a long time to retain the dictatorship of the proletariat and, at least gradually, to cure all the ills and crises besetting us. Only such a view of the problem will be correct and sober. (*Pravda*, March 10, 1921.)

Surely all this is a far cry from "abandoning the world revolution!"

It was as late as July, 1920, that the Third Internationale declared that "in nearly every country of Europe and America the class struggle is entering upon the phase of civil war—while as late as December (1920) it converted the French Socialist majority to that view. Discouraging and encouraging events have taken place since that time, but the total result of all revolutionary movements during recent months is far from such as to discourage visionary fanatics like the Bolsheviks. At the meeting of March 15 Kameneff made a report on foreign policy to the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party:

"We must consider," began Kameneff, "our relations with the capitalist states, seeing that our supposition of the *speedy* assistance which should come to us from Western Europe in the form of a world revolution has not been carried out *with the rapidity for which we hoped*. Though *counting on the world revolution*, we must shape our practical policy in such a way that it will be possible to take action at any time, should the course of world development force us to fight for the existence of our isolated Soviet Republic.

The words italicized again give a very satisfactory portrayal of the precise state of the Bolshevik mind as regards world revolution. The rest of this speech develops the grounds for the Bolshevik hopes. While indicating the usual state of extreme ignorance, these remarks are important as showing the pro-German prejudices, the hatred of America and England, the expectation of the Bolsheviks that they will participate in future wars (it is strange that the pacifist extremists

insist upon continuing their support of these militaristic and imperialistic fanatics) and also the willingness of the Soviets to arm the Asiatic against the European races.

Kameneff continues:

The great Powers have gained their end. They have succeeded in dividing up the world between them. The victorious powers have not only subjugated colonies and semi-colonies, but many countries such as Austria and Germany, are entirely dependent on them. A small party of the richest countries has divided up the world, converting *the most cultured countries in Europe, Germany and Austria*, into their enslaved vassals.

The danger of a new world war is arising. The struggle will be for the possession of the shores of the Pacific Ocean and *will take place between the former Allies, England and America, while Japan will support England*. It may be presumed that all the capitalist states will again be involved in this new struggle, only a rising of the world proletariat can prevent this new world catastrophe.

Soviet Russia took no part in the division of the world. Thanks to the three years' war Soviet Russia gained the right to an independent existence. This independence will make it possible for us to take up sides in the various historical events of the world. . . .

Soviet Russia is not isolated. Soviet Russia only in the West borders on capitalist states. In the East her neighbour is truly revolutionary Asia. The fact that we still exist is explained by the circumstance that a balance of power has been created between capitalist Europe and revolutionary Asia. Soviet Russia is situated half way between the East and West.

In a long communication to the Independent Labor Party the Third Internationale last summer outlined another war—this time it was a war of the world against



Great Britain and America. This also is a war from which the Bolshevists hoped to gain:

It is probable that when throwing off the chains of the capitalist Governments, the revolutionary proletariat of Europe will meet the resistance of Anglo-Saxon capital in the persons of British and American capitalists, who will attempt to blockade it. It is then possible the revolutionary proletariat of Europe will arise in union with the peoples of the East and commence a revolutionary struggle, the scene of which will be the entire world, to deal the final blow at British and American capitalists.

The pro-German tendency of the propaganda is always in evidence. The Bolshevists are particularly friendly to the Germans in the attack on the Versailles Treaty. We may see an illustration of this in a speech of Lenin's early in 1920:

The Germans are, above all, our auxiliaries because their hope of escaping from the penal clauses of the Peace treaty rests on causing disorder and agitation with a view to profit by the general confusion which will then arise. They seek revenge—we revolution.

This friendliness to the German junkers is also seen in a statement of Trotzky when he was at the Polish front:

It is said that the Russian communists were the serfs of the Prussian junkers, but that must not weigh with us. It must not be forgotten that organized Germany constitutes a danger to world imperialism, and nothing must oppose an understanding with Germany for the destruction of the imperialist governments of Europe.

We prefer such an understanding to fraternization with the so-called free countries.

At the same time the Bolsheviks have endeavored to line up for war upon England and France, alongside the junkers, the junkers' bitter enemies, the German communists.

The revolutionary German socialist leader Crispian, just returned from a visit to Russia at the invitation of the Soviets declared:

The Russian Soviet Government intended to make war on France if the Polish campaign had been successful, and England also would have been attacked. The Soviets were counting on the aid of the German communists." (From Crispian's speech at the Halle Congress of the Independent Socialist Party—October 13, 1920.)

While the Soviets rely largely upon wars out of which revolutions are expected to arise, they rely still more upon the direct results of revolutionary propaganda and organization through the Third Internationale. Their complicity in the German revolutionary movement of March, 1921, for example, is proved by the open assertions of the Moscow communist organ in Berlin, *Die Rote Fahne*.

In spite of such absolutely conclusive evidence and of innumerable other instances of equally stupid Bolshevik duplicity several entirely conservative non-Bolshevik newspapers in America and England insisted that it was incredible that Moscow could at the same time be instigating revolutions and seeking trade by governmental agreements!

## THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALE

THE Third Internationale is the child of the Russian Communist Party. It was created here, in the Kremlin on the initiative of the Communist Party of Russia. The Executive Committee of the Third Internationale is in our own hands. (Report of Radek, Secretary of Third Internationale, to Ninth Congress of Russian Communist Party—*Pravda*, April 3rd, 1920.)

At the Second Congress of the Communist Internationale held, at Moscow in August, 1920, the following resolution was passed:

The World Congress is the supreme organ of the Communist International.

The World Congress elects an Executive Committee of the Communist International which serves as the leading organ in the intervals between the (annual) World Congresses.

In his report to the Congress, President Zinoviev further explained the dictatorial powers possessed by the Moscow Executive:

The Congress has also emphasized the need of a united Communist International organization and has worked out its statute, according to which the executive committee of the III International is given very wide powers,

including that of expelling from the International a whole party for violation of discipline.

Another resolution passed unanimously by the Congress indicated that the control of the Russian Communist Party over this world revolutionary movement is absolute. This resolution declared:

The need of a strong world unity of the proletariat is too evident to allow discussion of any kind of autonomy.

Although there are "only" five Russians on the International Executive Committee, as a matter of fact, all the other ten members were practically appointed by the Russian Bolshevists and their names indicate absolute subserviency, since with one or two exceptions they have little or no representative capacity. For example, the late John Reed was selected to represent America! With the sole exception of Italy, only the most extreme of extremists were chosen. Moreover the permanent bureau or directing body of the Executive Committee consists of three Russians out of five members: Zinoviev, Bukharin and Radek.

This body now claims to have the sole right to represent the proletariat of the world and in their name proposes to overthrow all governments! Revolutionists who do not obey orders, such as d'Arragona, head of the Confederation of Labor of Italy, are immediately branded as traitors to the working-class.

The application of this principle of the divine right of the Russian Bolshevists to control "the world revolution" was amusingly represented at the Congress in the



speeches of Lenin dealing with the revolutionary movement in Great Britain. Here are some passages, as reported in the Bolshevik press:

Lenin protests against the supposition that the peculiar situation of the English labor movement requires that the decision as to the line of conduct of the British Socialist Party should be left in the latter's free judgment. Lenin does not understand why in such a case this Congress and this International are necessary.

Such tactics should be considered one of the worst traditions left by the activity of the II International. The 2nd Congress of the III International will, of course, act differently and will discuss in detail in the proper committee all the conditions of the English labor movement and the tasks resulting therefrom. . . .

Despite the opinion of Comrade MacLean, the Labor Party does not express the political state of mind of the working class of England as organized in trade-unions; it expresses the views and state of mind of its leaders, who are the most bourgeois, reactionary handmaid of British Imperialism. It is necessary that the party should effectively represent the ideology and interests of the proletariat. . . .

Furthermore, these traitors are at the head of the Labor Party which presents an unprecedented situation, for the latter expresses the political will of 4,000,000 workmen organized in its ranks. . . .

You are constantly speaking of the differences between the conditions in England and those in other countries. In so far as you enter the Communist International, you must remember that you must be guided not only by the experience of England but also by general revolutionary experience.

After the speech of Comrade Lenin the theses are put to a vote. Comrade Zinoviev proposed to vote first, and separately, on the thesis relating to the entrance of the

British Socialist Party into the Independent Labor Party of England. This Thesis is adopted by a majority of 48 to 34 with two abstaining.

This amazing act of coercion against the left wing of British labor, as the vote shows, was almost too much even for the hand-picked and thoroughly disciplined delegates of the Communist Internationale. Lenin's plan to capture the Independent Labor Party in this manner was, doubtless, not quite so wild as the plan of the British Communist delegates who were voted down. These latter wished to attack not only the British Labor Party, though it is pro-Soviet in its foreign policy, but also the revolutionary Independent Labor Party which expresses the warmest admiration for Sovietism—in Russia, but does not wish to have it in England and will not take orders from Moscow further than leaving the Second and Socialist Internationale at Moscow's suggestion. Lenin's tactics on the surface were somewhat less impractical. But they were futile in any event as the Independent Labor Party, at its succeeding congress, repudiated Communism by an overwhelming majority, leading to the secession of the small minority of Communists—as ordered by Lenin for all countries. Whether, from the Communist-revolutionary standpoint, this outcome in Great Britain justified Lenin's tactics or not, the British Communists were allowed little to say on the subject.

The autocratic control of Moscow is the key to the tactics of the Third Internationale. The Communists are unanimously agreed that if it is to succeed their revolution must be a world revolution. They are unanimously agreed that it must therefore have a highly

centralized control. They are equally agreed that Soviet Russia is the only "proletarian" country to-day, that it has led the world in revolutionary tactics, that it has started the world revolution and organized the only genuinely proletarian internationale. They are agreed, too, that the iron dictatorship established in Soviet Russia and within the Russian Communist Party furnishes a model for the international organization.

This is the feeling of the extreme revolutionists and communists of all countries. But Moscow goes much farther. It feels that the fate of Soviet Russia carries with it the fate of the world revolution and that therefore all that pertains to its safety and welfare must be given first consideration. It feels that as the light has come from Soviet Russia the light must continue to come from Soviet Russia. It feels that Russia has already experienced what other countries must experience. Russia is the older sister, the others must follow in her foot-steps. None of these ideas are shared even by the extremists of other countries. Lenin sometimes says, and possibly believes, he is allowing for the divergencies of other countries and treating them as equals. But this is scarcely consonant with his astounding twenty-one points, by which he drove away even such ardent and docile supporters as the leaders of the Italian Socialists. His real state of mind is portrayed in his speech before the All-Russian Political Education Conference (November 5th, 1920), in which he said:

The union of all great capitalist countries of the world against Russia, against Soviet Russia—this is the whole business of the present international political situation, and we must be entirely clear as to the fact *that the*

*fate of hundreds of millions of workers in the capitalist countries depends on this fact.*

In our country we experienced such a manifold shaping of events in the Kerensky period, among the Social Revolutionists and the Social Democrats, such a variegated color scheme in the various towns of Russia, that *we may say that we have been tested more than any other people.* If we look toward Western Europe we shall see that *the same thing is now going on there that happened in our country.* *We are beholding a repetition of our own history.*

This is nothing less than revolutionary chauvinism, similar to the doctrine of the French revolutionists when they undertook to force their creed on other peoples by the aid of the bayonet. But it is infinitely more crude. For while France was one of the most advanced countries of Europe, Soviet Russia is one of the most backward.

The Communist Internationale is now functioning in the United States and declares as its principal immediate object the destruction of the American Federation of Labor. By methods of secrecy, by its hold upon certain entirely foreign elements who do not understand anything about American conditions or American labor organizations, by the aid of the large sums it receives from Russia and by the sympathy and assistance it secures from our numerous "parlor Bolshevists" this organization is able to give considerable trouble to the American Labor movement.

The danger very largely takes the form of publications supporting the Soviet cause in the United States. Only a few of these are openly Communist. But a large number of publications and writers take the Communist posi-



tion of hostility with regard to the Federation of Labor combined with friendship to Bolshevism. There can be no doubt that some of them are subsidized by Moscow. A resolution passed by the Second Congress of the Communist Internationale declared:

The Communist parties must create a new type of periodical press for extensive circulation among the workmen; (1) Lawful publications in which the Communists *without calling themselves such and without mentioning their connection with the party*, would learn to utilize the slightest possibility allowed by the laws. (2) Illegal sheets.

One of the first actions taken by the new Bolshevik Government after it seized power was to vote money for such purposes. Here is one of its first decrees:

The Soviet of People's Commissaries deems it necessary to bring all possible means, including money to the aid of the Left International Wing of the workers' movement in all lands, quite regardless of whether these countries are at war or in alliance with Russia; or whether they are neutral.

To that end the Soviet of People's Commissaries, orders to appropriate for the needs of the revolutionary international movement 2,000,000 rubles, to be taken charge of by the foreign representative of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs.

(Signed)

President, Soviet People's Commissaries,  
Vl. Ulianoff (Lenin)

(Signed)

People's Commissary of Foreign Affairs,  
L. Trotzky.

(Published in *Izvestia*, Dec. 13, 1917. p. 9.)

Far from denying this governmentally subsidized propaganda the entire Bolshevik press of the world openly boasts of it.

In the report of the Executive Committee of the Communist Internationale to the Second World Congress of the Communist Internationale, Zinoviev wrote:

Russian workmen, to whom the progressive workmen of other countries have rendered brotherly assistance during the course of two decades, have considered it their proletarian duty now to render similar brotherly assistance to the struggling proletariat that is in more difficult material circumstances.

With respect to the assistance in money which the Communist International has rendered to brotherly parties, the yellow Social Democrats, with the support of the tattlers of the bourgeoisie press, have raised a lot of noise in various countries of Europe. People who do not consider it disgraceful to use material support given by the brigand-like League of Nations raise shouts of protest because the workmen (!) of one country support their brothers in another country.

The workmen themselves did not take this attitude toward the matter. The Italian Communists, for example, practically declared quite openly that some of their party organizations were able to be founded only because the Communist International rendered brotherly assistance to the Italian workmen. The workmen communists in other countries have made similar declarations. . . .

The entire western European bourgeois press, which is bought up by capital, has not ceased to throw dirt at communism because of the subsidy which the daily British Socialist paper, "Daily Herald," was receiving from the Russian proletariat.

This last statement was publicly denied by the *Lon-*

*don Daily Herald*, but many facts are known to point in the contrary direction. It will be noted that the Bolsheviks treat the entire labor press and even the non-Bolshevist Socialist press as "bourgeois."

The Bolsheviks regard their enormous expenditures in mendacious propaganda as having been brilliantly successful and there is some ground for their claim. Zinoviev has recently summed up this success at length in *Pravda*, November 7, 1920. We note a few sentences:

The campaign of slander was very well organized by the bourgeoisie and by its lackeys from the II "Internationale"; it was organized, one may say, scientifically and with talent. But nevertheless, we can say with the greatest pride, that *we* came out victorious from this unequal struggle. . . .

Up to the present, the international proletariat as a whole was on the defensive, and now it will be able to assume the offensive. . . .

When Soviet troops were at the gates of Warsaw, it became particularly clear that the international proletariat is entering on a stage which can be called: passing from the defensive to the offensive. . . .

The Council of Action in London, which showed such brilliant activity for a couple of weeks, was undoubtedly the forerunner of English Soviets of Workmen's Deputies.

Zinoviev's reference to the Second Internationale also includes as non-proletarian and bourgeois the entire non-Bolshevist Labor Union and Socialist press of Europe.

Krassin has also made recent reference to the success of the Soviet propaganda, frankly stating that "the hostility of Great Britain had been overcome by propa-

ganda." If we recall the ceaseless campaign of falsification concerning not only Russia but the entire labor movement of the world that is being carried on by the *London Daily Herald* and other Sovietist or pro-Soviet organs of Great Britain, circulated not only in that country but all over the world, we can realize the enormous damage that has been inflicted upon the British labor movement by the gold which the Bolshevists have looted from the poverty-stricken population of Russia.



THE NEW RED LABOR UNION INTER-  
NATIONALE

OPERATING solely in the field of politics, propaganda, and insurrection the Communist Internationale was not a perfect instrument for the purposes of the Soviets. The Communist, or Third Internationale, from its foundation in March, 1919, had directed its operations mainly, not against the bourgeoisie, but against what it calls "bourgeois" labor as represented in the Second or Socialist Internationale. But it soon discovered that the most formidable labor enemies of Bolshevism are not the political Socialists of the Right or of the Center (the orthodox Marxist followers of Kautsky, Longuet, etc.) but the labor unions of the world, from the American Federation of Labor to the British and German unions and even the syndicalistic French Confederation.

At the Congress of the Communist Internationale at Moscow in the summer of 1920, Lenin issued the following declaration of war against organized labor, thinly veiled as a war against leaders:

*Our main enemy is the opportunism in the upper ranks of the labor movement. This is not a Socialist or proletarian, but a bourgeois movement. That these leaders of the labor movement are defending the bourgeoisie better than the bourgeoisie itself, and that without their assistance the bourgeoisie could not maintain*

itself—is shown not only by the regime of Kerensky, but also by the present democratic republic in Germany, and by the attitude of Albert Thomas and Henderson toward their bourgeois Governments. *Here is our main enemy; we must triumph over this enemy, and leave this Congress with a unanimous and firm decision to carry this struggle through to the end in all countries. This is our main task.*

If that part of the labor movement which utterly repudiates Bolshevism is to be called “the upper ranks” then recent elections throughout the labor movement of Europe have proven that fully three-fourths of the membership is to be so classified.

Bolshevist enmity makes no distinction between the American Federation of Labor and the European unions adhering to the Amsterdam International Federation of Trade Unions. The fact that this international body was ready to declare not only a general strike but a food blockade of the Polish people and to forcibly interrupt the shipment of food and munitions to Poland, all in order to aid the Soviets to accomplish their declared purpose of conquering the Poles, counted for nothing in the minds of the would-be world dictators at Moscow. In spite of the servile attitude of nearly all the political parties of the Second, or Socialist, Internationale and of the controlling elements in the Amsterdam Trades Union Internationale, the Moscow dictators administer nothing but rebuffs to everybody who refuses to accept their absolute rule and demand that all existing organizations be wholly reshaped according to Moscow’s revolutionary specifications.

The Bolsheviks therefore decided at Moscow, last

July, to form a new Internationale of Red Labor Unions. This organization is based upon the fictitious membership of five millions claimed by the official Russian Soviet trade unions, upon the temporary adhesion of the Italian Confederation of Labor with its two million members—although this organization is at present rather outside than inside the Communist Internationale, and upon lesser but equally doubtful claims in other countries. The Communist Internationale adopted, by an overwhelming majority, the following amendment proposed by Radek in connection with this new Red Internationale:

It is the one weapon of the world revolutionary movement against the yellow International, because the principal enemy of the revolutionary proletariat is not Brussels but Amsterdam—that is the yellow international of trade union organizations. By overthrowing Amsterdam we shall deal the most terrible blow to the capitalistic order, but this blow can be dealt only by the Red International of trade-unions.

This Red Internationale is somewhat stronger than at first appears. While it has comparatively little direct support from the labor unions, with the exception of the Latin countries, it has a very strong support from the newly formed Communist parties created during the last six months by the split of the Socialist parties—according to Moscow orders—in several European countries. Thus a majority of the Socialist Party members of France, through the newly created Communist Party, have accepted the dictatorship of the Moscow Communist Internationale, including

the entire twenty-one points. A powerful faction of the Socialists in Germany, now organized as the Communist Party and including a million or two supporters, has taken the same action. And, finally, in Italy both the Communist Party and the Socialist Party adhere to the Third Internationale and accept the twenty-one points, although the latter also claims a certain measure of autonomy. The leadership of all these movements is largely in the hands of "intellectuals" and outsiders, non-members of the labor unions. This is markedly the case with the Italian Communist Party. But the influence on labor is, nevertheless, formidable.

Of Moscow's twenty-one points accepted by all these so-called labor parties, points nine and ten refer to organized labor. They are as follows:

9. Every party which desires to join the Communist Internationale must systematically and constantly develop a communist activity within the trades unions, the workmen's and factory councils, the consumers' societies and other mass organizations of the workmen. Within these organizations it is necessary to organize Communist "cells" which by constant, perseverant work shall win the trades unions, &c., over to the cause of Communism. The "cells" are obliged in their daily work to unmask everywhere the treason of the social-patriots and the fickleness of the "Centre." The Communist "cells" must be completely subordinated to the whole party.

10. Every party belonging to the Third Internationale is obliged to wage a stubborn war against the Amsterdam "Internationale" of the yellow trade unions. They must most emphatically propagate among the unions of organized workmen the necessity of a breach with the yellow Amsterdam Internationale. They must support



by all means the rising international unification of red trade unions which join the Communist Internationale.

If it is recalled that the orders of the Moscow Executive Committee are absolute over all Communist organizations and that Moscow is willing to spend the last gold ruble of the heritage of the Russian people for the disruptive purposes it may be seen that the danger threatening the labor union movement of Continental Europe is considerable. Indeed the French C. G. T. was saved for the cause of labor unionism at the last meeting of the Council only by a very narrow margin of votes. The struggle was most unequal. There is no bribery and corruption fund available for the legitimate labor unions to counterbalance the colossal corruption fund of Moscow. For every dollar legitimately raised and expended by organized labor in self-defense, the Communists, from the loot they have taken from Russian workmen and peasants, are able to spend a thousand.

The situation in Great Britain is similar, though somewhat less acute. Because of the absence of any powerful Communist political party, the Soviets are forced in that country to act mainly through the subsidy of the labor press and other propaganda, which Krassin admits obtained for the Communists the signing of the British trade agreement.

The purpose of the new organization was briefly declared by "The International Soviet of Trade Unions," the name which it first assumed. On August 1st, 1920, this body issued a statement from Moscow from which we take the following:

**The substance of our activity and of our program:**

The overthrow of the bourgeoisie by force, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a merciless class struggle on an international scale, a close and inseparable union with the Communist International.

From the first moment of its inauguration the newest Red Internationale was met with grave internal problems. A split was immediately threatened between the ultra-State Socialism of the Russians who hoped to extend their absolute authority from the Russian State to other nations, and the ultra-revolutionary labor unions of other countries, all of which tend in the direction of syndicalism or anti-Stateism. Apparently the conflict is insoluble, but the Moscow chiefs of the new Internationale decided to use their accepted Macchiavellian tactics of deception and to "take in" the syndicalist elements—as will be demonstrated by the evidence we shall now reproduce.

Among the reports unanimously adopted at the Congress of the Communist Internationale in July, 1920, was the following:

As for the revolutionary Syndicalists, as well as the representatives of shop-stewards, we shall not follow the example of the II International, which always harassed and persecuted all workmen who were not in agreement with its ideas.

We shall work in conjunction with all honest and honestly misguided workmen, and together with them we shall learn and make mistakes, because fundamentally, in our class aims and ideals we represent with them a single proletarian revolutionary whole.

Another resolution recommended the most "friendly attitude" and "closer connection" with these organiza-

tions. The language here chosen is highly significant, as is also the phraseology of the following sentence from the same resolution:

As regards the I. W. W. of America and Australia and the Shop-Steward Committees of England, we have to deal with a genuinely proletarian mass movement which *practically* adheres to the principles of the Communist Internationale.

In order, however, to show the utter impossibility of any real compromise on the part of Moscow toward any trade unions or any other body having to deal with it—no matter how revolutionary they may be—we may quote the following passages on the trade unions from “the theses and statutes adopted by the Third or Communist Internationale” at their 1920 Congress. We quote from the official publication issued by the office of the Communist Internationale in Moscow:

All voluntary withdrawal from the industrial movement, every artificial attempt to organize special unions, without being compelled thereto by exceptional acts of violence on the part of the trade union bureaucracy, such as expulsion of separate revolutionary local branches of the unions by the opportunist officials, or by their narrow-minded aristocratic policy, which prohibits the unskilled workers from entering into the organization, represents a great danger to the Communist movement. It threatens to hand over the most advanced, the most conscious workers, to the opportunist leaders, playing into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

Placing the object and the essence of labour organizations before them, the Communists ought not to hesitate before a split in such organizations, if a refusal to split

would mean abandoning revolutionary work in the trade unions, and giving up the attempt to make of them an instrument of revolutionary struggle, the attempt to organize the most exploited part of the proletariat.

Where a split between the opportunists and the revolutionary trade union movement has already taken place before, where, as in America, alongside of the opportunist trade unions there are unions with revolutionary tendencies—although not Communist ones—there the Communists are bound to support such revolutionary unions, to persuade them to abandon Syndicalist prejudices and to place themselves on the platform of Communism, which alone is economic struggle.

It is the duty of the Communists in all the phases of the economic struggle to point out to the workers that the success of the struggle is only possible if the working class conquers the capitalists in open fight, and by means of dictatorship proceeds to the organization of a Socialist order. Consequently, the Communists must strive to create as far as possible complete unity between the trade unions and the Communist Party, and to *subordinate the unions* to the practical *leadership of the Party*, as the advanced guard of the workers' revolution. For this purpose the Communists should have Communist fractions in all the trade unions and factory committees and acquire by their means an influence over the labour movement and *direct it*.

In a word, whether with or without a split, the aim is to subordinate. We shall now note the practical application of the Communist trade union principles, according to the method of Lenin already quoted, "We must know how to apply, at need, knavery, deceit, illegal methods, hiding truth by silence, in order to penetrate the very heart of the trade unions, to remain there and to accomplish there the Communist task."



As soon as the Trade Union Internationale was formed, the leading Bolshevist authority on trade unions, Losovsky, was delegated to prepare an official pamphlet. This pamphlet was printed in Russian and accepted, but when it was being translated into other languages it occurred to the Moscow authorities that it was indispensable as far as possible to keep from the knowledge of the revolutionary labor unionists of other countries the irreconcilable differences between syndicalism and Bolshevist state socialism which had developed in the Moscow conference. Therefore, when it was too late, the two following wireless dispatches were sent abroad:

To Litvinov for Asten, Chairman, Russian Trade Union Delegation.

Moscow, Sept. 8.

The international council of Labor Unions has now been joined by the British Shop Stewards and Workers Committees, Transport Workers' Federation of Holland, German Syndicalists and Italian Syndicalists. Please shape your policy in accordance with this fact. The aim of the Council is to unite all the Left elements of the Trade Union and Industrial movement. In view of this pp. 56-70 of Losovsky's story of the Council must be re-written before publishing.

General Secretary of the International Council of Trades Unions—Tomsky.

Wireless to Losovsky, Russian Trade Union Delegation, Christiana, Norway.

Moscow, Sept. 9.

Your booklet on the International Council of Trade Unions will be published in Russian with a foreword and additional matters. The polemic nature of the booklet as far as it deals with industrial syndicalists, shop stewards and Italian Confederation representatives such

as to make it inadvisable that it should be published in a foreign language.

General Secretary of International Council  
of Trades Unions—Tomsky.

The passages which it was wished to keep from the non-Russian adherents of the New Red Internationale were those describing the results of the Red Trade Union congress held in Moscow the beginning of July, 1920. Among the most instructive paragraphs are the following: [We quote from the pamphlet entitled "The International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions, by A. Losovsky, (S. A. Dridzo)—Price 25 cents—Published by the Union Publishing Company, New York City.]

*The German syndicalists, the British and American representatives of the I. W. W. and the Shop Stewards approached the question from quite a different point of view. They questioned the necessity of any form of dictatorship. They regarded the dictatorship not as the dictatorship of the proletariat, but as dictatorship over the proletariat and categorically protested against establishing this principle.*

The representatives of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions proposed the following point on the dictatorship of the proletariat: "The dictatorship of the bourgeoisie must be opposed by the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transitional, but resolute measure, as the only means by which it is possible to crush the resistance of the exploiters, and secure and consolidate the gains of the proletarian government."

This formula was adopted by all except the syndicalists, and the representatives of the I. W. W. and the Shop Stewards.

It was difficult to unite these conflicting tendencies—

from the denial of the necessity of a political party—to the recognition of the necessity of the inseverable connection between the party and the unions, on a single platform. It was still more difficult to reconcile the point of view of the Russian trade unionists on the supremacy of the party over the unions with the various views explained above. The discussion showed one thing, and that was that those elements of the labor movement which denied the political struggle, which denied the necessity of a political party of the proletariat, and the closest bond between the Communist Party and the trade unions could not enter the new international trade union centre, because the whole idea of international organization of the revolutionary unions lay in gathering all the economic and political organizations of the working class into one body—the Third International—for defensive and offensive operations against the capitalist class.

Pestana [of the National Confederation of Labor of Spain] said that he could not imagine such a relation between the party and the unions as existed in Russia, in Spain, for the reason that in Spain the unions are a great force, while the Communist Party is only in its embryonic stage. He opposed the subordination of the unions to the party, but was in favor of the closest contact between the party and the unions on a national and international scale. Neither the representatives of the British Shop Stewards' or the American I. W. W. objected to co-operating with the Communist Party, but the German syndicalists and the representatives of the industrial Labor Unions were categorically opposed to any co-operation.

. . . . .

*These comrades also raised doubts concerning the Soviet system.* They asserted that the Soviet system is not applicable to Western Europe, and that the industrial unions and the shop stewards' committees will perform the function of the Soviets there.

. . . . .

The representatives of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions were of the opinion that the trade unions should organize sections within the Trade International. From this it follows that the Third Communist International should be the general staff of all the militant revolutionary class organizations of the proletariat.

*All the delegates except the Bulgarians opposed the Russian delegation.* The Italians, French and English, approaching the question from various points of view were inclined to the opinion that an independent international organization should be set up which, while being connected by ideas and organization with the Third International, nevertheless should lead an independent existence. The representative of the German syndicalists and of the Australian I. W. W. were against all connection with the Third International and argued that the trade unions under no circumstances will associate with a political organization. It is characteristic that the same point of view was held by the representatives of the German Labor Unions, Otto Ruhle, who represented the German Communist Labor Party, the distinguishing feature of which is that it denies the necessity and usefulness of politically organizing the working class. On this question, as on other questions, the syndicalists and the I. W. W. differed. On this occasion it was due to the I. W. W. supporting affiliation to the Third International.

. . . . .

The question that raised most discussion was that of the tactics of the Communist revolutionary elements within the trade union movement in connection with the old mass unions. The question was: Should the old unions be split or captured? Considerable differences were revealed among the delegates on this point. Recognizing their weakness in comparison with the German "free" unions which embrace nearly 8,000,000 members,



the German syndicalists and representatives of the German Labor Unions declared that the present day "free" unions of Germany were hopeless, that it was necessary to destroy them and only by destroying them it will be possible to conquer the bourgeoisie. The representatives of the I. W. W. held the same viewpoint. In their opinion the American Federation of Labor is an invincible fortress. The only thing to do was to abandon it and set up a separate organization outside of it. They further asserted that the reactionary character of the American Federation of Labor is bound up with its very construction and to think of fighting the treacherous policy of Gompers inside the unions was an utopia. . . . Both the German and the American comrades were clearly illogical, for it is ridiculous to think that it is possible to bring about a social revolution in Western Europe without or in spite of the trade unions. To leave the unions and to set up small independent unions is an evidence of weakness.

. . . . .

It is obvious that a conference of representatives of trade unions of various countries could not adopt a point of despair, and it was resolved to "condemn the tactics of advanced revolutionary elements leaving the existing unions. On the contrary, these must take all measures to drive the opportunists out of the unions, carry on a methodical propaganda for Communism within the unions, and form Communist and revolutionary groups in all the organizations for conducting propaganda in favor of our programme."

. . . . .

That the conference took up the correct point of view is proved by the Second Congress of the Third International which sharply opposed the tactics of leaving the unions. The motto put forward by the Communist International, and which is our motto also, is: "Not the destruction, but the conquest of the trade unions."

It may have been possible on other questions to compromise in order to secure agreement, but on this cardinal question of international labor policy no compromise was possible.

These conferences ended in the acceptance of a declaration which should serve as a basis for gathering all the revolutionary class unions into one organization. This declaration was discussed for a whole month, and is the result of a compromise between various tendencies.

Losovsky quotes the declaration referred to in full. As he himself declares it is vague and for the most part unimportant. But one resolution should be noted together with the signatures:

To organize a militant international committee for the reorganization of the trade union movement. This committee will function as the International Council of Trade Unions and *will act in agreement with the Executive Committee of the Third International* on conditions that will be laid down by congresses.

Signed:

A. LOSOVSKY,  
All-Russian Central Council Trade Unions.  
L. D'ARRAGONA,  
General Confederation of Labor, Italy.  
A. PESTANA,  
National Confederation of Labor, Spain.  
N. SHABLIN,  
General Syndicalist Labor Unions, Bulgaria.  
A. ROSMER,  
Revolutionary Syndicalist Minority, C. G. T., France,  
N. MIKADO,  
Communist Minority Trade Unions, Georgia.  
N. MILKITCH,  
General Confederation of Labor, Jugo-Slavia (Serbia, etc.).

Losovsky follows this resolution with the following illuminating comment:

What is the reason of the vagueness and incompleteness of the declaration? It is the fact that several of the organizations represented—the General Confederation of Labor of Italy, the unions which Robert Williams and Albert Purcell represent—still belong to the Amsterdam Federation of Trade Unions, and that the leaders of even the revolutionary class unions of Western Europe lag behind the revolutionary masses.

It is indeed interesting that Purcell and Williams should be permitted by the organized labor of Great Britain to participate in an organization pledged to a war of extermination against the Amsterdam International. The same remark applies to d'Arragona who was later admitted to the Autumn Conference of the Amsterdam Federation of Trade Unions.

Losovsky proceeds to claim that the new organization is supported by nine million members. We have already shown the absurdity of this claim with regard to seven million of these, representing Russia and Italy. It may be doubted if the Spanish Confederation wholly accepts Moscow's dictatorship. The claim to "the revolutionary syndicalist minority of France," seven hundred thousand members, is absurd. The French labor movement has not yet been successfully disrupted by Moscow and the minority still accepts the discipline of the C. G. T., under Jouhaux, Dumoulin, Merrheim, Bartuel, Bidegary and other militant anti-Bolshevists.

Since its formation and the publication of these official pamphlets, the Red Labor Union Internationale has

proceeded with its work of attempted destruction of organized labor in all countries. In a recent publication entitled—"Two Months' Activity of the International Council of Trade and Industrial Unions," (the official title now assumed by the new Internationale) we read:

"The organization of the propaganda of the Council"—thus states the pamphlet—"has been started and manifestos have already been issued to the organized workers of Great Britain, America, Germany, India and France. . . . The Council is making arrangements for the establishment in each of the countries of at least one central propaganda committee with its members drawn from the revolutionary unions, where possible, the Communist Party. They will not hesitate to form more than one National committee where these are necessary. These committees are to undertake extensive propaganda throughout the unions by means of the publication of manifestos, *the use of labor papers*, by conferences of the unions, by controversy in the press, by the organization of speakers, distribution of our literature and general agitation throughout the labor movement."

In Great Britain the British Bureau of the International Council of Trades and Industrial Unions has been formed under the leadership of notorious pro-Bolshevist British unionists, whose names are known if not yet officially published. Two resolutions are being proposed by this "Council" in trade union locals in Great Britain and America and other countries, as follows:

1. To withdraw from the Amsterdam Federation of Trade Unions.
2. To join the new Internationale and send delegates to a world conference at Moscow pledged to sup-



port . . . a revolutionary policy aiming at the world-wide dictatorship of the proletariat.

The published program of the Communist Party in America indicates that they have studied carefully the Moscow policy of boring from within and battering from without. Here is its definition of the duty of Communist members of trade unions:

A Communist who belongs to the A. F. of L. should seize every opportunity to voice his hostility to this organization, not to reform it but to destroy it. The I. W. W. must be upheld as against the A. F. of L. At the same time the work of Communist education must be carried on within the I. W. W.

It will be noted that the same effort to capture is to be applied against the I. W. W. as against the non-Communist unions of Europe.

Naturally the elements of the European labor movement adhering to the Amsterdam Federation of Trades Unions do not accept the criticisms of the new Internationale—although as yet the Amsterdam body has made very feeble efforts to defend itself and its most important international action during 1920 was the violently pro-Soviet resolution for a general strike above referred to. At the Congress in London in November, the Federation passed the following resolution in reply to the Moscow Trade Union manifesto:

The Congress observes that the signatories of this manifesto set down their declaration of war by writing that the International of Moscow will destroy the "Yellow" Amsterdam International.

The Congress considers, judging from the facts of the situation, that these attacks do not emanate from the Russian proletariat and that the latter could not be regarded as in any degree responsible for them. Further, the Congress considers that these caluminous criticisms and this declaration of war prove either a total ignorance of the composition and actions of the International Federation of Trade Unions or else an evident bad faith arising out of the unwholesome desire to destroy the workers' organizations in every country. (From *Justice*, December 2, 1920.)

Throughout Europe the labor elements supporting the International Trades Union Federation and those supporting the Second or Socialist Internationale are largely identical. Perhaps because it had been longer under attack, the Second Internationale at its meeting in Brussels, a few weeks before the International Trade Union Congress of London, passed a far more resolute anti-Bolshevist resolution signed:

ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. (Great Britain).

EMILE VANDERVELDE (Belgium).

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Great Britain).

P. J. TROELSTRA (Holland).

OTTO WELS (Germany).

ARTHUR ENGBERG (Sweden).

CAMILLE HUYSMANS (Belgium), Secretary.

From this resolution we may quote the following:

They [the Bolshevists] trod the desires of the Russian people in the dust, and in place of democracy they established an armed dictatorship, not of the proletariat, but of a committee. Now they are attempting to impose their will and their decrees upon the Socialist and Labour

Parties of the whole world. They belong to the old world of Tsardom, not to the new world of Socialism.

They have insulted twenty-seven millions of organized trade union workers by calling them "scabs" and have declared their intention to disrupt the trade unions. . . .

They may have ended wage-slavery; they have established State-slavery and misery. They have robbed the workers of freedom of movement and of combination and are preventing the creation of economic democracy.

This resolution undoubtedly indicates the real state of mind of the trades unions of Europe towards the Russian Soviets. However, neither of these resolutions has led to any effective action of any kind against either the international machinations or the subsidized propaganda of Bolshevism. [For a later declaration of the Amsterdam Federation see the following chapter.]

## XII

### EUROPEAN LABOR DISILLUSIONED

LENIN, in the summer of 1920, abandoned his policy of excluding all persons from Russia who were not Bolsheviks. Socialist and Labor delegations were admitted from England, Italy, France, Germany, Spain, and Sweden which contained non-Bolshevist members. Few if any of their members belonged to the moderate wing of the European labor movement. The majority were pro-Bolsheviks and the others represented the revolutionary or orthodox "center" of the movement. On returning to their various countries the majority of these witnesses condemned Bolshevism, root and branch.

Serrati, Dugoni, Vacirca and d'Arragona, of the Italian Socialist and labor union delegation, after their visit, declared that while the capitalist régime had been destroyed "it has not been replaced by anything that meets even the most elementary needs of a civilized people." Crispian, the revolutionary leader of Germany's Independent Socialists, said that under the Third Internationale "a tyranny almost as bad as that of capitalism would prevail." Mrs. Snowden of the British Mission declared not only that the Soviets were anti-socialist and anti-democratic and anti-Christian, but that everybody she had met in Russia outside the Communist party "goes in terror of his liberty or his life." Serrati, editor of *Avanti* and revolutionary leader of the Italian



Socialists, stated that the Russian people are passive and indifferent and quoted Lenin to the effect that fifty years would be necessary to complete the work of the revolution. The eminent German Socialist, Dittmann, one of the radical members of the German delegation, reported that Russia was entirely under the control of the Bolshevist Party with 604,000 members, and that in one month last summer 893 people were shot by order of the special revolutionary tribunals and a much larger number unreported were executed "by administrative orders." This has happened since the Bolshevists were accredited all over the world in "intellectual" and "liberal" organs with having abolished terrorism. Tom Shaw, a member of the British delegation, pointed out that the working people of Russia were in a condition of actual slavery.

Both Professor Ballod of the German delegation and the Italians, in their official report, concluded that the Bolshevists are absolutely incompetent economically. Professor Ballod states that the Soviet leaders have proven themselves "wholly incapable of effecting an economic restoration in Russia" and that "bureaucracy is as bad as it was under the Czar and is on the ascendent."

The Italians, including the revolutionary Serrati, declared that the Soviet as an experiment had proved itself a failure, though the British report held that, as an experiment, it would prove valuable to other countries (carried out it will be noted, at the expense of the Russian and not of the British people). The Italians and Germans regarded the existing resistance to the Soviet oppressors as justifiable and inevitable. The

British report referred to this resistance under the Soviet term "counter-revolution" and concluded that the Soviet Government was supported by the Russian people. The Italians, as we have said, held that the population was passive and indifferent, while the above-named Germans, admirers of the Soviet and the Third Internationale, discovered after investigation in Russia, that the Soviet régime was a tyranny without support outside of the Bolshevik Party.

The second disillusionment of European labor came with the ultimatum of the Third Internationale (the famous 21 points) by which Lenin declared to his worshippers that they either had to accept the absolute dictatorship of Moscow or be excommunicated, and that they had to destroy the International Federation of Trades Unions as being a scab organization.

Finally, most frightful disillusionment, the Polish people were not conquered by the Soviets, in spite of all the revolutionary measures taken by radical labor throughout Europe to help the Bolshevik would-be conquerors.

All these events took a little time to have their full effect; it was not until the labor union and Socialist Party congresses of the fall and winter that European labor began to find itself—but it has answered Lenin at last! After a visit to the Caucasus J. R. MacDonald demanded that Great Britain protect the Social-Democratic Labor Government of Georgia and bring about an alliance of that country with Armenia and the Tartar Republic. As *Soviet Russia*, Lenin's official organ in America, rightly remarks, this alliance would be for defense against the Soviets as well as against the Turks.

Also Kautsky of Germany and De Brouckere of Belgium, after visiting Armenia, recommended military intervention and Huysmans, Secretary of the Second Internationale sent the appeal to that effect to the Socialist parties affiliated with that Internationale (including the British Labor Party). As between Turkish and Bolshevik armies and those of Great Britain and France, not only Georgia and Armenia, but also MacDonald, Kautsky and Huysmans were for the armies of the capitalist governments—a far cry from the summer's policy of assisting in the forcible Sovietizing of Poland!

The French labor unionists, especially, are lucid, consistent and outspoken. The Executive of the C. G. T., the French Federation of Labor, issued an appeal to French workmen to remain faithful to the union labor movement as against the Communist element that recently split the Socialist Party at Tours, and on February 15th (1921) this Executive was re-elected, though by a narrow margin—Moscow having spent millions of dollars in an attempt to purchase the Congress. In a long manifesto the Federation Executive charged the Communists with the intention of “destroying international syndicalism that comprises 27,000,000 workers,” and asked labor to support a program of social improvement, rather than “personal ambitions and greeds.”

The Federation Council squarely accepted Lenin's declaration of a war to the finish and authorized Jouhaux by a vote of 103 to 3, with twenty-two abstentions, to take any necessary measures (including expulsion) against any members who obeyed the orders of the Third Internationale and organized nuclei of Communists for the purpose of throwing out all non-Bolshevist

leaders. This was a logical step in pursuance of the Orleans Congress of the C. G. T. Congress in September, 1920, which issued a declaration of independence as against all outside political control. Merrheim, Secretary of France's leading union, the Metal Workers, at this congress denounced the Soviet Government and described Lenin as "a sanguinary megalomaniac and a pitiless tyrant, the greatest menace to the Russian revolution." When the Bolsheviks yelled in protest Merrheim replied that these were the very words used only a few years before by the Franco-Russian, Rappoport, now one of the French Bolshevik leaders. Bartuel, Secretary of the next largest union, the Miners, who has also been sustained in a recent congress of his union, describes Bolshevism as a militaristic and reactionary movement worse than capitalism.

At the French Socialist Congress at Tours in December, 1920, at which the revolutionary majority accepted Lenin as Czar and changed the name of the organization to Communist Party, the minority (itself Marxian and revolutionary) showed that the French General Strike of May 1st, 1920, engineered and subsidized by the Russian Bolsheviks, had almost destroyed the organized labor of France.

M. Faure presented to the delegates figures showing material decreases of the membership in the union syndicates of the Seine and of the French Confederation of Labor. The Confederation membership has decreased from 1,500,000 to 600,000, he declared, while that of the Seine syndicates has decreased from 292,000 to 140,000. He asserted this decrease was due to the extremist element, and that the party would suffer further losses if the revolutionary spirit of Moscow prevailed.



The most recent delegation to Moscow was that of the Spanish Socialists. Upon his return to Spain, Rois, one of the two delegates, a member of the last Spanish Parliament, reported as follows:

Any one who analyzes the curious state of mind in which the Russian leaders find themselves cannot fail to note that it is due to the contempt in which the notions of liberty and democracy are held. We pointed out to Comrade Kobetsky that the Spanish party was accustomed to refer policies to a referendum. "That," he said, "is playing democracy."

"How and when," we asked Lenin in our interview with him, "can we get out of this period of the dictatorship of the proletariat—which you call a period of transition—and arrive at a regime of freedom for labor unions, press, and individuals?"

"We ourselves," Lenin replied, "have never talked of liberty. All we have said is 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' That dictatorship we are exercising here from the seat of power in behalf of the proletariat. In Russia the working class, properly so-called, is in a minority. That minority is imposing its will and will continue to do so as long as other elements in society resist the economic conditions that Communism lays down. The peasants and the country people do not think readily in our terms. They have the mentality of shopkeepers, petty bourgeois. That is why Denikin, Kolchak, and Wrangel have found some support among them. . . ."

"However, to come back to your question: The period of transition will be a long one with us—I should say from forty to fifty years. Other countries, such as England and Germany, where industry is better organized than here, will recover from the proletarian dictatorship much sooner, though the development of revolution in those countries is taking longer than we had hoped."

Perhaps the most complete and authoritative statement of the attitude of European labor towards the Soviets and their Communist Internationale is to be found in the open letter of the International Federation of Trades Unions dated March 23, 1921. This letter is signed by the Executive Committee of the International Federation of Trades Unions as follows: Jouhaux (France), Martens (Belgium), Fimmen and Oudegeest (Holland). Only the name of the President of the organization, J. H. Thomas, of Great Britain, is lacking.

This letter was in reply to a very insulting epistle sent by Zinoviev, as President of the Communist Internationale, in which all the leaders of the International Federation of Trades Unions were declared to be "scabs" and traitors to the working class.

The Executive Committee of the International Federation of Trades Unions declares in its reply that it is ready to support the Russian people and the Russian revolution to the full extent of its powers, but it demands in return from the representatives of the Russian people that "they shall pursue a similar line of conduct towards the Internationale of Labor Unions." We see from this statement that the International Trades Union Bureau recognizes the Bolshevist Government as representing the Russian people—in spite of the absolutely contradictory evidence it furnishes later in the same letter. Of the Soviet régime it demands only a friendly attitude to the Trades Union Internationale; in exchange for this, it is ready to give Bolshevism an absolutely free hand in Russia to continue the despotic rule over labor described in the remainder of the letter! However, since this introductory statement shows that the International

Federation of Trades Unions wishes to be as friendly to the Russian Bolsheviks as the latter will allow, the indictment that follows has all the more weight. The International Bureau Executive continues:

Up to the present we have received nothing from those who claim the right to speak in the name of the Russian people but curses, libels and lies, which have been spread without the shadow of proof.

And is it possible for us to fail to state that we find it difficult to believe in your good will towards the proletariat? Is it not a principle of your party to subordinate the freedom of labor unions to political considerations? You suggest that we should hold conferences together, but up to the present you have not shown that you have learned how to consort with decent people. The proof of this is found in your lies and in the fact that you cannot write a letter without filling it with insults—and you haven't even enough cleverness to introduce variety in your attacks. Your dictionary of curse words, gentlemen, is as monotonous as the starvation and the news of massacres in your country.

For three years you have been destroying the freedom of the labor movement in Russia with fire and sword. And you have done this so thoroughly and radically that the "White Terror" of the bourgeois Government of Hungary is but a weak reflection of your "Red Terror."

The Executive of the Trade Union Internationale then turns its attention to the ignorance displayed by the Bolsheviks in all their discussions of the labor situation of other countries and especially of the labor unions. It points out that the International Trades Union Federation has twenty-four million members and estimates on the basis of Zinoviev's own statement that the new Red Labor Union Internationale has less than a million mem-

bers outside of Russia. The International Executive then continues:

That Zinovieff, who speaks in the name of a so-called Labor Union Internationale, is ignorant of all this only shows that he has no conception whatever of the European labor union movement. This does not surprise us. We are only too well aware that this gentleman knows the labor union movement only from books and pamphlets and was never a working man. Was it not Lenin who, shortly before the October (1917) coup d'etat, wrote as follows of this Mr. Zinovieff: "I knew he was an ignoramus; but I didn't know he was also a coward."

And this man accuses us of not being working men! The confusion which runs among the ideas of Mr. Zinovieff is very comprehensible to us. He is simply unable to conceive of a labor union movement which is fully independent of the political movement. Did he not write in the "Communist Internationale" on April 9th "You (the Communist Party) bind the political struggle and the economic struggle together as a single whole and supervise the political struggle of the proletariat just as you conduct its economic struggle."

We declare frankly that the situation in which the labor organizations of your country find themselves, owing to your conduct, doesn't entitle you to give us lectures.

Lectures from you! You do not appear to know, Mr. Zinovieff, that your standpoint has long ago become obsolete and belongs to the past. For more than thirty years the labor unions of Central and Western Europe have freed themselves from the guardianship of all politicians and political parties and experience has taught them they have acted wisely. All your arrogance doesn't do away with the fact that you are setting about to begin the development of the labor union movement all over again. Try, gentlemen, to be a little less behind the times and endeavor to gain some knowledge of the facts.



It is of little consequence whether these facts are known to you or not, or whether, according to the teachings of Lenin, you regard all poisons and tricks and cloakings of the truth as permissible in order to gain control of the labor unions. (This refers to the Machiavellian expression of Lenin cited in previous chapters.)

In our letter of the 15th of December we wrote: "If you or other representatives of your labor union movement chance to desire to gain more information about our movement—during which you would perhaps convince yourselves that you have hitherto done nothing but to damage your own movement and to harm the proletariat—then we are ready at any time to give you the desired information.

If we haven't had the opportunity of enjoying the blessings of your regime personally, at least we know your system and your principles. We know your theories, as they are printed on paper, but we also know them as applied in practice, which is well illustrated by your over-crowded prisons. We know the dependence of the Soviets upon the Communist Party—which has created a new autocracy. We know the happy condition the Russian people finds itself in and the welfare your rule has brought—on paper. And we hear with satisfaction that you regard Middle and Western Europe as not yet being ripe for your beneficent plans.

Look once more at our letter of December 15th which in your haste to answer quickly you read too superficially. For there we declared that we are very ready to teach you, however painful it is to us that men equipped with such complete power as you have can scarcely open their mouths or take a pen in hand without giving new proof that they are without the slightest knowledge of those things which men in their position ought to know.

We declare to you that we are still ready to undertake this work of instruction.

The Soviet Government itself has been forced to take notice of the rising tide of hostility in the ranks of European labor. The British Labor Party protested against the severe punishment meted out to Russian trade unionists who had been bold enough to give them truthful information during their visit to Russia. This protest had no effect upon the barbarian ears of the Soviets. They refused to moderate their policy in the slightest degree in response to such ineffective verbal pressure but at the same time felt obliged to issue one of their usual statements attempting to cover their actions by a few utterly meaningless phrases. The statement, signed by Krassin, was in part as follows:

The Soviet Government is responsible to the working masses of Russia and to the world proletariat for the maintenance of the success of the Russian Socialist Revolution.

The Soviet Government is extremely desirous to maintain the best relations with the British Labor Party, and with other proletarian or semi-proletarian organizations. The Soviet Government is extremely grateful to them for the support they have given to the cause of the Russian Revolution. [The British Labor Party has not even threatened to withdraw or curtail this support!—ed.]

The Soviet Government . . . considers, as is the case at present, that the sole organ having any right to impose conditions upon the Soviets and to make any complaints to them is the Russian working masses and the revolutionary organizations of the proletarian world.

That is, the Russian Communists, claiming to represent the revolutionary proletariat of the world, assert their right of life and death over anybody who happens to fall into their power, no matter how large the pro-

letarian majority which condemns their action! It may be doubted if a more thinly veiled defense of sheer despotism was ever offered to the world.

In spite of the fact that the Russian people are allowed no voice whatever within that country, it must not be supposed that they have been successfully stifled. Innumerable representative individuals from all classes, including the trade unions, men and women whose integrity and credentials cannot be questioned, have escaped, to give voice to the opinions of the Russian people. Moreover, the largest labor organizations of Russia, that is the rank and file of the trade unions, without reference to the new leaders appointed by the Soviets or the new imaginary organizations created by them, have been in continued contact with European labor. The same is true of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, numerically the most important political organization in Russia. There is, moreover, no misunderstanding whatever of the Russian situation in neighboring countries, such as Germany and Scandinavia, where the contact with Russia has been close and continuous and pro-Bolshevist "intellectuals" can deceive nobody. But besides this testimony the labor delegations visiting Soviet Russia have secured reports from the trades unions and from the socialist parties as organizations. Some of these are published in the report of the British Labor Delegation. From the most important, the address to British labor by the Executive Committee of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, signed by Chernoff, Gotz, and other leaders known to the entire labor and socialist movement of Europe, we quote the following characterization of the Bolshevist régime:

We quite understand that the British proletariat, deafened by the clamour of the recent world slaughter, not yet recovered from the wave of national chauvinism, would like to see in Russia, in spite of the libels of petty bourgeois penny-a-liners, the living example of how a people, after having shaken off its feet the dust of the old world, has risen on the ruins of the war conflagration to a new work of creation, free and untrammelled by any chains or bonds. We quite agree that some illusions must be left, and that the proletariat of Europe has created "the Red Legend" of a great country where Socialism, unrealisable to Philistine bourgeoisie, has not only been tried, but has now existed for nearly three years, in spite of the civil war, the blockade, and an artificial isolation from the rest of the cultured world, amid the gibes of inimically-inclined people hedging it round. We are well aware that this Red Legend, this Red Myth may exert an elevating influence on the ardour of the proletarian vanguard, causing its heart to beat faster, proudly raising its head, and straining to tenseness its revolutionary muscle. We are loath to confess that this Red Legend must react with a force directly proportionate to the square of its distance, and that the number of models of admirable energy worthy of imitation is far below the number of examples showing us how a Social Revolution should *not* be accomplished.

We would ask you to try and distinguish among the many strange and Asiatically-savage facts of Bolshevik-Communist dictatorship something more than the mere mad pranks of a Caliban. Do not forget that revolutionary passion carried to fanatical excess, added to the impatience characteristic of an active temperament, often prove fatal. You must always bear in mind that Russia has lived for ages under a regime of all-around oppression on the part of the Government; that the training of the people in ideas of democracy demanded a period of time too long for the patience of a great number



of the people themselves. The temptation proved too strong to effect a leap right over the dead level of unpreparedness with the help of enlightened despotism and the rod of Peter the Great shaped according to a new Communist fashion. Taking all this into consideration, it will, perhaps, be clear to you why in the tumultuous chaos of the revolutionary tempest, one part of the Russian Socialists so quickly and easily cast off the outward gilding of scientific Socialism, showing underneath the Asiatic nature of enlightened despotism with a Communist lining.

In spite of abundant evidence of this character contained in its report, the British Labor Delegation, being divided, took no decisive stand—and made statements flatly contradicted not only by other delegations, but by some of their own delegates, as already noted. This led to further protest by the Socialist-Revolutionists represented in Paris by another leader known in all countries, O. S. Minor—a man, like the others, who has spent most of his life in prison or exile because of his socialistic and revolutionary opinions. Referring especially to the failure of the British Labor Party to do anything on behalf of the oppressed population of Russia, in particular the labor unionists and agriculturists, Minor said:

Still less can we understand how so many of the Socialists can, with a clear conscience, justify the methods of Bolshevism for Russia, at the same time rejecting them for their own countries. Such a view shows either a conscious or unconscious deep contempt for the Russian people, an insulting attitude toward them as towards a nation of slaves for whom the Communism of the Whip is the most appropriate, natural and national brand of Socialism.

Such an attitude towards the working people of Russia, proved to be wrong by innumerable uprisings of workers and peasants, we, Russian Socialists, never expected to meet with among our European comrades, and, we declare, that we cannot leave such a perversion of mutual relations within the international Socialist family without our most emphatic protest.

## XIII

### THE CAMOUFLAGED TRADE AGITATION

BOLSHEVIST diplomats have repeatedly acknowledged that one of the purposes of their negotiations for governmental trade agreements is to obtain *de facto* recognition of the Soviet Government with all the prestige that this implies. Krassin, the chief negotiator with Great Britain, has acknowledged that there can be very little trade for some time and Mr. Hughes has demonstrated that trade will depend upon the extension of credit by somebody or other to the Soviet Government.

The whole negotiations are described by Lenin in a speech before the railwaymen, reported by the Moscow wireless on April 3rd, 1921, as "our game with the bourgeoisie."

But an additional purpose of these trade negotiations is Bolshevik propaganda throughout the world and as part of this propaganda the word has been passed along by the Bolsheviks—for foreign consumption—that by the very act of making trade agreements with capitalists, Communism in Russia was being abandoned.

There is no foundation for this claim. All the revolutionary wars, insurrections, general strikes and agitations openly subsidized by the Bolsheviks throughout the world for the past three years have been going on simultaneously with the agitation for trade agreements and the effort to interest capitalists through concessions,

that is, through alienating the patrimony of the Russian people without their consent.

There can be no question that the Soviet British trade agreement was a tremendous victory for Soviet prestige both in Russia and in every country of the world. There is ample ground for the following statement from *Soviet Russia* published on April 16, 1921:

The full extent of the victory won by the workers of Russia over the rulers of England is revealed in the text of the Anglo-Russian trade agreement published in this number of *Soviet Russia*. In the issue of January 22, 1921, there were published in *Soviet Russia* two preliminary draft agreements, one submitted by the British government on November 29, and the other submitted by the Soviet government on December 13, 1920. A comparison of the two papers afforded a view of the divergent and conflicting claims and purposes of the Russian and British Governments respectively. The final agreement is the outcome of the contest in which Mr. Krassin, representing the power and purpose of the Russian workers, met Sir Robert Horne, representing the power and purpose of the British imperialists. It was a test of strength, a significant skirmish, between Communism and Capitalism. We purpose here to examine the final document paragraph by paragraph, to see by comparison with the previous drafts which of the two powers prevailed in the adjustment of their opposing contentions. The examination will show that the Workers' Republic won an overwhelming victory over the Capitalist Empire. Point by point, clause by clause, the claims and principles advanced by the Soviet Government broke down the objections and evasions of the British Government.

The final document consists of a preamble and fourteen articles, and is accompanied by a separate declaration of claims, signed on the same day.



The very fact that the British Government claimed until the last moment that there was to be no political recognition of the Soviet Government shows how this aspect of the agreement was a defeat for Great Britain and a victory for the Soviets—a victory undoubtedly due, as Krassin claims, to the Bolshevist propaganda. Yet it was only a few weeks after the agreement had been signed that the British courts declared that it amounted to a *de facto* recognition, in spite of the fact that it is distinctly stated in that document that it was only preliminary to such recognition. A tremendous comment on this trade agreement is the fact that the Bolshevists apparently continued to expend the same vast sums of money in Great Britain for the overthrow of the British Government after that agreement as before. Apparently the Bolshevists put special hopes upon the coal strike (April and May, 1921). Although this was a purely economic struggle in the fundamental questions raised, a very considerable minority in the organization openly attempted to take advantage of the crisis for revolutionary purposes. In view of this fact the official statement made in the House of Commons by Edward Shortt, Secretary for Home Affairs, on May 12, is of the utmost significance:

The British Government is considering the possibility of introducing legislation to prohibit the receipt of foreign money in the United Kingdom intended to promote a revolutionary movement or to sustain a revolutionary propaganda.

If such agitation was indeed being carried on by the Bolshevists it was done with the encouragement of the British Government itself.

From the very first Lenin has advocated this policy, with the expressed belief that Bolshevist-aided revolutions would soon overthrow all existing governments and release him from his obligations.

As early as February, 1919, Tchitcherin, the Soviet Commissary for Foreign Affairs, sent to the governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States a note in which he said:

Seeing the great interest which has always been shown by foreign capital for the exploitation of Russia's natural riches, the Russian Soviet Government is disposed to grant concessions upon mines, forests, and so on, to citizens of the Entente Powers, under conditions which must be carefully determined so that the economic and social order of Soviet Russia should not suffer from the internal rule of these concessions.

At the meeting of the Russian Communist Party on March 15th, 1921, Kameneff used an identical argument (Moscow Wireless, March 18, 1921):

. . . Can we without the assistance of foreign capital rapidly restore our economic life? No, we cannot. We must have the assistance of foreign experts. By heroic concentration of strength we might have restored our economic life independently but for this we would require a very long time.

Yes, the foreign capitalists will not assist us for nothing! We will have to pay them a liberal tribute. . . . World capital having received this tribute from us will increase the productive power of Russia and will thus play the role predicted for it by Marx: Capital will dig for itself its historic grave.

In the *Pravda* (November 30th, 1920), Lenin defended the policy of concessions with these expressions:

We have defeated the world bourgeoisie up to the present owing to the fact that they can not unite. Both the Brest-Litovsk and Versailles treaties have tended to keep them apart. A bitter hatred is now growing up between America and Japan. We are utilizing this, and are offering Kamchatka on a long lease, instead of giving it away without payment, considering that Japan has taken away already by military force a large territory in the Far East. . . .

I must repeat, concessions are a continuation of war on an economic basis but instead of destroying they reconstruct our productivity. They surely will try to deceive us, to evade our laws, but for such purposes there exist our respective institutions, all Russian Extraordinary Commission, Moscow Extraordinary Commission, Provincial Extraordinary Commission, etc., and we are sure that we shall be victorious.

It must be remembered that these Extraordinary Commissions are the official Soviet bodies for enforcing the "red terror."

In his closing speech at the March (1921) Congress of the Russian Communist Party Lenin exposed all the main elements of Bolshevist policy. His internal policy, as there developed, has been discussed at the end of Chapter VII. It is closely linked with the external policy. Once more—*after* the adoption of his "new" proposals by the Congress—as in his opening speech, he based everything on the coming world revolution: "But when we look on our party as the hearth of world revolution, and observe the campaign now being conducted

against us by the governments of the world there is no room for doubt." That is, the growing certainty of world revolution, removes all doubt of Bolshevik success in impending negotiations with foreign governments for the official recognition of the Soviet title to Russia and all the resources and human chattels it contains! The Soviet leader does not deny the weakness of the Soviets. But let it be remembered that he ceaselessly drills his followers to the thought that all other nations are weaker still! As he says in his speech, "All this information given out by the international bourgeoisie . . . reveals once more how we are surrounded by enemies, and how feeble these enemies have grown within the past year!"

Bearing this blind and fanatical optimism in mind we can better grasp other parts of the speech in which Lenin shows he is counting absolutely on getting from America the credit and supplies to revive Russian Bolshevism by means of a trade agreement on the British model! As quoted by *Soviet Russia* (May 14, 1921) Lenin said:

The world press syndicate—freedom of the press consists there in the fact that *99 per cent of the press is owned by financial magnates manipulating hundreds of millions of rubles*—opened the world-wide campaigns of the imperialists, with the aim of preventing, first, trade relations with England which were begun by Krassin, and also *the imminent conclusion of trade relations with America*. This shows that the enemies who surround us, no longer able to bring about intervention, are counting upon a revolt. The events at Kronstadt revealed ties with the international bourgeoisie; and in addition to it we see that *more than anything else they now fear,*



*from the practical standpoint of international capital, the sound establishment of trade relations. But they will be unable to prevent it. There are now in Moscow representatives of big capital, who did not believe these rumors, and they have told us how in America a certain group of citizens carried on an unprecedented agitation for Soviet Russia. This group made extracts of everything printed about Russia for a few months in newspapers of the most diverse kinds—about the flight of Lenin and Trotsky, about Lenin's shooting Trotsky and vice-versa, and they published all this in the form of a pamphlet. Better agitation for the Soviet power cannot be imagined. The contemporary American bourgeois press has completely described itself. . . .*

Was there ever a wilder farrago of gross exaggeration and misstatement? A few foolish rumors are taken from thousands of substantiated dispatches and reproduced as giving a fair picture of the American press on Russia! But we must note, especially, that Lenin appreciates the aid he is getting in his propaganda from "a certain group" of American citizens, while at the same time he openly boasts of the British trade agreement from the practical standpoint as a defeat of international capital, i.e., a defeat of all existing governments (all regarded as capitalistic by Lenin) and of the existing social system.

A part of the so-called trade agitation has been the claim that the Soviets were abandoning Communism not only in making trade agreements with capitalists but in other directions. Such changes as have in fact taken place could be so absurdly misinterpreted and misunderstood only by those who have made no effort to follow the Bolshevist policy. The Bolshevist chiefs, and especially their foreign diplomats, have never hesitated

to use any and all methods for their purposes. In a letter which appeared in *Pravda* on December 10th, 1920, addressed to the Italian Socialists at a moment which Lenin thought to be "the eve of the revolution," the Bolshevist leader thus advised the Italian revolutionists:

The Italian party, in order to carry out the revolution successfully, must still take a certain number of steps to the Left without tying itself down and without forgetting that circumstances may very well demand some steps to the Right.

This advice is typical. Foreign trade agreements and other negotiations regarded abroad as compromises are not only presented to the Russian people as victories but are evidently so considered by the Bolshevist chiefs. The apparent concessions made to capitalism by the Russian Communist Congress about the time of the British Trade Agreement are explained by Krassin, the chief negotiator, as follows:

As we recede from wartime conditions and advance toward reconstruction and peace, we proceed toward a business-like adaptation of our methods to those of real life. We call it neither going to the right nor to the left. Whatever reports we may receive here, I am sure that Lenin will never abandon his communistic principles, but as he is a practical man with a practical mind, he may decide in one matter or another to take a practical course with regard to present-day conditions.

A Moscow wireless (April 16th, 1921) cynically and frankly states the Bolshevists' plan to repudiate any

treaty at the first favorable moment, as they did that of Brest-Litovsk. It may be said that the following dispatch is for home consumption by the ultra-revolutionists of Soviet Russia. But as long as such matter—uncontradicted—is the sole *pabulum* officially furnished the Russian people (the opposition being prohibited) how can we expect anything but a continuation of treaty-breaking to result? The dispatch is as follows:

The present peace is only an armed truce. We cannot base our peaceful policies on the present peace treaties, because the peace itself is not secured. All Europe is boiling. We do not know what will happen to-morrow. All our treaties are just like the Brest treaty and may suddenly become pieces of paper. But it makes no difference to us at present. We are striving to get in touch with the Far West (East?). Our chief aim still remains the fight with capitalism. But first we must give our country time to rest. *For a while we are smiling sweetly at Lloyd George and shaking his hand, but our policy remains the same.* We shall profit by the short breathing space offered us and then deal a death blow to capitalism.

Among the working people the agitation for a trade agreement with Soviet Russia is put forward on the double ground that it would give employment to the American workers and that it would relieve the suffering in Russia. The argument that it would give employment to American labor is fully answered by Secretary Hughes in response to a letter by President Gompers requesting information in this matter. President Gompers' letter was as follows:

March 15, 1921.

SIR:

If it is not incompatible with the public interest would it be possible for me to secure information from your department relative to the situation in Soviet Russia?

There is much propaganda being circulated in the United States claiming that the demand for manufactured goods in Russia is so great and the purchasing power of the Russian Soviet government so vast it is almost impossible to determine the actual capacity of the Russian market to absorb goods of foreign manufacture. This scarcity of goods is laid to the blockade, which as I understand it was removed July 8, 1920. It is said that the pressing needs of the Russians are large quantities of the following:

“Locomotives, cars, rails, tires, springs, etc. Tractors, plows, reapers, mowers, binders, harrows, and other tools, large and small, binder twine, motor trucks. Leather goods: shoes, etc. Textiles. Chemicals, drugs, soap. Notions. Belting, all kinds. Oil well machinery and piping. Mining machinery. Rubber goods. Ties. Typewriters. Sewing machines. Surgical instruments. Machinery and machine tools of all sorts. Printing presses, and printing supplies. Small tools. Sheet iron. Tool steel. Camera and camera supplies, films, etc. Raw cotton.”

It is also claimed that the Commissariat of Foreign Trade of the Soviet government has given orders for the purchase of the following in America:

“Agricultural machinery, including tractors, mowers, binders, reapers, plows, cultivators, etc., specified orders to the extent of \$50,000,000.00; machine tools, between \$3,000,000.00 to \$5,000,000.00; small tools, files, drills, etc. between \$3,000,000.00 and \$5,000,000.00; 30,000 to 100,000 tons of rails; 10,000 tons of locomotive ties; 250 tons of spring steel for locomotive and car springs; 10,000 tons of sheet iron; 50,000 tons of piping.”



These figures, it is claimed, do not represent all the orders that would be placed at once.

It is alleged that the Federal Reserve Board has refused to permit the transfer of funds to the United States from the Soviet Russian government in order to pay for the goods, although payment in gold is guaranteed. It is claimed that the American manufacturers are prevented from accepting the gold on the probability that it was illegally acquired by the Soviet government.

It is also said that the following raw materials are ready for shipment to the United States if only the American government recognizes the Soviet government of Russia:

“Lumber, unlimited quantities; Flax, 20,000 tons; Hemp, 10,000 tons; Furs, 9,000,000 pelts; Bristles, sorted and cleaned, 1,000 tons; Horse hair, 2,000 tons; Manganese ore, 250,000 tons; Asbestos, 8,000 tons; Hides, 3,500,000 skins; Platinum, large quantities; Petroleum and petroleum products, 2,000,000 tons.”

Another claim made is that if the restrictions placed on trade with Russia were removed it would place in operation many mills, shops and factories now closed down and would give employment to the unemployed of America.

This propaganda is being widely circulated among labor organizations and I have received many letters asking me what is the truth. In this connection I have repeatedly called attention to the action of the American Federation of Labor convention at Montreal, June 7-19, 1920, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor is not justified in taking any action which could be construed as an assistance to, or approval of, the Soviet government of Russia as long as that government is based upon authority which has not been vested in it by a popular representative national assemblage of the Russian people; or so long as it endeavors to create revolutions in the well-established, civilized nations of

the world; or so long as it advocates and applies the militarization of labor and prevents the organizing and functioning of trade unions and the maintenance of a free press and free public assemblage.”

This resolution was based on a report made by the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and previously unanimously approved by the convention as follows:

“Bolshevism has been a lure for some of our people and its doctrines have been propagated with great vigor. This hideous doctrine has found converts among two classes of people principally—those intellectuals, so-called, who have no occupation save that of following one fad after another, and those so beaten in the game of life that they find no appeal in anything except the most desperate and illogical schemes. The rank and file of the organized labor movement, as was to have been expected, has given no countenance to the propaganda of Bolshevism, but has, on the contrary, been its most effective opponent in America.”

Whether the statements in the circular are true or untrue, the widest publicity of the facts should be given. It would be more effective if it could be in official form. If that can not be done the proper knowledge should be transmitted to the various organizations that have resolutions on the subject before them for approval or disapproval and only awaiting an answer from me as to the real situation.

I, therefore, request, if it is not contrary to the rules of the Department of State or if not against the public interest, that you furnish me with such information as you might have on the matter. I would also like to know the amount of exports and imports between the United States and Russia for a number of years preceding the war, as it is claimed these would be enormous because they have been enormous in the past.

This question is of vital interest to the people of the United States as they should not be misled by propa-

ganda that is consciously or unconsciously directed to aid the Soviet government of Russia against the interests of our people. I therefore trust that I am not asking too much.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Sam'l Gompers.

President,

American Federation of Labor.

Hon. Charles Evans Hughes,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

Here is the response of the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

Washington.

Mr. Samuel Gompers,  
President, American Federation of Labor,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR:

The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 15, 1921, in regard to the trade relations between the United States and Russia.

I recognize the interest of the American people in the questions you raise and I take pleasure in replying in detail to them.

In reply to your first statement, it is evident that after years of war, during which normal industry was diverted to the production of war supplies and accumulated stocks were consumed, Russia does not now possess important quantities of commodities which might be exported. It should be remembered that in addition to the period of the war against Germany, Russia has now passed through more than three years of a civil war during which industrial activities have been almost completely paralyzed. In fact the devastation of industry in Russia has been so complete, the poverty of the country is so

acute, the people are so hungry and the demand for commodities is so great that at present Russia represents a gigantic economic vacuum and no evidence exists that the unfortunate situation above described is likely to be alleviated so long as the present political and economic system continues. Though there is almost no limit to the amount and variety of commodities urgently needed by Russia, the purchasing power of that country is now at a minimum, and the demand must consequently remain unsatisfied.

In some respects the condition of Russia is analogous to that of other European countries. The war has left the people with diminished productive man-power and largely increased numbers of the disabled, the sick and the helpless. In one important respect, however, Russia's condition does not correspond to that of other belligerent states in the world war. While those states are taking such action as is likely to reestablish confidence, the attitude and action of the present authorities of Russia have tended to undermine its political and economic relations with other countries. The Russian people are unable to obtain credit which otherwise might be based on the vast potential wealth of Russia and are compelled to be deprived of commodities immediately necessary for consumption, raw materials and permanent productive equipment. The effect of this condition is that Russia is unable to renew normal economic activities, and apparently will be unable to obtain urgently needed commodities until credits may be extended to Russia on a sound basis.

It should not be overlooked that there has been a steady degeneration in even those industries in Soviet Russia that were not dependent upon imports of either raw material or partly finished products, nor in which has there been any shortage of labor. The Russian production of coal, of iron and steel, of flax, cotton, leather, lumber, sulfuric acid, or copper, of agricultural products, of textiles, and the maintenance and repair



of railroad equipment, have degenerated steadily from their level of production at the time of the Bolshevik revolution. There can be no relation of the failure of all these industries to blockades or to civil war, for most of them require no imports, and the men mobilized since the Soviet revolution were far less in number than before that event.

During the existence of civil war in Russia, her ports were in the hands of anti-Soviet forces. However, trade with the world through Baltic ports was opened in April, 1920. Restrictions on direct trade with Russia were removed by the United States on July 8, 1920. The conclusion of treaties of peace with the Baltic States enabled Russia freely to enter upon trade with Europe and the United States. Both American and European goods have been sold to Russia, but the volume of trade has been unimportant due to the inability of Russia to pay for imports.

As suggested in your second statement, it is true that agents purporting to be representatives of the so-called Bolshevik Commissariat of Foreign Trade have placed immense orders for the purchase of goods in the United States, Europe and Asia. It is estimated that perhaps six and one half billion dollars' worth of orders have been booked. But shipments as a result of these orders have been made only in small volume because the Soviet agents were unable either to pay cash or to obtain credit so as to insure the delivery of the goods ordered. The actual result of the placing of these immense orders on the part of the Soviet regime has not, therefore, materially stimulated industry in the countries in which the orders were placed, but has chiefly resulted in further impairing the credit of the Soviet regime due to its inability to carry out the transactions which it had undertaken.

Much has been written about the large sums of Russian gold which have found their way abroad in exchange for foreign goods. In reality, such transfers of

gold have been relatively small. According to the most liberal estimates the Soviet authorities do not now have in their possession more than \$175,000,000 worth of gold. It is apparent that the proportionate share of this amount of gold which might be expected to reach the United States, and even the immediate expenditure of all of this amount of gold in the United States, would not have a pronounced or lasting effect upon the advancement of American industry and trade, while its loss to Russia would take away the scant hope that is left of a sound reorganization of the Russian system of currency and finance.

In response to your question regarding the transfer of funds from Russia to the United States it may be stated that there are no restrictions on the importation of Russian gold into the United States, and since December 18, 1920, there have been no restrictions on the exportation of coin, bullion and currency to Soviet Russia or on dealings or exchange transactions in Russian roubles or on transfers of credit or exchange transactions with Soviet Russia. It is true that no assurances can be given that Russian gold will be accepted by the Federal Reserve Banks or the Mint, in view of the fact that these public institutions must be fully assured that the legal title to the gold accepted by them is not open to question.

It has often been stated that if the Government of the United States would recognize the so-called Soviet Government, Russia would immediately export immense quantities of lumber, flax, hemp, fur and other commodities. The facts in regard to supplies in Russia completely refute such statements. Russia does not to-day have on hand for export commodities which might be made the basis of immediately profitable trade with the United States. Furthermore, the transportation system is utterly inadequate to move any large quantity of goods either in the interior of Russia or to Russian ports. The export of such commodities as exist in Rus-

sia at the present time would result merely in further increasing the misery of the Russian people.

The issue of January 1, 1921 of "Economic Life," an official organ of the so-called Soviet Government, reports that the production of lumber amounted to seventy million cubic feet in 1920, as compared with four hundred million cubic feet in 1912. The production of lumber is, therefore, less than one-fifth of the pre-war level, even though the lumber industry is in far better circumstances than other important Russian industries. This same situation is further illustrated by the following article appearing in the "Economic Life" of February 6, 1921:

"By December 20 the following supplies were gathered:

Horse hides.....	3,831	12	per cent of am't expected				
Colt hides.....	1,142	35	"	"	"	"	"
Cattle hides.....	22,701	20.6	"	"	"	"	"
Calf hides.....	15,679	14.6	"	"	"	"	"
Sheep hides.....	37,771	58	"	"	"	"	"
Flax poods.....	22,871	12	"	"	"	"	"
Hemp .....	6,863	18	"	"	"	"	"
Bristles .....	99	14	"	"	"	"	"

"The Government of Ekaterinburg, which occupies a high place in furnishing food supplies, for several reasons has proven to be very weak in furnishing raw materials.

"During the past week the results of the work have become still smaller, reaching zero in some places, in spite of the extreme energy and intensity of the work."

Note is taken of the statement that if restriction on trade with Russia were removed, many mills, shops and factories in this country, which are now closed, would resume operations, and unemployment would thereby be diminished. Even before the war, trade with Russia, including both exports and imports, constituted only one and three-tenths per cent of the total trade of the United States. In view of the fact that the purchasing

power of Russia is now greatly diminished, as compared with pre-war years, it is evident that at present even under the most favorable circumstances the trade of Russia could have but a minor influence on the industrial and agricultural prosperity of the United States. Under conditions actually prevailing in Russia, that trade is of even less importance; a statement amply demonstrated by the fact that though restrictions on trade with Russia have been eliminated, no business of consequence with that country has developed.

According to the reports of the Department of Commerce, our total trade with Russia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, was as follows:

Imports from European Russia.....	\$26,958,690
Imports from Asiatic Russia.....	2,356,527
	\$29,315,217
Exports to European Russia.....	\$25,363,795
Exports to Asiatic Russia.....	1,101,419
	\$26,465,214
Total trade between Russia and the United States .....	\$55,780,431

The total imports into the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, were \$1,813,008,234, and the total exports for the same year were \$2,465,884,149, the total of both imports and exports amounting, therefore, to \$4,278,892,383.

For the calendar year 1920, the total trade of the United States was:

Exports .....	\$8,228,000,000
Imports .....	5,279,000,000
	\$13,507,000,000

Excluding Finland, the Baltic States, Armenia, and Georgia and Siberia for the periods when they have been



free of Soviet Domination, the trade of the United States with Russia during 1920 was absolutely negligible, probably amounted to less than \$4,000,000.

Though figures for trade with Russia during that period are not available, there is every reason to believe that it was of far less relative importance than in 1913.

It is unquestionably desirable that intimate and mutually profitable commercial relations on an extensive scale be established between the United States and Russia, and it is the sincere hope of this Government that there may be readjustments in Russia which will make it possible for that country to resume its proper place in the economic life of the world.

I am enclosing herewith as of possible interest to you in this connection, copies of the Department's announcement of July 7, 1920, of the Treasury Department's announcement of December 20, 1920, of a statement made by Mr. Alfred W. Kliefoth, of the Foreign Trade Adviser's Office of this Department, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and of an announcement made to the press by the Secretary of State, dated March 25, 1921; also a brief statement of the total trade with Russia for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1911 and June 30, 1912.

I would also invite your attention to the recently published hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, entitled "Conditions in Russia," and of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, entitled "Relations with Russia." The former was held in compliance with House Resolution No. 635, and the latter in compliance with Senate Joint Resolution No. 164.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) Charles E. Hughes.

Enclosures:

(5) as stated above.

This disposes of the argument that a trade agreement with Soviet Russia could materially aid American industry. Even if trade were resumed on a pre-war basis, which is practically impossible, it would scarcely increase our exports by one per cent. But our foreign trade absorbs only one-tenth of the product of American industry. It is, therefore, practically impossible that the reopening of Russian trade on this comparatively large scale could keep American industry going for more than three or four hours!

Secretary of State Hughes has given a conclusive answer to the argument that a trade agreement might be materially helpful to the Russian people as long as they are still the helpless subjects of the present "government." In addition we may point out that two efforts were recently made to help the Russian people, one through the Norwegian statesman, Nansen, and the other through the Russian cooperative organizations. The Soviet Government refused both offers because the supplies to be sent were not to be left in the hands of the Bolsheviks. Rather than to lose this chance of strengthening their own hold over the Russian people they decided to let the suffering of their helpless subjects continue.

It must also be remembered in this connection that whatever the hidden objects of the British trade agreement, the position of the British Government would be strengthened by a similar policy on the part of the United States. The report sent out by Moscow wireless on November 17th, 1920, that "England is carrying on in the United States agitation in favor of a renewal of trade relations with Soviet Russia" is, at least, plau-

sible. A number of well-known Englishmen have been agitating for that object by speeches and by articles in the American press. Possibly the intention is that America shall provide the credits without which the British-Soviet agreement must remain an empty form. This agitation certainly offers no reason why America should fall in with the designs of the British Government. The British Empire is threatened by the Soviet military forces around the Black Sea and in Mesopotamia, Persia, Afghanistan and the Pamir region and by Bolshevik propaganda not only in these districts but also in Turkey, Egypt, India, and China. The foreign policies of the powerful British Labor Party as well as the Independent Liberals are thoroughly pro-Soviet. Certain groups of British capitalists fear they might get less out of Russia from a democratic and patriotic peasants' government than from the cynical diplomacy of the Bolsheviks—ready to give to foreigners the title to everything in Russia, so far as this is necessary to secure the means needed to hold their power and prevent popular government. In the same way a certain school of British diplomats note that Lenin is ready to alienate Russian territory in the belief he can win it back or at least control it by instigating revolutions. These financiers and diplomatists have another view of future probabilities. In the meanwhile they are ready to take advantage, for the purposes of the British Empire, of Lenin's willingness to sign away Russia's territory, natural wealth, and industries. These are certainly among the leading motives of British opinion on Russia and so undoubtedly influence British policy—if, indeed, they do not dominate it.

America neither hopes to gain anything at the cost of the Russian people, nor has this nation anything to fear at home or abroad from the band of insane fanatics momentarily in control of that great country. We are concerned with Bolshevism as a world evil, which operates in varying degrees in many countries. But we regard it neither as an indomitable power which we are forced to recognize and conciliate, nor as a movement with which honorable governments can afford to cooperate—as the beneficiaries of its unparalleled crimes against the Russian people.

The danger that the pro-Soviet agitation may be revived is not past. Krassin has boldly stated that the British trade agreement was obtained not by any fundamental concessions of communism to capitalism but by propaganda, and he plans to station himself now in Canada, whence he says he hopes to return “via New York.” Provided only he will come “as an individual” certain Senators say he will be welcome. But he can operate quite effectively from Canada.

What makes the Soviet campaign in America dangerous to some extent is the curious espousal of the Soviet cause by numerous so-called “liberals” and by the radical minority grouped in various camps.

Historians will look back upon this support of Sovietism with a smile, a sardonic grin at the pretenders of to-day.

Liberalism, when it is true to its mission, seeks the extension of democratic practice and the enlargement of the opportunities in democracy. It is the implacable foe of autocracy and of all dictatorial practices. The diseased state of mind that calls itself liberalism in



America at the moment is guilty of betraying democracy in the most portentous situation of our time. It sneers at the democracy of America, turns up a supercilious nose at the great American labor movement, and rushes with abnormal appetite into the social and moral violence of Moscow.

Perhaps some of this phenomenon is due to the fact that the so-called liberals of America have fallen victim to a mania for mysticism and Moscow is the small end of the cornucopia from which is emitted the great haze—the great narcotic supply of all the conglomeration of mental morphia addicts.

What this condition makes necessary is that Americans must distinguish between the true liberals and the false liberals, the real liberalism and the pretense of liberalism.

The pretending liberalism is for Sovietism in Russia and for American recognition of that reversion to barbaric type.

If, as we are told, all that now is required by the Soviets is a *de facto* recognition, let there be no misapprehension as to what that means. That means recognition to the extent that we declare the Soviet Government to be the government in fact—the government that is. An official Soviet wireless on September 10 said:

The only thing which the Russian Government demands is that *de facto* relations be resumed, as it is obvious that otherwise trade relations are impossible; therefore such resumption of *de facto* relations is inseparable from trade relations.

Plain notice, this, to the world that Russia will pay

in trade for recognition. It is an offer to bribe the supposedly gold-hungry Americans.

What the Soviets hope would follow such *de facto* recognition and free resumption of trade would be unlimited opportunity to attempt corruption of the world by propaganda.

The United States has lifted all trade bans. This government interposes no legal barrier to trade with Soviet Russia. A treasury order signed on December 20 took down the last barrier, permitting exportation of gold to Russia and allowing dealings in exchange.

This is surely enough. If it is too much may be a fair subject for discussion. But we have gone that far. Surely, democratic America will take no further step in compromise with an autocracy the like of which the world has never seen.

Information about Russia continues to accumulate. Only those who are determined not to be informed can remain uninformed. Upon encountering a questioning opponent the exponents of Sovietism say that we do not know what are the conditions in Russia and advise us to "wait until we can get the truth."

This is subterfuge that deceives only the unthinking. We do know the great, main truth about Russia and we do have fairly accurate information as to the material conditions of the people. It is perhaps no fault of the rigid control of visitors' permits exercised by the Soviets that numerous persons have gone into Russia as fervent Soviet advocates only to come out running, hands over their faces, like fugitives from a scourge. That ardent Socialist H. G. Wells found conditions so terrible that for a defense of the Soviets he had to resort to the

plea that no other government could stand and that if the Soviets fell we should have a nation of Asiatic hordes running stark wild over the country.

The all important thing that Americans know about Russia is that in every sense the Soviet Government and the philosophy back of it are absolute in their denial and repudiation of democracy. This is the principle that has been at stake in all the history of the contest between freedom and slavery, self-government and autocratic government, light and darkness. This was the issue in the struggle against Prussianism. It was the issue when the first man, in answer to a spark that had been lighted in his soul, struck the first blow against imperial rule. It is the issue over which the agonies of the world have rolled. It is an issue on which Americans can not be deceived and from which they will not be budged.

## APPENDIX I

### AMERICAN LABOR AND RUSSIA

THE friendship of American Labor for the Russian people has been invariable, steadfast, and unqualified. In a series of cablegrams the American Federation of Labor and its President have expressed at length their ardent interest in the permanent welfare of Russian labor and of the Russian people generally. This meant uncompromising hostility to Czarism and it means uncompromising repudiation of Sovietism. These cablegrams prove that American labor understands the elements of the Russian situation and takes its stand heart and soul with Russian labor and the Russian people.

#### CABLEGRAM

Washington April 2, 1917.

Tstcheidze [President of the "Soviet"]

Petrograd

Representative of working people of Russia. Accept this message to the men of labor of Russia. We send greeting. The newly established liberty of Russia finds a warm response in the hearts of America's workers. We rejoice at the intelligence, courage and the conviction of a people who even while concentrating every effort upon defense against foreign aggression have reorganized their own institutions upon principles of freedom and democracy. But it is impossible to achieve the ideal state immediately. When the right foundation has been



established, the masses can daily utilize opportunities for progress, more complete justice, and greater liberty. Freedom is achieved in meeting the problems of life and work. It cannot be established by revolution only—it is the product of evolution. Even in the Republic of the United States of America the highest ideals of freedom are incomplete—but we have the will and the opportunity. In the name of America's workers whose watchwords are Justice Freedom and Humanity we plead that Russia's workers and masses shall maintain what you have already achieved and practically and rationally solve the problems of today and safeguard the future from the reactionary forces who would gladly take advantage of your lack of unity to reestablish the old regime of royalty reaction tyranny and injustice. Our best wishes are with Russia in her new opportunity.

SAMUEL GOMPERS

President

American Federation of Labor.

#### CABLEGRAM

Washington, D. C.,  
April 23, 1917.

Tstcheidze,

Petrograd

Executive Council American Federation of Labor in regular session here as representatives of the labor movement of America send fraternal greetings to you and through you to all who have aided in establishing liberty in Russia. We know that liberty means opportunity for the masses especially the workers. The best thought, hopes and support of America's workers are with your efforts to form a government that shall insure the perpetuity of freedom and protect your rights and new found liberty against the insidious forces and agents of reaction and despotism. May we not urge you to build

practically and constructively. Our heartfelt sympathy is with you in the great opportunity and work that lie before you.

SAMUEL GOMPERS  
 JAMES DUNCAN  
 JAMES O'CONNELL  
 JOS. F. VALENTINE  
 JOHN R. ALPINE  
 H. B. PERHAM  
 FRANK DUFFY  
 WILLIAM GREEN  
 W. D. MAHON  
 JOHN B. LENNON  
 FRANK MORRISON  
 Executive Council  
**American Federation of Labor**

#### CABLEGRAM

Washington, May 6, 1917.

Workmen's and Soldiers' Council [Soviet] of Deputies,  
 Petrograd, Russia.

The gravest crisis in the world's history is now hanging in the balance, and the course which Russia will pursue may have a determining influence whether democracy or autocracy shall prevail. That democracy and freedom will finally prevail there can be no doubt in the minds of men who know, but the cost, the time lost and the sacrifices which would ensue from lack of united action may be appalling. It is to avoid this that I address you.

In view of the grave crisis through which the Russian people are passing we assure you that you can rely absolutely upon the whole-hearted support and cooperation of the American people in the great war against our common enemy, Kaiserism. In the fulfillment of that cause the present American Government has the

support of 99 per cent. of the American people, including the working class both of the cities and of the agricultural sections.

In free America, as in free Russia, the agitators for a peace favorable to Prussian militarism have been allowed to express their opinions so that the conscious and unconscious tools of the Kaiser appear more influential than they really are. You should realize the truth of the situation. There are but few in America willing to allow Kaiserism and its allies to continue their rule over those non-German peoples who wish to be free from their domination. Should we not protest against the pro-Kaiser Socialist interpretation of the demand for no annexation, namely, that all oppressed non-German peoples shall be compelled to remain under the domination of Prussia and her lackeys—Austria and Turkey? Should we not rather accept the better interpretation that there must be no forcible annexations, but that every people must be free to choose any allegiance it desires, as demanded by the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies?

Like yourselves, we are opposed to all punitive and improper indemnities. We denounce the onerous punitive indemnities already imposed by the Kaiser upon the people of Serbia, Belgium and Poland.

America's workers share the view of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies that the only way in which the German people can bring the war to an early end is by imitating the glorious example of the Russian people, compelling the abdication of the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs, and driving the tyrannous nobility, bureaucracy and the military caste from power.

Let the German Socialists attend to this, and cease their false pretenses and underground plotting to bring about an abortive peace in the interest of Kaiserism and the ruling class. Let them cease calling pretended "international" conferences at the instigation or connivance of the Kaiser. Let them cease their intrigues to cajole

the Russian and American working people to interpret your demand, "no annexations, no indemnities," in a way to leave undiminished the prestige and the power of the German military caste.

Now that Russian autocracy is overthrown, neither the American government nor the American people apprehend that the wisdom and experience of Russia in the coming constitutional assembly will adopt any form of government other than the one best suited to your needs. We feel confident that no message, no individual emissary and no commission has been sent, or will be sent, with authority to offer any advice whatever to Russia as to the conduct of her internal affairs. Any commission that may be sent will help Russia in any way that she desires to combat Kaiserism wherever it exists or may manifest itself.

Word has reached us that false reports of an American purpose and of American opinions contrary to the above statement have gained some circulation in Russia. We denounce these reports as the criminal work of desperate pro-Kaiser propagandists circulated with the intent to deceive and to arouse hostile feelings between the two great democracies of the world. The Russian people should know that these activities are only additional manifestations of the "dark forces" with which Russia has been only too familiar in the unhappy past.

The American Government, the American people, the American labor movement are whole-heartedly with the Russian workers, the Russian masses, in the great effort to maintain the freedom you have already achieved and to solve the grave problems yet before you. We earnestly appeal to you to make common cause with us to abolish all forms of autocracy and despotism, and to establish and maintain for generations yet unborn the priceless treasures of justice, freedom, democracy and humanity.

American Federation of Labor,  
SAMUEL GOMPERS, President.



## CABLEGRAM

Washington

September 13, 1917.

Kerensky Premier Russian Revolutionary Government  
Petrograd Russia

At a tremendously important national conference three days of representatives of labor and socialists at Minneapolis Minnesota September fifth sixth seventh called to solidify working class and all people of United States among other declarations the following was adopted with great enthusiasm and without a dissenting voice or vote. We address ourselves to the:

“Sons of liberty in all lands are now watching with heavy hearts the desperate contest of their brothers in spirit and arms now battling on the plains of Russia. Born amidst the thunders of the greatest war of all times, the great Russian democracy brought to all lovers of man’s freedom a new hope and inspiration. Assailed on all sides by a terrible and insidious foe, now spreading death and devastation in its ranks and now masquerading as a friend and penetrating, under the guise of a revolutionist into the very councils of the revolution, the Russian democracy is now passing through the most critical time in its struggle for existence.

The American Alliance for Labor and Democracy sends greetings to the fighters for liberty in Russia as brothers in the same cause. The aims of the Russian democracy are our aims; its victory is our victory and its defeat is our defeat; and even the traitors that assail the Russian democracy likewise assail us. In the conflict for the liberty of Russia, the liberty of America is likewise at stake. Every Russian soldier who faces unflinchingly the enemy in the field is striking a blow for the liberty of America.

The American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, representing every loyal thought of American Labor and

American Socialism, pledges and dedicates the American working class to the support and service of the Russian democracy. It calls upon the working people and the Socialists of America and also upon the government of the United States to strain every effort and resource in their command to the aid of the Russian democracy.”

SAMUEL GOMPERS,  
President, American Federation of Labor;  
President, American Alliance for Labor and Democracy.

### CABLEGRAM

Washington March 12 1918.

All Russian Soviet, Moscow.

We address you in the name of world liberty. We assure you that the people of the United States are pained by every blow at Russian freedom, as they would be by a blow at their own. The American people desire to be of service to the Russian people in their struggle to safeguard freedom and realize its opportunities. We desire to be informed as to how we can help. We speak for a great organized movement of working people who are devoted to the cause of freedom and the ideals of democracy. We assure you also that the whole American nation ardently desires to be helpful to Russia and awaits with eagerness an indication from Russia as to how help may most effectively be extended. To all those who strive for freedom we say, Courage. Justice must triumph if all free people stand united against autocracy. We await your suggestions.

American Alliance for Labor and Democracy.

SAMUEL GOMPERS, President.

This cablegram was sent before the full news of the overthrow of the Constitutional Assembly had reached America.

## APPENDIX II

### THE SOVIET ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

No better test can be found of any social system than its administration of justice. When that is utterly disorderly and without semblance of equity, the whole régime, we may be certain, is chaotic to the core.

In an article in the *Journal of the American Bar Association*, Judge Fisher writes that agents of the Soviet's supreme tribunal may combine in one person arresting officer, prosecutor, judge and executioner. He found secret courts engrossed in litigation to recover bribes promised by tradesmen but not paid. A former Moscow lawyer justified the system of wholesale bribery, he said, on the ground that it had become impossible to live at all without it. Judge Fisher found widespread trading despite the abolition of private property. Such illegal transactions were so general that they only could have been carried on with the connivance of corrupted officials.

Judges, the writer of the article found, were subject to no restraint but the "Revolutionary conscience." An effort was made to induce all workmen to act in that capacity, and in Petrograd there already had been more than 40,000 judges though there were only 40,000 workers.

Judges even in small villages had absolute power to carry out their decrees and the Cheresvechaika—"the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for the Suppression of Counter Revolution, Speculation and Sabotage" continues to employ capital punishment in parts of Russia which were declared to be under military rule,

although the death penalty was abolished in 1920. Offenders in Moscow whose deaths were desired were transferred to a military district for trial.

Judge Fisher says that the accused are not permitted to face their judges and are not told the nature of the charge nor given a chance to explain. Many have been executed without even knowing that they had been convicted. The tribunal "has no regard for the action of any other departments of the State." It is responsible to no one, and even the communist officials fear it. There is provision for appeal from the local or departmental Cheresvechaika to the All-Russian, but ordinarily the defendant has been executed before the appeal is perfected. Controlled by no law the tribunals, it is said, openly use their power to avenge the wrongs attributed to old-time enemies.

Judge Fisher, who is Chairman of the Russian and Ukrainian Committee of the Joint Distribution Committee, ends with a plea for the innocent sufferers.

(Summarized by the *New York Times*.)



## APPENDIX III

### THE TURKO-BOLSHEVIST ATTACK ON THE LABOR GOVERNMENT OF GEORGIA

#### AN APPEAL TO LABOR

THE Government of Georgia has issued from Constantinople an appeal to all Socialist Parties and Labor organizations "in the name of the Georgian people, whose liberty and independence has just been destroyed by the armies of the Russian Bolsheviks." The appeal describes how the Moscow Government have striven to extend their power over Georgia by "sovietizing" the country through insurrections organized by its subsidized agents. These efforts being unsuccessful, others were tried, and military operations resorted to.

On November 28, 1920, Trotzky, in a long speech before the Commissars of the Communist Party assembled at Moscow, pronounced the death sentence on the Republic of Georgia. "Armenia being sovietized, it is now the turn of Georgia," he said. "It will be sufficient to tighten our hold in order to connect Baku with Batum."

Bolshevist troops were massed at the frontiers despite protests of the Georgian Government. After refusing to discuss matters the Moscow Government launched the attack in the middle of February. The attack on Tiflis was at first repulsed. On February 21 a radio telegram

was despatched by the President of the Georgian Republic requesting Tchitcherine to "formulate the objects of the war you are conducting against us. Perhaps we can come to an understanding without bloodshed." Tchitcherine did not reply. Similar messages to Trotzky and Lenin shared the same fate.

Finally, Georgia was surrounded by Bolshevist troops, aided by those of the Turks at Angora. "The treachery of the Angora Government deprived us of the last possibility of continuing the struggle on the line at Rion. Our troops, surrounded on two sides by the armies of two great military powers—Soviet Russia and Turkey—were condemned to perish without the smallest hope of success. On March 17 the Georgian Government decided to cease fighting, and to disband the army. This step laid open the road to Batum to the Bolsheviks. On March 18 the Government left Batum, and a few hours later the Bolshevist troops entered the town."

The appeal concludes:

The Georgian people has the right to rely in this struggle on the fraternal support of the international proletariat. And it is to you, comrades, that we come for this support! You have always condemned wars of conquest. Are the authors of this war against Georgia less culpable because they hide their imperialistic characteristics under the flag of Communism?

We ask you to stigmatize the crime of the invaders of our country, and the hypocrisy of those who have recourse to bayonets to wipe out the influence of socialistic ideas and to implant their own ideas.

Raise your voices, comrades, and demand from the Government of Moscow that it withdraws its armies from Georgia; that it gives the Georgian people the right to

govern themselves, and to organize their life and their State according to their own wishes.

NOE JORDANIA, President of the Government of Georgia, the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Party of Georgia, and the Soviet of the Workmen of Tiflis.

NICHOLAS TCHEIDZE, President of the Constituent Assembly, member of the C. C. of the Social-Democratic Party.

EUGENE GUEGUETCHKORI, Minister of Foreign Affairs, member of the C. C. of the Social-Democratic Party.

NOE RAMISHVILI, Minister of the Interior, member of the C. C. of the Social-Democratic Party.

The whole Labor and Socialist press of Europe, both the moderates of the Right Wing and the orthodox Marxists and revolutionists of the Center, with few exceptions, has denounced this conquest as an example of the crudest imperialism. For example, *Die Freiheit* of Berlin, organ of the Independent Socialists, condemns the Soviet action against Georgia as "a brutal imperialistic coup d' état." (*Die Freiheit*, April 28th, 1921.)

## APPENDIX IV

### LENIN'S "CONVERSION"

EXTRACTS from his Speech on the Tax in Kind before the Congress of the Russian Communist Party, March 15, 1921. (Reproduced by *Soviet Russia*, May 15, 1921.)

*In Russia the industrial workers are in the minority and the small farmers overwhelmingly in the majority. The social revolution in such a country may meet with complete success only under two conditions:*

1. It must be supported by the social revolution in one or more of the advanced countries. *As you know, much has been accomplished in this respect in recent days, as compared with the past, but this condition is still far from fulfillment.*

2. There must be an understanding between the proletariat, which is the executor of the dictatorship and holds the state power in its hands, and the majority of the population.

After thus admitting the dictatorship and reiterating his faith in a steadily approaching world revolution, Lenin continued:

The small peasant has aims that are not the same as those of the worker. *We know that only an understanding with the peasantry can save the social revolution until the revolution is ready to break out in other countries.*



Now what is the nature of the proposed understanding? The Communist chief first shows that there is to be no fundamental economic concession, no restoration either of private property in land or of free trade in agricultural products:

We must say [to the peasants]: if you want to go backward, *if you want to restore private property and bring about free trade*, this will mean that you are handed over irrecoverably to the power of the landed proprietors and capitalists.

The one great argument to produce an "understanding" is that there is no choice for the peasant except Bolshevism or Czarism. The very existence of agrarian democracies is to be kept from him and, since his experience has been limited to Czarism and Bolshevism (except a few months of the Kerensky régime) there is some hope of success. On this point Lenin says:

A peasant who has even a modicum of class consciousness cannot help understanding that we represent as a government the working classes, those working classes with whom the toiling peasant can agree (and the peasants represent nine-tenths of our population). A class-conscious peasant understands very well that *every turn for the worse means a return to the old Tsarist Government*.

Lenin understands that the peasants cannot be converted to Bolshevism—at least for decades and generations, though he hopes that the process will be achieved *within a century*—with the aid of certain illusory economic and material benefits, such as electrification (!) of

Russia. In the meanwhile they are to be governed without their consent by "the proletariat," or Communist Party. He says:

The transformation of the entire psychology of the petty peasants is a labor that will require generations. This question of stabilizing the ideology of the small peasants can be solved only on a material basis. The application of tractors and machinery in agriculture on a large scale, the electrification of the whole country, would immediately produce a transformation of the thought of the small peasants. And when I speak of generations, remember that generations do not necessarily mean centuries. You know very well that the obtaining of tractors and machinery and the carrying out of the electrification of a gigantic country are a matter of decades. Objectively considered, that is the state of things . . .

Our problem in this Congress is to formulate the main lines of the question. Our party is a governing party and the decision that the party congress adopts will be binding for the whole Republic.

What now are the material concessions which are to "satisfy" the agriculturists with a government over which they have no control? Here is Lenin's project:

If we go carefully into this question we must at once come to the conclusion that the small peasants can be satisfied in two ways: *in the first place, by a certain freedom of exchange of commodities, a certain freedom for the small peasants, and, in the second place, we must get commodities and products; for what would be the use of a freedom to exchange commodities, if there are no commodities to exchange?*

If we were in a position to obtain even a small quantity of commodities and the state should take possession

of these commodities, the proletariat now holding political power would receive, *in addition to that political power, the economic power also.*

We cannot extricate ourselves from this difficulty without resorting to freedom of *local* exchange of commodities. If this exchange of commodities gives to the state a certain minimum quantity of grain, sufficient to satisfy the needs of the cities, of the factories, and of industry, this exchange of commodities will contribute to *solidify and strengthen the political and national power of the proletariat.*

In a word "local" free trade is to be permitted within narrow limits (see Chapter VII) in a manner to *increase* both the political and the economic power of "the proletariat," i.e., the Communist Party, over the agricultural majority.

Lenin then says: "We shall now be asked how and where we are going to get the commodities?" For a certain minimum of commodities are essential to "satisfy" the peasants, just as beads are necessary to extract valuables from the savages. The answer to this question is simple indeed. The commodities are to be obtained at the expense of the foreign and domestic enemy, the big and little bourgeoisie, the capitalists and the peasants. The patrimony of the Russian people—or a large part of it—is to be offered to foreign concessionaires at an enormous sacrifice, the argument of the concessionaires being that the uncertainty of continued Bolshevik rule and the vagaries of their methods demand a huge reward, while the Bolsheviks' calculation is that they will be released of the entire debt by world revolution. Or, if the world revolt does not materialize the future generation (90 per cent of it peasants) will pay.

Here is Lenin's answer to his question:

So long as the revolution has not yet broken out in other countries, we must not grudge the hundreds of millions and milliards, which our boundless resources and our rich raw materials afford us, as a compensation for the trade that the advanced capitalist countries may give us. We shall later recover all this with advantage to ourselves.

There is no thought either for the future Russia or for its population. The entire object—which may be achieved if other nations lend themselves to this maneuver—is to maintain the dictatorship of the Communist Party, which Lenin insists upon calling the dictatorship of the proletariat. As he himself sums up his position:

The situation is now this: either we must economically satisfy the medium peasants and consent to *a* freedom of commodity exchange, or it will be impossible to maintain the power of the proletariat in Russia, in view of the slowing down of the international revolution. (*Our italics.*)



## APPENDIX V

### CAN THE SOVIETS BE SAVED BY CAPITAL?

#### THE OFFICIAL BRITISH WHITE PAPER ON ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA

THE British-Soviet Trade Treaty was signed in March, 1921, after nine months of intensive negotiations. In May the British courts decided that this treaty amounted to a *de facto* recognition of the Soviet Government. But actual trading on any considerable scale depends not upon paper documents but upon the granting of huge credits. Without such credits the trade treaty will have little if any economic results. The official British White Paper on Russia, issued in that same month, shows that there are no grounds whatever upon which any intelligent investor would provide such funds.

When the British Government first began to consider the trade treaty it appointed a special committee of prominent business men to collect data on the subject. Selected in May, 1920, this committee reported in February, 1921, and a summary of its findings is now published.

Its main conclusions may be stated as follows:

*a.* There can be no important Russian exports for a considerable time to come.

*b.* There can be no economic regeneration of Russia at all without foreign capitalist aid, i.e., credits.

*c.* It is highly questionable if there can be any regen-

eration of Russia even gradually and with capitalist aid as long as Bolshevist rule continues.

As regards resumption of trade between Russia and other countries the report says:

We are convinced that for the economic equilibrium of the world the exports from Russia are most important factors to the European market. We do not, however, consider that Russia will be in a position to make its contribution toward the relief of Europe for a considerable time to come. There can be no question of the export of cereals in the immediate future.

It is our conviction that there is no possibility of economic regeneration of Russia in the near future without the assistance of capitalist countries. Our conclusions with regard to the rendering of such assistance are guided by the following considerations:

1. That the destruction of capitalism by violence, not only in Russia, but in other countries, is the deliberate aim and purpose of the Russian Communist Party, which forms the Government of Soviet Russia at the present time.

2. That, to this end, the Third or Communist Internationale has been established at Moscow, and we believe this has been done under the auspices of the Soviet Government, and with its financial and material support.

3. That the Russian Communist Party and the Third Internationale are actively endeavoring to compass the destruction by violence of capitalism in countries to which the Soviet Government has addressed overtures for trade.

4. That the Soviet Government, in destroying capitalism in Russia, has assisted to bring about a complete collapse of industry in that country.

5. That, in face of this collapse, the Soviet Government invites capitalists to help to restore Russian industry.

6. That the Soviet Government has carried on, up to the present time, an active and widespread international propaganda, and that had that propaganda achieved its object, international capital, to which the Soviet Government now turns for aid in restoring economic prosperity to Russia, would have disappeared.

7. That the credit and capital required for Russia's urgent needs are large; that no Government can give this credit and capital on the scale required, and that such aid can only be furnished by individual capitalists or financial groups who are willing to provide the necessary supplies in money or goods.

8. That it is inconceivable that the credit and capital required in Russia should be provided by foreign capitalists as long as the destruction of capitalism and the violent overthrow of so-called bourgeois Governments remain the main object of the Russian Government, or of the political forces by which it is controlled.

9. That if the Soviet Government renounce and abstain from propaganda directed to the destruction of capitalism and the established order in other countries, *it still remains to be seen how far in the near future they will be able to arrest the process of economic disintegration and to lay a foundation upon which it will be possible for Russian industry and agriculture once more to develop and expand.*

The report specifies certain changes in home and foreign policy that are indispensable before there can be any trade: "the complete renunciation of the Third Internationale," safety of foreign business men in Russia, "the restoration of rail and river transport," "the co-operation of the peasantry," and "the settlement of the agrarian question."

The White Paper makes it more than doubtful, however, whether the Bolshevist régime could arrest "the

process of economic disintegration" *even if foreign capitalists—encouraged and supported by their governments—should come to its aid.* One of its conclusions is:

That the state of administrative incompetence and corruption into which the departments of the Soviet Government have fallen militates against the proper distribution of available supplies among the population and must be remedied if the Russian worker is to be restored to the standard of health and strength necessary to re-establish the diminished productivity of his labor.

On the main industrial policy of the Soviets, the nationalization of the leading industries—which, together with the nationalization of import and export trade, remains unaltered after the "reforms" of March (1921)—the British report says:

The Soviet government, in a situation calling for the exercise of the utmost discrimination and care, carried out the policy of nationalization in haste, without taking account of the disorder already prevailing in Russia, of the complex structure of modern industry, of the absence of expert technical assistance, and of the disabilities resulting from the lack of knowledge and experience under which they themselves labored.

The document further declares that, as a result of this nationalization, "the power of officialdom in Russia has developed on a scale to which there is no parallel, and represents an attempt to control completely the conditions of work and leisure, of food and drink, of education and amusement, of travel, and even of the home life of every individual in a nation whose population even now exceeds 120,000,000." The report adds that recent



evidence shows that the tendency toward State control is increasing rather than diminishing.

“It would appear,” says the report, in summing up the persecution of labor and of the peasantry, “that the Soviet Government must decide whether they are going to maintain a *policy of political repression at home* and aggressive Bolshevik propaganda abroad, which will inevitably, whatever international treaties they may make, lead in practice to a continuance of their present economic isolation, or whether they will accept and honestly carry out the fundamental condition which can alone obtain for them the outside aid they so urgently need.

“If they decide to maintain the campaign for the violent destruction of capitalism in other countries, and the policy of ruthless repression which makes it impossible for foreigners to live and to do business in Russia, then Russia will of necessity be left to her own resources. Then will the future show whether or not the combined effect upon the worker of persuasion as to the merits of communism, and of *persuasion by payment for work done with the shadow of imprisonment and the bayonet ever present*, can restore the old productive power of Russia within the short time available for the experiment.

“If it does not Trotzky himself admits that the Russian Socialist Society is on its way to ruin, however it may twist and turn.”

Bolshevism or Sovietism consists in such nationalization and State control and in the rule of a minority by repression—the only way a minority can rule. The moment this control is abandoned and the peasants and

workmen are freed and repression is discontinued Bolshevism will have ceased to be. But all the evidence shows that the Bolshevist Party and its leaders have never for one moment considered either the cessation of repression, or the abandonment of their dictatorship.

It must be noted that the parts of the British report so far published in America do not deal with weighty political questions such as the commercial integrity of the Soviets or the probability that the succeeding government will repudiate their transactions. Nor do they touch upon certain vital economic factors. The Soviets propose to pay for the needed imports chiefly by concessions—since they have so little to export. Lomov, the head of the concessions division of the Soviet Government, declares that the Bolshevists are now ready to grant concessions not only in forests and mines but in oil and in the iron and steel industry. He confesses, however, that a serious problem is created by the higher wages the concessionaries would pay their skilled labor when compared with Russian wages, by the difficulty of feeding it, by the Soviet labor laws, etc. Lomov's admissions suggest another whole nest of additional obstacles to the regeneration of Russia by foreign capital and foreign trade. These are doubtless among the reasons why—as Lomov also admits—not one concession of importance has yet been accepted by foreign capital!

The White Paper, besides its interesting conclusions as to the probable practical outcome, goes to some extent into causes. For example, the antagonism of town and country is one of the most frightful of the existing conditions. As to the cause for this, the British report concludes:

That having due regard to the causes of economic disorganization antecedent to the rise of the Bolsheviks to power, the attempts of the Bolsheviks to realize the class war in the towns by a precipitate nationalization of industry and in the villages by the establishment of the dictatorship of the village poor were the principal contributory causes of the gradual separation of town from city.

The practical efforts of Bolshevism up to the present time, so far as they affect production, have been a disastrous failure. The magnitude of the industrial collapse in Russia and the consequent cessation of exchange of products between town and country are the factors that have forced themselves particularly on our attention. We know of no similar instance of a collapse so complete, so sudden and so far-reaching, although a similar tendency is to be observed in Central Europe, and more especially in those countries which formerly composed the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Want existed in Paris during the revolutionary period, but it was submitted to for the sake of the political liberty sought by the people, and there was no general economic débâcle such as has occurred in Russia.

The White Paper also points out that the financial policy of the Soviets is leading rapidly to inevitable bankruptcy. In 1918 and 1919 expenditure was three and two and one-half times income. In 1920 expenditure was seven and one-half times income. The report continues:

In spite therefore of *wholesale confiscation of property* and *repudiation of debt* the three years of Soviet rule have resulted in a deficit of enormous size and rapidly increasing magnitude. These deficits are being met by issues of paper which, month by month, become of less value. That the present state of things cannot continue is certain.

That is, wholesale confiscation and debt repudiation were but a drop in the bucket in view of the mad Bolshevik finance.

It might be supposed that this report, at last, would be enough to satisfy the pseudo-liberal pro-Bolsheviks as to the character of the Soviets. What is our amazement to find it also being interpreted as a pro-Soviet document! The same leading Democratic newspaper, one of the chief supporters of President Wilson in this country, already quoted in Chapter I, declares that the White Paper shows that Lenin and Trotzky "*have been doing their utmost since they were freed of the threat of invasion, 'to establish a system of individual control in industry in place of the collective system which has proved a failure, 'to repair locomotives and rolling stock, to revive industry and avoid famine by conscripting labor, to end bureaucratic control in local affairs and to encourage trade with other nations. They have not succeeded even passably in any of these undertakings, but it is plain that they have endeavored to apply a constructive programme in the face of disorganization and disorder for which modern history has no parallel.*

*"Whether disorganization and disorder would have struck so deep in Russia after the war with any other Government in power it is too late now to decide. Even to-day some of the countries of Central Europe are only a little better off than Russia; if they had been obliged to endure an Allied blockade they might have been no nearer recovery in 1921 than their neighbor to the east."*

An unparalleled inversion of the facts. "Individual control" by Soviet bureaucrats is the control to which the White Paper refers, and this was accomplished a



year or two ago. Lenin and Trotzky have not done their "utmost" because they are still working first, last, and all the time for Bolshevism and Communism—as the report demonstrates. It also shows that the conditions in Eastern Europe are *not* "only a little better," and that the blockade can *not* be held as the sole or chief cause of Russia's plight.

A leading Republican organ speaks of the new trading conditions established in March, 1921, as permitting "the factory owners" (!) to begin making things they believed could be traded to the Soviets for food. This also betrays amazing ignorance. Factory owners in Soviet Russia! The factories are *all* (except petty workshops) owned by the Soviets. This is the very essence of Bolshevism. The real conditions introduced by the March decree permitting *restricted* and *local* trade are portrayed in a Washington dispatch to the *New York Times* (May 28)—based on information from Soviet sources:

The Moscow Soviet has issued licenses to trade to the following: Bars in the theaters, tea houses, restaurants, gastronomic shops, dairy shops, butchers, green grocers, and owners of kiosks. Lately many artisans' workshops have been opened, hatters, shoemakers, etc.; big industries, however, are at a standstill, and the general economic life reminds one rather of the Middle Ages.

The only big or Sovietized industries "prospering" are those engaged in the manufacture of arms.

This page in the original text is blank.

## INDEX

- Agrarian Revolt, 126  
Agriculturists (Peasants), 11, 14, 15, 29, 33, 41, 45, 68, 79, 104-124, 240-244  
Alpine, 230  
America:  
    (1) and the Soviets, 1-19, 26, 156, 157, 207, 208, 224-227  
    (2) Bolshevist Press on, 22, 23, 24, 25  
    (3) Gompers-Hughes Correspondence, 212-221  
    (4) Lenin on, 22, 149, 208, 209  
    (5) American Press on Soviet Reforms, 10, 11, 14-16, 120, 153, 250-253  
    (6) Trotsky on, 150  
*American Bar Association, Journal of*, 235  
American Communist (Bolshevist) Party, 24, 185  
American Federation of Labor, 1, 7, 25, 165, 170, 181, 185, 228-236  
American Socialist Party, 18, 19  
American Socialists, Loyal, 230, 231  
Amsterdam International, see International Federation of Trade Unions  
Australia, 174  
Armenia, 190, 191  
Art, 133  
Assassination, see Terrorism.  
Asia, 156, 157  
Autocracy, Industrial and Political, 78, see also Dictators and Dictatorship.  
*Avanti*, 188

- Ballod, 189, 190  
Bartuel, 183  
Bavaria, 143, 149, 150  
Belgium, 186, 231  
Bidegaray, 183  
Blockade, The, 66  
Bondfield, Margaret, 63, 118  
Boni, Albert, 85  
Bonus System, 82, 83, 86  
Bourgeoisie, see Middle Class, Capital, Democracy  
Brailsford, 107  
Brest-Litovsk Treaty, 207, 211  
British Labor Party, 4, 34, 52, 64-67, 138, 161, 162, 186, 188,  
190, 198, 199, 201, 202, 223  
British Socialists, see British Labor Party  
British White Paper, see White Paper  
Brousilloff, 100  
Bukharin, 160  
Bulgaria, 182  
Bureaucracy, 126, 127, 189-191
- Capital, Foreign, see Trade Agitation and Concessions  
Chernov, 53, 64, 68  
Children, 134-141  
China, 223  
Chinese, 60  
Civil War Advocated, 143, see also Class Struggle  
Class-War, 46, 47, 106, 108  
Code of Labor Laws, see Labor Laws  
Colby, Secretary, 1, 2, 4, 10, 145  
Communist Labor, 84  
Communist (or Third Internationale), 18, 22, 23, 25, 31, 38, 44,  
45, 46, 144, 146, 148, 150-168  
"Communist Manifesto," 132



- Communist Party, Russian, 28, 30, 31-48, 67, 73, 85, 90, 91, 115, 118, 142
- "Compromises" and "Reforms," 6, 14-16, 112-116, 121-124, 209, 210
- Compulsory Labor, 6, 66, 72-87
- Concessions 170, 175, 182, 192, 203, 206, 226, 227, 243, 245-253, see also Trade Agitation
- "Conservative" Bolshevism, 12, 14
- Conscription of Labor, see Compulsory Labor
- Constitutional Assembly, 15, 28, 107
- Cooperatives, 14, 117-120
- Counter-Revolution, see Terrorism
- Cossacks, 59
- Credit, Foreign, see Trade Agitation and Concessions
- Crispien, 18, 158, 188
- Culture, 98, 133, 134-141
- 
- Dalin, 62, 64
- D'Arragona, 160, 182, 183, 188
- Dan, 64
- De Brouckere, 190
- Decrees, Government by, 128, 129
- Democracy, Bolshevism vs., 28-48, 78, 104, 142, 188-190, 200
- Desertion, Labor, 58, 74, 75, 86, 97
- Dictators, Factory, 77
- Dictatorship of the Proletariat, 7, 10, 19, 28, 30, 33, 37, 38, 91, 114, 122, 193
- Disciplinary Labor Juries, 129
- Disorganization, Economic, 126
- Dittmann, 18, 189
- Djerzinsky, 68, 98, 99
- Duffy, 230
- Dugoni, 188

Dumoulin, 183, 194

Duncan, 230

Economic Collapse, 125-133, 245-253

Economic Conference (Soviet), 42, 78

Education, 26, 107, 143-141

Egypt, 223

Elections, 35, 36, 71, 94

Electrification of Russia, Proposed, 241, 242

Extraordinary Commission for Fighting Counter-Revolution,  
see Terrorism

Factory Soviets, 72

Family, The, see Home

Farbman, Michael, 10, 112

Faure, 192

Finmen, 194

Fisher, 235, 236

Food, Requisition of, see Taxation in Kind

France, 22, 149, 154, 157, 184, 206, 207

Freedom, see Terrorism

Freedom of Press, see Free Speech

Free Speech, 26, 34, 36, 104, 189, 193

"Free Trade," 14, 43, 113-118, 241-244

*Freiheit, Die*, 239

French Confederation of Labor (C. G. T.), 53, 169, 173, 180,  
183, 191

French Revolution, 10, 164

French Socialist Party (now Communist), 147, 155, 171, 188

Friss, 108

Georgia, 143, 190, 191, 237-240

German Socialists, 18, 63, 154, 172, 186, 188-190, 231, 239

Germany, 4, 22, 150, 154, 156, 158, 177-182, 184

Gompers, 6, 25, 181, 211-215, 228-236

- Gorky, 130, 131  
Goutor, 100  
Great Britain, 3, 14, 32, 149, 156, 157, 161, 162, 173, 174, 184,  
203-205, 206, 208, 209, 223-224, 235-253 (see also British  
Labor Party)  
"Green Armies," 59  
Green, William, 230  
Guest, Haden, 63
- Harding, President, 3, 10  
Hearst Newspapers, 9  
Henderson, Arthur, 21, 170, 186  
*Herald, London Daily*, 4, 166, 168  
Holland, 186  
Home, War against the, 135, 140  
Horne, Sir Robert, 204  
Hostages, 52-55  
Hours of Labor, see Overtime  
Hughes, Secretary, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 132, 203, 215-221  
Hungary, 143, 149, 195  
Hungarians, 60  
Huysmans, 186, 190, 191
- Independent Labor Party (British), 161, 162  
India, 184, 223  
Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.), 175-182, 185  
Inefficiency, 130, 131, 248  
Intellectuals, 51, 128, 172, 189, 199, 214  
International Federation of Trade Unions, 170, 171, 173, 184,  
185, 190, 194-197  
Intervention, 66  
Italy, 4, 149, 150, 154, 206, 210  
Italian Confederation of Labor, 160, 171, 177  
Italian Socialists, 18, 45, 63, 149, 150, 166, 188-190

Japan, 22, 156, 206

Jugo-Slavia, 182

Justice, 235, 236

Jouhaux, 183, 191, 194

Kalinin, 70, 115, 116, 126, 144

Kameneff, 4, 155, 156, 206, 207

Kaplan, 55

Kautsky, 169, 190

Kefali, 92

Kerensky, 47, 52, 137, 164, 170, 241

Kliefoth, 221

Krassin, 94, 167, 198, 203, 204, 205, 208, 210, 224

Krestinsky, 109

Kronstadt Rebellion, 208

Kropotkin, 126, 127

Labor Army, Red, 77, 79, 85

Labor Conscription, see Compulsory Labor

Labor Delegations to Soviet Russia

“Labor Opposition,” 97, 98

Labor Unions, see Trade Unions

Lansbury, 4

Latsis, 50, 55

Laws, Labor, 72-87

League of Nations, 142

Lenin (Lenin is quoted under nearly all the topics of the present volume. Refer to topical titles)

Lennon, 230

Letts, 60

Libby, F. J., 134, 135

“Liberals,” Pro-Bolshevist, 14, 19, 120, 133, 140, 164, 189, 199, 214, 223-227, see also Middle-Classes and Intellectuals

Liberty, see Terrorism

Liebkecht, 54



- Lloyd George, 211  
*London Daily News*, 21, 22  
Longuet, 169  
Losovsky, 104, 177, 182  
Lunacharsky, 137, 138  
Luxemburg, 54
- MacDonald, 186, 190  
Mahon, 230  
Martens, "Ambassador," 7  
Martoff, 55, 87  
Marx, 32, 148, 206  
Massacres, see Terrorism  
McLean, 161  
Menshevists, see Social Democratic Labor Party of Russia  
Merrheim, 53, 183, 192  
Metal Workers Union, Russian, 75, 76  
Middle Class, Bolshevik Success among, 153, 154  
Militarism, see War  
Militarization of Labor, 75, 79-81, 95  
Minor, O. S., 201, 202  
"Moderates," Bolsheviks, see "Conservatives," Bolshevik  
Morrison, 230
- Nansen, 222  
Nationalization of Import and Export Trade, 248  
Nationalization of Industry, 116-120, 248  
*New York World*, 16  
Non-partisans, 37, 48  
Norwegian Socialists, 108
- O'Connell, 230  
Ossinsky, 42, 97, 112, 113  
Oudegeest, 194  
Overtime, 76, 83, 86

- Paris Commune, 29  
Pacifism, 52  
Paper and Printed Matter, Bolshevist Monopoly of, 26  
Peasants, see Agriculturists  
Perham, 230  
Pestana, 179, 182  
Press, Freedom of, see Free Speech  
Printers' Union, Russian, 93, 99-103  
Prisons, 68-70  
Propaganda, Bolshevist, 4, 9, 18, 20-27, 136-139, 173, see also  
    Trade Agitation  
Political Education Conference, 39, 163  
Purcell, 63
- Radek, 159, 160  
Railway Workers, 50, 94, 95, 98  
Rakovsky, 66, 67  
Rappaport, 192  
Recht, Charles, 7  
Recognition of the Soviets, Agitation for, 1, 2, 203, 205, 225,  
    see also Trade Agitation  
Reconstruction, see Reforms  
Red Labor Union International (or International Council of  
    Trade and Industrial Unions), 169-187, 194-197  
Red Terror, see Terrorism  
Reed, John, 161  
Reforms, Social, 134-141  
Revolt of Trade Unions, 94-103  
Revolutionary Agitation, see World Revolt  
Rois, 193  
*Rote Fahne, Die*, 158  
Rúdzutuk, 129  
Ruhle, Otto, 180  
Russian People, Voice of, 199-201  
Russian Relief, 7, 8, 222

- Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, see Social Democratic Labor Party
- Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party, see Socialist Revolutionary Party
- Russell, Bertrand, 18, 63, 107, 108
- Rykov, 71, 149
- Sabotage, 51, 52, 55, 58
- Savinkov, 53
- Schliapmkoff, 77, 97
- Schools, see Education
- Science, 133
- Serbia, 231
- Serrati, 45, 188
- Shaw, Tom, 18, 63
- Shop Stewards, 177-182
- Slavery, see Compulsory Labor
- Snowden, Philip, 21, 188
- Snowden, Mrs., 18, 63
- Social Democratic Labor Party of Russia (Menshevists), 35, 36, 52, 53-55, 56, 61-63, 64-67, 71, 137
- Socialist (or Second) Internationale, 19, 31, 167, 168, 170, 174, 185-186, 192
- Socialists on Sovietism (see Labor Delegations)
- Social Revolutionary Party of Russia, 36, 52, 56, 137, 199-201
- Socialist Review*, 33
- Soviet Elections, see Elections
- Soviet Form of Government, 15, 33-36, 37, 42
- Soviet Russia*, 84
- Spanish Socialists, 18, 45, 63, 179, 182, 193
- State Capitalism, 16, 17
- State Socialism, see State Capitalism, 36, 42
- Steklov, 59
- Strikes, 76, 89
- Sverdlov, 47

- Swedish Socialists, 18, 63, 186  
Switzerland, 4  
Syndicalists, 72, 97, 174, 177-183
- Taxation in Kind, 14, 108-122  
Tchitcherin, 206  
Terrorism, 30, 31, 34, 43, 46, 49-71, 85, 96, 98, 106, 188, 189,  
195, 235, 236, 249  
Thomas, Albert, 170  
Thomas, J. H., 194  
Tomsky, 25, 177  
Trade Agitation, 3-15, 203-227, 243, 245-253  
Trade Treaties, see Trade Agitation  
Trade Unions, 20, 25, 31, 33, 36, 37, 39, 63, 71, 74, 75, 83,  
88-103, 169-187, 193  
Transport Workers' Congress, 47  
Troelstra, 186  
Trotsky, 11, 12, 35, 36, 41, 50, 51, 60, 77, 79-82, 94, 95, 108,  
143, 145, 148, 152, 165, 249  
Tscheidze, 228, 229  
Turks, 190, 191  
Turkey, 223, 231, 238  
Turner, Ben, 18, 63  
Twenty-one Points, The (Communist Ultimatum to Socialist  
Parties), 147, 155, 172, 192
- Ukraine, 66, 67  
Uritsky, 52, 54, 55
- Vacirca, 188  
Valentine, 230  
Vandervelde, 186  
Versailles Treaty, 22, 207  
Violence, see Terrorism  
War, 45, 143, 155, 156, 237-239



- Watts, A. J., 135  
Wells, H. G., 107, 207  
Wels, Otto, 186  
White Paper, British, 245-253  
Williams, Robert, 63  
Wilson, ex-President, 4, 10  
Wilson, ex-Secretary, W. B., 7, 8, 148  
Wrangel, 53, 148, 193  
World Revolution, Movement for, 3, 8, 12, 142-168, 240, 244,  
226, 227
- Yaroslav Prison, 68-70
- Zemstvos, 133  
Zinoviev, 31, 45, 89, 152, 159, 160, 166, 167, 194-197  
Zorin, 90