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Foreword

(written in 1842)

Communism is the secret name of the dread antagonist setting proletariat rule with all its consequences against the present bourgeois regime. It will be a frightful duel. How will it end? No one knows but gods and goddesses acquainted with the future. We only know this much: Communism, though little discussed now and loitering in hidden garrets on miserable straw pallets, is the dark hero destined for a great, if temporary, role in the modern tragedy . . .

Will the religious doctrines of the past rise in all countries, in desperate resistance—and will perhaps this attempt constitute the third act? Will the old absolutist tradition reenter the stage, though in a new costume and with new cues and slogans? How could that drama end?

Wild, gloomy times are roaring toward us, and a prophet wishing to write a new apocalypse would have to invent entirely new beasts—beasts so terrible that St. John's older animal symbols would be like gentle doves and cupids in comparison. The gods are veiling their faces in pity on the children of man, their long-time charges, and perhaps over their own fate. The future smells of Russian leather, blood, godlessness, and many whippings. I should advise our grandchildren to be born with very thick skins on their backs.

Heinrich Heine
THE SECRET NAME
Introduction

“There are people tired of work, there are Polish apples unobtainable by Polish children, there are children scorned by criminal doctors, there are boys forced to lie, there are girls forced to lie . . . , there are people waiting for justice, there are people who have been waiting for a long time. On this earth we appeal on behalf of people who are exhausted from work, we appeal for locks that fit the door, for rooms with windows, for walls which do not rot, for a holy human time . . .”

ADAM WAZYK
in Nowa Kultura
Warsaw, August 21, 1955

The Russian revolution has gone a long way in the past forty years, a very long way indeed from the starting point. We are long past the brandishing of arguments and learned disquisitions on orthodoxy and deviationism, and what is revolutionary and what counter-revolutionary. Even the words “masses” and “proletariat” have grown stale with use and abuse. It is time to talk of facts, not theories, for what we have are the facts of the Soviet rule across four decades, hidden and camouflaged by tons of rigmarole ideology.

The Communist problem is essentially a human problem, and the only proper approach to the problem is the
human approach. Economics should be seen basically as factors which make human beings more or less happy. But dissertations on Communism are often so weighted with statistics and figures that the feelings of the human beings involved in the system, though implicit, appear almost obtrusive in the work of the industrious researchers. The Polish poet quoted above gives us a direct and, by means of suggestion, a complete picture of men behind the Iron Curtain and brings us close to the center of the picture. Because he speaks in human terms, we can hear through him the voice of the men, women and children in the Communist-dominated countries. He talks to us in common, everyday terms, without falsification and without distortion, but with human warmth about people, about what the world might be and what it is not against the cold, gray sky of Warsaw. A poet does not analyze; he does not rationalize; he is almost ignorant—happily for him—of polemic clichés and controversial theories. He reaches clarity. He speaks of people, not a people, or the people, not even with a capital letter, just people. When he speaks of the pain and hurt and unquenched longings of people, he really expresses himself.

Marxism may be right, or it may be wrong, but Soviet Russia must stand acquitted or condemned by the naked facts of forty years of uninterrupted evolution of the Soviet rule. If the facts do not bear out its pretentions, no amount of dogmatic, doctrinaire rationalization is going to be of any help. Today, after 40 years, the Communists and non-Communists all over the world have to square the complex of Soviet life, not with Marxist theory, but with the simple question: What have you done to your neighbor, especially to the working man?
Long ago, at the very beginning of the Revolution, when Lenin suppressed the labor unions and made them subservient to the state machine, the Communist leaders were already asking questions. When Lenin, at the moment of power, forgot all the wisdom of his revolutionary days, turned his back on democracy, dissolved the first freely elected Constituent Assembly on January 18, 1918, crushed the workers' rebellion, and indulged in Cheka terror, Madame Kollontay and a number of others, like Schliapnikov, the Commissar for Labor, were already stating the question of the working class.

"The workers ask—who are we? Are we really the prop of the class dictatorship, or are we just an obedient flock that serves as support for those who, having severed all ties with the masses, carry out their own policy . . . under the reliable cover of the party label?"

Maria Spirodonova, a woman Socialist Revolutionary who had always supported Lenin, began to ask questions, too. Lenin answered by jailing her. Spirodonova was exiled to Central Asia in 1925 and was last seen in 1930. Since we are mentioning women, who seemed to have a better grip of the realities of the revolution, I may mention also Rosa Luxemburg, leader of German Communists, who protested, "the remedy discovered by Lenin and Trotsky, the abolition of democracy, is worse than the evil it is supposed to cure." There was, too, Stalin's young wife, Nadiejda Alliluyeva, who quarreled with her husband at Voroshilov's dinner over Stalin's ruthless killing and deportation of the Ukraine peasants, and who mysteriously died shortly afterward. Alexander Orlov tells us:
About three months after the death of Nadiejda Alliluyeva, at a party given by the chief of the Operative Department of the NKVD, Pauker, the conversation touched upon Alliluyeva. Somebody remarked that she did not take advantage of her high position and that she was modest and very meek. "Meek?" repeated Pauker sarcastically. "Then you didn't know her. She was a peppery woman! I wish you had seen how she flared up once and shouted straight to his face: 'You are a tormentor, that's what you are! You torment your own son . . . you torment your wife . . . you torment the whole Russian people!'"

In a grand show of devotion and sorrow of the bereaved husband, Stalin insisted, against the repeated advice of his secret police chief Yagoda, on following her coffin on foot for a distance of seven kilometers. After the whole route had been covered and guarded with secret police at every house, Stalin suddenly changed his mind after a few blocks, and got into a bullet-proof automobile, to arrive at the cemetery long before the procession.

People are not interested in theories any more. As Madame Kollontay says, people are asking pertinent questions. Some of these questions are: How does the working class fare under the working class dictatorship? How much do they earn? Can they refuse to work overtime if they want to? How about their housing? Are the chairmen of the unions elected or appointed? Will the unions speak for them? No? Can they speak for themselves? Is the inequality of pay and income greater or smaller than in capitalist countries? Are they free to quit jobs? Do their wives have to go to work at factories because the workers' pay is too low? Are there free elections in the People's Democracies? . . . Finally, who is the enemy of the work-
ing class? No questions of dogmas or doctrines, these, just plain questions of fact.

This habit of asking questions can be at times embarrassing. During Khrushchev's visit to London in April, 1956, he was asked many of these embarrassing questions by British Laborites. From dogmatic arguments, there was always possible retreat under a cloud of ideological twaddle; from questions about facts, there was no retreat. It happened that Khrushchev had just sent an appeal to the Social Democrats of Europe, and the Council of the Socialist International had replied only a week before his visit and rejected it unconditionally in these words: "Where the Communists are in power, they have distorted every freedom, every right of the workers, every political gain and every human value which the Socialists have won in a struggle lasting generations." There was nothing proletarian about Khrushchev except the cut of his trousers. When he was asked these questions, his face got very red, and he used some uncouth language. He was not the only one to get red in the face when asked. Alexander Zawadzki, member of Polish Politbureau, wrote on January 27, 1956, in *Trybuna Ludu*, "Various Party and state posts are still occupied by people who... get angry when faced with the necessity of changing their attitude toward the people." Gaitskell, the British Labourite, asked questions about the imprisoned socialist leaders in a so-called socialist republic. Even Aneurin Bevan asked some pointed questions. After reading Khrushchev's famous speech of February, 1956, denouncing Stalin's murder of innocent Communist leaders, Bevan asked "about the millions of common folk who suffered in less dramatic ways. About the workers who
went to jail because they clocked in late at the factory. About the farmers turned out of their houses for eating food which was earmarked for state delivery . . .” Petty, nasty questions about facts, but very close to the people who lived with these facts daily. Bevan visited the USSR in 1954; so he knew. André Gide, another sympathizer, who visited the USSR eighteen years before Bevan, also knew. George Brown, British trade-unionist MP, who visited Poland in 1954 also knew. “The inequalities, the unhappiness and the oppression just can’t be hidden or ignored . . . There is a bureaucratic minority that is extremely comfortably off by any standards.”

The workers and students behind the Iron Curtain are asking questions, too. When Ekaterina Furtseva, secretary of the Moscow city Party organization, lectured workers at the Kaganovich Ball-Bearing Plant for their slackness, one of the workers in the back of the hall shouted, “And how much money do you make?”

One tends to ask questions that are mean. That is exactly it. No more grandiloquent defenses on orthodox, genuine, correct Marxist thesis, but just pointed, mean questions of fact, because the people of Russia and Russian colonies live daily with these facts. Alexei Pludek, a writer, said at the Czechoslovak Writers’ Congress in Prague (Apr. 22-29, 1956), “Young people will not be prompted to self-sacrifice by a high functionary who . . . with the money of the working class buys a villa in Prague, a country house and a private automobile in addition to Government cars — especially if he fortifies that villa and surrounds it with armed men, possibly to protect himself against the working class.”

So the entire world of men and women are asking questions, those in the USSR, those in labor camps, and
especially those in the colonial empire of Eastern Europe now under Russian subjection. They are asking questions because their whole lives, down to their bread ration, are affected by it. Those like ourselves outside the Russian Colonial Empire are asking questions, not so much because of any military threat, but because of an inner necessity to understand, and because we want to know what is happening to human beings like ourselves. We wish to understand, how it all happened, for whatever you may say, Stalin, Lenin, Khrushchev are men too, like ourselves. To what influences are they subjected? What are the motives of their action? Why are apparent crimes committed against so many millions in so many countries? Why should the Russians try to subjugate a vast empire of a dozen countries in East Europe (Georgia, Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania—and Yugoslavia if they could) and a number of autonomous peoples elsewhere (Crimean Tartars, Chechens, Kirghiz, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Mongols, etc.) under regimes set up by them by fraudulent elections and maintained by occupation troops? Why should the Bolshevik Revolutionists who set out to destroy world empires end up by setting up an empire of their own? Why should men who hated despotism under the Tsars deliberately become despots and preach despotism? Why should the state which called itself dictatorship of the proletariat turn out to be a dictatorship over the proletariat, and keep on, almost like an automaton driven by forces beyond their control, until it became an absurdity? Lenin knew well that this would happen, for he said back in 1905: "He who wishes to proceed to Socialism by any other path than political democracy must inevitably arrive at absurd and reaction-
ary conclusions, both in the political and economic sense.” (Italics mine).

Of course, socialism is an absurdity, when it not only permits, but encourages *inequality* of income. Of course a democracy which is a totalitarian state is an absurdity. Of course an election which is a race with one horse is an absurdity. Of course, socialism has become a farce, Marxist theory a joke, and democracy a travesty. Why did they do it? These are the contradictions, the perplexities which puzzle the outside world and harass the Communist rulers themselves. There must be an explanation for this most extraordinary phenomenon in modern history and an understanding of the forces and the circumstances which drove them, and are still driving them, to it.

The answer is clearly that Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky were also mortal men, with human motivations, driven by their position as the ruling class and, if you like, by the materialistic necessity of their class interests, driven, I am almost embarrassed to say it, as a man who has committed one murder is driven to commit a number of others to cover up the traces. And I do not see how Khrushchev, being human that he is, can get out of the impossible paradoxical situation of degrading labor in order to liberate labor, of building up the most despotic state power in expectation for the state to wither away, and of maintaining by every conceivable means a ruling class with the hope of ending up somehow, though quite vaguely, in a classless society. The folly that men do is enough to make the angels weep. As Heine once said with such sad humor:

Yes, even in the highest pathos of the world tragedy, bits of fun slip in. . . . On this great stage of the world all passes exactly as on our beggarly boards. On it, too, there
are tipsy heroes, kings who forget their parts, scenes which obstinately stay up in the air, prompters' voices sounding above everything, danseuses who create extraordinary effects with the poetry of their legs, and costumes, which are the main thing. And high in heaven, in the first row of the boxes, sit the dear little angels, and keep their lorgnettes on us comedians here down below, and the blessed Lord Himself sits seriously in His great box, and, perhaps, finds it dull, or calculates that this theater cannot be kept up much longer because this one gets too high a salary, and that one too little, and that they all play much too badly. . . .

This, then, is the intention of the book: first, to strip all discussions of ideological talk and deal with facts, not theories and, having done so, to call things by their right names; and second, to explain in human, not ideological terms, how this tragicomedy has come about, how today the socialist republics are anti-socialist, how the invariable victims, wherever Soviet power appears, are the Socialist leaders, peasant leaders and trade union leaders to whom the Soviets could show no mercy, and how wherever Soviet rule extends, the repression, subjugation and degradation of labor follow, without exception, as is well-known in Eastern Europe. This monstrosity of fact requires an explanation. But if we understand the Soviet leaders as human beings, we also understand their actions. For the story of the Soviet regime is the story of the triumph of human nature over Marxism, and the message of the story is that it will continue to triumph over Marxism until Marxism is destroyed, discredited and forgotten as the childish dream of a philosopher, strong in economics, but weak in elementary human wisdom.

For myself, the thinking and reading involved in writ-
ing this book are a matter of curiosity, and an effort at a satisfactory understanding. Curiosity, because as the Polish poet quoted at the beginning makes plain, the Soviet experiment is an experiment with people, with men and women and children involved; and an effort at understanding because of an inner necessity. It is a matter of intellectual need to square contradictory and paradoxical (even absurd) facts with some semblance of a logical explanation. As such, I constitute myself a tribunal of one, in the privacy of one's conscience, to see the facts without confusion and without distortion, to leave no evidence untouched, and to ask myself, is this the destiny of man and of human culture? And I have come to the conclusion that the whole experiment was not worth it, that it is a pity Lenin forgot what he had foreseen, that the voices of those honest men near him, like Lozovsky and Tomsky, were silenced and that labor was stripped of its defenses, so that hundreds of thousands of Russians and millions of peoples from the Baltic to the Balkan today have to live a life of fear and poverty and degradation, while the elite and the state machine grow stronger and stronger every day. I have come to the conclusion that, in spite of the much touted technological development, the saving of a child's life, the return of a mother to him from Siberia, the liberating of one slave from his chains, is worth more than sending up those sputniks. A man living on a subhuman level and falling dead in snow out of exhaustion and malnutrition, a prisoner sending out a heartrending plea of innocence from his cell (see Khrushchev's speech), a child in Lithuania seeing his mother taken away by the security police at midnight—these things seem infinitely more important than all the sputniks the Soviets are sending up in space. And they are our business, because we in
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the twentieth century permit these things. I do not know whether to understand is to forgive, but at least, let us try to understand . . .

So everybody has to take up an attitude toward Russia. John Dewey was attracted by the Soviet educational system and its marriage laws during the opening years of this Revolution. When he learned in 1935 that a child of twelve, drifting into the cities as a beggar after the terrible Stalin-made famine, could be punished by capital punishment for stealing things at the railways, he turned away. André Gide looked to Soviet Russia as the realization of a dream. After his trip to the USSR, in 1936, where he saw the growth of the new bourgeoisie, its toadyism, its conformity, and its callous indifference to human sufferings, he, too, turned away. Bevan of Great Britain, André Philip of France, Nenni of Italy and others have also taken trips to square the facts with their conscience. After the Hungarian Revolution, many more Communists in the different countries, Jean-Paul Sartre in France and Howard Fast in the U.S., have turned away, because after that event the revolutionary clichés have lost their authentic ring. Only men like Jawaharlal Nehru and Hewlett Johnson have not asked questions. They have nothing to square with. But it is just as well. It is for the development of such old-womanish eccentrics as Hewlett Johnson that democracy exists and protects the right of everyone to think for himself, including the right to make a fool of himself . . .

This, then, is what I believe. Having seen the whole Soviet experiment for what it is, and noted the contradictions which human nature had foisted upon a dogmatic system of society, I do not see how Communism can help but destroy itself in the end. The gradual disintegration of
the Communist state, the corruption from within, and of the Great Russian Empire with its contradictions, can be delayed, but not halted. This for the simple reason that what is against human nature cannot last long, in spite of all the tanks and bayonets. He who has the heaviest tanks and thickest prison walls but has lost the hearts of men under him is not to be feared. To put it more explicitly, I firmly believe that it is against the dictum of all human history that human enslavement can last forever. He who must suppress the human cry for freedom by secret police methods is already lost. For that is the verdict of history, and it is the verdict of history because among the many instincts of men, there is not an instinct for slavery.

Many statesmen and publicists who are doubtful of themselves and their own society are not aware of the nature of the problem. Many who are inclined to accept the status quo, including that of the Russian colonial empire, do not even understand the nature of the conflict of human forces involved. I hope, through these chapters, to make this entirely clear, that the reader may gain that ultimate conviction that God has not made men to be slaves, that such is not the ultimate human destiny, and that, however imperfect the present society is, the most foolish thing to do would be to jettison the very few precious gains of human progress, such as increasing protection of human rights, and necessary checks and limitations of rulers, and the people's power to overthrow governments through free elections. The *habeus corpus* is one of these few precious things. I have written elsewhere that one writ of *habeus corpus* is worth all the Confucian classics, and I still think so now. The reversion
Introduction

to autocracy is one of the easiest things and is an ever-present danger; the moment the checks are withdrawn, autocracy reappears. But autocracy is nothing very new. Nothing is very new which is not very old.
"Wherever Marxism is popular among the workers, this political tendency ("bourgeois labor party") will swear by the name of Marx. It cannot be prohibited from doing this, just as a trading firm cannot be prohibited from using any particular label, style, or advertisement. It has always been the case in history that after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular among the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes."

LENIN

Selected Works, XI, p. 761

Confucius, when a guest in the state of Wei, was asked what he would do as the first step if he was asked to head the government of that country, replied, "Evidently, as a first step, I would see to it that things are called by their right names." His disciple was greatly puzzled, and Confucius continued, "Why can't you understand? For if things were not called by their right names, then the statements would be misleading, and when the statements are misleading, then nothing can be accomplished." What Confucius was bothered about was the extreme confusion of terms, the euphemisms and circumlocutions of the diplomats of those days, and the shameless claims which the rulers of those days had arrogated to themselves. His only original work, the book he wrote himself and
not merely edited or compiled, was called *Spring-Autumn*, or chronicles of his times. It was, as a matter of fact, only a compilation of dates of historical events, consisting entirely of headlines and no text, as in an almanac. This book was a merciless practice of his theory of “calling things by their right names,” and as modern editors will appreciate, an exercise in the economic and precise choice of words in such headlines, heavy with import and implications. As an illustration, Confucius, writing the chronicles of the present age, would probably write in his succinct style, “1939, August 23: Stalin signed pact with Hitler. Sept. 1: Hitler invaded Poland. Sept. 17: Stalin invaded Poland and partitioned it.” The mere juxtaposition of the two dates implies premeditated action, and the implication of responsibility is that Hitler and Stalin started World War II together. Simple words like “usurper,” “murder,” “aggression” imply passing a historian's judgment upon people and their actions. Confucius was particularly fond of the word “assassination.” In the case where a king was assassinated by a hireling of the crown prince, he wrote in apparently restrained anger that the crown prince assassinated his father, without mentioning the hireling. Thus writing of the Moscow trials, he would most probably write, “1936, Aug. 23: Usurper Stalin murdered Kamenev and Zinoviev, with the aid of Prosecutor Vishinsky.” The words “usurper” and “murder” imply examination of a whole train of events; the mention of Vishinsky fixes the responsibility for complicity and failure of the prosecutor’s office.

In any attempt to know and understand the Russian Soviets, the first step is to do away with the confusion of terms, and to call things by their right names; otherwise “nothing can be accomplished.” For as Lenin prophe-
sied, "after the death of revolutionary leaders who were popular with the oppressed classes, their enemies have attempted to appropriate their names so as to deceive the oppressed classes." This is exactly what has happened. The Supreme Soviet which officially approved the punishing by penal servitude of a worker for clocking in twenty minutes late at his place of employment, or being "tardy" in his return after lunch recess, still, upon every possible occasion, called on the names of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and V. I. Lenin.

A situation therefore was produced whereby every act and every measure must be equated with Marxism-Leninism. Very soon the "Workers' State" became a state where workers do all the work, and a "dictatorship of the proletariat" became, without any possible contradiction, a dictatorship over the proletariat, and "Socialism," as defined by Stalin in so many words, meant "inequality." Today, the second "S" in USSR still stands, without shame or compunction. A whole series of inverting of meanings has taken place. As far back as 1936, André Gide, the sincere admirer of the USSR, already pointed out that in present-day Soviet Union, "counter-revolutionary" meant "exactly its opposite," and the revolutionary spirit was "not wanted," and was "in the way." We shall come to the substantiation for all these statements as we go along, but it must be pointed out in this first chapter, that the inversion of meaning has taken place.

When I was a child, we used to play a game which may be called "double-think." The game consisted in calling an object by anything but its right name. Let us say, with a children's book of pictures of trees, animals and utensils spread before us, one child would point to a
particular animal, say, a lamb, and the other child must say outright any animal's name except a lamb. It could be applied to colors, black, white, etc. The game could be continued in any place without a book, and the children enjoyed it. The fun consisted in knowing that "it ain't so."

A similar situation has grown up whereby Soviet party workers and editors have to practice this art of double-think. They soon became expert at it. Actually, the terminology is no more than thirty or forty words and phrases, like "counter-revolutionary," "monopoly capitalist," "decadent bourgeois," "fascist lackeys," etc. and it is not too difficult. With some practice, it becomes as easy as the way a bilingual child can switch off from German to French, or French to German. There are two languages in Soviet Russia, the language of double-think, and the language of no-think, and one can, with some practice, hop from the one to the other. With the party workers, it very soon becomes automatic, unconscious, as speaking in all languages should be. In order to understand Communism, one should get into the Communist frame of mind and penetrate not merely into the meaning, but the meaning of meaning of these familiar Communist words and phrases.

There is general agreement in the practice of all civilized languages that "rightist" means pro-capital, and "leftist" means pro-labor, pro-peasant. How is it then possible for a pro-capital and anti-labor regime to call itself "leftist"? Apparently, here is an inversion of meaning, the forcing of a word to mean its opposite. Reading any statement of the Soviet leaders in the newspapers, we are forced to learn not what the words mean, but what they do not mean and what the Communist rulers have de-
cided arbitrarily that they should mean. Confucius today would have short shrift with these confusing and misleading writers and compel a return to the basic realities of language.

Why did the Russian Communists stick to the labels of "leftist" and "Marxist" after abandoning Marxism? The primary reasons are two: (A) The Communists have a Holy Cause, and anybody with a Holy Cause cannot be trusted; and (B) the Communists possess a very charming set of terminology, which would be an extreme pity to throw away. At whatever cost, the Holy Cause, its ritual and litany must be kept, as Lenin says with such unusual frankness and prophetic candor, "so as to deceive the oppressed masses." To no small extent, the efficacy of Communism in the yet uncommitted countries in the cold war of propaganda is due to the utter charm of these revolutionary phrases, to which the free world has nothing to offer in comparison.

How was such an inversion of meaning possible? How was it possible for the leaders to square every one of their acts with Marxism until it became "a standing joke" among the party workers, according to Djilas? What happened was that Marxism was a theory of principles of struggle and destruction. Djilas has pointed out that Marx never planned any program of positive construction. Rosa Luxemburg, the revered German Communist, wrote in Spartacus that it was dangerous to play with pulling out the checks on the rulers and suppressing the voice of the workers because Marx never planned anything, and the step-by-step evolution of a workers' democracy must be learned by giving the workers themselves an opportunity for political experience. Lenin turned a deaf ear to these pleas of members of his own Politbureau, and set up the
doctrine of leadership within the Party leadership; today this leadership doctrine is incorporated in Khrushchev's "party vanguard" who will think for the blind masses.

This is the internal condition in which the inversion of meaning was brought about. Add to this the fact that Marxism was only a set of principles, but the program was worked out by the leaders, and add to it the further fact that this so-called Marxist program was not something set, but conceived of as a line, a moving line at different stages of progress, and further, this line was "circular" (as defined by Lenin) and a "spiral," constantly changing in directions, and you see how simple and easy it is to equate everything by this "dialectic" of spiral progress. At every point in this spiral, there was a flying tangent; if the tangent was taken by the opposition, it was labeled "opportunism," or "revisionism," and if wished by the leadership, it was orthodox "socialist realism" and a "necessary stage" in the revolutionary progress. It is like a skein of tangled wool consisting of circles. To understand how Marxism easily lends itself to manipulation, one can visualize just a single "circle" in that skein as follows:

As the illustration indicates, in a skein of such circles, it soon becomes impossible to say whether a certain direction is "rightist" or "leftist" because the line continues
from right to left and from left to right of the dotted line toward Utopia. In Communist practice, it does not matter so long as it is a deviation, e.g., Rykov's pleading for better prices for the farmers' produce was labelled "rightist" deviation, whereas it was actually leftist. Thus it becomes possible to go left by going right, to march toward a classless society by widening class inequalities, to work for the withering away of the state by strengthening the state security police, to be imbued with the ideal of brotherhood of mankind by raping one's neighbors, etc.

With such a set-up, the "Marxist line" simply means following the party leadership. The proletariat is supposed to accept, not to "react." He who reacts at all becomes a "reactionary." A man who resents the bread ration becomes automatically a "reactionary." A farmer who dislikes compulsory sale of his crops at prices fixed by the Party government also becomes automatically a "reactionary." The common people who revolted in the streets of Hungary were denounced as "reactionaries." Thus the word "reactionary" is applied, not in reference to a theoretic goal of the Revolution (the ultimate liberation of the working class), but in reference to the Party leadership. The word "counter-revolutionary" similarly can only mean, not against the ultimate goal of the revolution, but against the revolutionary leadership.

(A) The first reason why it was so easy to effect an inversion of meaning is that the Communists have a Holy Cause. Since the revolutionary state owns the means of production, any pregnant woman who comes late at the factory because she could not get into a crowded train (see Chapter 5) is not just an "idler," "slacker" or "truant" in the usual sense of the word; what she did was "sabotage of Socialist production" and in theory she is
an “enemy of the state” and an “enemy of the people.” To do anything against the authority and discipline of the state is therefore to commit a “crime against the people.” The greatest discovery of the Communist rulers is the word “people” in whose name anything can be done. It then becomes possible to shoot the working class in the name of the people, or shoot the people in the name of the working class. Double-think becomes automatic, unconscious. An example of this is the declaration of Communist Premier Cyrankiewicz of Poland during the Poznan strike of June 28-29, 1956. The Poznan workers had struck for hunger. After killing 38 workers and wounding 270, according to the government’s figures, Cyrankiewicz declared, “if any one dares to raise his arm against the people’s rule, the people’s rule will chop off that arm in the interests of the working class.” A closer study will show that an absent-minded transposition of words on the part of the Communist Premier will make no appreciable difference. If he had said, “the rule of the working class will chop off that arm in the interests of the people,” it would be just as good. Khrushchev himself pointed out in that historic speech that the phrase “enemy of the people” was invented by Stalin and merely meant anybody Stalin, the Sun and Father of the Proletariat, wished to execute.

Naturally, some of the simpler objective words have already a generally accepted meaning and refuse to take on their opposite meanings gracefully, words like “stomach” and “equal.” In this case, nothing can be done except by taking the bull by the horn. Of the more grotesque applications, nothing is quite as amusing as the official Communist position regarding the question of the identity of stomachs in size and appetite in all human beings. The
Party merely decides that "it ain't so." On March 12, 1954, the Prague Rude Pravo rebuked Party members for abetting "social democratic demands based on the old-fashioned theories that everybody's stomach is the same." This is not an isolated instance. In May of the following year, Frantisek Zupka, trade union chairman, reported that Czech workers were exhibiting "social democracy" in that "claims are made that stomachs are the same." Claims are actually made, imagine!

This rather bland reference to old-fashioned theories about the identical appetites of all human beings and identical perceptions of hunger---this reference is possible because back twenty years ago, when the First Five Year Plan was in progress, Stalin had formulated the Doctrine of Socialist Inequality, and led the fight against equality of income. Stalin, I insist, was a realist, and would have made a first-class President of General Motors. At first, during November, 1917, in the first heyday of the Revolution, Lenin had promised that "all official persons, without exception, will be paid at a rate not exceeding the average wage of a competent worker." It didn't work. After the NEP, it was soon felt that to pay the party worker the same as that of the manual worker would be unfair. At this stage, inequality of pay could be called "socialist realism," but it was permitted, rather than touted about. But as the years passed, it became intolerable for the ruling class to admit that they were equal to the common man, and the necessity for coquetry with the proletariat was gone. By the time of the forced industrialization under the First Five Year Plan under Stalin, autocracy was already established and it became necessary to take the bull by the horn and preach openly and squarely that "Socialism means Inequality." The clearest definition of
this capitalist reactionary doctrine was made in June, 1931. The stand for Inequality was bravely taken, formulated and approved.

"These people think," said Stalin, "that Socialism requires equality, equality in the needs and personal life of the members of society. These are petit-bourgeois views of our left-wing scatterbrains. We know how greatly our industry has been injured by the infantile exercises of our left-wing scatterbrains." *

It is easy to imagine how intellectually relieved and morally comfortable the party delegates felt to have their higher income and life of privilege in the sea of general poverty of the wage-workers thus rationalized and formally established. They did not have to explain the inequality and the privilege and material comforts of their living any more. The Revolution rewarded its faithful workers in cash and material goods immediately. Stalin led this fight by the use of a subtle word, "equalitarianism," or "egalitariansim," in Russian uravnilovka, a slang word of contempt. Like "libertarianism," it reminded one of the "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" of the French Revolution, and sounded antiquated. They had gone far beyond such eighteenth-century concepts. "Down with uravnilovka!"

(B) There was a real, justifiable reason for keeping the arsenal of revolutionary phraseology after the Communist Party of Soviet Russia had entered the road of Counter-revolution. The reason was, Marxism had developed really a set of very charming, effective and attractive terms. Any time, in any language, the phrase "the solidar-

* Quoted by David J. Dallin, The Real Soviet Russia, p. 92, Yale Univ. Press. 1947.
ity of the international proletariat,” or “the sovereignty of the revolutionary masses” has an impressive ring. Then there are good fighting words and phrases, like “executioners of monopoly-capitalists,” “spies,” “fascist lackeys,” “running dogs of imperialism.” In addition, Marxism is regarded as a science, a science of ideology, the latest science which, according to Lenin, is the culmination of “classical German philosophy, classical English political economy, and French Socialism together with French revolutionary doctrines in general.” Fellow-travelers everywhere, in China as well as in U.S. and Great Britain, felt a scientific pride and even literary charm merely in the act of writing and speaking these clichés, in the same sense that a medical intern is happy to mention casually in talks with his colleagues such phrases as “cardiac thrombosis” or a woman’s “puerperium” (just childbirth confinement). I have positively heard a Ph.D. say, some twenty-five years after his graduation, “And Mrs. X, how is Stella’s pattern of group behavior?” Stella of course was the child.

In the nineteen-thirties, when I was in Shanghai and saw the transformation of Chinese prose style, I was forced to admit the charm of the revolutionary phrases of the leftist writers, and noted their fascination for young school students who were beginning to write. They were absolutely enamored of them. There was an abrupt change to preference for long, involved and quasi-scientific words and phrases. The “present attitude of the farmers” became the “present-stage ideological reaction of the agricultural producers.” It sounded scientific, modern, educated and refined. I heard my nephew and his young friends confess to the “fascination” of such a style—a fascination, no doubt based upon, and related to, the sophomoric delight
in long words, that first fine confidence in one's vocabulary and first pleasure of command and fluency ringing in one's own ears. But when in the Chinese language, *proletariat Aufheben* (upheaval) became PU-LO-TA-LI-AH OW-FU-HEI-PIEN, it was irresistible. A Chinese speaks it and writes it with the same pride with which an Englishman returning from Paris practices some French phrases he has just picked up upon his neighbors. And what is true of Chinese youth in the nineteen-thirties is true of the youths of India, Ceylon, Jakarta today.

Words, once created, can become independent of their creators. They gain a certain vogue and have a life of their own. Sometimes the bottle is prettier than its contents, and after the latter is used up, one has not the heart to throw away the bottle. This is what has happened to the brave, exciting words of Marxism in Soviet Russia. You know their use is played out, that the Socialist bottle has no more content, but you have not the heart to throw out such pretty revolutionary terms. For these words have acquired a *display value*, an unearned increment. Obviously, one does not gladly part with a phrase like "revolutionary proletariat." It will grace the speech of any speaker anywhere any time in Soviet Russia, and help to secure the length of life of its speaker.

To help the reader to get into the Communist frame of mind and understand their language, I have jotted down below a glossary of Communist words, and their approximate meaning in the usage of Communist literature.

1. **Workers' State**—That in which the workers do all the work.
2. **Democracy**—(1) A form of stabilized shooting of the people, by the people, for the people.
1. (2) Term used interchangeably with dictatorship; e.g., *people's democracy equals people's dictatorship.*

(3) That form of government in which if the Democrats (U.S.) win, the Republican leaders go to San Quentin, and if the Republicans win, the Democratic leaders unite with the masses in Alaskan mines.

3. THE STATE—The political entity which withers away silently and naturally through the growth of the secret police and a dependent judiciary.

4. ELECTIONS—A race with one horse (Attlee).

5. FREE ELECTIONS—Those in which the people register their choice of one alternative after the security police have done with the opposition candidates (as seen in the classic examples of establishment of people's democracy in Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany, see Ch. 8).

6. ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE—(Class of) individuals liable to be shot, comprising those who like chicken with garlic after the Politbureau has already decided that it tastes better without.

7. CONGRESS—Parliament, or a session of parliament, irregularly held, to approve unanimously what has already been decided. (No Party Congress held between 1939 and 1952, for 13 years).

8. DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM—A system of democratic party organization in which the Party Congress is responsible to the Central Committee, the Central Committee to the Politbureau and the Politbureau to the General Secretary, and the General Secretary to none.

9. DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT—One in which the proletariat is really dictated to, and moreover likes it.

10. PROLETARIAT—That wage-earning class of workers de-
dependent on jobs, the more genuine the more dependent they are, considered the most revolutionary class of society; ancienly [from Latin proles, "offspring"] denoting "class of people whose sole contribution to the state is to produce offspring" as workers and soldiers (like the worker ants)—hence proletariat consciousness, of proletarians who know they are just that; proletariat heroes, those who eat the least grub but produce the most work; decadent proletariat, those who eat the most, but produce the least; also solidarity of the international proletariat, an exceptionally fine phrase referring to the unity and willingness of workers of all nations to take orders from a foreign country.

11. dialectic—A method of reasoning or evolution, or any conclusion thereof which you know "ain't so."

12. Marxist materialistic dialectic—An optical arrangement of many mirrors, by means of which you can always see what you want to see.

13. transition—A process of Socialist change by which the very sad present guarantees a very happy future.

14. opportunism—Any tendency away from ruthless destruction of the enemy (See No. 38).

15. counterrevolution—(Esp. as adj.,—ary) Just about everything you do not agree with.

16. right—Left (pampering labor with rights to strike, collective bargaining, etc.).

17. left—Right (capital ownership of labor, monopoly of market, prices, prohibition of job-quitting, etc.).

18. work of spies and imperialist agents—Strikes and strike agitation for bread, freedom, higher wages.

19. progressive and reactionary—Common terms covering different areas. (A) Prog. labor, in countries where labor has no rights, strikes and collective bargaining
have been abolished, and chairmen of unions are appointed by government; React. labor, in countries where labor is free. (B) Prog. peasantry, where the peasantry is disinherited; React. peasantry, not so disinherited. (C) Prog. individuals, those who try, however unsuccessfully, to bring about a temporary suspension of thinking; React. individuals, those who resent the government control of their bread, jobs, movement and thinking. (D) Prog. press, that which is owned by the state and edited only by Party members; React. press, that which is privately owned and edited by nonpartisan editors with no recognizable ideology.

20. ANTI-SOCIALIST ART OR LITERATURE—Any art which springs from a spontaneous creative impulse, unrelated to political needs.

21. ECONOMY—Concentrated politics (Djilas).

22. SOCIALIST—Term now generally replacing the word "Communist" in Russian literature, e.g., Socialist progress, achievements, medicine, etc. Socialist society, that in which the rich with income over 1000 rubles a month are taxed a flat 13%, while the tax on the poor man's food and clothing is 100%-200%, cotton 100%, but silk 50%.

23. SOCIALIST REALISM—Romanticizing about the conditions of peasantry, or benevolence of rulers, etc.

24. SOCIALIST COMPETITION—A term used often, but not always, to refer to the system whereby the worker continually but voluntarily stretches the hours of his work to catch up with a constantly raised piece-work "norm" set by Stakhanovite "shock brigades."

25. TRAITOR—A Pole who loves Poland and a Hungarian who loves Hungary more than the Fatherland of International Communism (Russia). TREACHERY, n.
26. LACKEYS, INSECTS, and the like—Terms liberally applied to all Lenin's comrades-in-arms and all members of Lenin's Politbureau except Stalin in (official) *History of the Communist Party, Short Course*.

27. COMRADE—Boss; a person you have to look out for.

28. REMNANTS OF BOURGEOIS MENTALITY—A disposition to show displeasure at Party acts and decrees, such as compulsory crop-purchase at prices fixed by government.

29. BOURGEOIS, DECADENT B.—(A) In ethics and society; showing curious characteristics of bourgeoisie, such as individualism, belief in God and the church, belief in freedom, etc. (B) In science: b. biology, physics, wherein scientific truth is regarded as more important than political conformity.

30. SOCIO-POLITICAL PROPHYLAXIS—Killing or deportation of groups of people who are potential elements of opposition and who may commit crimes some day, although they have not committed them yet.

31. SOCIAL DEMOCRAT(ISM)—People who believe (the belief) that all stomachs are the same (see preceding discussion).

32. SOVIET AMBASSADORS—(1) Generally, people who lie abroad and die at home. (2) People who generally were shot after their return to their country, and perhaps ought to be. Examples: Karakhan (China, Turkey), Sokolnikof (England), Rakovsky (England, France—life sentence), Bogomolov (China), Yurenev (Japan), Davtyan (Poland). Also Soviet Ministers: Yakubovitch (Norway), Tikhmenev (Denmark), Bekzadian (Hungary), Brodovsky (Latvia), Asmus (Finland).

33. SOVIET STAFF ABROAD—Emissaries sent abroad who,
like Catholic nuns, must appear in public in pairs or more, but never singly.

**34. SOVIET DELEGATE TO U.N.—**A diplomat (1) whose function is essentially conceived as a torpedo (Gromyko), or (2) who was sent abroad to defend democracy against Bolshevism after he had murdered all the Old Bolshevists at home (Stalin’s Prosecutor Vishinsky).

**35. ORDER OF LENIN—**A decoration awarded to persons of distinguished merit (example, Yagoda), whose life was an exemplification of Lenin’s doctrines.

**36. TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, OF PEACE, OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE, OF NON-AGGRESSION—**An instrument signifying peaceful intent towards a neighboring country, such as Russia’s treaties with Germany, Japan, China (Nat.), Finland, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Georgia, the Ukraine.

**37. SPHERES OF INFLUENCE—**A phrase referring to areas of imperialist domination in colonies and semi-colonies, originally one of the great objectives of the Soviet World Revolution to destroy (Marx, Engels, Lenin), now to be studiously avoided.

**38. LENINIST-STALINIST—**(1) A revolutionary strategic concept of perpetual ruthless struggle in which ruthlessness is the constant element and the essence, but with changing targets, generally in the following sequence, directed toward—

A. Opposition parties (Lenin);
B. Capitalist-bourgeoisie when A is wiped out (Lenin);
C. Landowning farmers, when B is wiped out (Lenin-Stalin);
D. Workers’ unions, when C is wiped out (Lenin-Stalin);
E. Party opposition, when D is wiped out (Lenin-Stalin);
F. Top party echelons, when E is wiped out (Stalin);
G. Friends, when F is wiped out (Stalin);
H. Mere acquaintances, when G is wiped out (Stalin);
I. Foreign countries, when there is nothing more to wipe out domestically and “Socialism is complete” (Stalin).

39. PURGE, EXTERMINATION OF SPIES, ETC.—Hidden persuasion of the majority by the minority. E.g., 17th Party Congress, of whom \(\frac{2}{3}\) of delegates and \(\frac{2}{3}\) of Standing Committee members were shot or disappeared.

40. TRIAL—Optional legal procedure, chiefly interesting as exhibiting the identity of police, investigator, prosecution, defense, judge and executioner.

41. SOFT TRAINS—De luxe trains for the privileged, corresponding to first-class in decadent bourgeois society, which obviously does not exist in a society where class distinctions have disappeared.
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"In proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of labor, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is therefore at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation at the opposite pole."

KARL MARX

At this point, it is useful to have a quick glance at the highlights of Soviet political history and have a very brief résumé of the main periods and trends of development. The chronological Table of Events at the end of the chapter will be useful for pin-pointing dates and events and for future reference.

It is possible to visualize the outlines of this development in schematic form in the accompanying "Labor Clock." It is in clock form because Soviet progress is circular, rather than rectilinear. The Labor Clock represents the story of Russian revolutionary and counter-revolutionary developments in sixty years, 1900-1960, each minute standing for one year. It will be seen of course that the further the clock hand travels, the nearer it approaches the starting
point. After 1930, for instance, to attempt to go back to Marxism and Socialism would be to turn the clock backwards and would in fact be regarded as "reactionary," (specifically called "Rightist deviation").

A momentary look at the clock would show, roughly from the halfway point, 1930, the development from revolution to counter-revolution in respect of Marxist aims. This gradual transformation is in itself a demonstration of the second law of materialistic dialectic, which is that
everything reverts to its opposite. The word "counterrevo-
lution" is used here to mean simply, definitely, "degrada-
tion of labor." By the evidence in a country where there is,
in Marx's own words, the greatest "accumulation of
misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental
degradation," we may assume or suspect that there exists
also the greatest accumulation of capital, and that "coun-
ter-revolution" has set in. The progress of Soviet politics
and Soviet economy from Marxism to Antimarxism should
always be adduced as the best illustration of the correctness
of this fundamental Marxist thesis, however it may err on other points. The correctness of Marx in predicting
the inevitable development from accumulation of monopoly-capital to colonial expansion and war with neighboring
countries is also fully borne out in the Russian experiment,
the first time Marxist theory has been put to trial. Above all, the foundation of Marxism—the idea of class interests—explains why it is *inevitable* that as soon as capital accumulates and power and privilege are established, the privileged class must exploit and oppress labor and the peasantry. Power becomes vested interest, and the entrenched privileged class must, according to materialistic dialectic, use every means at its disposal to destroy opposition and keep itself in power. This then *inevitably* leads to the rise of a new bourgeoisie which will sell itself to the ruling class as it did under the Tsars, sharing and partaking in its material comforts and privileges. Lenin called this a process of "bribing" and "selling" of the upper-class bourgeoisie, but this is spoken of in a general sense, as a general conditioning toward acceptance of the ruling power, of acquiescence, rather than direct bribes. The intelligent, the educated, and the ambitious are drawn toward a zone of comparative security, rather than work under conditions
of slave labor. At the same time, all the prerequisites of privilege in the form of villas, cars, special stores closed to the proletariat (called "special distributors"), operas, sumptuous sanatoriums and resorts and "soft" trains—all these are theirs if they have the wit to cooperate. It is inevitable, even axiomatic, that thesis must proceed to antithesis, in this case from Marxism to Antimarxism, according to Hegelian logic. It is inevitable that the proletariat should be oppressed.

It will be noted, as indicated in the outer circle of the clock, that there is no abrupt change, that this process of change from revolution to counter-revolution is gradual, silent and at close range hardly perceptible. It will be seen that the periods of revolution, counterrevolution, etc., overlap. Thus:

Tsarism: 1900-1917  
Revolution: 1905-1923  
Ultra-Marxism: 1917-1926  
Anti-Marxism: 1924-1942  
Colonial Expansion: 1939-1949  
Disintegration: 1948-

I do not know whether Hegel had read Confucius, but I know that Fichte did. This idea of gradual change from thesis to antithesis is both Confucian (in the *Book of Changes*) and Taoist (*yin* and *yang*). Karl Marx incorporated the Hegelian dialectic and spoke of the "identity and interpenetration of opposites," which is best illustrated in the Taoist symbol of *yin* and *yang* (see page 39).

Thus the head of Marxism lies in the tail of Tsarism and the head of Tsarism lies in the tail of Marxism. One thing grows naturally into the other. The *Book of Changes*, also called the "Philosophy of Mutations" (one of the Five
Confucian Classics), is a study of the forces governing human events, with periods of “hibernation” and of “rise” and “manifestation.” The best common illustration is that of winter and summer. At winter solstice, when the day is shortest, there lies the hibernating principle of summer; on that very day the day begins to lengthen. At summer solstice, when the day is longest, it begins to grow shorter, and winter begins.

I. Period of Revolution. Thus it is seen that the Russian revolution has a long history dating back to the nineteenth century. The “October Revolution” (November in Western calendar) was only the climax of many forces fighting for a representative government, for civil rights, for labor rights and labor legislation. The important beginning is the general strike from the Baltic to the Black Sea in 1905. The short period of Lenin’s regime (“Ultra-Marxism” on the clock) marks the transition from revolution to counterrevolution. This is important because the decisive turn toward autocracy and away from democracy and the entire basis for Stalin’s tyranny over the working class and over the party itself were laid in Lenin’s time. This is what is meant by “Marxism-Leninism.”

What is “Leninism,” as distinct from mere Marxism? It
is a doctrine of absolute force and violence, as a means of establishing class dictatorship. Lenin defined “dictatorship” as follows (1920): “The scientific concept, dictatorship, means neither more nor less than unlimited power resting entirely on violence, not limited by anything, nor restrained by any laws or absolute rules. Nothing else but that.” It is a terrible formula. That is why Lenin’s Cheka chief, Felix Dzerzhinsky said in his first address, “Do not think I am on the lookout for forms of revolutionary justice. We have no need of justice now.” It is not that Lenin was a “very devil.” His hunting down of the Social Revolutionaries who after all were working for the same aims, was based upon Karl Marx’s idea of the necessity of dictatorship and violence, which again was based upon Marx’s personal disappointment over the failure of the Revolution of 1848. Hence he considered the persecution and wholesale arrests of the social democrats as a necessity to “save the revolution.” When in the November elections, he found the Bolsheviks in the minority (Bolsheviks, 9 million; Social Revolutionaries, 20 million; total 36 million) and rejected the Railway Workers’ demand for a coalition government, 5 members of the Central Committee resigned, and 11 of 15 of Lenin’s People’s Commissars predicted the “establishment of an irresponsible regime.”

The following elements were present in Leninism:—

1. Ruthless arrests and jailing of non-Bolshevik socialist and peasant leaders (1918-1922).
2. Taming of the trade-unions (“The whole syndicalist nonsense must be thrown into the waste-basket”—Lenin).
3. Forbidding of strikes (1920, 1921, 1922 Party Congress).
4. Central management of factories (1921).
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5. Shooting of unarmed workers (Jan. 19, 1918).
6. Crushing of workers' and sailors' rebellion (Kronstadt, 1921).
7. The principle of holding families as hostages (Kronstadt rebels, 1921).
8. Ascribing labor strikes to the "work of the Entente interventionists and French spies" (1921).
9. Crushing of the Workers Opposition and demand of ending of all opposition within the Party leadership (1921).
10. Exile to Siberia and forced labor for those "recognized as dangerous to the Soviet structure."

Thus Stalin had a lot to go upon when he based himself on "Marxism-Leninism." Stalin's own real contribution, Stalinism as distinguished from Marxism-Leninism, is the enforcing of Party unity, plus murder of all opposition, which Lenin did not commit. Khrushchev denounced Stalinism, but held aloft the principles of Leninism.

Briefly, Leninism regarded terror as a necessary measure during the revolutionary period, expecting a classless society soon to emerge; Stalinism regarded terror as a permanent policy after "Socialism" had been "completed." There is also one essential difference, Lenin killed all his enemies; Stalin killed all his friends. Incidentally there is also a difference between Stalinism and Al Caponeism: both murdered the witnesses of their crimes, but Stalin went further and murdered his trusted aides (Yagoda, Yezhov), and life-long friends (Yenukidze, Orjonikidze) which Al Capone did not do. But this Antimarxist counter-revolution is also inevitable materialistic evolution; Marxism does not admit the role of individuals. The Central Committee formally denied that it was the work of an
individual in its Resolution of June 30, 1956, after Krushchev’s denunciation: “To imagine that an individual personality even such a large one as Stalin could change our politico-social order means to enter into profound contradiction with the facts, with Marxism and with truth . . .” Ultra-Marxism must of necessity evolve into Anti-Marxism. If Marx turns in his grave at what Stalin did to labor, it is, I suppose, also a kind of silent revolution, but not necessarily more macabre than that which took place above the ground.

II. Period of Counter-revolutionary Reaction. This covers the period from the death of Lenin in the beginning of 1924 to the death of Stalin in 1953, almost thirty years. Generally, this is regarded as the period of “socialist construction,” of forced industrialization and collectivization when Russia grew into a powerful industrial state in the short period of one generation, with strong emphasis on heavy industry as against consumer goods. This was parallel to the progressive shackling and degrading of labor for increased and enforced production. It is generally regarded as a one-man dictatorship, with complete disappearance of democracy of any kind, within or without the Party. It is not possible even to speak of “democratic centralism” at this period. This is best shown in the progressively increasing intervals between the Party Congresses.

The real achievement of this period was industrialization of heavy industry (its collectivized system of agriculture was a signal failure). But industrialism was a secondary goal, at the most, of socialism. Socialism, it must be remembered, did not set out to create industry; it set out to create socialism. As a socialist experiment, it must be judged by socialist objectives.
The disappearance of democratic control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY CONGRESS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INTERVAL OF YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This period was characterized by three important developments, owing to three human motivations which Karl Marx forgot to reckon with. These are elements of Human Nature (HN\(^1\), HN\(^2\), HN\(^3\)).

1. Purges and trials (Ch. 4)  
   \(\text{HN}^1\)—Desire for power

2. Shackling of labor (Ch. 5-6) and rise of the new bourgeoisie (Ch. 7)  
   \(\text{HN}^2\)—Desire for comfort, privilege and security  
   \(\text{HN}^3\)—Desire for national glory

3. Colonial Expansion (Ch. 8)

The full story of these developments will be told in the chapters indicated above. In essence, these are rather
common human failings, of greed for power, greed for money and comfort, and greed for national expansion, carried out with brutal methods, on the whole a rather sordid record for any country to have as part of its history. The sheer immensity of its scale, whether of actual construction or of slave labor or genocide, has a certain grandeur; its façades of factories, dams, monuments and sanatoriums are no less impressive than other products of slave labor, like China’s Great Wall, or the Egyptian pyramids. But a search for socialist achievements, for improvement of labor conditions, is hardly a search for the mausoleums of the Pharaohs.

Chronological table of events

I. PERIOD OF REVOLUTION

1870 Lenin born.
1879 Dec. 21 Stalin born in Gori, Georgia.
1894 Nicholas II became Tsar.
1895 Lenin was arrested, sentenced 5 years in Siberia.
1898 Social Democratic Labor Party organized.
1900 Dec. 21 Party paper ISKRA started; Lenin one of its editors.
1903 Social Democratic Labor Party held Second Congress in London. Party split into two, (a) Bolsheviks (majority) and (b) Mensheviks (minority).
1904-5 Russo-Japanese War.
    Oct. 30 Nicholas II granted civil liberties.
    Dec. Lenin returned to Russia.
1906 May-July First Duma (Constituent Assembly) called and dissolved.
Highlights of Political History

1907 May-June
Second Duma called and dissolved.

1907-12
Third Duma on restricted basis, favoring property class.

1912-17
Fourth Duma (Nov. 1912-Mar. 1917).

1910
Stalin connected with bank hold-up in Tiflis to finance party activities, arrested and exiled to Siberia. Maxim Litvinov arrested for trying to pass hold-up bills.

1912
First issue of Pravda.

1914 Aug. 1
Germany declared war on Russia. Lenin in Geneva firmly advocated turning imperialist war into civil war.

1916
Rasputin assassinated by embittered Russian nobles.

1917 Mar. 8-14
March Revolution, setting up Provisional Government, March-October, composed of Socialist Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks and headed by Kerensky.

Mar. 15
Nicholas II abdicated.

Mar. 25
Stalin returned.

Apr. 16
Lenin returned to Petrograd (Trotsky returned from America).

July 17
Petrograd uprising of Bolshevik sailors; Lenin fled to Finland, secretly returned in October.

Oct. 23
Bolsheviks planned coup d'état.

Nov. 7
Bolshevik coup at Petrograd. New Bolshevik government decreed distribution of large land estates to peasants, promised complete abolition of police and standing army, all officials subject to recall by the people, workers' control of industry. Promised but tried to hold off Constituent Assembly meeting.

Nov. 25
Elections returned 9 million votes for Bolsheviks, 20 million for Social Revolutionaries out of total of 36 million. Lenin rejected Railway Workers' demand for coalition government. Rykov, Kamenev, Zinoviev and 11 of 15 of Lenin's Council of People's Commissars resigned in protest, warning against "establish-
ment of an irresponsible regime and destruction of the revolution."

Dec. 20
Cheka (secret police) set up and terror against Social Democrats began.

1918 Jan. 18
Constituent Assembly dissolved by Cheka guards. The next day, Lenin's soldiers shot down unarmed Petrograd workers celebrating Assembly, causing angry testimony by Maxim Gorky. Gorky challenged, "Pravda lies . . ."

Mar. 3
Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, ending war with Germany after Bolshevik sabotage of army morale, and ceding Russian territory.

summer
Cheka terror mounted, democratic Socialists (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries) hounded.

Trade Unions absorbed and controlled by government; workers denied right to strike (First Russian Trade Union Congress).

1918-1920
Civil War—White Terror, Red Terror—Bolshevik seizure of peasants' granaries. Complete Bolshevik victory and complete economic chaos.

1921 Feb.
Stalin personally led invasion of Georgia.

Feb. 23-Mar. 17
Kronstadt Rebellion by sailors and workers, who through Izvestia demanded freeing of imprisoned union leaders, charging "constant fear of the Cheka which by its horrors surpasses even the gendarme regime of Tsarism. . . ." Trotsky and Tukhachevsky quashed rebellion: families of workers and sailors held as hostages.

Mar. 8-16
Tenth Party Congress, faced with economic chaos, announced free market for agriculture, legalized trade and small private enterprise (New Economic Policy = NEP); but (a) maintained Bolshevik dictatorship, (b) demanded end of the Workers' Opposition within the Party, and (c) endorsed "central management of the factories."
Highlights of Political History

1921-2

Great famine due to general dislocation and workers' low morale.

April 3
Eleventh Congress elected Stalin General Secretary, declared free trade unions as "survival of capitalist past."

1922 June 8
Trial of 22 leaders of Social Revolutionaries stirred world protest by Albert Einstein, Maxim Gorky, Anatole France and others.

Oct.
Mussolini came into power.

Dec. 25
Ill, worried about Stalin's power, Lenin wrote his Testament.

1923 Jan. 4
Added postscript to Testament, recommending Stalin's removal as Party Gen. Secretary.

Jan. 25
Lenin published scathing attack on Stalin in Pravda.

Mar. 5
Lenin dictated note breaking all comradely relations with Stalin, because of latter's insolence to his wife.

Mar. 8
Lenin was stricken ill and hence inactive till his death.

1924 Jan. 21
Lenin died of cerebral hemorrhage.

II. PERIOD OF ANTISOCIALIST REACTION

1926
Trotsky edged out of power.

1927 Dec. 27
Fifteenth Congress sealed Stalin's victory over Trotsky. Kamenev and Zinoviev expelled.

1928
First Five Year Plan (1928-32), forced collectivization, involving dispossessing independent farmers (kulaks) of land, and forced industrialization. Between 1928 and 1932, the Ukraine population was decimated by 5,000,000 through deportation and starvation.

1929 Oct. 22
Annihilation of labor unions; function of trade unions was defined by union chief as "to help management." First evidence of workers' desire to be paid as low wages as possible (demand by Dnepropetrovsk workers).

1930 Sept. 6
Labor decree defined quitting of jobs as "infraction of work discipline."
Hitler gained 107 seats in Reichstag.
Central Executive Committee of Party ordered "refractory disorganizers of production" (repeated job-quitters) to be barred from any job.

**1931 Jan. 8**

**1931 Apr. 12**
Trade union leaders discovered "vast possibilities" in revising work norms upward.

**1932 Nov. 15**
*Labor Code* revised; Sec. 47 provides discharge of worker for one-day absence without valid reasons, taking away of food cards, and evicting with his family from quarters provided by plant "at any time of the year" and "without providing transportation facilities."

**Dec. 27**
*Labor decree* introduced internal passport.
Trade unions followed Stalin's leadership in fight against equality of payments.

**1932-3**
Man-made famine due to draining of manpower and killing of livestock by peasants.

**1932**
Stalin's young wife died after quarrel over Ukraine famine.

**1933 Jan.**
Union workers' attitude to help workers became "trade unionism, pure and simple"—a term of reproach (denunciation by union chief).

**Apr. 6**
Those opposed to lowering of wages ("revision of norms") were regarded as "class enemies."

**1933 spring**
Collective bargaining specifically forbidden to discuss wages.

**Jan. 10**
Hitler became chancellor. March, made dictator; May, seized unions.

**1934 Jan.**
"Unlucky Seventeenth Congress" convened (of 1,966 delegates, 1,108 later purged and disappeared; of 139 members of Central Committee, 98 were arrested and shot, mostly in 1937-8).

**Dec. 1**
Kirov, an opposition leader to Stalin, mur-
Ordered by Stalin's agent in Petrograd. Stalin's murders began with that of Kirov, later framed up against Kamenev and Zinoviev.

1935 Jan. 15-17
Kamenev and Zinoviev tried for treason and for murder of Kirov. Beginning of Stakhanov movement for speeding up production. Under this movement, workers enjoyed "ecstasy of work," or "fury of work," or "insane exertion" (See Ch. 5). *Seventh Comintern Congress* ordered "Popular Front" tactics in all countries, favored cooperation with League of Nations, stopped antagonizing capitalists and social democrats in different countries.

1936 July
Franco started war in Spain.

Aug. 19-23
Second Trial of Kamenev and Zinoviev, 16 Bolshevik Old Guards executed. That summer, Tomsky, who had been exiled to Siberia, committed suicide. Trotsky compelled to leave Norway. Hitler marched into Rhineland.

Nov.
Adoption of the new Constitution.

1937 Jan. 23-30
Trial of Piatakov, Radek and others (15 of 17 tried shot). Throughout year, wave of suicides and disappearance of Bolshevik leaders and their wives and children.

June 12
Secret trial of Tukhachevsky (9 generals shot). Almost all 80 members of 1934 War Council disappeared. Officers killed estimated at 30,000.

1938 Mar. 2-15
Trial of Rykov, Bukharin and Yagoda. Rykov died broken-hearted. Mostly in the years 1937-1938, of the 1,966 delegates to the 17th Congress, 1,108 were arrested, and of its Standing Committee, 98 members out of 139, were arrested and shot, according to Khrushchev.

Mar.
Hitler occupied Austria.

Sept. 30
Hitler's triumph at Munich Conference.

Dec. 28
*Labor decree* ordered work-book after Hitler model, tied social security benefits to six-year employment at one plant; being late 20 min-
utes was identical with unjustifiable absence for one day, with its consequences (see above for 1932, Nov. 15).

III. PERIOD OF COLONIAL EXPANSION

1939
Jan. 1
Labor books introduced.
Mar. 15
Hitler marched into Prague; seized Memel.
Mar. 31
Great Britain and France guaranteed Poland against attack.
May 3
Litvinov succeeded by pro-German Molotov.
Aug. 23
Stalin signed pact with Hitler and started World War II.
Sept. 1-17
Stalin and Hitler invaded Poland. War started.
Sept. 28
Poland was partitioned.
Sept. 28-Oct. 10
Molotov signed friendship treaties with Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, permitting entry and stationing of Soviet troops.

Nov. 29
Finland having rejected offer of friendship treaty, Stalin invaded Finland with 47 divisions and 3000 planes and one army corps of tanks.

1940
Feb.
Nazi-Soviet Trade Agreement. Stalin to supply oil and grain for Nazi armies.
Mar. 12
Finland ceded Karelian Isthmus and Hangoe naval base.
April-June
Hitler attacked Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France. Some time before May, massacre of 10,000 Polish prisoners (officers, intellectuals) at Katyn Forest, near Smolensk.
June 26
Labor decree, made lateness of 20 min. for work a criminal offense, prison sentences 2-6 months, 25% reduction of wages during penal servitude, loss of social benefits, ejection from living quarters.
July 22
Labor Regulations extended "truancy" (lateness of 20 min.) to cover leaving early for lunch and returning late from lunch, with similar punishments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 3-6</td>
<td>Annexation of ESTONIA, LATVIA, LITHUANIA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 20</td>
<td>Trotsky assassinated in Mexico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td>Berlin-Tokyo-Rome Axis formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 Jan. 18</td>
<td><em>Work Rules</em> stretched “truancy” to cover refusal to work overtime as demanded by management (see above for 1940, June 26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 13</td>
<td>Stalin signed Non-Aggression Pact with Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>Hitler invaded Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>Stalin invited 16 Polish underground leaders, then arrested them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>Germany surrendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-Aug.</td>
<td>Potsdam Conference; Stalin promised free elections, restoration of civil liberties and representative governments in occupied countries of E. Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 6</td>
<td>Hiroshima destroyed by atomic bomb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 8</td>
<td>Russia entered war with Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 10</td>
<td>Emperor Hirohito announced readiness to accept conditions of surrender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 14</td>
<td>Japan surrendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-8</td>
<td>Communist seizure of power in Eastern Europe by fraudulent elections after first rounding up of opposition candidates, as follows:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Germany:** 1945-6, wrecking of plants, silencing of press, dismissals.

**Poland:** 1946, Mar. arrested 1200 delegates. Nov., arrested 300 more.
1948, Mar. more purges after defeat in elections.
Czechoslovakia: 1947, fall, Secret police terror, "action committee" intimidations.
Hungary: 1946-7, arrest of Small-Farmers leaders, abductions, deportations.
Bulgaria: 1946, summer, half of Agrarian leaders in prison or concentration camps.
Rumania: 1945, Communist control of police and court.

1948, Feb. coup without elections.
1947, Aug. "free elections."

1947 Sept. 15 Friendship and Mutual Assistance and Collaboration treaties with Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary, pledging not to change their social or economic system.

1948-9 Stalin set up colonial governments in CZECHOSLOVAKIA (Feb. 25), RUMANIA (April 13), POLAND (July 22), BULGARIA (Aug. 11) in 1948; and in HUNGARY (Feb. 1) and EAST GERMANY (Oct. 11) in 1949. Other colonial governments set up in various years in ALBANIA, GEORGIA, UKRAINE, ARMENIA, AZERBAIJAN, TURKMENISTAN, UZBEKISTAN, TAJIKSTAN, KIRGHISTAN, KAZAKHSTAN, MONGOLIA, comprising many originally independent peoples. A total of 20, including annexation of 3 Baltic countries and a port and Karelian Isthmus of Finland.

IV. PERIOD OF DISINTEGRATION

1953 Mar. 5 Stalin died. Malenkov became Premier.
June Czechoslovakia strike. Berlin strike spread into strikes through East Germany.
summer Lavrenti P. Beria killed.
July 2-Aug. 1 Vorkuta (Siberia) mine camps strike.
Highlights of Political History

1955
Feb. 8 Malenkov resigned.
Apr. 18 Nagy removed and expelled from Hungary.
May Khrushchev apologized to Tito.
July Geneva Conference.

1956
Feb. 12-25 Twentieth Party Congress, Khrushchev denounced Stalin as murderer and master of frame-up, deprecated one-man cult, but maintained Leninist line of terror and discipline.

Apr. 22-29 Czech Writers' Congress at Prague.
June 28 Poznan strike in Poland.
Oct. 6 Rajk reburial demonstration in Budapest.
Oct. 23 Hungarian revolution.
Nov. 1-3 Soviet intervention with 15 divisions and 4000 tanks re-imposed puppet colonial government.

1953-58.

The Game of Nikita Khrushchev

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khrushchev's Allies</th>
<th>Khrushchev's Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953 summer</td>
<td>Malenkov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955 Feb.</td>
<td>Molotov, Kaganovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 summer</td>
<td>Zhukov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>Bulganin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958 March</td>
<td>(one-man “collective leadership”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cf. Game of Stalin, pp. 72-3)
3 The Russians Are Human

"[At the North State Fishery Trust] the Moscow GPU Comrade Boki (member of OGPU Council in charge of camps) and his equals were given salmon for export to England and a special kind of Solovetzki herring marked by four zeros. In fact, 'four zeros' herring was never placed on the market but was reserved for bribes. The export salmon and the 'four zeros' herring were also given to the chief of the camp and to the chiefs of the investigation department. Officials of lesser importance received salmon of inferior quality, a box or two of ordinary smoked White Sea herring; the lower officials a few cans of preserved fish."

Vladimir V. Tchernavin  
*I Speak for the Silent* (1935)

All this sounds a little familiar, and takes away the enchantment of distance which surrounds the Soviet State and sometimes makes it sound very remote and incomprehensible to us. In order to understand Russia, one must look at it from the inside, at the details of everyday living. The Iron Curtain is not so tight but that lots of people have been able to escape and write about it. The American Federation of Labor has interviewed hundreds of witnesses who lived in the Soviet labor camps and who have made their escape during and after the war, and made a report to the United Nations, "Slave Labor in Russia" (1949); there is the "Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor" (1953) made by the United Nations and the Inter-
The Russians Are Human

national Labour Office (covering all countries, with a large section on USSR). There is the very revealing book *L’USSR, telle qu’elle est* by M. Yvon (1938), a worker who worked in many parts of Russia for eleven years. Among the more important firsthand accounts by people connected with the NKVD is Alexander Orlov ("Secret History of Stalin's Crimes"). There are the absolutely amazing revelations by Khrushchev in his speech of February, 1956; the profound analysis by Djilas ("The New Class"), formerly Vice-President of Yugoslavia under Tito; Max Eastman, who was quite close to Trotsky and Lenin ("Heroes I Have Known"); William Henry Chamberlain, who saw the Ukraine famine ("The Russian Enigma," and other books), to name only a few. The literature of Escape from Paradise is literally endless and growing every year. And we have all the Party Congress resolutions, the infamous Labor Decrees of 1932, 1938 and 1940 (the most revealing of all) and the works of Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky themselves (especially Trotsky, "The Revolution Betrayed"). The silence of the democratic socialist leaders, for whose disappearance Khrushchev was not able to account to the British Laborites, is perhaps even more eloquent.

The writer of the above quote, Vladimir V. Tchernavin, was a professor of Ichthyology at the Agronomic Institute of Leningrad, and narrowly escaped being shot with the 48 eminent scientists and specialists in 1930. His appointment as Director of Production and Research Work of the North State Fishery Trust slave camp and later transfer to the Northern Camps gave him the opportunity to escape to Finland. I have selected the herring passage because herring is herring, neither revolutionary nor counter-revolutionary, and because the passage throws a strong light
on what you or I would have to do if we wanted to keep our jobs at the fisheries. It contains all the elements of human pathos and bureaucratic cares and worries and their practical means for survival. Here we are far removed from Marxist-Leninist dogmas. We are dealing with facts in a so-called Socialist state. At least herring is understandable, and the preference for better-quality herring is only human. We can start from these small facts and end up in the stupendous discovery that, as the poet Yessenin says before committing suicide:

"Au revoir, my friend, au revoir . . . .
. . . . There is nothing new about dying in this life,
but there is surely nothing new about living."

I shall show how the small matter of the herring, by its implications, develops into the key to the entire development of the Soviet Union as it is today. But let us read further:

"Whenever a 'plan' or a report was to be submitted to the camp administration or to Moscow, the necessary preparations proceeded along two contrasting lines: in the offices, the prisoner-specialists working day and night compiling memoranda; in the storeroom, other prisoners packed fish in barrels, boxes and baskets—this was the more important work. The Chief of Section, Simankoff, often with both of his assistants, personally supervised the packing, inspected the 'presents' which were being sent to these 'higher-ups,' and themselves carefully marked the destination of each package. God forbid that an assistant should get a larger 'present' than a chief. And the practice was the same when higher authorities came on an official visit. The main concern was to arrange a good reception and to prepare a pleasing package as a gift. The Section of Fisheries was no exception in this
respect. All sections sent 'presents' to their chiefs. The Agricultural Section sent hams, butter and the best vegetables; to local authorities it sent cream, and to the ladies, flowers. The shoe and clothing factories, among whose prisoner-workmen were the best tailors and cobblers of Leningrad and Moscow, dressed and shod their chiefs and their families, while the Handicraft Section made elaborately carved boxes for their superiors."

Karl Marx had nothing to do with this. It is cited here, however, first to prove that the Russians are not incomprehensible human beings, but act very much in the same way that a branch manager in Arkansas would if the chief from the Main Office of New York were about to arrive. The little trimmings vary according to countries, and to the democratic checks placed upon those who go beyond the accepted bounds. Secondly, and this is the central theme of the book, the herring passage is cited to show how a Socialist philosopher, by failing to recognize the foibles of human nature in such a naive formula as "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," is placing temptations in the way of human nature, perhaps inconsequential in a herring factory, but disastrous in matters of state and state policies. The peculiar and truly amazing transformation of the Soviet Socialist Republics into the most reactionary anti-labor monopoly-capitalist society, with the worst sins and characteristics of monopoly-capitalism, is to be found in rather simple human terms:

(1) Human desire for POWER, and the inevitable struggle for power in politics, usually kept within bounds in democracies by constitutional controls and public opinion. In the Soviet Russia, in the absence
of such controls, this developed into the most gruesome murder of comrades;

(2) Human desire for MONEY, for privilege, for a better living (such as better schools for one's children, and better groceries and resorts for one's wife)—generally encompassed under the terrible word "money." This desire for security, comfort and a better living was a motivating force, by means of which, according to Lenin, the upperclass bourgeoisie was "bribed" into supporting the ruling class under the Tsars. In Soviet Russia, it drove an entirely disproportionate percentage of the population into the bureaucratic caste with entrenched privileges, i.e., into the class of parasitic, non-productive elements of society. It gave rise to the growth of the new bourgeoisie, feared and anticipated by André Gide, and confirmed by Djilas.

(3) Human desire for NATIONALISM, forcing the monopoly-capitalist system into colonial expansion, with development of a political sphere of influence, originally one of the prime objectives of the World Revolution to destroy, and of an artificial "Socialist world market," and for the emotional satisfaction of nationalistic egotism and glory.

A necessary consequence of the working of the capitalistic autocracy with absolute control of labor and means of production leads naturally to the last and most deplorable result:—

(4) Ordinary business GREED AND SELFISHNESS, the desire to get the most out of one's fellowmen at the least cost to oneself, usually restrained in civilized communities by progressive labor legislation.
In Soviet Russia, labor being stripped of its defenses, the tendency is toward an ever-increasing demand for lower wages and higher production, with the consequence of degradation of labor, autocratic control of work shops and factories, inhuman penalties for "absence" and "idleness" (taking way of food cards and eviction from homes), penal labor, forced labor (which costs almost nothing), job freeze, and breakneck pace-setting in the so-called "Socialist competition."

The element of brutality and violence is implicit and explicit in Karl Marx's teachings. Even so, Marxism-minus-Leninism, could have developed democratic checks on human nature as the Soviet state got along, such as Rosa Luxemburg and the earlier Lenin (before coming to power) saw the course ought to be. The degradation of labor certainly started with the 10th and 11th Congress under Lenin, and was completed under Stalin. Lenin tamed the unions; Stalin harnessed them for state production. Still, Lenin honestly believed that force and terror, even Cheka terror, were necessary until all the capitalist bourgeois classes were liquidated; he dreamed that the classless society would soon arrive and terror could then be stopped. The addition of Stalinism to the Marxist-Leninist compound carried it still further, and turned it into a naked Tsarist-capitalist regime of permanent terror in the satisfaction of the first human desire for power. The prolongation of intervals between Party Congresses steadily increased, as we have noted in the preceding chapter, until there was an interval of 13 years! The 1939 Congress was held in March of that year; so neither the Hitler-Stalin Pact of August, 1939 (technically "collaboration with fas-
cists" with which Stalin charged his political opponents), nor the Hitler-Stalin war of 1941 required the calling of a Party Congress! Three years elapsed after Stalin's death before the 20th Congress was called in 1956, because the contestants for power—Malenkov, Molotov, Beria, Khrushchev—were too busy maneuvering among themselves. Meanwhile, the Communists still go about calling themselves "People's Democracy."

Since we are on the subject of herring and of the North State Fisheries, we might conveniently examine it here from the point of human understanding. If we cannot make Communist theory make sense, we shall at least insist on satisfying ourselves that Soviet human behavior make sense.

How did slave labor come about, inevitably? A simple law of economics states that cheap labor drives out higher-paid labor, unless stopped by legislative and other political measures. A factory manager would be insane if he artificially increased the cost of labor, or paid labor when he could have it for nothing. To reduce wages and demand increased production as far as humans can stand is obviously good capitalist business. Soviet Russia is not the only sinner in this respect. Soviet capitalism only develops it to a higher point—a difference in degree, not in kind.

We have the curious phenomenon of slave labor in a Socialist state after forty years, with no signs of diminishing—an important, integral part of Soviet Socialist economy and economy planning. Why? Because slave labor has many economic advantages. We tend to forget that the Soviet Union, having control of capital and labor, is also in business. It is Soviet business, entirely understandable in business terms. Tchernavin writes:
"... the camps have slave labor. This personnel is actually the invested capital of the GPU enterprises; it takes the place of expensive equipment and machinery. Machines require buildings, care and fuel of a certain quality and in a fixed quantity. Not so with these prisoner-slaves. They need no care, they can exist in unheated barracks which they build themselves. Their fuel ration—food—can be regulated according to circumstances: one kilogram of bread can be reduced to 400 grams, sugar can be omitted entirely; they work equally well on rotten salted horse or camel meat. Finally the slave is a universal machine; today he digs a canal, tomorrow he fells trees, and the next day he catches fish. The only requisite is an efficient organization for compelling him to work—that is the 'specialty' of the GPU.

"But that is not all. This invested capital costs nothing to obtain as slaves did in capitalistic countries where slavery existed; the supply is limitless and there is neither interest to pay or funded debts nor any depreciation reserve to be set up when the balance sheet is made out.

"And then there is the matter of wages, salaries, social insurance, union dues, and so on, all of which may be grouped as 'labor costs' of vital importance to Soviet business. The GPU does not have to bother about these. Among the thousands of workmen in a camp section, not more than a few free hired employees get salaries; the remainder work without pay... the absence of these two factors—depreciation and wages—gives the GPU a saving of not less than 35 per cent in such a venture as the fisheries and a considerable greater saving in works like the construction of the White Sea Canal."

Tchernavin goes on to describe the horrible, truly feudalistic entrepreneur system of exploiting profits. There is the initial advantage of selling GPU products in the
market—goods that no firm would dare to refuse to buy. “Here is an example . . . The Section of Fisheries bought frozen herring from the fishermen at the fixed price of 10 kopeks the kilogram, delivered to the warehouse of the Section, where it would be resold, on the spot, to another GPU organization—called ‘Dynamo’—for 1 rouble (100 kopeks) the kilogram. The new purchaser would cart it to the State Kem Inn, two blocks away, and sell it there for 3 roubles (300 kopeks) the kilogram. That ended the transaction for the GPU. I might add that the state innkeeper, who had nothing to fear from the authorities, would salt it slightly and retail it in his restaurant at one rouble a fish. The White Sea herring is small—there are fifty to sixty in a kilogram—so that the consumer was buying them at the rate of fifty to sixty roubles the kilogram, which was 500 to 600 times the fixed price of 10 kopeks established by Soviet authorities.”

Everything is perfectly clear. Soviet slave business is good business. Tchernavin wrote about conditions in 1925. In 1934, the GPU became NKVD and the branch in charge of labor camps was renamed the GULAG,—Main Administration for Corrective Labor Camps. The GULAG, according to Anatole Shub in “Labor in the Soviet Orbit,” administered an empire larger than any European countries; the slave labor was estimated at three million or more; it was in charge of all highway construction, numerous coal, copper and gold mines, and vast canal and dam-building projects. The United Nations Ad Hoc Commission on Forced Labour Report (1953) confirmed that such slave labor formed an important element in Soviet economy and economic planning. This report (p. 477) quotes Averbakh, author of From Crime to Labour, as going into raptures over the projects of convict labor
camps, carried out "in an extremely trenchant and consistent manner," and "achieving striking, efficient and moving results" in construction projects "whose grandeur dazzles the imagination"—all of which is true. It further quotes (p. 478) the Large Soviet Encyclopaedia as bragging, "The stupendous victories of socialism on all fronts enabled the work of convicts to be widely used in the general task of socialist construction . . ." (italics mine). Here the editor really meant, "The stupendous victories, etc. were made possible by the work of convicts. . . ."

It is irrelevant to say that slave labor is inhuman, *et cetera*, because humanitarianism was never meant to be provided for in Marxism. It is equally pointless to say this is anti-socialist—you cannot argue it out with the Communists (they are perfectly legal in punishing "spies," "agents" and "traitors" and "class-hostile elements"). You cannot say that this was all Stalinist; Lenin started condemning to forced labor those considered "dangerous to the Soviet structure," and Khrushchev in denouncing Stalin under the Leninist banner never condemned such slave labor. But you can, however, say definitely that this degradation of human labor is *rightist* and *reactionary*, and not *leftist* or *progressive*, if these English words still have any meaning. That is the important point this book hopes to make. Hewlett Johnson and Jawaharlal Nehru, particularly Nehru who freely aired his opinion on every affair including the celebration of the 60th birthday of Paul Robeson "in the cause of human dignity," never felt here that either Canterbury Christian or New Delhi Hindu human dignity was involved.

And here I must register a point; if there is a brotherhood of men, the condition of labor in Soviet Russia is as
much our business as slave labor anywhere else. I do not understand what the diplomats are talking about when they, in a tired tone of appealing for peace, quite jauntily speak of peaceful co-existence, without a qualm of conscience. Are not the slaves in labor camps in Hungary, Rumania and Siberia our brothers? It should have been the subject of repeated diplomatic protests and demands, now that the heads of states are so much occupied in public exchange of long letters. To what avail, the diplomats would say? To what avail the United Nations inquiry into Russian intervention in the Hungary Revolution? Acquiescence in evil is an evil itself. No one is going to be dragged into a war because of condemnation of slave labor. The Communist world of slave labor, the size of an empire and an integral part of Soviet economy (its gold, coal, iron and water power) is a world of which the twentieth-century man should be ashamed to be a contemporary. The pressure of world opinion can help to relieve it, it cannot make it worse.

Again, it is Winston Churchill who scores. In 1919, Churchill said, prophetically in the Lenin period:

"Russia, like all great nations, is indestructible. Either she must continue to suffer and her sufferings will distract and convulse the whole world, or she must be rescued . . . I say to the thoughtless, I say to the uninstructed, I say to the simple, I say to the busy—you may abandon Russia, but Russia will not abandon you . . . You cannot remake the world without Russia. You can’t go on into victory and prosperity and peace and leave the vast proportion of the human race suffering torture in the night of barbarism."

He did not know how prophetic he was.
4 The Hatchet-Go-Round

"If you want to kill a person, why worry about a criminal charge?

ANCIENT CHINESE PROVERB (6th Cen. B.C.)

"To choose one's victim, to prepare the blow, to slake an implacable revenge, and then go to bed . . . there's nothing sweeter in the world,"

STALIN

(in a friendly conversation with Kamenev and Dzerzhinsky in the summer of 1923)

The most stunning political satire I have read in my life is the self-satire of J. V. Stalin in the "History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Short Course)," edited and hand corrected by Stalin, according to Khrushchev who had access to the draft copy. An inordinately large space in this history was given to the famous Moscow trials (pp. 289-395, 324-329, 359-361, and scattered references everywhere). These passages concern the murder of Kirov and plans for murder of all members of the Central Committee by Trotskyite conspirators—the "Whiteguard pigmies," "White guard insects," "fiends," "contemptible lackeys of the fascists," et cetera. But if Stalin was the real killer, then the denunciations of the murderer were written by the killer himself. According to Khrushchev, Kirov
was really murdered, not by "Trotskyites" like Kamenev and Zinoviev, but by Stalin himself (p. 21 in New Leader edition of Khrushchev's speech), most of those shot were innocent ("all the cases were fabricated," p. 27): they were shot to "cover the tracers of the organizers of Kirov's killing" (p. 22), and "confessions of guilt of many arrested . . . were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures" (p. 27). After these revelations, passages in the History make the most extraordinary reading, giving a self-portrait of the killer which literally fits in to a word with Stalin's own acts and motives.

Here I put in corrections in parentheses and italics, substituting Stalin for the Trotskyites, as emended in substance by Nikita Khrushchev. Here it is, (Short Course, Party History, p. 324-327, New Leader edition):

". . . the lickspittles of the defeated class—the puny remnants of the following of Bukharin and Trotsky (Kh.: of Yagoda and Stalin). These gentry were guided . . . by the interests of their own wretched and putric faction. . . . These people began to revenge themselves on the Party and the people for their own failure, for their own bankruptcy; they began to resort to foul play . . . And in order, while doing so, to shield their puny group from exposure and destruction, they simulated loyalty to the Party, fawned upon it, eulogized it, cringed before it more and more . . . their fulsome praise of the Party (was) only meant to hide an uneasy and unclean conscience. However, the Party did not yet know or suspect that while these gentry were making their cloying speeches at the congress they were hatching a villainous plot against the life of S. M. Kirov.

"On December 1, 1934, S. M. Kirov was foully murdered in the Smolny, in Leningrad, by a shot from a revolver.

"The assassin was caught red-handed and turned out to be a member of a secret counter-revolutionary group made up of
members of an anti-Soviet group of Zinovievites (Kh.: of Stalinites) in Leningrad.

"S. M. Kirov was loved by the Party and the working class, and his murder stirred the people profoundly, sending a wave of wrath and deep sorrow through the country . . .

"Soon afterwards the existence of an underground counter-revolutionary organization called the 'Moscow Center' was discovered. The preliminary investigation and the trial revealed the villainous part played by Zinoviev, Kamenev, Yevdokimov (Kh.: played by Yagoda, Yezhov, Stalin) and other leaders of this organization in cultivating the terrorist mentality among their followers, and in plotting the murder of members of the Party Central Committee and of the Soviet Government (Kh.: 98 out of 139 members of the Central Committee of the 17th Party Congress were arrested and shot, New Leader edition, p. 20).

"To such depths of duplicity and villainy had these people sunk that Zinoviev (Kh.: that Stalin), who was one of the organizers and instigators of the assassination of S. M. Kirov, and had urged the murderer to hasten to crime (according to Alexander Orlov, Stalin personally hastened to the scene of the crime and had the accomplices shot to cover up the traces), wrote an obituary of Kirov speaking of him in terms of eulogy (as seen in this very quote) and demanded that it be published (Kh.: in the History of the Communist Party). . . .

"A year later (Kh.: years later) it became known that the actual, real and direct organizers of the murder of Kirov were Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev (Kh.: were Stalin, Yagoda, Yezhov) and their accomplices, and that they had also made preparations for the assassination of other members of the Central Committee . . . they had not only organized the assassination of Kirov, but had been planning to murder (Kh.: and actually did murder) all the other leaders of the Party and the Government (Kh.: and the Soviet Army generals). Later investigation established the fact that these villains had been engaged in espionage (Kh.: through replacement of
Maxim Litvinov by Molotov in secret trips to Berlin) and in organizing acts of diversion (Kh.: in organizing war with Poland by collaboration with the fascists in pact signed August 23, 1939). The full extent of the monstrous moral and political depravity of these men, their despicable villainy and treachery, concealed by hypocritical loyalty to the Party, were revealed at a trial in Moscow, 1939 (Kh.: were revealed in my speech to the 20th Party Congress, Feb. 24-25, 1956).

“The chief instigator and ringleader of this gang of assassins and spies was Judas Trotsky (Kh.: was Judas Stalin).”

History will have to wait a long time before it finds another document like this, written by the murderer himself. Khrushchev pointed out toward the peroration of his speech passages of corrections and additions made in Stalin’s own handwriting. Khrushchev says, “And when Stalin asserted that he himself wrote the Short Course of the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), this calls at least for amazement. Can a Marxist-Leninist thus write about himself, praising his own person to the heavens?” Consider, yourself, was Stalin right when he wrote in his biography that “. . . he did not allow himself . . . even a shadow of conceit, pride or self-adoration?” (New Leader edition, p. 56).

What an extraordinary document! And for the present I cannot think what Khrushchev is going to do about the millions of copies of the Short Course or the Large and the Small Soviet Encyclopaedia. Burn them?

One should not jump to the conclusion that the Communist Party is as full of “Whiteguard insects” and “scums of humanity” and “scabs,” “traitors,” “capitulators,” “fascist lackeys” as the Short Course tries to paint it. There were weak men, like Kamenev and Zinoviev, helpless in Stalin’s hands. But there were also strong, brave men, de-
voted and dedicated men who had gone to penal labor in Siberia under the Tsars for their convictions, and who under Stalin refused to compromise almost to the last day (Rykov, Radek, Tomsky, Piatakov) until the life of their dear ones was threatened. There were many who died silently without a trial.

As for the successful ones, the Khrushchevs, the Voroshilovs, the Bulganiins, even the Molotovs, Malenkovs, and Berias who survived Stalin, a distinction should be made between careerists and hypocrites. Perhaps careerism under Stalin inevitably included toadyism, and “spittlelicking” as Stalin called it. None of them is free from the taint of toadyism while Stalin was alive. Perhaps less pronounced, but equally eloquent, was Khrushchev’s self-satire, as compared with Stalin’s. He also castigated himself for “dissolute flattery” and “loathsome adulation” (p. 54) of which he himself furnished some shining examples (see Ch. 9). But, men like Khrushchev were trying to make a living and fighting for their personal survival as they saw the most trusted men picked off right and left. Khrushchev and Company are motivated like careerists of all countries; there was an excuse in that a careerist in a western country could resign in anger, but for a careerist in Soviet Russia, it was either going on licking spittle or Siberia. These career men all love their families, and I am sure Nikita Khrushchev does. So there is some excuse for Khrushchev when he joined the “lickspittles” of Stalin and consented to be the lackey of the lackey of the fascists. Marshall Voroshilov, a member of the Politbureau, wanted to attend a meeting of the bureau, but waited in fear until Stalin gave the permission. “When the Political Bureau was in session and Comarde Voroshilov heard about it, he telephoned each time and asked whether he would be allowed to
attend” (New Leader ed., p. 62). And Khrushchev himself spoke of his fear before the “sickly suspicious” Stalin. “He would look at a man and say, ‘Why are your eyes so shifty today?’ or ‘Why are you turning so much today and avoiding to look me directly in the eyes?’” (p. 34). “Stalin was a very distrustful man, sickly suspicious . . . Possessing unlimited power, he . . . choked a person morally and physically . . .” (p. 34). I sympathize with him.

But I somehow draw a line at hypocrites. I think Stalin’s profession of modesty is entirely unnecessary. Stalin wrote in his biography of himself, “Stalin never allowed his work to be marred by the slightest hint of vanity, conceit or self-adulation” (p. 54). An example of this modesty is the following cited by Khrushchev (p. 54):

Original draft of biography

“Stalin is the Lenin of today.”

Stalin’s hand correction

“Stalin is the worthy continuuer of Lenin’s work, or, as it is said in our party, Stalin is the Lenin of today.”

Hitler never pretended modesty, and therefore Hitler was a stronger man, and more straightforward crook. The unbearable part for me would be to see people like Luciano and Frank Costello go to church and repeat the Lord’s Prayer. I am glad that they don’t. I did not mind Oscar Wilde at the trial; I could not stand his De Profundis. Perhaps I am unfair, but it is just an instinctive reaction of mine.

Let us pause for a moment for a closer look at Stalin, the central figure. There is no use belittling Stalin or the Russians. There is something elemental about their character. They have produced great scientists, artists, ballet dancers, composers and novelists. Lenin was a giant, so
was Stalin. There is a depth and greatness and enormity in whatever they created. But neither Gogol, nor Dostoievsky could create characters quite like Lenin, or Stalin. Their very enormity impresses, even their ruthlessness has a new dimension. Stalin had the face of a successful butcher and the mind of an efficient tycoon. He did create an empire; he did transform a backward country into an industrial society. Like all great tycoons, he was a ruthless taskmaster. Shod in leather boots, and whip in hand, he went about among his slaves, demanding results. And he did get results. Contemptuous of ideas, he was a realist. He did not serve Marx, he made Marx serve him. His was an extraordinary, hard, practical kind of intelligence. He was cold, independent, treacherous, suspicious, hard-working, cruel and ruthless, and friendless. He was a great career revolutionist and a classical bureaucrat, and he wielded the state and party machine like a toy. He liked Marx and he liked Lenin, for without understanding what Marx was talking about—he fell flat and dull when he tried to write—without understanding what Marxism or socialism was about, he smelled the dry, bleak, dehumidified air of materialism and felt it congenial to his soul. One year he shot his opponents for “collaborating with the fascists,” the next year he collaborated with the fascists himself. Such contradictions did not bother him. During the first years of World War II, he intensified repressive measures and gave Hitler the sinews of war, principally grain and oil. He helped to feed the Nazi army, and grease the Nazi army machine in its overrunning France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway. Hitler doublecrossed him, but he was incredulous at first. He did not believe it. His deliveries to Hitler’s army doubled in March, 1941. Then he panicked when Hitler invaded Russia. In the first four
months of the war, he lost more than two million soldiers, more than three million in the first eight months. He begged Great Britain to land divisions at Archangel and begged the U.S. to lead divisions to Kiev. But he was lucky. The inhumanity of Hitler's army and the patriotism of the Russian people saved him. Then he timed Soviet entry into the war with Japan two days after the atomic bomb struck Hiroshima. The war over, he would sign anything, promising free elections in Poland at Yalta, and promising at Potsdam free elections and civil rights and freedom of assembly and the press for the countries of Eastern Europe under Soviet occupation. Churchill believed him. Roosevelt and Truman believed him. Roosevelt smoked a puny cigarette, Churchill smoked a long cigar, but Stalin smoked a pipe. And he won.

At this point, it is appropriate to ask, "What is Stalinism?" or since it is a shifting, deviating line, "What is the Stalinist Line?" The answer is clearest in the following diagrammatic form:

**What is the Stalinist Line?**

1920-23—Stalin with Right Opposition (Rykov, Tomsky, Bukharin); denounced Trotskyite program for immediate forced collectivization and emphasis on industrialization; Comintern founded

1924-26—Stalin joined Left Opposition (Kamenev, Zinoviev) to oust Trotsky, then
1927 expelled Kamenev and Zinoviev to embark on Trotskyite program of forced collectivization, beginning 1929
1928-1930—Ousted Rykov, dropped Tomsky and Bukharin who protested on behalf of peasants and workers; 1935-38, killed all Politbureau members on charge of a Trotskyite conspiracy to form pact with Hitler; “Popular Front” or “United Front”

1939—Stalin signed pact with Hitler, of which he accused the “Trotskyite gang”; annexed the Baltic states; told Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis his real enemy was U.S. and Britain; End of “United Front”

1941—Pleased with Roosevelt and Churchill for sending divisions to Archangel and Kiev to drive out Hitler;
1945—came in to fight Japan 2 days after Hiroshima; sat at Yalta and Potsdam promising civil liberties, free elections to E. European countries

1946-48—Soviet military forces and Communists arrested all opposition leaders in E. Europe before elections to make sure “elections were won before elections.” Founded Cominform

And so we have this most extraordinary phenomenon in contemporary history, of a proved murderer and master of frame-up worshipped by Communists all over the world and ruling over a nation of nearly 200 million people for 30 years, and no one could tell the truth until he
died. He was the fruit of Marxism-Leninism, and by its fruit we shall know the tree. Heredity could not account for such a figure, and social origins would not help. Stalin just arrived, exploiting the Marxist-Leninist system of organization and methods of violence to the full and beautifully to suit his rise to power. Europeans like to think that he is an Oriental, and an oriental Chinese likes to think he is European. Bukharin once remarked to a friend, behind Stalin's back of course, that he was a Genghis Khan; Stalin himself once said to a representative of Japan in 1941 that he was "an Asiatic." Such claims are questionable. At most he was born on the borderline outskirts of Asia.

Khrushchev's dethroning and debunking of the Communist god created great embarrassments for the Communist followers of the world. One Chinese poet, Kuo Mo-jo, once a Vice-Premier of Communist China, who sang repeated, fulsome praises to the "Beloved Sun" and "Great Steel" after the fashion of the Uzbek poet-aster, was embarrassed no end. You cannot dethrone a god suddenly without producing the most grotesque situations. Khrushchev's speech has repercussions he could not foresee. Take a minor instance. Imagine a hundred-foot monument to Al Capone standing at Times Square. But this is what the Russian people daily have to see. There are whole towns, plants, schools and farms named after an equivalent of Al Capone. The Moscow Ball-Bearing Plant is still named after the brother of Stalin's alleged sweetheart, Kaganovich. There is of course Stalingrad on the Volga. There is Stalinabad on the high Pamir Plateau, and the new steel town in Siberia (formerly Kuznetzk) still called Stalinsk; a coal center southeast of Moscow is called Stalingorsk. "Caponegorsk," "Caponesk," and "Ca-
poneabad" or "Capone Ball-Bearing Plant" would sound terribly funny to me at least. Imagine Texas full of "Capone Farms," and "Capone technical high schools" all over the United States! Imagine a popular school book called "I like to be like Al Capone," and a Washington D.C. state publication entitled *Marxist-Caponist Education* writing for all American youth to read, "All know his modesty, his artlessness, his solicitude for people and his ruthlessness to the enemies of the people" (*Marxist-Leninist Education*, Moscow, 1947). Shall we call these comic bits new and rather unexpected "inner contradictions" of the Soviet regime? The bronze statue of Stalin at Budapest was destroyed by angry Hungarian workers; it may be quite appropriate to have Khrushchev's monument erected in its place to commemorate Russia's lack of desire to interfere in the internal affairs of another country. But the hundred-foot statue of Stalin still stands near the St. Carlos basilica in the former Russian zone of Vienna—protected by a treaty between Russia and Austria. What will Austrian children think when they look up at that high statue of Stalin?

These are very minor questions raised as a result of the debunking of a Communist god. Such an act provokes deeper questions—everywhere in the minds of men. And the crimes of murder committed by Stalin shall always fascinate students of history. This hatchet-go-round drama has touches of Gilbertian humor and satire in it. At the end of the drama, at the closing of the second decade of the Russian Revolution, the ground was strewn with the corpses of practically every member of Lenin's Politbureau, every member of the Society of Old Bolsheviks, almost every member of the War Council of 1934, two-thirds of the 17th Party Congress, two-thirds of its
Central Committee—and the blood of their wives and children. Read the stunning story of the thirteen-year-old daughter of Alexander Karin after her parents were suddenly arrested and shot without trial. She was turned into the streets. No one dared touch her. No one dared receive her or give her refuge (Alexander Orlov, English ed., pp. 227-228).

Lenin was a worried man in the last year of his life. He discovered that he had invented a car without brakes and had concentrated on its brutal explosive power. He had run the car without brakes with himself at the wheel. But he had suffered a stroke, which partially immobilized him. On December 25, 1922, he wrote his Political Testament, his will to the Bolshevik Party. In this he expressed his deep worries about a split in the Party; he had particularly in mind the split between Trotsky and Stalin. "I think that the fundamental factor in the matter of stability—from this point of view—is such members of the Central Committee as Stalin and Trotsky . . . Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution . . ."

Why had Lenin written this? Three days before, Lenin had dictated to his wife a short letter to Stalin. Stalin, hoping probably to bring about another stroke of the leader, telephoned to Lenin's wife, Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya, and used vile invectives and threats against her. On Dec. 23, two days before the writing of the Testament, Krupskaya wrote to Kamenev for help. "During all these 30 years I have never heard from any comrade one word of rudeness . . . I need at present the maximum of self-control . . . I am turning to you
and to Grigory [Zinoviev] as much closer comrades of V.I. [Lenin] and I beg you to protect me from rude interference with my private life and from vile invectives and threats . . . And I am a living person and my nerves are strained to the utmost.—N. Krupskaya."

If Stalin had hoped for a quick end of the leader by provoking another cerebral stroke, he did not succeed. Lenin’s wife must have kept Stalin’s brutal threats against herself from the invalid husband. Kamenev and Zinoviev must have come round to discuss the very grave matter, first with Lenin’s wife, eventually with Lenin, breaking it in as gently as possible. Anyway, ten days later, on Jan. 4, 1923, Lenin added a postscript to his Political Testament, recommending the removal of Stalin as General Secretary of the Party, noting that it might “seem an insignificant trifle,” but that “it is not a trifle, or it is such a trifle as may acquire a decisive significance.”

On January 25, Lenin wrote in Pravda, condemning Stalin’s work as Commissar for Workers’ and Peasants’ Inspection in scathing terms. On March 5, 1923, Lenin demanded an apology or else he would “sever relations between us.” Three days later, Lenin suffered another stroke from which he never recovered and was incapacitated till his death on Jan. 21, 1924.

This important document, Lenin’s Will to the Bolshevik Party, was not read at the 13th Party Congress, May 22, 1924, against the requests and entreaties of Lenin’s wife.* Only small groups of top men knew about it. Readers of the New York Times could read it on October 18, 1926, through a communication by Max Eastman as revealed to him by Leon Trotsky. But the Rus-

* See Max Eastman, Since Lenin Died (1925).
sian public and the great majority of the Communist Party workers did not hear about it till thirty years later when Khrushchev mentioned these letters in his speech of February 24-5, 1956.

As soon as Lenin died, the hatchet-go-round drama began. What Lenin feared had happened. At Lenin's funeral, Trotsky was persuaded to stay away. Stalin sent him a telegram, "The Politbureau thinks that because of the state of your health you must proceed to Sukhum." He was en route already, and the date of the funeral did not allow him to get back in time. Anyway, it did not matter whether Trotsky was basking in the Black Sea sunshine or in the limelight of the funeral of the great leader. Since Lenin's death, it has ever been an unlucky thing to be one of the pall-bearers at one of the state funerals. It was as if a curse of the Romanovs had fallen upon those who bore the coffins of Bolshevik leaders. As the casket was carried aloft and the booted legs trudged the ground, each man was thinking silently an identical thought and haunted by one identical fear. And the ghost of the Romanovs said, "Through the hand of one of thy comrades shall I strike thee down," and each man's eyes were slyly directed toward his fellow pall-bearers. The funeral dirge got weaker and weaker as the footsteps of the men grew louder and louder, echoed by the pebbled streets, until they merged suddenly into a rhythmic unison refrain: who next?—me next?—who next?—me next?—who next? Then the noise of the feet, too, died away, and it seemed as if their bodies did not exist any more and only eyes of dark suspicion remained and they all spoke one thought only: who next? It was weird, it was goofy. So it was at Lenin's funeral, and so it was at the funeral of Stalin.
When Lenin died, there were seven men at the Politbureau: Stalin, Rykov, Bukharin, and Tomsky on the right, and Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev on the left. These were important men, the Bolshevik "Old Guard." Rykov was Premier after Lenin, Bukharin was the Party's "most valuable and biggest theoretician," Tomsky was head of the unions, Trotsky was the military genius who beat the hastily got-up Bolshevik conscripts and volunteers into an invincible Red Army, Kamenev was head of the Moscow Soviet and Zinoviev was head of the powerful Leningrad Party and secretary of the Comintern. These men, with the exception of Stalin himself, were to become convicts, charged with selling out the Communist Party to foreign agents, and at last in 1938, Bukharin and Rykov were charged with plotting to kill Lenin himself, poisoning Maxim Gorky and being in the service of foreign governments during Lenin's life-time! We are told to believe that Trotsky tried to kill Lenin in 1918 when he was organizing and leading the Red Army to fight in the civil war!

At the home of international brotherhood of mankind dreamed of by Karl Marx, the manoeuvring for power among the comrades began. As far as Stalin was concerned, it was a battle to the death. Brothers were to kill brothers and comrades perjure against comrades. In such a fight, it was the man without principles who must win. Rykov and Tomsky never forsook their principles of helping peasant and labor, and resisted the cruelty and deprivations being practiced upon the kulaks and the factory workers. Both died broken-hearted and Tomsky committed suicide in exile. Kamenev and Zinoviev were weak characters. They worked with Stalin to suppress Lenin's will and oust Trotsky, were expelled themselves from
the Central Committee, then came back repentant to re¬
cant and castigate themselves and go along with Stalin. As for Trotsky, his prestige was so great that he could have gone to the country, made a few speeches, won over a huge following by his gift of a brilliant speaker, and staged a coup against Stalin. But Trotsky was not a hun¬
dred per cent realist: he had respect for ideas and princi¬
ples. An able administrator, he was yet a bad politician. He had not the leopard smoothness of Stalin. Fighting the class enemy, he was quite ruthless, but to stage a coup against a comrade was something he could not bring him¬
self to do. He was eased out of power, exiled first to Central Asia, then expelled outside Russia. None of the six had the massive jaw and the recalcitrant stiff hair of Stalin.

Concerning the technique of extracting confessions, Khrushchev's revelations are of sufficient authority to war¬
rant quoting here a few highlights. Of course he never meant his speech to be made public. "We cannot let this matter get out of the party, especially not to the press" (p. 64). But he was naive enough to believe that a speech of such importance, to be discussed among party workers in all the provinces, could be kept secret. He and his colleagues had examined the papers and documents of many cases for these years.

On the whole, his revelations went beyond what the western diplomatic observers or journalists had dared to surmise, such as the matter of the use of tortures. "And how is it possible that a person confesses to crimes he has not committed?" asked Khrushchev. "Only in one way —because of application of physical methods of pressuring him, tortures, bringing him to a state of unconscious¬
ness, deprivation of his judgment, taking away of his hu-
man dignity. In this manner were 'confessions' acquired" (p. 34). "Confessions of guilt of many arrested and charged with enemy activity were gained with the help of cruel and inhuman tortures" (p. 27). In the case of the doctors' plot, Stalin personally ordered beating. "He personally issued advice on the conduct of the investigation and the method of investigation of the arrested persons. He said that the academician Vinogradov should be put in chains, another one should be beaten. Present at this Congress as a delegate is the former Minister of State Security, Comrade Ignatiev. Stalin told him curtly, 'If you do not obtain confessions from the doctors, we will shorten you by a head.' (Tumult in the hall.) Stalin personally called the investigative judge, gave him instructions, advised him on which investigative methods to use; these methods were simple—beat, beat, and once again, beat" (p. 49).

In the case of the trial of Eikhe, Khrushchev stated, the latter declared in a document, "Not being able to suffer the tortures to which I was submitted by Ushakov and Nikolayev . . . who utilized the knowledge that my broken ribs have not properly mended and have caused me great pain, I have been forced to accuse myself and others" (p. 28). In the case of Rudzutak, a candidate-member of the Politbureau, "the protocol of the session of the Collegium of the Supreme Military Court contains the following statement by Rudzutak: ' . . . the investigative methods are such that they force people to lie and to slander entirely innocent persons in addition to those who already stand accused.'" His plea for a hearing was ignored. "Sentence was pronounced on him in 20 minutes and he was shot (Indignation in the hall)" (p. 30). In the case of Rozenblum, Khrushchev said that investiga-
tion "revealed the following fact: when Rozenblum was arrested in 1937, he was subjected to terrible torture . . . He was then brought to the office of Zakovsky, who offered him freedom on the condition that he make before the court a false confession fabricated in 1937 by the NKVD concerning 'sabotage, espionage and diversion in a terroristic center in Leningrad.' (Movement in the hall). 'You, yourself,' said Zakovsky, 'will not need to invent anything. The NKVD will prepare for you a ready outline of every branch of the center'. . . ." (pp. 30-31).

The most vivid description is an old man's plea of innocence from the depth of a cell. The case concerns Mikhail S. Kedrov, a Bolshevik since the 1900's who was once himself a representative of the Cheka on the Archangel front, "notorious for his extreme brutality," according to Boris I. Nicolaevsky. Khrushchev stated:

Here is what the old Communist, Comrade Kedrov, wrote to the Central Committee through Comrade Andreyev (Comrade Andreyev was then a Central Committee secretary):

"I am calling to you for help from a gloomy cell of the Lefortovsky prison. Let my cry of horror reach your ears; do not remain deaf; take me under your protection; please, help remove the nightmare of interrogations and show that this is all a mistake.

"I suffer innocently. Please believe me . . . I am not a spy; I am not a member of an anti-Soviet organization of which I am being accused on the basis of denunciations. I am also not guilty of any other crimes against the party and the Government. . . .

". . . Today I, a 62-year-old man, am being threatened by the investigative judges with more severe, cruel and degrading methods of physical pressure. They (the judges) are no longer capable of becoming aware of their error and of recognizing that their handling of my case is illegal and impermis-
sible. . . . But let the party know that I am innocent and that there is nothing which can turn a loyal son of the party into an enemy, even right up to his last dying breath.

"But I have no way out. I cannot diverge from myself the hastily approaching new and powerful blows.

"Everything, however, has its limits. My torture has reached the extreme. My health is broken, my strength and my energy are waning, the end is drawing near. To die in a Soviet prison, branded as a vile traitor to the Fatherland—what can be more monstrous for an honest man? And how monstrous all this is! Unsurpassed bitterness and pain grips my heart. No! No! This will not happen; this cannot be, I cry. Neither the party, nor the Soviet Government, nor the People's Commissar, L. P. Beria, will permit this cruel, irreparable injustice. I am firmly certain that, given a quiet, objective examination, without any foul rantings, without any anger and without the fearful tortures, it would be easy to prove the baselessness of the charges. I believe deeply that truth and justice will triumph. I believe. I believe."

The old Bolshevik, Comrade Kedrov, was found innocent by the Military Collegium. But, despite this, he was shot at Beria's order (Indignation in the hall.) (pp. 52-3).

The results of such methods of extracting confessions were amazing—sometimes to Stalin himself. It is said that there is no perfect crime, that a criminal, with the greatest forethought and precaution, is always caught by some perfectly insignificant detail. Upon this are built all the detective novels. Stalin thought he could escape detection and to a certain extent he was justified. He had the whole NKVD, the judges, the investigators, the prosecutors and the defense working in harmony for him. Sometimes there was even an element of Gilbertian comedy in it; the judge agreed, the prosecutor agreed, the prisoner agreed, and the defense all agreed. Then the judge
praised Stalin, the prosecutor praised Stalin, and lastly the defense and the prisoner joined in praising Stalin. Forgetting that it had nothing to do with the defense, the counsel for the defense Kommodov, not wishing to be outdone by Prosecutor Vishinsky, shouted "And what about Stalin's leadership against which this struggle is directed? 170,000,000 people surround their leader with a shield of love, respect and devotion, which nobody will ever pierce. Nobody and never!" Of course the outsider, unused to such conduct of a defense counsel, already has a dark suspicion that the man Stalin was quite a rascal.

Stalin did not reckon that his crime would be found out, of all persons, by a carelessly dressed stooping old professor of Columbia, John Dewey. So long as the accused was charged with crimes committed on Soviet territory, and the testimony was concerned with acts within the territory, the crimes seemed to be perfect. However, the moment testimony involved acts outside Russia, Stalin was immediately exposed. Stalin wanted to prove that Trotsky, living abroad in Europe, was plotting with German Fascists to overthrow his regime, that there was contact between Trotsky abroad and Trotskyites in Russia under Smirnov. In the only two cases where testimony concerned Trotsky's contacts with his agents outside Russia, Stalin was caught with most embarrassing proofs of his falsifications of evidence. In one of the cases, John Dewey, the professor, unearthed a lot of documents and testimony which might excite the envy of Scotland Yard. These are The Affair of Hotel Bristol, and The Affair of the Kjeller Aerodrome.

(1) Affair of Hotel Bristol. This was the trial of Holtzman, Aug. 1936, during the second trial of Kamenev,
Zinoviev and fourteen other Bolsheviks, charged with conspiring with Trotsky abroad to enter into a pact with the Nazis, ceding to Germany the Ukraine and other advantages, in return for helping to overthrow the Soviet regime under Stalin.

Holtzman testified that in November 1932, on an official trip to Berlin, he met Trotsky's son Sedov, then studying at the Technische Hochschule, and agreed to go with him to Copenhagen to meet his father.

"I agreed," testified Holtzman at the trial, "but I told him that we could not go together for reasons of secrecy. I arranged with Sedov to be in Copenhagen within 2 or 3 days, to put up at the Hotel Bristol and meet him there. I went to the hotel straight from the station and in the lounge met Sedov. About 10 A.M. we went to Trotsky."

The case had been carefully prepared by Yezhov's NKVD—the name of the hotel, the time, the presence of Trotsky in Copenhagen at the time, etc. There was some inconsequential detail, such as the fact that the son Sedov, could not, under the circumstances, have obtained the visa to travel outside Germany, but that the NKVD thought could be ignored, or the NKVD did not know. As soon as he heard of the Holtzman testimony, Trotsky challenged Vishinsky and the Soviet court to ask Holtzman under what name and with what kind of passport Holtzman entered Denmark. This of course could be easily verified by the frontier authorities. Vishinsky did not want to answer the questions. The next day, Aug. 25, 1936, Holtzman was shot, on the very safe basis that dead men tell no tales.

Vishinsky now felt secure. It is the same André Vishinsky who talked about truth and justice at the United Nations. But the affair took an unexpected turn when "on
1st September, 1936, six days after the defendants had been shot, the *Socialdemocraten*, the official paper of the Danish Government, published a sensational announcement: that the Hotel Bristol, in which Holtzman allegedly met with Sedov in 1932 and from which both went to Trotsky's apartment, *had been demolished in 1917*.” (Orlov: *Secret History of Stalin's Crimes*, Random House, 1953; but this passage from Eng. ed., p. 68.)

John Dewey, heading the "Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Made against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials" went to work. What came out of the inquiry was that between 23rd of November and 2nd of December, during the nine days when Trotsky was in Copenhagen, Sedov Trotsky could not be, and was not, in Copenhagen. I quote Orlov (*ibid*, p.69):

Of all the documentary evidence obtained by the commission of Professor Dewey I will mention here only two examples:

1. Sedov's college notebooks and examination papers, bearing stamps and signatures of professors of the Technische Hochschule in Berlin, and his student attendance book, bearing dates of the month and signatures of professors, which proved conclusively that on those days when Trotsky was in Copenhagen his son Sedov was taking examinations at the Technische Hochschule in Berlin; and

2. The personal correspondence of Sedov with his father and mother, the contents of which leave no room for doubt that in the period between 23rd of November and 3rd of December Sedov was in Berlin. In one of his letters Sedov wrote to his parents on the eve of their departure from Denmark: "My dears! In about 36 hours you will find yourself but a few hours from Berlin; however, I cannot come to see you! The Germans have not given me permission for
continued residence, without which I can neither have a Danish visa, nor will I be able to return to Berlin."

Even more eloquent documentary evidence is contained in a postcard which Mrs. Sedov-Trotsky wrote to her son Sedov from the Danish port Esbjerg, on the day of her departure with Trotsky from Denmark. In that postcard, which bears the postmark "Esbjerg Dec. 3, 32," Mrs. Sedov-Trotsky expresses to her son her deep regret that he was unable to come to Denmark. She concluded the postcard with the pathetic words: "I want to continue hoping that a 'miracle' will occur and that we shall see each other."

But how could the NKVD make such a woeful mistake? Stalin of course was furious when he heard of the Danish paper exposure. Yagoda sent an experienced officer to Copenhagen to investigate into the mystery of the Hotel Bristol, and to see if there was any way of covering up the mistake, if for instance there might be a Pension Bristol, or a Hotel Crystal, which could then explain the mistake of the court reporters. He wanted just anything to cover up. The officer came back despondent.

What had really happened was that Yezhov had asked the NKVD to dig up the name of a Copenhagen hotel to put into Holtzman's testimony. Molchanov, chief of the Secret Political Department, had asked his secretary to telephone to the First Division of the Foreign Department for a list of hotels in Oslo and Copenhagen, just as if some one wanted to plan a trip abroad. The secretary took down the lists of hotels. In typing the two lists, however, he had made a mistake, placing "Oslo" over the Copenhagen Hotels, and "Copenhagen" over the list of hotels for Oslo. Thus it came about that Holtzman met Trotsky's son at the lounge of a hotel which had already been non-existent for 15 years!
(2) The Affair of the Kjeller Aerodrome (Trial of Piatakov, Jan. 23, 1937).

The trial and murder of Piatakov, one of the ablest and most honest and highly respected men among the old Bolsheviks, is interesting not only as another concocted crime that went awry, but also as an example of how Stalin sold his friends, including Piatakov and Orjonikidze, and how the threat of killing one's child was most effective in extracting confessions from a prisoner.

This was in 1937, the year of killing of another batch of 13 top Bolsheviks in the spring and of General Tukhachevsky and 8 other generals in summer, and of mass suicide of other elderly Bolshevik leaders. The trial in January followed half a year after the murder of Kamenev, Zinoviev and 14 other top Bolsheviks.

Piatakov was indisputably one of the ablest and best men under Lenin. Economist, able administrator and organizer, he was noted for his courage during the Civil War. As Chairman of the State Bank, in 1929, he occupied two rooms in a neglected house in the Gniezdnikovsky Lane, with his wife and child. He was one of the six leaders mentioned in Lenin's Testament, as one of the two ablest young men with Bukharin. In 1917, he had resigned a high post close to Lenin (Chief Commissar of the State Bank) in order to fight in the underground in the Ukraine. And he was the genius Stalin had relied upon for the main task of industrialization of the Soviet Union. Stalin appointed Orjonikidze, his own kinsman from Georgia and partner in intrigue whose only education was that of a male nurse, as People's Commissar for Heavy Industry, and made Piatakov his deputy. Piatakov had forsworn politics, and his life was his work. The man who had the most opportunity to enjoy all the
privileges of bureaucracy wore a drab, inexpensive suit always too small for him.

At the trial, Piatakov testified that while he was on a business trip to Berlin to place an order for 50,000,000 marks in December 1935, he flew one night in a special plane to Oslo, drove from the Kjeller Aerodrome to Trotsky's house, and discussed the plans for overthrowing the Soviet regime with the help of German bayonets and received Trotsky's orders to accelerate sabotage and wrecking of Soviet industries at home.

The testimony was safely vague, without details. Piatakov said only that he flew to Oslo and back to Berlin under the cover of the night. Taking warning from the fiasco in the affair of Hotel Bristol, the NKVD avoided all details. The precautions taken in making an airtight case of the testimony were described in Orlov's book. The author knew Piatakov very well since 1924 when he was deputy chief of the Economic Administration of OGPU and Piatakov was head of the Supreme Economic Council. This is how Orlov recounts the preparation of the case.

Piatakov had a ten-year-old child. At this time, the Bolshevik leaders had heard about the disappearance of the children of the Bolshevik leaders executed the previous summer. They were ready to believe that Stalin was capable of anything. The NKVD had found that prisoners with children were the easiest to work on for a confession. Unbending and dignified, Piatakov refused to talk to his inquisitors. He had risked his life many times during the war, and his pride was still with him.

At this stage appeared Orjonikidze, Piatakov's close associate and nominal boss, a jovial, gesticulating fellow-Georgian of Stalin. Orjonikidze came to visit Piatakov in prison, and the two were closeted together. Orjonikidze
had a promise from Stalin himself, and was probably sincere. Piatakov should confess and his life would be spared. Orjonikidze probably had given his personal guarantee that he would not be executed, as we shall see later.

Piatakov was proud and adamant. A few days later, Orjonikidze came again. "Yury, I come to you as your friend. I gave battle for you and I won't stop fighting for you! I talked to him about you . . . ."

Orjonikidze was unaware of the tragic role he was playing. Piatakov had complete confidence in Orjonikidze and Orjonikidze had confidence in Stalin. By this time, the NKVD was able to extract a confession from Piatakov's wife in order to save their young child. Piatakov weakened and agreed to testify.

The preparations for a trial usually took months. He had been arrested by Yagoda in the autumn of 1936. Now, Yezhov had taken over, and Slutsky, chief of Foreign Department had charge of preparing the confession (not the evidence, for in all these cases, evidence there was none). At first Slutsky prepared a confession consisting of correspondence by mail between Piatakov and Trotsky.

Orlov tells the story, as follows:

When at a conference at the Kremlin Stalin listened to the report about Piatakov's "testimony," he asked whether it wouldn't be better to say in the deposition of Piatakov that he had received the directives from Trotsky not by mail, but during a personal meeting with him. Thus was born the notorious legend that Piatakov had made a trip to Norway to see Trotsky.

In order not to get into a scrape with the new version, Stalin ordered Slutsky, chief of the Foreign Department of the NKVD, to work out a legend about Piatakov's trip to
[see] Trotsky, taking into account railroad schedules between Berlin and Oslo.

I learned in detail what occurred at the next conference in the Kremlin from Slutsky himself, when he visited me in Paris at the sanatorium of Professor Bergeré, in February 1937.

At that conference Slutsky reported to Stalin that the data which he had gathered made it inexpedient to adopt the story of Piatakov's trip to Norway. He explained that because of the existing railroad schedules Piatakov's trip from Berlin to Oslo and back, including the time necessary for driving to Trotsky's residence in the town of Veksal and a conference with him, would require at least two days. But, warned Slutsky, it would be dangerous to assert that Piatakov absented himself from Berlin for such a long period of time, because it was well known in the Soviet Trade Agency in Berlin that Piatakov had daily conferences with various German firms and that he signed contracts with them almost every day.

Stalin was dissatisfied with Slutsky's report and didn't let him cite all his reasons against the legend of Piatakov's trip to Oslo. "The things you said about the train schedules might be true," said Stalin, "but why couldn't Piatakov fly to Oslo in an aeroplane? Such a flight there and back could most likely be made in one night."

In answer to that Slutsky remarked that aeroplanes carry very few passengers and that the name of every passenger is entered into the register of the air-line company. But Stalin had already made his decision: "It must be said that Piatakov flew in a special plane," ordered Stalin. "For such a job the German authorities would gladly give an aeroplane."
Slutsky, who loved to boast of every talk he had with Stalin, told me about that conference in strict confidence. Several days later, I learned that Slutsky had told the same story, also "very confidentially" to the Resident of the NKVD in France, in the presence of another officer of the Foreign Department.

Accordingly Piatakov testified on Jan. 23 with the hope that his wife and child would be spared, and perhaps his own life, too.

Everything was fine. Then on Jan. 25, the Norwegian newspaper Aftenposten published the following contradiction:

**PIATAKOV'S CONFERENCE WITH TROTSKY AT OSLO QUITE IMPROBABLE**

... He is supposed to have arrived in a monoplane at the Kjeller Airfield. Information obtained at that field, however, states that no civil aeroplane landed there during December 1935.

Once more, outside the Iron Curtain, Stalin's NKVD was caught doing an amateurish job. It was extremely embarrassing for Prosecutor Vishinsky. The latter produced an official certificate that "the arrival and departure of aeroplanes is possible also in winter months," that is, a plane could land. It turned out that the certificate was not obtained from Norwegian authorities, but from the consular division of the Soviet Commissariat for Foreign Affairs in Moscow!

Unfortunately, on Jan. 29, another Norwegian newspaper, Arbeiderbladet, published another statement:

... A representative of the Arbeiderbladet made another inquiry today at the Kjeller Aerodrome, and Director Gullik-
sen confirmed by telephone that no foreign aeroplane landed at Kjeller in December 1935.

It was further reported that “according to the official journal of the airfield not a single plane had landed at the Kjeller Aerodrome during the whole period between September 1935 and 1st May, 1936.”

Trotsky threw down the gauntlet. He challenged Vishinsky to name the passport details and the Norwegian visa under which Piatakov was supposed to fly to Oslo on a night in December 1935. Vishinsky did not pick up the gauntlet. Quickly, on the 30th, Piatakov was shot.

Then Trotsky played his last card. He offered to go to Moscow for the trial himself, and challenged the Soviet Government to have him extradited from Norway. Actually, Trotsky knew that Norway might refuse, because according to the procedures, the Soviet Government had to name the charges. This would involve looking into the alleged aeroplane trip to the Kjeller Aerodrome and possibly bringing to memory the scandal of the Hotel Bristol as well. Stalin would think thrice before he took this step, and Trotsky knew it. Stalin preferred to keep quiet.

The Kjeller Aerodrome affair had an interesting sequel. Three weeks later, on Feb. 18, Orjonikidze died under mysterious circumstances. According to Khrushchev, Orjonikidze was “forced to shoot himself.” The original version published in the Soviet press was that he had died of a heart attack. Coming so close after Piatakov’s execution, it could not be a coincidence. Either Orjonikidze had protested to Stalin on the latter’s breaking his word, and the two fellow-Georgians could have had a hot exchange of words. Then of course Orjonikidze had to die.
Or else, Orjonikidze had found himself made an agent provocateur to betray and deceive an old friend whom he respected, and took his own life. This reminds me of the suicide of the physician who had certified the death from suicide of Jan Masaryk, also a few weeks after the event. Human honor and the wrestling with a human conscience? There was plenty of it in the mass suicides of the summer of 1937.

The trial of Piatakov sheds light on another important angle of the trials, the threat to one's dear ones, to one's wife and children and grandchildren.

While Khrushchev emphasized physical tortures as a means of getting confessions, Orlov who was himself an important officer of the NKVD and knew practically all the Party's inner hierarchy personally and many of their families, carefully explained that the threat of killing one's children was the most effective weapon for getting the defendants to accuse themselves in court in the hope of saving their loved ones.

Such was the case of Kamenev and others. The preparations of a case before the trial took months, sometimes a year. During the preparations for his trial, Kamenev had refused to testify as he was told. He could not believe in the threat against his children, as Yagoda told him. Bolsheviks didn't do that. Then Stalin took an unprecedented and otherwise inexplicable step of publishing in March, 1935, a law that children above twelve were subject to the same penalties as for adults, and that they were punishable by the death penalty for theft of state property (such as grain belonging to the state farms). This in itself was inexplicable, for Stalin had been jailing and shooting children beggars wholesale in Communist prisons during the preceding 1932-3 famine for pilfering at railway cars,
etc. He didn't require a law to make it legal, and needed not publicize a law unheard of in civilized nations. This was 1935 and the problem of rounding up drifting orphans from the Ukraine had on the whole passed its worst crisis. Why did Stalin do it? It served a very useful purpose. After being shown the law published in the Moscow papers which obligated the courts to apply to children all the clauses of the criminal code, the arrested men were ready to confess to anything the NKVD had prepared for them.

Thus [wrote Orlov], the decree about the children was incorporated into the arsenal of Stalin's inquisition as one of the most effective instruments of moral torture and physical pressure against the arrested Bolsheviks. By order of the Secretary of the Central Committee of the party, Nikolai Yezhov, whom Stalin had sent to the NKVD to supervise the preparation of the Moscow trials, every inquisitor of the NKVD was obliged to have on his desk during the interrogation of the arrested Bolsheviks the law which decreed the application of the death penalty to children.

The operation of this threat against the children of the accused was effective not only in the case of Piatakov and Kamenev, but also in the case of Grigori Sokolnikov (formerly Ambassador to England), of Paul Ivanov, of Krestinsky, and of the pathetic daughter of Alexander Karin.
5 They Have Gone a Long Way

"The whole syndicalist absurdity must be thrown into the waste basket."

LENIN at the 10th Party Congress (1921)

"Every additional interference by labor unions in the administration of enterprises must be recognized as injurious and forbidden . . . Neither the Communist Party nor the Soviet Government nor the trade unions can under any circumstances forget that the resort to strikes in a country with a proletarian government can be described only as a bureaucratic assault on the proletarian government and as a survival of the capitalist past and institutions on the one hand, and as showing the lack of political development and the cultural backwardness of the toilers."

11th Party Congress (1922, under Lenin)

Today the popular conception of Soviet Russia as leftist instead of extreme rightist is an anachronism. It is merely a continuation of a habit of expression started during the October Revolution, quite hypnotic with the revolutionists themselves, but quite senseless to an objective observer today. The present usage of these words is quite well established in all countries. Political parties are classified as "right" or "left" (center, right of center, extreme right; left of center, extreme left) mainly according to their respective stands with regard to labor and capital. To be "left" is to be pro-labor; to be "right" is to be pro-capital. The addition of the word "democrat" (Christian Democrat, Social Democrat, etc.) means stand-
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ing for peaceful reform through parliamentary action and for the right of the ruled to criticize and overthrow their ruler.

The official formula for Communism is “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs”; Stalin’s official modification of “Socialism” is “according to his deeds.” The reference to a man’s physical, emotional and intellectual needs is ridiculously naive. Many men outside Arabia need a harem. I need perhaps a castle to write books in; Goering needs a private collection of art treasures from the Louvre and Stalin needs a collection of pornography (see Orlov p. 343). This formula is therefore too fantastic. It would be simpler to limit the needs to food, since eating is at the back of all human progress. It appears that the following formulas exist:

**ABSENTEE CAPITAL MANAGEMENT OWNERSHIP**

: You do the work and I eat.

: I direct, you work, and I hope we both get enough to eat.

**UTOPIAN SOCIALISM**

: We all do what we like, when we like, and eat what we like, as much as we like.

**THEORETICAL STATE CAPITALISM**

: I direct, you work, and I shall see we all get work and have enough to eat.

**FASCIST STATE CAPITALISM**

: I direct, you work, and those I like can eat. Don’t ask what I eat.

**STALIN’S STATE CAPITALISM**

: I direct, you work, and those I like can eat. You work faster, you eat more. Don’t ask what I eat.
Everybody who wants to eat must work, but everybody must work anyway. "All stomachs are not the same."

You work, and I shall see that you eat well.

My work is to see that you work, and work fast; it is not my business what you eat.

"Only those who work very fast shall eat" (Manya Gordon's phrasing).

The Russian Soviet history in the development of the past four decades, 1918-1958, has revealed some fatal "contradictions" (a Marxist term) and some superficial paradoxes. Some of these paradoxes are:

1. One expects to go left by going right.
2. One expects to arrive at political democracy by ruthless autocracy.
3. One hopes to create a classless society by creating a new class and widening the gap between classes.
4. One hopes to encourage the "withering away" of the state by creating and strengthening a despotic state machine.
5. One must degrade and shackle the working class in order to liberate the working class.
6. One must develop colonial power to fight imperialism.

I do not think any of the above paradoxes was intentionally willed by the Soviet Republics. But these paradoxical facts grew. The paradoxes are chiefly verbal; Russian developments grew into opposite directions while the
ruling class clung tenaciously to the old labels and slogans and watchwords and dogmas of the revolutionary era. They cease to be paradoxes if Russian claims to be “leftist,” “democratic,” “pro-labor,” etc., are frankly laid aside.

All these paradoxes will appear in the following discussion, but one must firmly resolve the first paradox of “right” and “left” because this is fundamental.

What happened? How did such paradoxes grow? The only explanation is class interests, the interests of the ruling class. By class interests is meant that attitude of mind of regarding all pedestrians as “bastards” or “idiots” when a taxi-driver, and regarding all drivers as “heartless devils” when a pedestrian is trying to cross the street. Lenin was sitting behind the wheel when he forbade all labor strikes and regarded them as “assault on the proletarian government.” He rationalized it as a tactic of the Revolutionary Proletarian Government. Actually, Communist or Marxist teachings did not require shooting of unarmed workers at Petrograd or the forbidding of strikes, but the contrary. The only explanation was that he was now at the helm of the government, and being at the helm of the government, could not tolerate criticism, could not tolerate “interference by trade unions in the administration of enterprises.” It is an old, familiar feeling, not even Marxist, common to those in power. The “workers’ control of the industries,” championed and promised only a brief two years ago, was now completely forgotten. His psychology, his attitude had changed. From this point of departure only is it possible to explain the development of a revolutionary dictatorship into a despotic autocracy. Thus, the human interpretation of history overrides the economic interpretation. One could
describe the forty years of Soviet rule objectively as a development from Tsarist monarchy into a state-capitalist form of government; but one could view it also as a human story of a frantic struggle for power and personal survival among the Old Bolsheviks, for privilege and comparative security among the bureaucracy, and finally as a struggle for national glory and expansion. Frailty, thy name is Man.

The one question which everybody in the world is asking and is entitled to ask, and the one question which the rulers of the Soviet Union have to face sooner or later is, What has it done to labor? The one question which the Soviet rulers hate to answer is also, What has it done to the working class? Communism is in the dock today, and it will have to defend itself on that one simple issue to satisfy the jury of world opinion. Let us forget that it has exterminated and murdered and sentenced to hard labor the capitalist class and the upper bourgeoisie of Tsarist Russia, because it had said frankly that it wanted to exterminate them for good reasons. But it must answer this question about the laboring class and the peasant, and what it has done to them. On this and this alone it must justify and defend itself. At every public debate, every forum discussion, every international conference, every cocktail party among the delegates to the United Nations, the only really vital, legitimate, pertinent question is, What has the Soviet Union done to the poor farmer, the poor worker, the poor common man?

Frankly I am not interested in the top 12—14% (as of 1940) non-productive bureaucratic elements of the Soviet population who live off the 20—22% of industrial workers and the 53% of peasantry and 8—11% of forced labor. Much less am I interested in the top 10% who hold two-
thirds of the total national savings deposits (see Chapter 7) and are “clipping coupons” (Lenin’s term) of the state loans with attractively high interest, who are moreover guaranteed by law of family inheritance of those bonds and coupons (strictly private property), and who are favored by a regressive income tax of a flat 13%. Frankly I am not interested in these people and their wives and their “soft” trains and “special stores” and yachts and summer houses. I am not interested at all.

For this is clear: Communism makes sense only when it avows its aim to be the betterment of the conditions of the working man and proceeds unwaveringly toward that goal.

At a stretch, we can even waive the question, are the proletariat the real dictators in Russia? or are they the dictated? It is always embarrassing to ask such a question of Khrushchev and Company, and besides, when you ask this question, the apologists can spin out a web of dialectic, and say with Romain Rolland that the proletariat “must be led to their own happiness against their own will,” or as one might improve upon it, must be dragged to its throne in chains. We can ignore such casuistry and ask the simple question, “After forty years of Bolshevik rule, are the poor factory workers and their wives better cared for, better looked after in food and housing, and do they feel more the dignity of the human being or are they more degraded?”

I am afraid the answer to the whole situation will be this: in the last forty years after the Bolshevik Revolution, there has been a constant increase of industrial output paralleled by a constant degrading of labor; that moreover, the degrading of labor under harsh coercion and severe penalties is the very essence and cause of the
increase in industrial output; and that there is no way of changing it. Once class interests are established, the class will use every weapon at its command to maintain its privilege. Individual will to reform is of no account. Tomsky was much belabored by the Party and finally expelled from the Central Committee because he actually tried to defend the interests of the working class against the point of view of “management cost-accounting.” Bukharin, on trial for his life, confessed and admitted that he “pitied the expropriated kulaks for so-called humanitarian motives.” Rykov was dropped when he championed developing light industry of consumer goods to improve the living conditions of labor. Every worker and every intelligent man today in Soviet Russia is dialectically conditioned to hope to climb up to the non-productive coupon-clipping upper class. The situation has developed so that nothing, according to Karl Marx, nothing short of a revolution by violence is going to change this system; and it would be silly to rely on parliamentary reformism for redress of intolerable working conditions inside Soviet Russia because parliamentarianism itself does not exist. Consistently for the last forty years and up to the time of writing, any tendency to emphasize betterment of the lot of workers has been labelled “rightist deviation” and “opportunism”—the latter word being used principally in the sense of being unwilling to go “all out” in an uncompromising spirit in some direction, never mind what. It has the sense of being half-baked and immature and unreliable for the revolutionary task, still retaining sentimentality and humanitarianism. Typical of the “opportunists” was Rykov, the most humane of them all, who died broken-hearted.

Price and wage statistics, real and nominal wage in-
dices, labor supply and labor turnover, etc., can be the
dullest of reading. Not so with Russian labor. The story
of Soviet labor is mysterious, weird, fascinating, and
sometimes even heart-rending. Here are some extraordi-
nary statements:

1. Free unionism is “trade unionism pure and simple,” or
“bourgeois unionism”—a term of reproach.
2. “The whole syndicalist absurdity must be thrown into
the waste basket” (Lenin).
3. “The resort to strikes in a country with a proletarian
government can be described only as a . . . survival of
the capitalist past” (11th Party Congress).
4. “These people think that Socialism means equality . . .
They are petit-bourgeois views of our left-wing scatter-
brains” (Stalin).
5. “Any thought of equalitarianism must be discarded”
(Decree of 1921).
6. “Let them (women) rather work in the mines than prac-
tice prostitution.”
7. Trade unions’ campaign to widen the gap of unequal
pay is to “fight petit-bourgeois equalitarianism.”
8. Trade unions’ fight for lower wages and higher piece-
work quotas in a campaign for “counter-quotas” an-
nounced that the campaign showed “vast possibilities.”
9. Strikers and strike agitators are “enemies of the working
class,” or “class-hostile elements,” or “class enemies who
make non-proletarian, greedy demands.”
10. Trade unions demanded plant managers should be prose-
cuted by law for giving higher pay to workers because
the managers had found that the workers could not live
on wage norms set by the state.

All these shall be documented below.

The story of the repression and subjugation of labor
is so unbelievable that I must here confine myself chiefly to the Party Resolutions and Labor Decrees themselves, which make comments unnecessary. They are under the general headings:

A. The Frame — trade unions and wages.
C. The Rack — speed-up, periodic revision of work quotas.
D. The Noose — labor disciplinary measures, involving loss of jobs, food, housing, social security.

In other words, (A) first you put the trade unions over the workers and make them entirely dependent on jobs and wages controlled by the state; (B) then you control labor movements by compulsory registration, internal passport, and penalty for job-quitting so that they stay put; (C) then you put on the squeeze by demanding ever higher and higher production quotas; and finally (D) you hold the whip of threatening loss of jobs, taking away of food cards, eviction from homes and penal service, to make them obey. Thus, framed and chained and stretched and living in fear of making life worse than it is, labor starts into a splurge of production (or as the official Party History calls it, "an upsurge of labor enthusiasm") and you have an industrialized state. With the state controlling the secret police, I do not see how the "upsurge of labor enthusiasm" could have lagged or how the Russian industrialization program could have failed to succeed. Lenin stated, and all writers in Soviet Russia agreed, that all labor is compulsory in Russia and the distinction between hired labor and forced labor is "a difference in degree, not in kind."

These are all interrelated. I rely here on Manya Gor-
don, *Workers Before and After Lenin* (Dutton, 1941), a well-documented, authoritative study, and more particularly for the various Labor Decrees, on Solomon M. Schwarz, *Labor in the Soviet Union*. The authors use throughout Russian sources including painstaking research on Soviet trade union journals (*Trud*) and official revelations in *Pravda*. It is a strange sight to come across these Labor Decrees in a state run by the disciples of Karl Marx. Any one of the following quotations would be a gem in the anthology of Marxist literature, inspired, as it were, by some satiric genius.

A. **THE FRAME** (Trade unions and wages)

The whole basis for subjugation of labor in the Soviet Union is the Leninist definition of the function of trade unions conceived as a means of labor control, without Labor's right to strike or to collective bargaining, and as it further developed later, without the right to discuss either wages or work quotas. It is true that Lenin here ran into a terrible dilemma and that he, like Tomsky later, still tried to defend the workers' interests. But the terrible dilemma was there. And that was the plain fact, the state had become employer, and the class interests of the state employer and the working class were not identical. As it was the state employer who made the decisions, of course it was the employer who won. A clear definition of this party policy was formulated as early as 1920.

1 The dates and texts of the various labor decrees, party resolutions, work regulations and ordinances are as quoted by Schwarz unless otherwise stated. Schwarz' book was published by Praeger, 1952.
1920 (Ninth Party Congress)—“There can be no question of trade union opposition to the institutions of the Soviet State. Such opposition is a deviation from Marxism to bourgeois trade unionism.”

1922 (Eleventh Party Congress)—This clearest statement of the party position has already been given in the quotation at the beginning of the chapter.

The reference to strikes as an “assault” upon the government means that to be on strike is to be charged with being anti-government, a very dangerous thing to do. The other reference in this quote with regard to strikes as “a survival of the capitalist past” and to “cultural backwardness” means clearly that: having strikes = cultural backwardness; no strikes = progressiveness.

The first evidence of the desire of the workers to be paid as low wages as possible is seen in the appeal of forty-two workers of two Dnepropetrovsk metal plants, as reported in Pravda:

1929, Oct. 22—“When collective agreements come up for renewal, backward groups of workers stirred up by counter-revolutionary Trotskyites, rightist opportunists, kulakophiles, and initiators of whispering campaigns will start presenting their non-proletarian and greedy demands . . . ” (italics mine).

This was entirely in line with the duty of the trade unions to reverse the trend of the first revolutionary years and fight for social inequality of pay under the banner “Fight Petit-Bourgeois Egalitarianism.” The word “Egalitarianism” (uravnilovka, Russian slang implying contempt) was introduced into Marxist ideology by Stalin (in his famous speech of June, 1931) to fight the trend
toward equal pay. Under extreme economic stress, the pay of the lower-grade workers had been raised faster than the higher-class. Referring to that period of 1927-1928, R. Vladimirov wrote for Russians in *Voprosy Truda* (trade union journal):

1932, Nov.-Dec.—"Because of the opportunists in the trade unions and in the People's Commissariat for Labor, the wage scale reform of 1927-1928, became the starting point for an intensive unfolding of petit-bourgeois egalitarianism."

Stalin was a hero in this fight against equality of wages.

1932, Central Trade Union Report to Ninth Trade Union Convention—"It is only thanks to the direct, specific intervention of the Central Committee of the Party and Comrade Stalin that the trade unions have begun to tear down the old system and expunge egalitarianism."

The "wage scale reform" of 1931 was to put work on piece-work basis, with "progressive piece rates," paying "premiums" to work done beyond the "performance quota." The "performance quota" or "piece-work norm" was based on the performance of the best "shock brigade" workers. It laid the basis for the Vertical Rack (*see below*). Unable to feed his family, the worker stretched his hours of work to obtain premium rates, and when many workers did so exceed the norm, the norm was raised again, abolishing previous gains in pay. Hence there grew a worker resistance to this constant rise in "work norms." But listen to the extraordinary bit of Communist language when workers who did not like the rise of work norms became *class-enemies* or *enemies of the working class*. So the union paper *Trud* reports:
1933, April 6—"The revision of quotas met with considerable resistance from class hostile elements, grabbers and loafers. Numerous sorties of class enemies have been recorded, directed at hampering fulfillment of the plan to increase productivity. These sorties were of various kinds: now threats against TNB (Rates and Standards Bureau) employees, now clever slowdowns, sabotage of time keeping, propaganda against quota revision, attempts to organize resistance by individual groups of workers."

This "class enemy" had been recognized as far back as 1929 when the First Five Year Plan got under way, as may be seen in the appeal of the above-quoted forty-two workers of metal plants, although it is possible with more intensive research to discover an earlier formulation of the equation: worker = class enemy:

"We appeal to all workers of the Soviet Union to put up the most active resistance against the sorties of the grabbers and whisperers and actively to fight the class enemy who has infiltrated our plants" (October 22, 1929).

Now, by 1933, it had become crystal clear that the function of the trade unions was to "help management" and identify itself with it, as was so ably elaborated by J. D. Veinberg, Secretary of the All-Union Central Trade Union Council, at its Plenary Session as reported in Trud:

1933, July 8—"To set up the wage system and the establishment of job standards correctly . . . it is necessary that the responsibility for such decisions be imposed directly on plant administrators and technical managers . . . No one but management shall be primarily responsible for technical standardization, for wage scale, quotas, piece rates, etc. Today quite a few comrades in the plants share the idea that
the union should have quite as much to say about wages as management. That is a fundamental error. It would imply that the union takes the place of management. It is a "leftist" opportunistic distortion, undermining of one-man management, interference with the operational functions of management. This must be stopped."

If this is not the voice of management class interests, what is it? (The use of the term "leftist" opportunism may be confusing to the uninitiated, since any one in Soviet Russia—Rykov, Tomsky—who stood for the welfare and interests of the working class, was usually described as "rightist opportunist." It had already been established that pro-management was "leftist" and pro-labor should be "rightist." Veinberg forgot himself here. To the initiated, however, the terms right and left do not matter and can be used interchangeably, so long as it is a "deviation").

The next thing which happened was that in view of the inadequate pay and low subsistence level following the rapid depreciation of the rouble, the plant managers had been paying the workers more than the official rate. It was the duty, then, and the great task of trade union officials to fight this class-hostile and illegal rise in pay. However it was felt, and Veinberg indicated that he felt it, that it was shameful for a unionist official to fight the already established rise in pay. Hence Veinberg threatened and castigated with great eloquence such tendency and such conduct as "trade unionism pure and simple"—the worst invective he could think of. It is difficult to remember, but one should keep in mind constantly the fact that Veinberg here was speaking strictly for the employer class, and then the vitriolic hatred of trade unionism becomes very clear and natural. One must constantly remember that we are describing conditions
and acts in a monopoly-capitalist state, and not in a working-class dictatorship. Veinberg was speaking before a special conference on wage policy, called by the Central Trade Union, as reported in *Trud*:

1933, January—"We must take to tasks any trade unionists who tolerate any distortions of the Party line on wage questions, proceeding with the same severity as does the Party against opportunists in its own ranks . . . You sometimes hear whispering in union ranks, like this: 'Does it behoove unions to oppose concessions which industrial executives grant in wage questions? If we do that, how can we face the workers?' This is the most shameful misconception of union tasks. It is 'trade unionism' pure and simple . . . We must actively combat this kind of 'defense' of labor's interest!"

It sounds unfair. You could not ask the Secretary of the Soviet Central Trade Union Council to talk like that, to accuse other officials of "trade unionism pure and simple." It sounds almost like a badly written satire. We have already gone very far; we are not talking about Bolshevik opposition to freedom and to social democracy; we are now talking about the very core of the Bolshevik movement, the liberation of the proletariat from the oppression of its employers. That was what the entire class struggle was for. We have gone so far that Walter Reuther should stand unequivocally convicted as a trade unionist and an enemy of the working class. That is that.

Lastly we almost forgot one thing. The trade unions were so actively occupied that they had no time to think of the workers' wages. So in following the trade union work, we also forgot all about the wages. But who is interested in the workers' wages? Veinberg, quoted above, had already made clear that the question of wages was
none of the business of the trade unions, but was the sole concern of management. The "Soviet Labor Law," textbook for law schools, published by the People's Commissariat for Justice in the U.S.S.R. (Moscow, 1939), says that an ordinance in the spring of 1933 provided that "collective agreement might no longer contain any clauses assuring wage and salary earners of any rights or advantages beyond those guaranteed by the existing legislation." Harry Schwartz (Russia's Soviet Economy, p. 480)\(^1\) quotes the Russian writer Aleksandrov and Genkin as saying "Detailed regulation of all sides of these [employer-worker] relations by normative acts of governmental power does not leave any room for any contractual agreement concerning one labor condition or another."

In practice, since 1933, a trade unionist bargains for work, but not for wages. That is the solid, unshakable basis of Soviet stand on labor.

For some comparative figures on wages, see p. 157.

B. THE CHAIN (Job freeze)

No factory manager, unless he is insane, welcomes a rise in wages. So far the Soviet State, as the employer, has acted logically and sensibly in holding the wages down and widening the gap in salaries between management and labor. The next thing which management least desires to see is a constant labor turnover, a floating labor that moves and migrates freely and can quit its job any time it wants. In the society of free enterprise, where labor is free, the management cannot do anything about it. But in the Soviet Union, where the state is the manage-

\(^1\) Prentice-Hall, 1950.
ment, it could do a lot and it did. It instituted the job freeze. The net difference between private capitalist countries and Soviet Russia as far as labor is concerned, is that in the former he can quit if he likes if dissatisfied, but in Soviet Russia, he is not thus free in his movement, for the state controls all the jobs. The application of the Stakhanovite Vertical Rack to labor is possible and made easier if the worker is first bound to his place, or is placed as it were "on a spot." Medieval torturers had always known that before you do anything to a prisoner, you must tie him up and chain his feet to some kind of encumbrances.

If one looks up the Soviet Labor Code of 1922, one will find the most progressive guarantees of labor freedom, of quitting a job, prohibition of night work for women and juveniles, social insurance, etc. When the Soviet rulers, however, found themselves in the position of monopoly-capital, owning all man-power and all means of production, their class interests changed, to use a hackneyed Marxist phraseology. In other words, whereas they started as pedestrians when every driver looked like a heartless road-hog, now they suddenly found themselves behind the wheel when they regarded every pedestrian as an idiot who couldn't see where he was going. Particularly, they were now a management with a set goal of production. As management, they wanted to lower not only wages and cost of production, but also felt it desirable to have absolute control of manpower supply, or what was once the "labor market." Hence exploitation of the masses began and the job freeze was one of the most natural things to expect. In every colonial country governed by the Soviet imperial power, the pattern of exploitation is identical. Very soon it became compulsory labor, without any
one thinking of repealing the clauses of the Labor Code of 1922.

Around 1930, the labor turnover (shifting of jobs) was at its worst because of low pay and labor unrest. At first, the effort to compel the worker to stay at one plant was vague. As reported in Pravda:

1930, Sept. 3—The manifesto of the Central Party Committee said: To combat labor turnover, steps must be taken to assure the attachment of workers to production by a proper build-up of proletarian public opinion; by getting the workers to pledge themselves to the proletarian public to hold their jobs for at least a certain length of time; by bringing to bear various means of public pressure, including a boycott of refractory production deserters; and by the introduction of different forms of bonuses and supply designed to make the workers stay in the plant.

Three days later:

1930, Sept. 6—A Labor Decree of the Central Party Committee defined job-quitting although in accordance with Section 46 of the Labor Code as “arbitrary termination of the employment contract” and “tantamount to an infraction of work discipline.” A week later, the force of the decrees was felt in depriving a job quitter of social benefits and of that always very important matter, his food-cards. It happened that the state as employer was also the party who controlled the worker’s bread.

1930, Sept. 13—The People’s Commissariat for Labor issued an ordinance to the effect that employees who had “arbitrarily terminated their employment” lost their claims to unemployment benefits permanently. In applying for jobs, they were to wait behind others. “Stubborn floaters” were liable to have their food-cards cancelled.
1930, Dec. 15—The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party ordered that "refractory disorganizers of production" (which included the "floaters") should be "barred for six months from any job, in industry or transportation."

1931, Jan. 8—A decree of the People's Commissariat introduced the wage-book as means of control of workers' movements, at first limited to the plant where he was working for the period.

1932, Dec. 27—A decree extended it further and obliged every one to carry an internal passport which must be shown when applying for a job.

The outlines of the mechanism for manpower control were now complete. There is in this life no argument quite as effective as somebody being able to take away your bread from your mouth. It is basic. That is why Marxist theoreticians love the wage-earning proletariat as the most reliable elements, while always suspicious of the small land-owning peasant. The man who has a plot of land he can call his own has a kind of dignity and independence which makes him a bad tool for Communism. But in the case of the job worker, the Lord (in this case the State) gives it to us and the Lord can take it away, and the worker cannot complain. The fact that they were completing the First Five-Year Plan and building "our proletarian state" made it doubly dangerous to be considered a saboteur or "disorganizer of Socialist production."

Labor was well on the road to captivity, but still not chained. The chains were forged in the "labor reforms" of 1938 followed by the famous or infamous decree of June 26, 1940.
1938, Dec. 28—This important decree issued jointly by the Central Committee of the Party, the Council of the People's Commissars and the Trade Union Council, ordered many things, some of which concern job freeze; (a) the work-book was introduced after the Nazi model. This work-book was permanent and accompanied the worker from plant to plant. It was kept by the management, entries were made in it for any refractions such as lateness, etc., and the worker could not quit and apply for another job without getting it back from the management, that is, without its consent; (b) full sick benefits were tied to a six-year employment at one place and proportionately reduced according to the length of employment; (c) these were ordered together with a number of very stiff penalties (see below D).

1940, June 26—This infamous decree marked the climax. It obliterated the difference between free labor and forced hired labor. It will be recalled that this is the period of Stalin's flirtation with Hitler when he was helping to feed and grease the Nazi war machine for the subjection of Europe. Sections 3, 4, 5 of this decree made quitting a job a "criminal offense." Section 5 specifically provided for criminal prosecution of employees who quit a plant of their own accord, with prison sentences for two to four months. Together with other disciplinary measures the work-book practically held the laborer captive as long as he lived. Work had ceased to be a contract agreement.

C. THE RACK ("Socialist competition" and Stakhanov movement)

With the permanent work-book, the control of food cards and the immobilization of labor in general, except by official transfers, the situation was especially favorable for
getting as much out of labor as management desired. This "as much as" soon assumed maniac, abnormal proportions under the system of Stakhanovite competition. "Socialist competition" between plants or between teams in the same plant for excelling each other in results was introduced as early as the beginning of the First Five Year Plan. It got better and better until Stakhanovite "shock brigades" appeared in 1935.

Briefly, this was a device based upon premium rates to make the worker exert his last ounce of energy and exceed himself in trying to beat a constantly raised piece-work norm. It became a form of breathless pace-setting by the youngest and the best for the average workers to follow. Finally it reached a stage of "insane exertion," "beyond human endurance." Of course "Socialist psychology" helped along; a Marxist psychology professor proved that "fatigue" was largely subjective. The norm was set by the best healthy workers, while the worker who merely managed to meet the norm was unable to feed his family properly. Under the spur of premium rates, he stretched his hours of work voluntarily to get the premium rates above the norm. Of course everybody tried, but as soon as a number of such workmen had exceeded the old norm, the norm was raised. This was called "revision of norms" which encountered a great deal of bitterness. Medieval racks were on a horizontal plane with the prisoners outstretched on the ground, head and feet tied to bars. Two jailers, one at the head and one at the feet then turned the bars to get the stretching effect. On the other hand, the vertical rack resembles a man with his feet chained to a rock on the beach trying to stretch himself against a continually rising tide to prevent himself from being submerged.
The result was, the U.S.S.R. was able to report an amazing speed in the industrial transformation of the country.

So correctly did Karl Marx prophesy: "In proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the laborer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. Accumulation of wealth at one pole is at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation at the other opposite pole."

He was so right! While collecting the data of these Soviet Labor Decrees, I had a curious creepy, subterranean feeling, a feeling as it were, of some one finding himself in a medieval dungeon or exploring some ancient tunnel, where the air was putrid and musty as if no humans had breathed in it for centuries. Finding these Labor Decrees was like finding the Dead Sea scrolls or some ancient legislative code of the Pharaohs. I was fascinated and felt I must delve into the mysteries of these scrolls. And while reading them, I imagined hearing somewhere from one of the vaults the feeble muffled groans of an old man. I went toward the source of the noise and found it came from an ancient crypt on the lintel of which stood the inscription on bronze: CAROLUS MARCUS ANNO DOMINI MDCCCLXXXIII. Anyway, as there was such accumulation of misery we can suspect the accumulation of wealth somewhere (see Chapter 7).

As Manya Gordon points out, a Stakhanovite performance was essentially "a stunt, without continuity," not a "normal method of increasing production," 1 i.e., not a pace which could be sustained for a long period.

1 Manya Gordon, Workers Before and After Lenin, p. 409. She is a good writer and, in spite of the heavy subject matter, the work reads very well.
The Stakhanovites, after performing a miracle of production within a given period of time, became "labor heroes" and were then promoted to various party or managerial jobs. They did not have to repeat these miracles, but they had proved what human endurance was capable of, and that the common workers were not putting forth their best.

It all depends on from what point of view you look at it. To a Stakhanovite hero, it was "ecstasy of work." As the famous metal forger Busygin describes it: "The entire brigade is in the grip of a tremendous work fury. It is simply impossible to conceive of going up to one of these people to distract him for a minute. No one smokes, no one talks. I have visited many plants, but nowhere have I seen such an ecstasy of work." But as an old worker puts it, writing an appeal in Trud, July 3, 1929, even in the early days of "Socialist competition": "Present-day working conditions are called 'sweating', anyway; and now Socialist competition—it just smells of capitalist exploitation! As an old worker I share this view, and that is why I don't take part in the competition and don't try to outdo the other fellow's performance.

"A cheap thing, the achievement that those records brag about! Supposing a man like that gets more work done per day and then suggests raising the quota. Well, then, who are these record-workers? Young Communists, youths full of strength and zeal. With that you can move mountains. And their example is imitated by reckless oldsters who may once in a while succeed in a record performance. But how long can this last? One month, two months, maybe six months you can bear up under these conditions: you don't have the stamina for more. But

---

2 Ibid., p 172.
They Have Gone a Long Way

we are just ordinary workers and have to work our jobs for years to come."

Piatakov, the genius who put through the Soviet industrialization program before he was shot by Stalin, thus defines the Stakhanov movement: "The essence of the Stakhanov movement lies in the fact that the Stakhanovite—actually with his own hands, not just in theory but in practice—overthrows all so-called technical work norms . . . technically based norms represent a phantom that serves to intimidate us, a brake that held us back."

And again: "We will smash the devil himself and attain unheard-of production results of which no one has ever dreamed . . . One must simply shout: 'The devil take it!'"

The director of the Petrovsk works in Dnepropetrovsk, after describing vividly a twenty-four hour period of Stakhanovite fury, ended the report thus: "All this was achieved through exertion of a kind that cannot be stood uninterruptedly. The section chiefs cannot, after all, work continuously, nor can the plant management spend day and night in the various sections. One also cannot expect every brigade to report for work voluntarily several hours before the beginning of its shift and remain at work several hours after the end of the shift . . . This literally required insane exertion." 3

Yet the Stakhanov movement was not a one-time, spectacular display like swimming across the English Channel; it was a national movement, promoted and touted about as a great new Socialist technique for increasing production. Solomon M. Schwarz, from whose book Labor in the Soviet Union the above documenta-

3 See the full story of the crazy twenty-four hours in Manya Gordon, pp. 407-408.
tion was taken, points out that the Stakhanovites invited great hostility among the laborers, because it was they who set the pace for the others to follow.

Stakhanovism could not last, as it was not a normal method of stimulating production, and it wrecked the machinery. It died out a year or two afterwards. It is interesting as showing the truth of the class interests of the capitalist exploiters and slave drivers in going to all limits with complete callousness to the suffering and exhaustion of the workers. Production was everything and the welfare of the workers nothing. But "socialist competition" had been from the very beginning a feature of Soviet labor policy, and continued after the Stakhanov technique was abandoned.

More interesting is the role of the trade unions in the matter of revising work norms. In a normal civilized society, one would have thought that labor unions should fight any increase in demands upon the workers' time unless with proper compensation in pay. In the union of the "Socialist" Republics, however, the trade unions are the watch dogs of the state over production and it was their curious role to go out around the country and see that the work norms were revised upward, which means a higher scale of production was demanded with the same pay. This was called the "counter quotas" or "counter norms." The trade unions had consistently fought higher wages, sometimes paid by plant managers on the spot, because of actual impossible price conditions. Now, the trade unions proudly announced that its campaign for higher piece work norms promised "vast possibilities." In other words, the energy of the workers had not yet been fully tapped. Things like these help to establish the true character of the Soviet system as strictly "capitalist."
This report was published in *Trud*, April 12, 1931, “The unions conducted their campaign in exemplary fashion . . . Under pressure from the union council, the revision of quotas was begun. A flood of counter quotas, greatly in excess of TNB (Rates and Standards Bureau) schedules, made plain the vast possibilities existing.” “Finally,” says Schwarz, “the union asked the public prosecutor to institute criminal action against a number of plant managers who had raised wages.”

It is a curious world indeed. All this because Lenin at the outset of the Revolution, had decided to permit no interference from the trade unions and made them completely subservient tools of the state machine. He had now, as has been proved, only made them tools and running dogs of the monopoly-capitalist executioners of the working class. What a curious world!

D. THE NOOSE (Disciplinary measures)

All these things show that the analysis of the Soviet system as truly “capitalist” is not just a figure of speech. We have so far presented only the outline. The wage policy, the central management of industry, the socialist competition, the control of manpower supply, could more or less be argued as necessary features of state capitalism. Unquestionably, they have exploited labor, they have tried to extract the most out of labor with the least cost to the state; they have chained labor like owned chattel or galley slaves. These things are not pretty, but they are things capitalists have often done and would like to do,

if not curbed by the laws of civilized man. We can even say that if you want state capitalism, that is approximately what you must expect, unless democratic controls step in.

Yet there is something in the behavior of the Communist Party in Soviet Russia, both in their persecution of other parties and in their inhuman internecine slaughter, which prepares us to expect something beyond what a private capitalist’s conscience would permit. A slave driver in the old plantation days in the South was often cruel, but nobody compelled the bureaucratic Communist tycoons and their toadies to be mean, to set the world’s record for extreme exploitation of labor, to punish lateness of twenty minutes with penal servitude or to see to it that the workers did not lose a single minute at their luncheon recess. Let a man work hard and even sweat for you, but let him eat his lunch in peace. These things are abnormal, gratuitous, mean and uncalled for. Here are three instances happening to labor which amount to mysteries.

The first episode of a woman falling from a streetcar contains many mysteries and provokes many questions:

“The defendant Zotova had fallen from a streetcar on her way to work and cut her leg. She reported to work on time, had her name taken down, and announced that she was going to the plant dispensary. There she was given a paper to the effect that medical treatment had been administered and that she had refused a sickness certificate although her condition rendered her unfit for work. The plant management and the judge of the People’s Court for the 11th Moscow City District, to whom the evidence concerning Zotova’s one-hour absence from work, found the above-mentioned facts immaterial. The people’s court sentenced Zotova
to a four-month term of corrective labor at her place of employment." (Sovetskaya Yustitsiya, 1940, Nos. 21, 22, quoted by Schwarz, pp. 113-114)

Why did this woman refuse a sickness certificate? Why had not the doctor insisted on a certificate in question? Why was she sentenced to four months' penal servitude for one hour's absence during her consultation in the dispensary? Was the plant manager scared? Was the doctor scared? Was the judge himself scared?

Then there was the episode of a pregnant woman who missed a crowded train and arrived late at the factory and was dismissed:

"A woman worker, comrade Fedayayeva, sued the Moscow Bread Factory No. 5 for re-instatement before the People's Court in the Proletaskii District. F. had been fired for being more than 20 minutes late for work. The court had established that F. was pregnant and living outside the city. On her way to work she was unable to get on the overcrowded train and so arrived at work twenty minutes late. She lost fifteen more minutes in the crowded locker room of the bakery. The court decided in F.'s favor and ordered her re-instated." (Trud, Feb. 10, 1939)

In this case, the judge was not afraid, but why had the plant manager fired her? Why was he scared?

Finally there was the man who got permission to meet his wife at the railroad station and was nevertheless fired:

"On September 11th, the Moscow City Court dismissed truancy charges against the defendant B. The defendant had been sentenced by the People's Court for having left work well ahead of time, with permission from the management to meet his wife at the railroad station.
"The dismissal in this case can hardly be considered correct. We hold that in such and similar cases, action must be taken against both the plant manager who permitted the employee to leave ahead of time and the employee who left it. The management's explicit permission to commit an act of absence from work without valid reason does not free the absentee from criminal liability." (Vyshinskaya and Men'shagin, quoted by Schwarz, pp. 109-110)

In other words, who was scared? The key to the above mysteries can only be found in the atmosphere of terror prevailing in the Soviet autocracy when worse things were happening to Lenin's Old Guard. Secondly, it could only be found in the disciplinary measures and pressures on the workers and managers, doctors and judges, as they developed from the first "reform" of 1931-1932 to the second "reform" of 1938, to the crowning "reform"—the culmination—of 1940. When the Labor Decree of 1940 was issued, the noose about the captive laborer's neck was completed.

With the job freeze and the speed-up and the manager's control of workers' food and housing, it was simple enough to enforce work discipline. Yet, the matter of work discipline to prevent absence, sick leaves, sabotage, loafing on the job, was maintained with measures which do not belong to a modern civilized community. The various "reforms" of 1931-1932, 1938, 1940, were occupied with truancy, or "absence without valid reasons." The reform of 1932 was well described by Solomon M. Schwarz in his book (pp. 99-100).

"On November 15th, 1932, Section 47 of the Labor Code was thoroughly revamped. Employers were now obliged (not merely entitled as previously) to discharge 'truants' without
notice; and one day of unjustified absence sufficed. A discharged truant was to be relieved of his food cards and merchandise coupons (for rationed manufactured goods) . . . and he was to be evicted from any dwelling furnished to him by the plant. 'Instantly'—the People's Commissariat for Labor added on November 26th, 1932. He was to be evicted with his family, regardless of a lack of other accommodations, 'at any time of the year,' and even 'without providing transportation facilities.'

"The whole regulation evidently centered in the ruthless eviction clause. It was made even more stringent on June 27th, 1933; now the offender was to be evicted not only from buildings owned by his employer but also from the property of construction or housing cooperatives which had allotted him 'dwelling space' under an agreement with his employer. There are few other housing facilities available for wage and salary earners in Soviet industry, especially in the new giant plants."

The Decree of Dec. 28, 1938, carried it further. Penalties of reprimand followed by dismissal and transfer to lower-paid jobs in case of repeated offense were imposed on every kind of slackness, being late for work, quitting early for lunch, or malingering on the job. "Being late more than twenty minutes" was interpreted as "constituting unjustified absence" for one day with its dire consequences.

It was really getting mean. The penalties accompanying knocking off early for lunch or tardiness in coming back for work—that alone could make a lunch a nightmare for the workman. But Trud, Feb. 3, 1939, published the boast of a canteen manager of the Moscow Precision Tool plant, Tochizmeritel, that "lunch takes our workers from fifteen to twenty minutes." In the same union paper (Feb. 2, 1939) an assistant manager of Khar-
kov Traction Works boasted that his workers "sometimes do not get around to eating their lunch."

But we have not seen all. It was a matter between the Communist Party and the toiling masses, and the toiling masses were already held subdued, captive. Nothing was going to stop the Union of Soviet “Socialist” Republics. By 1940, more teeth were put into the disciplinary measures in the mad drive for productivity until they reached monstrous proportions. By the infamous Decree of June 26, 1940, first, “truancy” or “unjustified absence” was made a criminal offense, punishable with up to six months of corrective labor at the place of employment. This means (1) for that period the offender worked at his plant with twenty-five percent reduction in wages; (2) any infringement or disobedience was treated as in a prison, and (3) the worker’s eligibility for social benefits was forfeited. But this infamous Decree went on. It gave full government and party authorization for the matter of luncheon started in 1938, first, extending punishment for one day’s absence to lateness of twenty minutes and then extending the same kind of punishment for leaving early for lunch or coming back late from recess.

But this was not all. The work rules issued on Jan. 18, 1941, stretched “truancy” penalties to cover refusal to work overtime.

“Persons must be regarded as truants if they fail to comply with orders given by the management with regard to overtime work and to work to be done on days off . . . Today, when conditions often compel management to insist that workers put in overtime, non-compliance with such orders cannot be tolerated . . . the worker has no right to check on whether the conditions for permitting overtime work have been formally complied with. On the contrary, it is
his duty to carry out the assignments; he is liable to prosecution as a truant if he refuses, leaves the job ahead of time, or fails to report for work on a Sunday or another day off.”

As if to emphasize the grotesque character of these measures, the Presidium of the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union, forbade the introduction of evidence such as the worker’s past record issued by managers or anything that might tend to work as an extenuating circumstance.

We see now why the pregnant woman who was late for work was dismissed and why the other woman who had hurt her leg and was absent for one hour wanted to refuse a sickness certificate, because if that should happen a second time or if there should be an unavoidable delay it would make her a repeated offender. She might lose her food card, she and her children might be evicted, and she certainly would lose all her insurance benefits. With the uncertainty of interpretation of the Labor Code by the plant manager and the People’s Court, as we have seen above, she had full reason to be scared. The same was true of the plant doctors and the plant managers. The Communist Party controls not only the working class directly, but also the plant managers, the doctors and the judges themselves. The trade unions which in any other country outside the “Socialist” Republics represent and fight for the working class had become degenerate subservient tools and running dogs of the capitalists. The noose around the worker’s neck was now complete.

The complete record of Russia of the past forty years shows conclusively that, in spite of the Soviet flag, the nature of the Soviet regime is truly bourgeois-capitalist and anti-labor. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
is neither a union, because it is a completely centralized state, nor is it Soviet, because it has no free Workers' Councils, nor socialist, because it represses labor and accentuates class differences, nor a republic because it is an unlimited autocracy. The USSR stands more properly for the Union of Sweatshop Runners.

Apart from the shopworn labels, Russian society is composed actually of three social classes. According to Marxism, "classes" are defined according to their relationship to the system, the organization and the means of production, and their respective attitudes are determined by that relationship. These three classes are: (1) the ruling class, which is at the same time the owner-employer class with all its worst characteristics, like disregard of labor welfare, etc.; (2) the industrial working class, dependent entirely on the employer class for jobs, for food, and completely at their mercy; and (3) the peasantry. This complex contains many inner contradictions, for their interests are far from identical. The fiction, extremely useful to the ruling class, that they, the rulers and the ruled, are of one class does not stand up under close scrutiny, or even under a cursory glance. Everywhere the Communists rule, we see that it is not true that the rulers are thinking of the interests of the workers. On the other hand, every day we pick up the papers, we see how these contradictions of interests are ruining the Marxist theory.

Gomulka, for instance, is today in an awful dilemma of maintaining power and going anti-labor, or going out of business altogether. In the second week of April, 1958, one reads that Gomulka, true to the nature of the ruling class, is forced to solve these contradictions in favor of the employer class: the workers' councils, won in 1956,
are being changed to come under the Party secretary, the plant manager and the running-dog type of union leaders; work quotas are being revised upward exactly as in Soviet Russia, masses of workers are being put out of employment and assigned to dreaded parts of the country by decree, not by consent; the increasing voice of the workers and writers must be silenced, and the right to strike, also won in 1956, must be stopped. In Yugoslavia, they have tried to restore Workers' Councils, but it has not worked out as intended. Always the employer-exploiters have managed to secure the lion's share of the products of labor. And in every Communist country—in Poland, Hungary, Red China—the peasants fight the collectives and prefer to have their own land. Here the interests of the state or of the ruling class are directly opposite to those of the peasants. And so the problem continually arises whether to go slow on the collectives, or to yield to the people's wish, or to force the collectives down the unwilling throats of the peasants. These are the glaring conflicts of class interests which will continue to pester the Communist rulers in every country.

The simple fact is, Marxism cannot be carried out in practice. The Communist rulers know that the workers and the peasants are their natural enemies and that therefore suppression is necessary if they expect to remain in power. In theory, it is possible to imagine a working class democracy, with workers' control of industry, of their own wages and work quotas. The rulers know, however, that the moment the workers have their rights, they will press for "non-proletarian, greedy demands" for better wages, and that such demands are "class-hostile," i.e., hostile to the employer class. Any tendency to liberalization is a threat to the security of the ruling class, tied
down as it is to its love of power, comforts and privileges. No class in power is going to give that up. Hence in a Communist country, the state, in the nature of the employer-owner of labor, will and must exploit labor and suppress liberalization, as the Soviet record amply shows.

Hence no Communist government can derive its support from the workers or the peasants whose class interests are opposed to the professional revolutionists and career politicians. Every Communist government, without a single exception, derives its support from the secret police. Lenin has said well, "Force and hatred are the twin foundations of the Soviet power." It is truer than he knew when he said it.

But degradation of labor is degradation of labor, however you explain and rationalize it. The Soviet rulers, by being unwilling to throw away the antiquated labels of Socialism, are forced into a false position, a daily contradiction between their acts and their professions. If today, for instance, a Fascist dictator takes over at the Kremlin, the condition of labor can be no worse, which proves that the "Socialist" labels are entirely inconsequential and irrelevant. UFR will function just as well as USSR, and be no worse threat to the rest of the world. Are they hypocrites, then? The matter is not as simple as that, as we shall see in the next chapter.
6 But a Little Too Far

“We had the feeling that the Revolution had not been carried out in order to benefit man and enhance his dignity, but that it had succeeded in reducing man to the role of a tool.”

PIERRE COMMUN
Secretary of French Socialist Party,
on his return from the USSR

“A theater without an audience, the actors play and go into raptures over themselves. They think as automatically as they eat; their brains cook thoughts in response to the most elementary needs. This is how it is with these high priests who are simultaneously policemen and owners of all the media which the human intellect can use to communicate its thoughts . . . as well as all substance that keeps a human being alive—food and a roof over his head.”

MILOVAN DJILAS

The Soviets are nothing if not thorough. The liquidation of the kulaks had cost in the neighborhood of 10,000,000 lives. At the Yalta Conference, Churchill expressed his appreciation of the sacrifices of the Russians during the war with Hitler, and Stalin answered him that the collectivization program had cost twice that number. Exact figures are not published, but in the general estimate of writers on Soviet Russia, between deportations and the ensuing man-made famine, 5 to 10 million men lost their lives. They behave as if they were driven by a new faith
and a conviction that the more thorough-going they were in their so-called "leftist" brutality, the more they were helping to construct a socialist society. The always conscious veil of this dialectic hangs like a pall, covering up everything and justifying everything, giving comfort to their suppressed bourgeois conscience for doing things that they know are inhuman. The mystic Marxist line is conceived as something inevitable, inexorable; one must follow this line with a constant fear of deviations. They are not fanatics—I do not believe they are; they are merely in a trance. Always there is a note of Marxian "necessity," of an inexorable march toward something, somewhere. Any sensible inhibition, any tendency to go back to the original goal of emancipation of the proletariat, is immediately labelled as "Rightist Opportunism." They are caught in their words. Double-talk became rapidly double-think, and double-think, persisted in too long, became automatic double-believe.

Only this state of mind can explain the absurdities they have permitted and even encouraged in respect to child labor, woman labor and slave labor. Lenin long ago denied any essential difference between free labor and compulsory labor. All labor is, or should be, compulsory. It is a belief, a philosophic attitude regarding the purpose of existence of man in society. In such a society and in such a state, the doctrine of the free man has ceased to have any meaning whatsoever.

Manya Gordon said that productivity was a gospel of the Soviet state. It was more than a gospel; it has been, and still is, a fixation. Productivity justifies everything, excuses everything, condones everything. A crime against women, against child labor, becomes something to boast about, if it increases production. On the other hand, any
degree of laxity or human consideration in enforcing work discipline, and any loosening of the work rules in a state busily occupied in “socialist construction” becomes, in the traumatic minds of the Soviet ruling class, the manifestation of an “enemy of the people.” Totalitarianism in practice means all or nothing—total mobilization, total control, total exploitation of human power, total submerging of man in the state. It means totality of everything, including oppression. A moderate totalitarianism is a contradiction in terms.

The only inherent danger, or contradiction, in such a phenomenon of a Party state talking and working under a trance is that it rests on the false premise that man can be made not to think. Man thinks. That is something the Marxist brotherhood cannot do anything about. But if man thinks, and continues to think, the Soviet state and the whole totalitarian system is like a house built upon quicksand. That it has lasted forty years means nothing: Tsarism lasted 300 years, which did not ensure its survival in human history. A double-think man is a good circus show, like Siamese twins; a no-think man is an impossibility. This I know. For the present, while the Soviet state lasts, double-think must cover up the no-think with the appearance of think, while double-talk flourishes as a manifestation of double-think and perpetuates it.

In such a state of trance, the following absurdities have been committed against men, women and children.

First about woman labor. Women working in coal mines was prohibited in England as far back as 1842; but double-think enables the Soviet party worker to believe it is “progressive,” i.e., they are progressing somewhere, in some direction, they think.
Manya Gordon's study of fifty years of Soviet labor, 25 before Lenin and 25 after, gives such a good summary that I quote it in full (pp. 274-5):

As with night work for women, so with the enlistment of women in the heavy and hazardous occupations. . . . Before the revolution two-thirds of all the Russian women workers were in the light trades, but in 1936 less than one-third were so employed. The women workers in heavy industry—mines, metal and machine works, construction—were nearly three and a half million.

In the Communist version the presence of women in the mines and steel mills really means “their release from socially unprofitable and exhausting domestic toil.” To prove to the world that Russian women love to work in mines and foundries the Soviet poets compose ballads and sing them in public. Here is one:

Formerly women only knew how to cook soup and porridge,
Now they go to the foundry—
At the foundry it is nicer.

The new ideas on the industrial equality of women refuse to take account of physical and biological differences. Instructions from the Commissariat of National Health forbid physicians to permit women “to absent themselves from work because of diagnosed menstruation.” Kléber Legay, the French mine worker, was shocked to find women in the coal mines of Gorlovka in the Don Basin; he was told by the chairman of the regional miners’ union: “Let them rather work in the mines than practice prostitution.”

This reply was not just a happy impromptu. After 1935, when women were suddenly taken into all the heavy indus-
tries, the central committee of the Communist Party published a pamphlet for party agitators which stressed this point. The pamphlet explained that to limit the number of enterprises where women can be employed is "to swell the ranks of prostitution." But if the point of the propaganda text-book is that women must work or sell themselves, it does not endeavor to explain why in 1936 the number of women workers in light industry—textiles and needle trades—was less than half of what it was prior to 1917. All these lost jobs could not be the result of overproduction of clothes, for the citizens of Soviet Russia have been pitifully underclad. Plainly the drafting of women into the mines and foundries was inspired by the furious tempo of the Five Year Plan and the concentration on heavy industry.

The prostitution argument was introduced to silence Communist opposition to the indiscriminate employment of women and to placate the world proletariat. People in and out of Russia knew quite well that to be economically independent it is not at all necessary for women to work in the coal pits or to remain at their tasks when they are periodically ill, contrary to the opinion of the Communist physicians. The instructions of the Commissariat of National Health carry Russia back a hundred years. For that matter, it is difficult to imagine that even the Russian female serfs, once the master consulted his physician, were compelled to continue at work when the doctor found them too ill to do so. In no country where the trade unions are free would such enslavement of women be tolerated.

I am aware that a Soviet apologist can quote section and clause in the Labor Code for the protection of women, but Manya Gordon was speaking of the actual practice which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union criminally permitted and encouraged. The strange affinity of
Russian women for iron and other metals is provocative of thought and wonderment; on the assumption that Russian women are endowed with the same emotions and feelings as women in other parts of the world, it requires a more convincing explanation than that it is a better alternative than prostitution. Even more unnatural is the liking of Russian women for coal-mining, since coal dust does not make good face powder. It is hardly likely that Soviet biology can prove that it does. Prostitution after all is a woman selling her body for money; woman, and man, could do worse than that, such as selling one's mind for money, like the Soviet author Alexei Tolstoy, who frankly admitted it, or the myriads of Communist party functionaries and trade union officials. Let's not be too critical. Solomon M. Schwarz quotes the trade union paper *Trud* (Dec. 24, 1944) for this exciting information:

“In the Chelyabinsk mines (Urals), special women’s teams were set up for all coal-digging; they proved so successful that a special mine district was set aside for women in Kopeisk (near Chelyabinsk), and this women’s mine earned wide renown for its high rate of output.”

Schwarz further quotes from *Pravda* (Sept. 7, 1944) the specific boast of the Secretary of Stalino Provincial Committee of the Communist Party:

“In the pits of the Stalino Coal Combine women today represent more than one-third of all workers employed.” And a few months later, in December, 1944: “In many pits, women have become the basic, decisive power. In the various coal trusts, such as Kuibyshevugol’, Artemugol’, Sovetskugol’, the proportion of women among the total number of miners is 50 to 60 per cent.”
The statistics of percentage of women employed in the industries, light and heavy, on Nov. 1, 1939, is certainly overpowering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coal mining</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron ore mining</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron and steel</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal trades</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodworking</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The truly remarkable progress of advanced womanhood is reflected in the comparative figures for women workers in the four Five Year Plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>MILLIONS OF WOMEN EMPLOYED</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EMPLOYED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927-8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Only once," writes Schwarz, "on March 8, 1948—Pravda mentioned in passing that in 1947 the proportion of women in the total number of wage and salary earners in all branches of economy and administration amounted to 47 per cent" (Labor in the Soviet Union, p. 75).

Truly in no other country has Womanhood made such a remarkable progress or so nearly achieved Sexual Equality! In no other country, except the Soviet Union, guided by the Great Stalin, could such an Enthusiasm for Coal Dust be kindled and glow so brilliantly.

As for endurance, the ability to work consecutive shifts, the Soviet women have also proved the equality of the sexes. Soviet physiologists have proved that fatigue feel-
ing is largely “subjective,” and in this the women are the equal of men, according to a *Trud* report, May 8, 1934 (*see* Schwarz, p. 285). The “continuous week,” the seven-hour shift, the “stretch-out,” the “split shifts”—every skullduggery which the human mind can think of to exploit labour has been invented and practiced, far beyond the imagination of Karl Marx himself.

The crux of the matter, as every student of Soviet economy has pointed out, is that the wages of the male head of the family are so low that their wives are forced to go out and help earn the living for the family or let their children starve. It is all economics and the comrades know it. *Pravda* covered up the economic factor; it’s either the coal mines, or the home, and of course women prefer the former. This may be all very true except that the women of the parasitic better-paid Communist ruling class do not exhibit the same preference. Soviet ambassadors’ wives and daughters still exhibit the some bourgeois-feminine preference for crocodile handbags, Chanel No. 5 and Cadillacs. Once the arrival of a truck of women’s shoes almost caused a women’s riot in the streets of Moscow.

Amidst all the anti-socialist monstrosities, there are three acts of the Soviet state which they have to answer to humanity for. They are:

1. Making children of twelve subject to capital punishment.
2. Sending women to under-surface work in coal mines.
3. Harassing a man at his luncheon recess with threats of prison sentences (June 26, 1940) for tardiness in return to work.

If these people are “socialists,” then Tsar Nicholas II was an extreme radical. These acts do not belong even to
Tsarism, nor to the worst days of labor exploitation of the Belgian Congo mines or Dutch tin mines. They are not a blot upon the Socialist Republics alone. They are a blot upon the entire twentieth-century humanity. Any civilized man ought to be able to eat his lunch in peace.

As for exploitation of child labor, I content myself with two quotes from the authoritative and well-documented work of Manya Gordon:

Harassed by the impossible demands of the successive Five Year Plans the factory directors pocket their Socialist principles, ignore the labor laws and exploit the workers even as the capitalists did in Czarist Russia. For instance, "many minors are employed as hod carriers in the brick factories and the Siberian stone quarries, notwithstanding the fact that Soviet law forbids children to engage in this kind of work. The carts which they push often become derailed and fifteen-year-old boys are compelled to lift them, and a cartful of bricks weighs a ton and a half." The director of the quarry was fined, but the indictment continues: "Many of the minors work as stone cutters and the majority are employed not four hours but eight. The trade unions play a very ugly part in this matter. The regional committee of the brick makers' union is timid before all these facts of an abominable infringement of the child labor laws." (Komsomolskaya Pravda, Aug. 27, 1935). . . . So far as night work for children is concerned the Communists seem to have gone back sixty years. The ordinance of 1882 prohibited night work for children under 15 years of age, and the statute of June, 1885 raised the age limit to 17 years. (Workers Before and After Lenin, pp. 270-1)

But if the exploitation of labor, and particularly of children, is rampant in the factories it is much worse in the villages. Here there is not the slightest attempt to protect
the children. *Komsomolskaya Pravda* (August 4, 1935), official organ of the Communist Youth, reports that on the collectivised farms children of twelve to fourteen years work along with the adults 12 to 16 hours a day. At the Kolkhos "Red Dawn" in Northern Caucasus, "twelve-year-old boys work from dawn to dusk. Twelve-year-old boys operate the threshing machines all night." In the same region, in the Kolkhos "Politotdeletz" a twelve-year-old boy worked three days and nights and finally fell asleep in the middle of the road while driving the oxen. This was discovered and the offender was reprimanded in the local newspaper and at the meeting of the kolkhos as an idler and cheat, and he was deprived of food. In other regions "the protection of child labor is not a bit better." (*Ibid.*, p. 272)

I like to think that the saying of Jesus, "Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me," contains a sentiment which is the goal of civilization, that such a statement is universal and eternal, and that therefore the opposite does not properly belong to civilized humanity, but to an earlier barbaric state of civilization.

I have not gone into the question of slave labor in the 250 labor camps spread over all the Soviet empire. In the return of some of the over 1,000,000 Poles from the Siberian camps after the treaty with Poland of 1945, the full story of the condition of these slave labor camps has come out. There are many additional sources of information from persons who have lived through the forced labor and survived to tell the story. A little of this was told in Chapter 3 ("The Russians are Human"). Those who like to get at the facts can read the *Report of the Ad Hoc Commission on Forced Labour* of the United Nations (1953) which comes to the conclusion that slave labor
constitutes a sizable factor in the Soviet economy and economic planning. The American Federation of Labor has published its findings from interrogations with hundreds of witnesses who lived in these camps, and a detailed map of the location of the over 250 camps, some of which contain as many as 100,000 laborers. Many of these are Russians who suffered for their opinion; others are Poles, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Hungarians and Jews in the Balkan countries. The Soviet double-think ready answer is that they have no slaves, and that those deported to Siberia and Central Asia to work on gold, copper, iron and coal mines, and construct roads and canals are "criminals, assassins, traitors, spies, saboteurs, etc." The answer to this is that according to the Soviet official figures, the number of these assassins, saboteurs, traitors, spies increased by leaps and bounds coinciding, for instance, with the liquidation of independent peasants in the Ukraine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>57,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>122,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>242,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No more reliable source exists for the wholesale deportations of entire ethnic groups than Nikita Khrushchev himself. Speaking before the 20th Party Congress, Khrushchev said:

All the more monstrous are the acts whose initiator was Stalin and which are rude violations of the basic Leninist principles of the nationality policy of the Soviet state. We refer to the mass deportations from their native places of whole nations, together with all Communists and Komsomols
without any exception; this deportation action was not dictated by any military considerations.

Thus, already at the end of 1943, when there occurred a permanent break-through at the fronts of the Great Patriotic War benefiting the Soviet Union, a decision was taken and executed concerning the deportation of all the Karachai from the lands on which they lived.

In the same period, at the end of December 1943, the same lot befell the whole population of the Autonomous Kalmyk Republic. In March 1944, all the Chechen and Ingush peoples were deported and the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic was liquidated. In April 1944, all Balkars were deported to faraway places from the territory of the Kabardino-Balkar Autonomous Republic and the Republic itself was renamed the Autonomous Kabardian Republic.

The Ukrainians avoided meeting this fate only because there were too many of them and there was no place to which to deport them. Otherwise, he would have deported them also. (Laughter and animation in the hall.)

Not only a Marxist-Leninist but also no man of common sense can grasp how it is possible to make whole nations responsible for inimical activity, including women, children, old people, Communists and Komsomols, to use mass repression against them, and to expose them to misery and suffering for the hostile acts of individual persons or groups of persons.

According to Boris I. Nicolaevsky, Khrushchev omitted the mention of deportation of populations of two republics to Siberia and Kazakhstan, i.e., the Autonomous Volga Germans and the Crimean Republics.
If this is true, as true it must be, one can estimate the figures.

Kabardian-Balkars 180,000
Kalmyks 220,000
Crimean Tartars 250,000
Chechens & Ingush 490,000
Volga Germans 400,000
1/4 Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians 550,000
Poles 1,500,000
Ukrainians 5,000,000*

8,590,000

* Orlov's estimate, 5 to 7 millions.

If a fraction of these deported, plus what the Communist Party please to call "assassins, traitors, saboteurs, spies" from Mother Russia itself, the figures should easily run to over 10,000,000.

Sufficient has been said that in main Russia itself, labour has been made compulsory, both by law and by actual economic pressure, that labour has been held captive and its exploitation has gone beyond anything in the history of capitalist society. And everywhere in the Soviet colonies and semi-colonies, the shooting of socialist and peasant leaders and the repression of labour have followed the same identical pattern, enforced by the same technique. A new slavery has arisen side by side with the new parasitic bourgeoisie.

It has always seemed to me that back of the Soviet problem is a universal problem: What is man? Is there a purpose in human existence, or intrinsic value in human life, or is he just a tool of the state? It has also seemed to me that the degradation of labor in Soviet Russia, Russian colonies and Red China requires a little more world at-
tention than it has enjoyed so far. Communism has laid claim to a global role in its doctrine of World Revolution. But democracy, too, has a universal message. It is the Doctrines of the Common Man, the Free Man and the Universal Man. What distinguishes specifically the modern world, as against the mediaeval society, is the general acceptance that the common man has his rights. We pride ourselves as being modern exactly upon the continuing fight against aristocracy and privilege and the increasing freedom and equality of all men. And this progress marks the history not only of any one country, but is a universal historical movement of all mankind which cannot be stopped.

So phrased, the Doctrines of the Common Man, the Free Man and the Universal Man make the condition of Soviet labor everybody's business. What is happening to Soviet labor, Chinese labor, Polish labor is the subject of legitimate inquiry of every citizen of the modern world. While the heads of governments are indulging so much in long correspondence, I think the subject of the conditions of Soviet labor should be the first to be taken up with Russia. President Eisenhower should write long letters discussing the matter with Gomulka and Kadar and Khrushchev, showing his deep concern in the welfare of Soviet workers and exploring various avenues by which the repressive labor legislation can be changed, Soviet trade unions can be considerably improved and brought in line with modern practice, and in general the pitiful conditions of the Russian workmen and their wives can be brought up to the standard of the capitalist countries. Khrushchev might angrily reply that the way we increase the workers' wages, the U. S. Government is nothing but Bolshevik. On the other hand, having nothing closer to his
heart than the welfare of the workers, Khrushchev might conceivably evince the keenest and liveliest response to such a suggestion. President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles, might, with as much tact and sensitiveness as possible, sound out Soviet reaction to a delegation composed of George Meany, Walter Reuther and others, together with selected representatives of the International Labor Office, to go on a tour of inspection of the USSR and advise, through mutual consultations, on the ways and means to bring up the relatively feudalistic conditions of Soviet labor and peasant to the level of the monopoly-capitalists. The British Labor Party might contribute Attlee or Bevan to go along, and to make the gesture of peace and mutual understanding as painless as possible, the labor experts of Holland, Sweden and even Czechoslovakia (which had very advanced labor legislation and organization under Eduard Benes) should be also represented. It should not be a play of words, or conceived as propaganda, but should aim at working out concrete measures for increasing the voice, the strength and the independence of the working class which the Communist saint-philosopher Karl Marx ever wished to be the goal of human evolution.

To me, the sight of Walter on the Volga, haranguing the workers of Stalingrad, would be a great event and would do much to bring the East and West closer together. However desirable cultural exchanges may be, the exchange of experts on union labor seems much more important if we mean to do our bit to help the progress of mankind in the reactionary anti-labor countries. I do hope that Soviet Russia, having come through thesis and antithesis, is now humble and ready for synthesis. Walter Reuther should make an excellent catalytic agent.
7 They’ve Got Class and Money

“… The difference between the pay of qualified and unqualified labor is of such a colossal magnitude as does not exist in western Europe.”

M. P. Tomsky
Soviet 7th Trade Union Congress, 1928

“The restaurants are open again, and the Soviet press is filled with advertisements for the benefit of those with cash, such as have not been seen since the times of the ancien regime. These ads give the addresses and phone numbers of de luxe night clubs, praise the quality of their jazz, and invite their customers to spend gay nights there. Dancing, champagne, the rarest liquors. Other ads offer fancy perfumes for the ladies at two hundred rubles a tiny bottle (Izvestia, Feb. 4, 1936) and dolls for children at ninety-five rubles each (Izvestia, Feb. 2, 1936). One enterprising restaurant—the workers’ fatherland must ‘catch up and overtake capitalism’—offers to organize banquets, official or private, for which it will deliver everything, including the servants. A simple phone call—and the lackeys of the State will serve you up a dinner in your own apartment at 200-300 a plate.”

M. Yvon
l’URSS, telle qu’elle est

“The left-wingers do not understand that money and monied economy will remain with us for a long time.”

Stalin (June, 1931)
The last quote is the first sensible thing which Stalin has said and about the only honest thing he ever said.

The subjugation and de facto enslavement of labor has been told in the preceding chapter for its own sake, as the first subject to be investigated with regard to the claim of the Soviet Union to be called "leftist" or "pro-labor." But it requires an explanation and leads to the question, What had caused it? The explanation must be reasonable, human, understandable and adequate.

Nobody planned it. It just grew, developed by group human interests. These are the human interests of the upper class, the desires for comfort, privilege, climb to power and maintenance of power and security—desires which are common to all of us. Put in extreme simple terms, it is the desire to be on the top, and to live better than one's fellowmen. In so far as these desires are deep-seated in human nature, eternal and universal, the development of the new bourgeoisie class in Soviet Russia may be said to be unavoidable. As Djilas says in The New Class, "everything has happened exactly contrary to predictions," "nothing of the original Marxism has remained," and "not a single goal has been achieved."

What set out to be a classless society has developed into an all-powerful, privileged, luxuries-loving autocratic class on the one hand, and an oppressed class who have only the duty to work and no rights, on the other. Karl Marx did not plan this; he based his Utopia on a ridiculously childish view of human nature. Sharp and thorough-going in his analysis on the necessity of hatred and destruction, he was vague and naive to the extreme in his assumptions of the prospect of a classless society. Nothing is more downright childish than to say that in the great complex of a modern industrial society (and
this is what he was looking ahead for) there would be no need of government, or the government would be an administration by entirely unselfish and dedicated individuals; or to assume that if there was no class, the state would just "naturally" and automatically "wither away." Such childish simplicity is like saying that there is no need for traffic lights in an era of automobiles if all the drivers love one another. Such is the simplicity of the official Communist formula, "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs." The first half is fine, the second half suggests arrested mental development. Try to picture to yourself what you would like to have, and you realize how fantastic the whole haunting dream of Communism has been. Marx claims his doctrines to be "scientific Communism," as opposed to "Utopian Socialism," but it is Utopian all the same. The facts of the Soviet development prove it.

So the whole development of a new aristocracy and a new slavery just grew. Karl Marx and even Lenin failed to foresee the growth of the new aristocracy—the political bureaucrat (I feel the need of this word to denote bureaucracy as a social class). Stalin, the realist, saw it and obedient to reality, deliberately nurtured it into being.

Sympathetic travelers in the Soviet Union, Socialist leaders, liberals, men who are interested in the working conditions of the poor, have repeatedly visited the Soviet Union. The contrast of red plush and black bread (the title of Marguerite Higgins' book) has struck every observer from the 1930's up to the present. Their verdict is unanimous. Of course, the most foolish thing the Soviet government did was to show these liberal thinkers the de luxe dinners and great edifices; what these men were primarily interested in was how the poor lived. These
were trained observers who had an eye, not for the red carpets in the hotel rooms, nor the luxurious layouts immediately behind their hotel windows, but just a little further out where the wooden shacks stood and the poor lived.

André Philip, French Socialist and professor of political economy at Lyons University, who visited Moscow in 1936, says:

"In the middle there are great avenues with luxurious hotels, but all around there is a network of unpaved streets with wooden shacks, roofed with metal sheets. The fountain is at one corner of the street, and it is there that the housewives go to fetch water."

And this is the country which has scientifically advanced enough to send up a sputnik. The simplest summing of the economy of the USSR is in two words: *sputnik* and *hunger*.

One should always remember what the October Revolutionists had promised. Lenin promised the Russian people immediately after the Revolution: "All official persons, without exception, will be paid at a rate not exceeding the wage of a competent worker." The most embarrassing thing is, they are compelled to continue to promise the same thing for some unforeseeable future.

Oscar Pollak, editor of the Vienna Social Democratic *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, who visited the Soviet Union in 1955, observed: "One rides in automobiles, the other in overcrowded streetcars. One lives in new apartment houses, the other in old wooden shacks." Of course, Soviet Russia has built a lot of great new buildings. During the brief spell of freedom in Poland, 1956, Radio Warsaw read a letter from a listener: "Why is it that families must share
apartments and live in dingy holes? Somebody should explain why we are building palaces of culture, cinemas and theatres, but not apartment houses. When flats are built, they are given to directors, managers, or Army officers, but not to us workers.”  

The best summary is that by M. Yvon, a quotation from whose book is given at the head of the chapter. He was a French worker who lived for eleven years not only in Moscow, but in all parts of the Soviet Union, in Siberia, Turkestan as well as on the banks of the Volga, as worker, foreman, plant chief and director. Yvon has some interesting things further to say about the inequality of pay:

“The position of the new masters is incomparably superior to that of the other strata of the population. They receive ten to twenty times as much income as the other workers. They get the best apartments and the right to larger dwelling space; furnishings are often free; watering places and first-class beaches are at their disposal . . . They travel in ‘soft’ and ‘international’ trains (the Soviet terms for first class and parlor cars); official business is a frequent pretext for free tickets. And then they have first call on ‘secret funds’, the use of which is permitted to help important people out of difficulties. In case of sickness, they receive the best care in first-class hospitals, naturally at no expense to themselves.

1 These quotes from travelers are taken from Anatole Shub, Labor in the Soviet Orbit (New Leader, 1956), a brief but excellent presentation of the question of Soviet labor.

2 His work, L’URSS, telle qu’elle est, appeared in a shorter version, Ce qu’est devenue la révolution Russe. The latter, the shorter version, has been translated into English and issued by International Review, 1937, as What Has Become of the Russian Revolution? but is now not easily obtainable. I have the French version, published as No. 15, Spartacus, March 1947.
... Cars and chauffeurs or carriages and drivers are free and replaceable, since they are attached to the job and not to the job-holder, who has a larger and larger use of them. The opportunities for personal savings are very few, but savings are no longer necessary where one's job is a better guarantee of a high standard of living than a bank account."

Trotsky says in *The Revolution Betrayed* (p. 142), that 15 to 20% of the population enjoy as much of the nation's wealth as all the rest.

Perhaps the matter is simpler than that. It is not necessary to speak of the “exploiting class” and the “exploited” and the “oppressor” and the “oppressed.” In the eyes of the common people under Soviet rule, it is just *rich* and *poor*. After all, the Polish revolt in late 1956 carried the banner “For Bread and Freedom.” It was just hunger. Hungry men do not use fine words like “oppressor” and “oppressed.” It was more elementary than that. That is why the Polish Revolt and the Hungarian Revolt were so significant. The Russian March Revolution forcing the abdication of the Tsar started with women marching to protest hunger. The French Revolution broke out with cries for bread. That is why the Polish poet quoted in the first chapter pleaded for “rooms with windows” and “locks that fit.” That this is so may be seen in the following episode in the famous Poznan trials:

At the second trial, nineteen-year-old Janusz Kulas said he had joined the demonstration because he had learned in school that workers should struggle to improve their living conditions. Noting that court officials' salaries were three times his own, Kulas said that this was a case of the “*rich trying the poor*."

---

They've Got Class and Money
Hunger was what caused the downfall of the Tsarist empire. Hunger plus NKVD is what has kept the Russian state so far going. There can be no NKVD without hunger, but the reverse is also true, there can be no hunger without NKVD or the state will fall apart. Hunger continues to make NKVD necessary; more hunger, more NKVD. That is about the general situation which the Soviet state is in today—a terrible conflict that some day has to be resolved by no other means except violence. The hand that rules just cannot let go its whip, any more than the trainer in a lions’ cage. God have pity upon him! He dare not.

Let us not get away from the grim fact. We are dealing with elemental human emotions. “Sad people write sad poems,” says Guyla Hay at a session of the Writers’ Union in Budapest (Nov. 10, 1955). Zelk had written “sad poems only because he had seen sad people on the streets.”

The matter is as simple as that.

How then can capital have accumulated so far that the Soviet Union could assign hundreds of millions of dollars for tanks, artillery, submarines and sputniks, side by side with an appalling hunger of the masses? The answer lies in a statement by Stalin quoted in the beginning of the chapter and in the assertion of Molotov in 1932: “It is necessary to oppose vehemently all those who believe that socialism means production for use.” Molotov did not explain socialism should mean production for what else. The reader can well spend several days puzzling out the answer. It is an interesting puzzle.

So socialism is (1) not equality in use and enjoyment of the products of labor, according to Stalin, and (2) not production for use, according to Molotov. Neither the coarse Stalin nor the reserved and severe-looking Molotov
ever exhibited a true sense of humor. It is bad for Molotov not to have a sense of humor, now that he is in Outer Mongolia.

The fight against "egalitarianism" was led by Stalin from 1930 on, as has been already mentioned in the first chapter. He explicitly revised the official Communist formula "to each according to his needs" and made it read "to each according to his deeds" (see Party History). In this Stalin shows himself to be a realist, as hardboiled as a Wall Street financier. In other words, Stalin did not believe in the nonsense that no monetary incentive for work was necessary to any man, whether public functionary or humble worker, except an abstract "love of the Revolutionary masses." What he called the "left-wing scatterbrains" thought that the love of the Revolutionary masses was sufficient incentive. It did not work, and as Stalin has said, their "infantile exercises" had been "injurious" to industry. The important thing, the realistic thing is to differentiate the pay and personal income and widen the gap, making pay the incentive as in capitalist countries. The Stakhanov movement with its vast differentiation in money payments was the extreme development of this drive for inequality as a means of speeding up production. Both in his dictum about money and in his recognition of the necessity of providing money incentives for work, Stalin was sound and correct. Trotsky wrote that Stalin had a contempt for ideas and Djilas wrote that careful search indicated that Stalin had never read Das Kapital! He has my respect. He should make a first-class president of General Motors.

"Statistics are a weapon in the fight for Communism," announced the Communist Party in 1930 when it purged the Statistical Bureaus. The proper purpose of statistics
should not be to find out the facts, but to make the facts presented in such a way as to serve Communism. Everything, from art, literature, science to statistics and even the workers' insurance benefits have become a "weapon" ("We have made out of social insurance a weapon in the struggle for the increase of the productivity of labor," declared Trud, April 11, 1934—obviously by depriving slack workers of insurance benefits). This sounds like Gogol. Like good genuine borsch, it cannot be imitated, cannot be copied. Leonard E. Hubbard says in Soviet Trade and Distribution (p. 368), "No statistics of any kind are issued dealing with prices, currency, housing, cost of living and a number of other phenomena which are indispensable to a true evaluation of any economic system." Solomon M. Schwarz has pointed out that whenever the Soviet government publishes "average" wage, it never publishes the differentiated wages for the different classes from the director down to the lowest paid, but lumps them together to raise the average. However, there are trade papers, actual records of prices and wages and Soviet economic publications, which have been ferreted out and painstakingly put together by the indefatigable labors of Leonard E. Hubbard, Manya Gordon, Solomon M. Schwarz, Harry Schwartz and others. My work here is mainly one of condensation and presentation of their material in clear visual forms. There are also two very able and excellent brief presentations by Peter Meyer in Soviet Union: a New Class Society (Politics, Mar.-Apr., 1944) and Anatole Shub Labor in the Soviet Orbit (1956). The following statistics under (A) and (B) are taken from Peter Meyer's pamphlet.

1 Quoted by Manya Gordon, p. 386.
A. WAGES


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One week's food</td>
<td>3.5 rubles</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly wage</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66 (2.5+ times)</td>
<td>245 (10 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of food</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>172 (1.72 times)</td>
<td>1,499 (15 times)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of real wages</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>154 (1.54 times)</td>
<td>68 (⅓ decrease)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing the Food Index and Monetary Wage over 1913 to 1937.](image)
(Note that 1929 is the year when the program of the First Five Year Plan really began. Workers' wages had improved after NEP, 1921.)

2. *Basic Average Wage* (based on Hubbard and Florinsky, as compiled by Meyer; directors' pay lumped together with workers')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>37.5 r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(estimated) 1939</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Index of prices</th>
<th>Index of monetary wages</th>
<th>Index of real wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2248</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **INEQUALITY**


**1937 MONTHLY WAGES**

- Housemaid: 50-60 rubles
- Workers: 110-400 (usually 150-250)
- Minor officials: 110-300 (usually 130-225)
- Middling officials and technicians: 300-1000
- "Responsible ones": 1500-10,000 (often 20,000-30,000)
They’ve Got Class and Money

5. *Donet Basin Mine* (with 1535 employees) in 1935 (based on *Trud*, January 20, 1936)

- 1000 persons: 125 rubles monthly
- 400 persons: 500-800
- 75 persons: 800-1000
- 60 persons: 1000-25,000

6. Leon Sedov, *New International* February 1936: “There is hardly an advanced capitalist country where the difference in workers’ wages is as great as at present in the USSR . . . One could show without difficulty that the wages of the privileged layers of the working class are 20 times higher, sometimes even more, than the wages of the poorly paid layers . . . Ostrogliadov, the head engineer of a pit, gets 8600 rubles a month; and he is a modest specialist, whose wages cannot, therefore, be considered exceptional. Thus, engineers often earn from 80 to 100 times as much as an unskilled worker.”

7. Anatole Shub, in *Labor in the Soviet Orbit* (p. 24) quotes “An October 1934 study” showing:
2% more than 500 rubles (wage earners and salaried workers in Soviet industry)
79% less than 240 rubles (a third of them less than 120 rubles)

8. Directors' Fund (since April 19, 1936). This fund is composed of 4% of earnings provided by the Plan and 50% of earnings in excess of Plan. The figures are for a plant in Kharkov.

![Bonus Distribution Chart]

1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Secretary</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Production Office</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Clerical Staff</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman of Union</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the rest put together</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60,000 r. divided as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1943</th>
<th>RED ARMY</th>
<th>U.S. ARMY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private 10 rubles</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant 1000</td>
<td>150 (3 times that of private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel 2400</td>
<td>333 (6.6 times)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 10 rubles = $1.25

C. THE BUREAUCRATIC

10. Growth of Bureaucrat (based on David J. Dallin, The Real Soviet Russia, 1944, p. 128 and pp. 97-98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>1917-1918</th>
<th>1,000,000 persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The growth of the large class of bureaucracy was due to the growth of Party control of all aspects of the Soviet life, but was also encouraged by the offers of better and more attractive income and standard of living to the bureaucracy. Below is the distribution of national income among different classes of the Russian population, which means the share of each class in the enjoyment of
the national products of labor, contrasting rather sharply with the percentage of population represented by each class. For the year 1940:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF INCOME</th>
<th>IN BILLION RUBLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government employees (12-14%)</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>38.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers (20-22%)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasants (53%)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced labor (8-11%)</td>
<td>2-3%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be remembered that the richer group are guaranteed the right of inheritance by the Soviet Constitution of 1936 and they can also invest in State loans with attractive interest.

11. Bureaucrat in the Farm. The invasion of the bureaucrat which constitutes the Party and administrative staff of the collectives is horrifying, according to Dallin's
figures (pp. 172-173). "Neither Russia nor any other country had ever had such a huge swarm of officials." As I read these figures, it amuses me to picture a village somewhere in the vast Russian steppes, with two or three farmhouses, some two dozen sheep, and at the entrance to the village, huddled in a small room, a dozen executives of the kolkhoz.

1938

| Chairmen and vice chairmen of collectives | 384,389 |
| Bookkeepers                          | 248,390 |
| Chairmen of inspection committees    | 232,431 |

Total nearly: 1,000,000

In addition: 1,530,000

| Chauffeurs and mechanics employed in tractor stations | 2,530,000 |

D. Taxes

12. Income Tax. Meanwhile, the Stalinist spirit of inequality cannot be better expressed than in the matter of taxation. So far as income tax is concerned, and if this were the only consideration, all millionaires should establish residence in Moscow, for there is a flat income tax of 13%, while the tax on the poor man's consumer goods is 80% to 300% (cf. Harry Schwartz, Russia's Soviet Economy p. 419). The scale is such that workers whose pay is under 150 rubles are exempt; from 150-500 the tax scale progresses from 5 1/2% to 8%. There is a jump to 10% for those earning 500-700. From that point on the better paid are favored by a practical standstill in the scale. Employees earning from 700-1000 are taxed 12%; the rise in tax above 1000 is only a difference of 1%, that is,
the tax is 13%. From that point on, all employees earning a thousand a month beginning with party functionaries and going on to engineers who earn five to eight thousand, factory managers and higher party officials who earn ten, twenty, thirty thousand, and still higher up, those who earn fifty, eighty, one hundred thousand a month, are taxed a flat 13%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. ANNUAL INCOME IN THOUSAND DOLLARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. INCOME TAX 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR INCOME TAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR MONTHLY SALARIES IN THOUSAND RUBLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Turnover Tax. Perhaps the most revealing thing is the difference in taxes on luxuries and on the essentials of living like food and clothing for the poor, according to F. Forest, *New International* January 1943. Here are a few items on the sales tax on necessities and luxuries:

100% on cotton goods
300% on bread
50% on silk

To U.S. and British citizens who are used to paying exorbitant luxury tax on leather and silk goods this borders on insanity, or suggests fantasy from the Arabian nights. Or if the Russian practice is the normal thing or
represents the future of mankind, then Khruschev should write a letter to President Eisenhower denouncing his administration as Communism pure and simple in its taxation system. It is well known that the English aristocracy has already been taxed out of existence. Now we find the correct answer to Molotov's famous question that Socialism cannot possibly mean production for use. The question is, Use for whom? If one looks at the tax system, one can see that the production for use of cotton-stockinged women is penalized while production for the use of silk-stockinged ladies is encouraged. This is also borne out by the fact in the increase of production of luxury goods over the increase of production of necessities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of Increase of Production Between 1932 and 1936</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Cotton Fabrics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bearing out the statement by F. Forest quoted above on the percentage of tax on poor man's necessities, I give here a few items listed by Harry Schwartz (p. 417).
### Wheat and Rye
- Selling Price: 75-76

### Meat
- Selling Price: 63-69

### Butter and Eggs
- Selling Price: 70-75

### Dairy Products
- Selling Price: 50-62

### Textiles, Knit Goods
- Selling Price: 74.2

#### (E) SAVINGS

14. Perhaps the most astounding thing is the percentage of savings deposits held by the top ten thousand of the so-called Socialist State. As a matter of fact, the average poor worker has no opportunity to save anything. The fact remains, however, that "10% of all savings depositors owned two thirds of the value of all deposits" according to Harry Schwartz, who gives the following table (*Russia's Soviet Economy*, p. 435):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF ACCOUNT</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF DEPOSITORS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF SAVINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 100 rubles</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-1,000 rubles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000 rubles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

![Pie chart](NATIONAL_SAVINGS_DEPOSITS)
There is no need to rack our brains over this puzzle. The above facts are not astounding at all if Soviet Russia frankly admits that it is not a workers' state, but a bourgeois-capitalist state.

It is clear, then, that we have here in present Soviet Russia a bourgeois-capitalist society rather of the stark kind. Why have Soviet rulers been forced to tread the road of reaction? The answer is given by Milovan Djilas in his book *The New Class* (Praeger, 1958). Djilas was Vice-President of Yugoslavia under Tito, but is now in jail for writing an article in the *New Leader* on the Hungarian Revolution. Djilas has proved to be the conscience of Communism. His book is of historical importance in the development of Marxist theory because of its basic analysis of the implications of the Soviet experiment, and because it is the result of a great mind grappling with the implications and their ideological significance. It is different from other books written by those who have renounced Communism in that he is a theoretician, trained in Communist thought. Its greatest characteristic is the fierce honesty of a searching mind facing up to inevitable, regrettable conclusions. Its style is sober and abstract, its language succinct and packed with thought rather than eloquent, but for that reason the book carries the cumulative weight of a creeping dinosaur. What he writes is the dirge of Marxism.

It is perhaps possible to summarize and group the more central ideas of his book in a few pages. Because of its importance, I shall try.

(1) "Almost nothing remained of original Marxism . . . only a residue of formalism and dogmatism remained of Marxist dialectics and materialism; this was used for the purpose of cementing power, justifying tyranny, and violating human conscience" (p. 9). "No other
revolutions promised so much and accomplished so little” (p. 31). “In practice, nothing is done according to Marx” (p. 104). “Of the former international proletariat, only words and empty dogmas remain” (p. 174). “The development of the economy in Communism is . . . but a reflection of the development of the regime from a revolutionary dictatorship to a reactionary despotism” (p. 103).

(2) The New Class. “. . . The Communist Revolution, conducted in the name of doing away of classes has resulted in the most complete authority of any single new class. Everything else is a sham and an illusion” (p. 36). “The new class is really a new class, with a special composition and a special power. By any scientific definition of a class . . . even a Marxist definition. . . a new class of owners and exploiters is in existence” (p. 54). “More than anything else, the essential aspect of contemporary Communism is the new class of owners and exploiters” (p. 58). “This new class, the bureaucracy, or more accurately the political bureaucracy . . .” (p. 38).

“The new class may be said to be made up of those who have special privileges and economic preference because of the administrative monopoly they hold” (p. 39). “The specific characteristic of this new class is its collective ownership” (p. 54). “Ownership is nothing other than the right of profit and control. If one defines class benefits by this right, the Communist states have seen, in the final analysis, the origin of a new form of ownership or of a new ruling and exploiting class” (p. 35). “The Com-

1 Official Marxism defines classes according to their relation to the system of production, to the means of production, and their enjoyment of the products of labor. See Nikolai Bukharin, Historical Materialism, 1926, p. 282.
2 Here it shows the need of a new term “bureaucariat,” which I have suggested, i.e., the political bureaucracy as a class, differing from other bureaucracies and endowed with autocratic powers.
communist bureaucracy has been compelled to establish a type of economic system designed to insure the perpetuation of its own power" (p. 104). "... The new regime also regulates all political, labor, and other relationships and, what is more important, distributes the national income and benefits and distributes material goods ..." (p. 34). "All changes initiated by the Communist chiefs are dictated first of all by the interests and aspirations of the new class" (p. 64). "The class grows stronger, while the party grows weaker; that is the inescapable fate of any Communist Party in power" (p. 40).

(3) Definition of Contemporary Communism. "Contemporary Communism is that type of totalitarianism which consists of three basic factors which control people. The first is power, the second ownership, the third ideology" (p. 166). At first, when Communism was only an ideology, "it was almost impossible to see through it completely" (p. 166). "The moment came ... that of its maturity. It then became possible to reveal the nature of its power, ownership and ideology" (p. 166). It is unique. "Contemporary communism has its own essence (the three basic factors) which does not permit it to be confused with any other ... while absorbing into itself all kinds of other elements—feudal, capitalist, and even slave-owning" (p. 172).

Djilas' book analyses the three factors. Collective ownership is a mere "legal fiction"; it owns labor and all means of production; it is a monopoly of property and labor. Power is necessary to maintain the class interests of the new class. The thirst for power is insatiable; it must destroy everything it does not possess. For that reason it enslaves labor and attacks peasantry, has a "superstitious fear" of the latter; to maintain power, it is necessary to
control the judiciary, and police, and makes loopholes in law for itself; the Communist government is in a "perpetual civil war" with the people it controls. *Ideology* has "run its course"; it "has nothing new to say"; the people are in despair and in deep discontent; the rulers are confused and degenerate. This general position is developed as follows.

(4) *Monopoly ownership.*—*Because of state ownership, this nature was concealed.* "For a long time, the Communist revolution and the Communist system have been concealing their real nature" (p. 47). "... even the terms 'socialist,' 'social,' and 'state' property denote a general legal fiction" (p. 65). "As defined by Roman law, property constitutes the use, enjoyment, and disposition of material goods. The Communist political bureaucracy uses, enjoys and disposes of nationalized property" (p. 44). "This is the relationship between the monopolists of administration, who constitute a narrow and closed stratum and the mass of producers (farmers, workers and intelligentsia) who have no rights" (p. 45). "The monopoly which the new class establishes in the name of the working class over the whole society is, primarily, a monopoly over the working class itself... this is the biggest deception the class must accomplish" (p. 42). "The borderline between work in the labor camps and work in factories was almost eliminated" (p. 106). *This monopoly is necessary.* "To divest Communists of their ownership rights would be to abolish them as a class. To compel them to relinquish their other social powers so that workers may participate in sharing the profits of their work... would mean the Communists are being deprived of their monopoly over property, ideology and government" (p. 45). "In the Communist system, nothing
is done to aid the working people, particularly the working class, to attain power and rights. It cannot be otherwise" (p. 79). "The claim that it is a dictatorship of the proletariat becomes an empty slogan" (p. 79). "Is there then any sense in talking about the dictatorship of the proletariat under Communism?" (p. 83).

(5) Power. "—It has created a closed economic system with forms of property which facilitate the party's domination and its monopoly. At first, the Communists had to turn to 'collectivistic' form for objective reasons . . . later they did it for the purpose of maintaining their absolute control and domination. That is the real reason for such far-reaching and inflexible political measures in the Communist economy" (p. 105). \textit{It will never be given up.} "Ideas, philosophic principles and moral considerations, the nation and the people, their history, in part even ownership—all can be changed and sacrificed. But not power" (p. 170). \textit{For that reason} "Communism has to be totalitarian, exclusive and isolated" (p. 170). "The reasons for this autarchy lie in the character of its government and leadership" (p. 121). "The thirst for power is insatiable and irresistible among Communists" (p. 81). "The new class is voracious and insatiable" (p. 60). "Because of its totalitarianism and monopolism, the new class finds itself unavoidably at war with everything which it does not administer or handle and must deliberately aspire to destroy or conquer it" (p. 56).

(6) \textit{(Exploitation)} \textit{For that reason, it is against labor.} "Under Communism, compulsory labor has remained a permanent feature" (p. 106). "The worker finds himself in the position of having not only to sell his labor; he must sell it under conditions which are beyond his control, since he is not able to seek another, better employer"
"The labor force is indirectly the property of that (ruling) group" (p. 108). Djilas mentions the various penalties for quitting jobs, lateness etc. (p. 111). "Working conditions in various enterprises, or the connection between wages and profits, are of no concern to the bureaucracy" (p. 108). "The standard of living is the last concern of the new owners" (p. 115).

(7) For the same reason it must attack peasantry. It hates everything it does not own. This leads to "imposing of low wages and the pillaging of peasants through the compulsory crop-purchase system" (p. 116). "The new class felt insecure, as long as there were any owners except itself. It could not risk sabotage in food supplies or in raw agricultural materials. This was the direct reason for the attack on peasantry... this was done through the kolkhozes (collectives) and machine tractor stations... as the result, bureaucracy mushroomed in the villages too" (p. 56). "Collectivization was a frightful and devastating war" (p. 57). "The new class has succeeded in making vassals of the peasants and grabbing a lion's share of the peasants' income" (p. 63).

(8) It must also attack and subjugate the judiciary. "The Communist state cannot be a lawful state, or a state in which the judiciary would be independent of the government, and in which laws could be actually enforced" (p. 88). "An independent judiciary and the rule of law would inevitably make it possible for an opposition to appear" (p. 88) which cannot be tolerated. "Laws in the Communist system guarantee all sorts of rights to citizens... in practice there is no such thing" (p. 88). Communist laws leave loopholes for the rulers; such loopholes are "hostile propaganda" and "enemies of socialism" which are exceptions to all laws and purposely not de-
They've Got Class and Money

fined (p. 89). The Communists trampled on their laws in the Poznan trials. “Occupying and colonial powers seldom take such severe measures” (p. 91). “Modern history has no record of actions against the opposition of the masses which are so brutal, inhuman and unlawful as those of the Communist regimes” (p. 91). “It has been impossible in practice to separate police authority from judicial authority. Those who arrest also judge and enforce punishment. The circle is closed; the executive, the legislative, the investigative, the court, and the punishing bodies are one and the same” (p. 89). On parliament: “Communist parliaments are justifiably called ‘mausoleums’ for the representatives who compose them. Their right and role consist of unanimously approving from time to time that which has already been decided for them from the wings” (p. 94).

(g) Ideological disintegration.—This totalitarian regime has resulted in a number of contradictions, in misery, despair and resentment among the masses, and confusion and degeneracy among the ruling privileged class.

(a) For the masses: “The new class actually seized the lion’s share of the economic and other progress earned by the sacrifices of the masses” (p. 50). “In the Communist system, insecurity is the way of life for the individual. The state gives him an opportunity to make a living but on the condition that he submit” (p. 98). It is interesting to note that Djilas who himself lives in the Communist countries quotes foreign observers like André Philip, Edward Crankshaw and Harry Schwartz as neutral authorities on the desperate situation of the masses (p. 115).

(b) For the ruling class: “The discrepancy between legal and actual conditions means that the words of the
leading group do not correspond to its actions” (p. 65). “This . . . is the source of the new class’s biggest internal difficulties . . . while promising to abolish social differences, it must always increase them by acquiring the products of the nation’s workshop and granting privilege to its adherents” (p. 66). “Completely dominant, the ruling class has begun to abandon and lose the ideology, the dogma which brought it to power” (p. 161). “The ruling class will not be able to preserve its dogma” (p. 161). “Communism as an ideology has mainly run its course. It does not have many new things to reveal to the world” (p. 167). Consequently, speaking of the creative artist, “the greatest minds have lost their direction, faith, and powers. Suicide, despair, alcoholism and debauchery, the loss of internal powers and integrity because the artist is forced to lie to himself and to others—these are the most frequent phenomena in the Communist system . . .” (p. 144). The new class is “a class with very limited views, views which are false and unsafe. Closely ingrown . . .” (p. 69).

Djilas is finest, writing with intellectual and moral passion, when he discusses the moral turpitude, emptiness and corruption of the ruling class. He comes back to it again and again because it bothers him, tortures him. “By stifling the consciousness of others, and by emasculating human intellect so that it cannot take courage and soar, they themselves become gray, barren of ideas, and completely lacking in the intellectual enthusiasm that disinterested meditation inspires. A theater without an audience: the actors play and go into raptures over themselves. They think as automatically as they eat; their brains cook thoughts in response to the most elementary needs. This
is how it is with these high priests who are simultaneously policemen and owners of all the media which the human intellect can use to communicate its thoughts—press, movies, radio, television, books and the like—as well as of all substance that keeps a human being alive—food and a roof over his head” (pp. 133-134).

Once Communist comrades were different, devoted, enthusiastic, clever fighters, attached to each other not only by ideas and common sufferings, but also by a selfless love, comradeship, solidarity (p. 153), and so on for two pages. It is one of the most convincing passages of the whole book. But now, after the gain of power, they have lost themselves. “. . . They become self-centered cowards without ideas or comrades, willing to renounce everything—honor, name, truth, and morals—in order to keep their place in the ruling class and the hierarchical circle. The world has seen few heroes as ready to sacrifice and suffer as the Communists were on the eve of and during the revolution. It has probably never seen such characterless wretches and stupid defenders of arid formulas as they become after attaining power” (p. 155).

(10) Coming, brewing storms.—“The Communist economic system has been showing deep fissures and weaknesses since the moment of its complete victory . . . its future is less and less secure” (p. 123). “At the top everything is peaceful and smooth, but below the top, in the depths, and even in its ranks, new thoughts, new ideas, are bubbling and future storms are brewing” (p. 161). “Communist totalitarianism leads to total discontent, in which all differences of opinion are gradually lost except despair and hatred” (p. 99). “Today, this resistance is the greatest, the most real threat to Communist regimes. The Communist oligarchs no longer know what the
masses think or feel. The regimes feel insecure in a sea of deep and dark discontent" (p. 99).

The above analysis by Djilas of the Communist state as a new type of totalitarianism based on ownership and power is important. His position was not to attack the ideal goal of Communism, as embodying the "ideas of equality and brotherhood among men" (Preface, p. vii). "It would be wrong to criticize these basic ideas as well as vain and foolish" (p. vii). His job was merely to trace and analyze the record, the performance and actual evolution of the Soviet regimes. His claim is quite modest: "I claim no exclusive credit or distinction for presenting the picture..." But his book is actually more important than he thinks. It takes a good Marxist to point out the failure of Marxist theory. Marxism has not worked in Russia and he points out the reason why. It is Marxist "class interests" which have destroyed the Marxist experiment in Russia. And it is exactly the Marxist weapon of materialistic dialectic which shows why the whole development was inevitable. "It cannot be otherwise," it is "inevitable," Djilas repeats in so many places. The fears, the political measures, the repression of labor, the seizure of peasantry and land—everything proceeds from the point of view of the ruling, ownership class. To allow workers' control of industry would be to "destroy the rule of that class." Compulsory labor follows naturally from ownership, etc.

We who are not disciples of Marx find that easy to understand. To like to have workers compelled to work overtime without right of choice and often without pay is something which any plant owner can easily understand even if he does not approve. To see the workmen working at a plant in an "ecstasy of work," no lateness, no
knocking off early for lunch, and no tardiness in coming back after the noon recess, should make any plant manager happy. 'Tisn't even a Marxist discovery. It is just human. The early nineteenth-century English employer who had no compunctions about child labor did just that sort of thing which the “Socialists” of Russia are now boasting about. As for the amazing speed of her industrial progress, I also know that Spanish galleons rowed by chain-gangs of galley slaves also made pretty good speed.

I note that Khrushchev is boasting that Russia will out-sell consumer goods and overtake the Free World countries. No doubt they have a good record of productivity, but only by captive labor. I fear that this new battle-cry will mean a new Holy Cause for whipping labor to “insane exertion” and a “work fury.”

So we have come round a full circle. This has to do with the rise of the new bourgeoisie which has all my sympathy because there are so many of them and because they are all good fathers and husbands trying to do their best for their families. If a workman is so poorly paid that normally his wife has to work, why blame him for wishing to rise to the bourgeoisie, where his wife will not have to work and will have white soft hands? Why blame him, if he wants to send his children through the last years of secondary schools and college, which he cannot do with his salary on account of the tuition fees? Since the party membership nowadays consists of college men (58% in 1952) and only to a small extent of workers (9.3% already in 1934), why shouldn’t he wish his sons to have a better future than himself? And the only way he can rise is to support the government and follow the party line and join the very busy and active toadies. Economics is working—all the time. The desire to give orders
and not to be ordered, to assign others to work and not
be assigned, to make decisions and rule instead of being
ruled, to examine the workers' record instead of having
one's own work-book examined, to grant and take holi-
days instead of asking for holidays, to ride in "soft" trains,
to have better seats at the opera for yourself and family,
to be eligible for sanatoriums and wintering places, to
have trips to other towns paid for, to have the best doctors
attend your child's illness—these are the thousand and
one things that bear on a Soviet citizen's life and waft him
like a succession of ocean waves in the direction of sup-
port of the powers that be. Yes, even to bury one's pride
and self-respect and grovel and bend low, if that is the
only way, and in Soviet Russia it is the only way. A thou-
sand invisible influences, economic pressures and drives,
work to strengthen the ranks of this upper-class bourgeo-
sie. If I lost a child suffering from tuberculosis on account
of malnutrition (the ratio of consumption of meat is 5:1
among different classes of employees), would I not swear
to do anything including even praise of Stalin, in the
hope that this might not happen again? Should one be
contented with being a "failure" and not make up one's
mind to be a "success" . . . well, he would know what
to do. Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Voroshilov all knew what
to do.

So Marx is right in this case. Lenin, Bukharin and all
the other Marxist writers repeatedly analysed the logical
interests of the upper-class bourgeoisie as naturally sup-
porting the aristocracy of Tsarist Russia. If there is an
aristocracy, there is bound to be an upper-class bourgeo-
sie, which Lenin repeatedly derided as the "coupon-clipping" class. The glaring fact of the Russian regime is the
rise of a social hierarchy of top, middling and minor state employees.

We are now entering strictly the field of private capital and private property. Soviet Communists have gone a long way in taming and chaining labor. They've got class, they have money and monied economy as Stalin so effectively pointed out. They have rich and poor. They have monopoly ownership and unlimited autocratic power, as Djilas has pointed out. They have land (99% of land) and property (all capital goods) and slaves (forced labor) and deported "conquered" races. These are all more or less under the category of state property.

However, the boundary of private property is crossed when they have:

(a) Regressive income tax favoring the rich,
(b) Savings—over two-thirds of the total national savings deposits held by less than 10% of the population,
and (c) Inheritance.

Dallin writes, "The huge interest paid on government loans represents a striking example of 'unearned increment,' making it possible for the beneficiaries to live without the need of working, or at least to live by the work of others. The guarantee of the right of inheritance is another example" (David J. Dallin, The Real Soviet Russia, p. 99).

Peter Meyer writes informingly of the matter of inheritance of private property. "There are three ways in which privileges are handed down: by inheritance, by the monopoly of education, and by patronage. To be sure, the right of inheritance has been restored and the USSR
is the only country today in which the right to the unrestricted disposal of property through a last testament is guaranteed by the constitution itself. But you can only will away what you own: furniture, works of art, summer villas, cash, bank deposits, government bonds—all of which have an enormous value amidst the general poverty—but you cannot hand down factories and shares of stock” (Peter Meyer, *The Soviet Union: a New Class*, March-April, 1944, *Politics*).

Of course you have to have inheritance guaranteed when you have savings and government bonds. What is the point of having savings and government bonds if they all go back to the state upon your death?

I thought that Communism meant abolition of private property if it meant anything at all. “To each according to his needs”—that’s where the whole trouble lies. I need high-interest-bearing government bonds and a fair-sized inherited savings deposits, and substantial cash and perhaps just a villa and/or a yacht. I shall be quite contented. So do all my fellowmen, as far as I can see. The top ten thousand of Russia have appropriated just that.

This reminds me of filter cigarettes. I don’t believe in the principle of filter cigarettes anyway. What do you change to a filter for? On that question my mind is a complete blank. The only harm it can do is to prevent the proper flow of nicotine and of a good, mild, satisfactory smoke from good tobacco. But Khrushchev, what do you change to Communism for?
And They Have Colonies

"Words have no relations to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water, or wooden air."

STALIN

"One swift blow from the left and another swift blow from the right, and nothing remained of the ugly child of Versailles [Poland]."

MOLOTOV

Marxism is a tricky thing. It has a tendency to be as often right as wrong. It is wrong in many crucial places. It drops its tools as soon as destruction ends and construction begins. The state will "wither away," silently, naturally, almost at the shaking of a little finger, Marx said. Marx lived in a period when he had no chance to see the development of powerful labor unions in the democracies, in particular he had no chance to see the development of the most powerful labor union in the world in the monopoly-capitalist U.S., owning real estate and bonds in hundreds of millions of dollars. He had seen only the disillusionment of the 1848 revolution and the horrible conditions of labor in Western Europe. What is still more significant, Henry Ford was only twenty years
old when he died, and he could not possibly have foreseen the development of a new kind of economy, the economy of mass production, which makes the manufacturers absolutely dependent on the purchasing power of the masses. He never dreamed of David Dubinsky or Walter Reuther. Coupled with his teaching of ruthless struggle was an infantile belief in the natural goodness of man, which apparently is the basis for his belief in the absence of exploitation among men as soon as class distinctions are abolished. Human nature is simply not that good, or that simple. He discounted many urges in human nature, for money, for power, for nationalism. But he is sometimes right, too—about colonies, for example. An expanding capitalist state must have colonies in its search for a cheap supply of labor and of raw material.

So far up to the present chapter we have seen how two elements of human nature have played havoc with Marxist theory—the struggle for power and the struggle for money and material comforts among the revolutionary Communists themselves. The third human element is Nationalism, a natural love for one’s country, which Marx would not allow. When Marx spoke of an international proletariat, he brought out a new concept and a new vision. Essentially, it was syndicalism—the trade solidarity transcending national solidarity. Russia proved him wrong. World War II proved him wrong. Stalin proved him wrong. Even Roosevelt and Churchill proved him wrong, by showing that nationalism overrides ideological frontiers. One could say after the way Stalin spoke about money, “These left-wing scatterbrains do not realize that nationalism, national pride, and love of national independence will remain with us for a long time.”

This is a part of the great “contradictions” of an in-
adequately conceived Marxist philosophy. Personally, I have come to the conclusion that the Russian empire—the present Soviet regime—will be destroyed by the problems of its colonies first, and by their own domestic class struggle later. If one believes in Marx, he must believe these events are inevitable. Soviet Russia today has caught itself in an impossible dilemma with regard to its twenty colonies. It cannot go on and it dare not let go. It is not right to use force, and it is equally not right not to use force. The problems of Russia's satellites will be chronic and insoluble. Hungary is merely a striking example. The storm is gathering, not slackening. The British and French empires were caught by such a dilemma; the Russian empire's turn is due to come.

The dilemma is this: today Russian Communists can love Russia, but Polish Communists must not love Poland first without being labelled "traitors." To be more precise, they are "traitors to international Communism," or "traitors to the Communist regime," but usually they are just called "traitors," "spies" or "conspirators." Stalin himself, as Djilas has pointed out, was a Great Russian, a believer in Russian glory and expansionism. He was a patriot in the exact sense that Hitler was a patriot, but it is equally obvious that it is just not possible for Russia to go on ruling Poland with Russian patriots like Rokossovsky, or ruling Hungary with Russian patriots like Rakosy or Kadar. The change must come. It has already started to come in the case of Poland. It is inevitable like any laws of the physical world.

There is a law of the rise and decay of empires from which none may escape. While at the peak of its power, the cracks in the structure are difficult to detect, but one can be sure of one thing: what is against human nature
cannot long endure. Apparently, Soviet Russia seems to be at its peak of its power now, and the advent of the sputnik seems to symbolize it. Yet the flaws in the structure of the Union of Socialist Republics have already begun to show. Everything evolves materialistically, if you like. First and most important are the internal flaws, the “inner doubts” of the rank-and-file Communists which Djilas speaks about in the preceding chapter, the fact that their rulers have daily to face the “discrepancies of words and action,” the pomposity which accompanies those fears, and the feeling of loss of direction and of the emptiness of the dogmas. The success of the secret police rule gives it an illusion of permanency, that they are there and their sons and sons’ sons forever, saddled in the security of a force system and power system. Khrushchev’s rude taunt to Western diplomats, “We shall bury you,” is symptomatic. But Khrushchev is a practical man and no more concerned with ideas as such than Stalin himself. He is the least able to discern the process of corruption within, or the inevitable conflicts and contradictions that bother more thinking minds like Djilas. As Djilas says, the ideology has run its course, is played out. They have nothing more to say except stick to their guns. But there are more intelligent men and women in Russia whose doubts are yet unexpressed.

It is my belief that Russian imperialism has gone as far as it dares, that from now on, its chief business will be to consolidate its gains and to win from the Free World a recognition for its colonial governments set up abroad and supported by Russian guns. That would seem to be the chief obvious difficulty which even people like Khrushchev are able to see, especially after the simultaneous breakout of the movements for national independence.
in Poland and Hungary and elsewhere in the fall of 1956.

Two events of world importance happened in that year: one, Khrushchev's speech of February, demolishing their erstwhile god Stalin, and two, the events of Poland and Hungary. They are by no means over, for their repercussions are echoed around the world, especially among the Communist ranks in the different countries. While Soviet Russia could blandly ignore the world condemnation of its rape of Hungary, and the United Nations could as an organization do nothing to stop it, it set the world thinking, and that thinking is not going to do Russia any good. It practically brought about the collapse of the American Communist Party.

The fact is that Russia is getting found out. Very gradually its true character behind its ideological façade is being perceived. The judgments of the common people go upon deeds, not words. The "biggest deception" of the Communist regime—the transformation of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a dictatorship over the proletariat—is something which the peoples of the world were not able to see for themselves, and no amount of books by travellers, or words alone, can quite offset the torrent of words of Communist world propaganda. But it is in the nature of things that a sham or a lie gets found out if the people are given enough time. As Abraham Lincoln says, "You cannot fool all of the people all of the time." Given time, the people will find out for themselves. It is my observation that in Western Europe and in America, Russia has already been found out. We need not go into statistics regarding the decline of Communist followers in Europe; there is a statistical study on "Communism's Postwar Decade" by Simon Wolin, published by the Tamiment Institute, New York, showing
the "gains and losses of Communist parties in the non-Communist world since 1945." The general tone of the NATO countries in reply to Khrushchev's appeal indicates that the peoples of the Western Europe know and have come to realize what Russia has been up to. You had to give Russia time to show itself in acts and you had to give the people of the world time to see and appreciate them.

The great artificial man-made famine in the Ukraine of 1932-3 revolted a sincere admirer, André Gide. The Moscow trials of 1936-8 revolted John Dewey. The Stalin-Hitler pact shocked the entire world; if Hitler had not turned against his partner, World Communism would have died then and there. By a stroke of luck, World Communism gained a new lease of life by Hitler's jilting of Stalin. Frederick Vanderbilt Field's abrupt calling-off of the march on Washington in protest against the "Imperialist War" when overnight this "Imperialist War" became a "war for democracy" did not help the Communists any. The American Communist party was found out; from that day its decline in the U.S. began. Meanwhile U.S. liberals like Henry Wallace were still suffering from the "Popular Front" Trojan horse tactics of the Comintern. As an ally, the USSR was still popular among an army of dupes who thought they were "intellectuals." People like Alger Hiss and Owen Lattimore had the ear of Roosevelt up to the very end. The war with Finland, the partition of Finland and the annexation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were like the first ripples of Russia's imperialism that set people's minds wondering. The events which followed in 1946-48 in Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria further unmasked Russia's character. But these conquests
were made with practiced deception, which like the Moscow trials produced suspended judgment and doubts in men's minds. The common people (and I am concerned with the common people's judgments)—the common people as a whole never bothered to look into the details and technique of this deception. Russia still got along fine.

Time, however, tells. The revolutions of the workers and the intellectuals in Berlin (Sept. 9, 1948; 1953) and Warsaw (1953) and in Poland and Hungary (1956) were inevitable. When I saw in the Hungarian Revolution the naked fist of imperialism, I watched the reactions. Jean-Paul Sartre resigned from the French Communist Party and Howard Fast from the U.S. Communist Party. I was watching the honesty and integrity of the so-called intellectuals, noting whether a man meant what he said when he spoke out for justice and against imperialism and exploitation of the masses of mankind. I was watching the conscience of mankind. I did not see any expression of disgust or dismay on the part of Picasso, who was supposed to be horrified at Guernica. I watched Jawaharlal Nehru. He was not disgusted; he felt fine. His slow, reluctant statement after the pressure of Hindu public opinion several weeks after the event has passed, contrasted sharply with his shrill cries—the first moment, usually the next morning—against anything the NATO countries did.

The free world can survive with honest-thinking men, not with politicians. But the people of Asia at large, too, are thinking. They are wondering. Beneath the surface, Russia's credit with the Asiatic peoples has plummeted down and the Hungarian Revolution had a lot to do with it. It had deep repercussions even in Communist China,
as Mao Tse-tung officially admitted. It is my belief that even in Asia the Russians will go this far and no farther. The Middle East Moslems are more nationalist than pro-Russian.

I have always considered that what happened in the USSR concerns the whole world. But granting that the Russian people have the right to a type of government of their free choice (which they do not have), the events happening outside Russia in East European countries are more liable to set the masses of common people thinking. Regardless of ideology, the common people will take sides with Poland and Hungary and simply say, "Why shouldn't Hungary be free? Why shouldn't Poland be free?" The Acheson doctrine of Condonement, Containment and Contentment belongs to the category of stop-gap measures that have nothing to do with an analytic basis of first principles. It is a doctrine based on the wicked formula, You shut your eyes to what is happening outside the Iron Curtain and we agree to shut our eyes to what is happening inside. It is not diplomacy, but the reverse. For this is a one-sided bargain; Russia gains by the Free World agreeing not to look behind the Iron Curtain, but the Free World gains nothing at all. It is like Roosevelt's (really Alger Hiss') invitation at Yalta for Russia to walk into Manchuria, the very thing which Teddy Roosevelt was trying to prevent and which the U.S. should have paid anything to avoid. Without Yalta, there would be no question of Manchuria, and without Manchuria, there would not be a Communist government in mainland China today. There would not have been even the Korean war.

A colony is a country governed by a colonial government set up by, and responsible to, a foreign government,
and supported by a foreign force, either visibly on its soil or within the orbit of that force. A country is a semi-colony if it has an independent government, but is strongly sensitive to foreign pressure, and if its economy is tied up to, and shaped for, the benefit of a foreign country. These constitute the "spheres of influence" of the white empires which Marx, Engels and Lenin declared should be one of the objects of the world revolution to destroy. Under this definition, a great number of countries in East Europe, Central Asia and Mongolia have been turned into colonies and semi-colonies by the expanding Russian empire. The presence of these colonies and semi-colonies precludes any further usefulness of the Communist dogma, the solidarity of the international proletariat, and has in fact effectively killed it. This for the simple reason that no country aspires to such a colonial status. The "liberation" talk, the talk of "emancipation from white colonialism" must sound weaker and weaker as time goes on, and as the British and the French took steps in concrete form to give expression to the peoples' desire for independence. There will be national leaders in Eastern Europe who have a psychosis about Red Imperialism as Nehru has about White Imperialism.

A list of countries and annexed territories where Russia has set up colonial puppet governments would comprise the following, including those which Russia has annexed outright:

1. Georgia  
2. Ukraine  
3. Karelian Isthmus of Finland  
4. Estonia  
5. Latvia  
6. Lithuania  
7. Poland  
8. Czechoslovakia  
9. East Germany  
10. Hungary  
11. Rumania
12. Bulgaria 17. Turkmenistan
13. Albania 18. Uzbekistan
15. Azerbaijan 20. Tadjikstan

The pattern and technique of Russian conquest and usurpation of government in the different countries should be learned carefully by all those who aspire to come within the Russian orbit. Before we go into that, it is highly instructive to take a glance at the Soviet record of her contempt for treaties which surpasses Hitler's and the Kaiser's in spite of the latter's well-known opinion of the worth of a "scrap of paper." Stalin's own opinion about diplomacy which has been quoted at the beginning of the chapter loses nothing by comparison with Hitler's. In the forty years of Soviet Russia, it has broken its word with every single country to which its government attached its signature. Today, at the time of the writing of this book, millions of words are wasted over discussion of Khrushchev's plea for a summit meeting on the sole condition that Russia's commitments at the last summit meeting in Geneva be totally discounted and regarded not as commitments. Stalin was breaking the provision of a treaty at the very moment when Maxim Litvinov was signing it. Any number of photographs exist of Stalin sitting before a desk, pen in hand, complacently signing a scrap of paper, or of Molotov signing it while Stalin stands behind, chin up, hands at the sides, perfectly at ease with himself. In the switch-over to pro-German policy, Litvinov was dropped and Molotov ushered in a new era. This was the same Molotov who declared in writing in September, 1947, "The carrying into effect of the present pact must in no way affect the sovereign rights of the contracting parties,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>DATE &amp; NATURE OF TREATY</th>
<th>WHEN BROKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Georgia†</td>
<td>1920, May 7—Independence recognized</td>
<td>1921, Feb. 11—invaded by Stalin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Ukraine†</td>
<td>1920, Dec. 28—Treaty of Alliance</td>
<td>1922, Dec. 30—forcibly annexed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Poland†</td>
<td>1932, July 25—Treaty of Non-aggression</td>
<td>1939, Sept. 28—partitioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Estonia*</td>
<td>1939, Sept. 28—Treaty of Mutual Assistance</td>
<td>1940, Aug. 3—forcibly annexed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Latvia*</td>
<td>1939, Oct. 5—Treaty of Mutual Assistance</td>
<td>1940, Aug. 5—forcibly annexed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Finland†</td>
<td>1932, Jan. 2—Treaty of Non-Aggression</td>
<td>1939, Nov. 30—Finland invaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Japan†</td>
<td>1940, Apr. 13—Treaty of Non-Aggression</td>
<td>1945, Aug. 8—Manchuria invaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Germany*</td>
<td>1939, Aug. 23—Pact with Hitler</td>
<td>1941, June 22—broken by Hitler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. China*</td>
<td>1945, Aug.—Treaty of Support for Nationalist Government</td>
<td>1945, Nov.—contact with Mao with plan for Manchuria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1949, Feb. 1—People’s Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. U.S.A.,</td>
<td>1945, July-Aug.—Potsdam Agreement for re-storing civil liberties, free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>elections and representative governments in E. Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* By indirect aggression       † By direct aggression
their economic and social system, etc.” in the Treaties of Mutual Assistance with the Balkan states, which Russia then proceeded to gobble up hardly before the ink was dry. Three months later, King Michael of Rumania was forced by Vishinsky to abdicate; eleven months later, Bulgaria became a “People’s Democracy.” This was the same Molotov with whom the delegates of other countries to the United Nations had to keep company. Should not there be a standard of international decency? Should there not be a rule in the Credentials Committee that delegates to the UN should have a clean personal record not below a certain standard, a provision that would save the other delegates from listening to liars and murderers? The moral atmosphere of the UN sessions would have been considerably purified.

Sometimes I feel that the reputation of Hitler has obscured that of his totalitarian peers. His extermination of the Jews will make him stink for all eternity. And yet why should he enjoy the sole distinction for coldblooded slaughter of millions of his own people as well as of the conquered peoples? Hitler and Stalin both understood each other perfectly. Both were anti-Semitic, both were patriots. Hitler was less feared by his own friends; if Hitler were Stalin, Himmler and Goering would have been dead before the war. In any case, it is entirely appropriate and natural that the two of them should have started World War II hand in hand together. The whole story of Stalin’s collaboration with the Fascists through the German Embassy in Moscow and the successive trips of Molotov to Berlin, and especially the story of Stalin’s cringing before Hitler in the spring of 1941 have not been popularly known. Communists the world over hate Fascism sincerely, as if the two Parties were enemies, which
they are not. Communism as it developed under Stalin in the twentieth century is Fascism. It has the same disregard for human values, the same ruthlessness and contempt for humanity. After all, the two-year courtship of Communism and Fascism was broken by Hitler—not by the Russian Communists, and not willingly. How labels deceive!

**Hitler-Stalin Parallels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HITLER ON THE RECORD</th>
<th>STALIN ON THE RECORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The bigger the lies, the better</td>
<td>1. “Sincere diplomacy is as impossible as dry water or wooden air”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Purged top Nazis</td>
<td>2. Purged top Bolsheviks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Invented Reichstag fire</td>
<td>3. Invented Trotskyite conspiracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Introduced work-books for labor, suppressed labor unions</td>
<td>4. Introduced work-books for labor, suppressed labor unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exterminated Jews (Germany, Poland, Austria)</td>
<td>5. Jailed and shot Jews (Russia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Massacred and deported Poles</td>
<td>6. Massacred 10,000 Polish prisoners (Katyn forest) and deported 1,500,000 Poles and ¼th Lithuanians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Detached Sudetenland before absorbing Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>7. Detached Carpathia-Ukraine before absorbing Czechoslovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Invaded Poland and started World War II with Stalin</td>
<td>8. Invaded Poland and started World War II with Hitler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bet Allies would not fight Germany</td>
<td>9. Bet Hitler would not fight Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Took Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland</td>
<td>10. Took Karelian Isthmus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
11. Conquered Ukraine by force (1941)

12. Broke Non-Aggression Pacts with Poland, Russia, Denmark, Belgium

13. NKVD; MVD
14. Rapid industrialization; full employment
15. Guns before butter
16. Labor camps
17. Loved uniforms, restored ranks, restored Tsarist Cossack Guards

18. Loved adoration, “Heil Hitler!”
20. Killed all his friends

The Russian technique of indirect aggression is worth careful study. One of the first shocks to the world in the post-war period, one of those revelations which culminated in the Hungary Revolution of 1956, was the seizure of Poland by fraudulent elections and of Czechoslovakia by strong-arm methods. These were all inevitable results of the development of Russian nationalism and imperialism. The world was not prepared to accept Great Russia as a new imperialist power. But they were also events by which the Free World got “wise” to the set pattern and technique of conquest. This technique, which is very much
worth studying, also became the standard routine of all Communist seizure of power in all countries. A democratic front, a period of cooperation under a coalition government but unconditionally with Communist control of the Ministry of Interior (police and elections) and of justice, a period of terror (arrests, putting opposition leaders behind bars or deporting them, striking their names off ballots) and the “winning of elections before elections,” and finally “elections” followed by the liquidation of all opposition to establish a Communist state. (Free World statesmen frequently talk nonsense when they say the people of Russia and of Eastern Europe are entitled to a type of government “of their own choice,” when it is obvious that tanks and fascist terror, not free choice, dictate the form of government.) This programmatic behavior of Communist Parties is identical in all countries and it has become standard.

A comparative table of this standard technique is extremely instructive. The practiced, smooth deception reminds one of the wolf in Aesop's Fables. Chou En-lai was as disarming and “democratic,” as gracious and effective with the American journalists in the 1940's in Chungking as the head of the only Communist province in India today. At the Bandung conference, I noticed that Chou En-lai was equally smooth, disarming and harmless. It is for this reason that countries aspiring to join the Russian orbit should be warned. Before the revelation of this technique of conquest, it was not surprising that the naive gullibility of Americans included not only scores of newspaper correspondents and diplomatic representatives, but several professors of the Oriental Department in American universities whose business was to know better. It is questionable, however, that the Cry-
wolf game could be repeated too often. Perhaps it may work yet, for the public have a short memory or the public may not even have heard of the technique. It is only necessary to remind one that when Stalin was signing the Yalta agreement and the Potsdam agreement which promised "civil liberties," "free elections, with secret universal ballots," and "representative government," he had even then a complete program worked out for the nullification of these promises and the successful seizure of power and suppression of freedom. The Yalta agreement, for example, declares with regard to Poland that "this new Government of National Unity. . . . should be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and the secret ballot." Stalin signed. Why shouldn't he?

The technique consists of four steps:

I. **Coalition** with Communist control of police and court.
II. **Terror before elections.**
III. **Elections;** forced liquidation of opposition if elections won; stepped-up terror if elections lost.
IV. **Consolidation** and complete elimination of opposition by force.

This is the well-known Lenin pattern—now generally called "Marxist-Leninist line" in party phraseology. It was the pattern of the October revolution which is the father for the pattern of seizure of power in the Eastern countries later.

**The Father Pattern of Lenin**

I. **Coalition:** 1917, Mar.-Oct., Provisional Government; July 17, aborted uprising of Petrograd sailors; Lenin promised peace, bread and land and self-government of
workers; Oct. 8, forced out Social Democratic leaders from Executive Committee of Petrograd Soviet.

II. Terror before elections: Nov. 1, again promised free elections and democratic self-government of workers; Nov. 7, Bolshevik coup timed one day before scheduled elections, knowing their inevitable defeat; captured Winter Palace and public buildings.

III. Elections: Nov. 28, Socialist Revolutionaries 20 millions, Bolsheviks 9 millions, total 36 millions; rejected Railway Workers’ demand for coalition government with Socialist Revolutionaries; Dec. 30, Cheka terror established and terror began.

IV. Consolidation: 1918, Jan. 18, Cheka guards occupied Constituent Assembly on first day of meeting; next day closed it down by force; stepped up arrests and deportations of opposition Socialists.

Stalin further advanced the revolutionary technique in the details if not in the essential principles and he made one of the important contributions to Marxist technique when he told his Polish agents in Warsaw to make sure that “the elections must be won before the elections.” This complete revolutionary technique becomes therefore the Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist line.

The lesson to be learned from the pattern of Communist seizure of power is that one learns to beware of its promises of democracy and free elections and championing of labor and peasant, during its period of infiltration and propaganda to enlist mass support. During General Marshall’s mission to China to bring about a “coalition” government, he could not possibly have known what the word “coalition” meant in the Leninist pattern of seizure of power, since the Potsdam Agreement had just been signed and the Communists seemed so eminently reasona-
# Technique of Indirect Aggression  
*(How to “Win Elections before Elections”)*

## Poland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Boleslaw Beirut (ex-NKVD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Coalition

| a. Puppet Lublin committee formed 1941, recognized 1944 |
| b. 1945, spring, under Beirut; March 1948, invited 16 Polish leaders to Moscow and jailed them |
| c. controlled security police and unions |

### II. Terror before elections

| a. 1946 March, arrested 1200 Peasant delegates to Congress; Nov. arrested 300 Socialists, struck names off ballot. Despite this, elections to Workers' Committees |

## Czechoslovakia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 1945, Apr.-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Nat. Soc. (Benes); Soc. Dem., Slovak Dem., People's Party (Czech Catholic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Klement Gottwald; Antonin Zapotocky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Eduard Benes (resigned June 7, '48); Jan Masaryk (killed March '48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Coalition

| a. Pro-labor in country with advanced labor legislation |
| b. 1945 supported “National Front” government of Benes |
| c. Gottwald premier, May, 1946; Nosek controlled police. |
| d. Com. control propaganda; Zapotocky controlled unions. |

### II. Terror before elections

| a. 1947 fall, stepped up terror for coup in Feb.; changed police chiefs, added 1500 Com. police, Workers and Agrarian Congress timed for coup; Feb. '48, So- |
1947, Jan. 17, Soc. polled 68%, Com. 21%. May to June, 200 more Soc. arrests. Mikolajczyk fled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. 1948 March, purged entire Exec. Com. of Socialists; dismissals |
b. Dec. 15, forced absorption of PPS |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. 1948, Dec. 5, People's Democracy founded |
b. 1949, Gomulka expelled from Cent. Com.; 1949 Rokosovsky, minister of defense; 1951, Gomulka jailed to 1954 |

Soviet envoy Zorin arrived, Sov. concentrations on border.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. 1948 Feb. 25, Com. putsch, Gottwald forced cabinet on Benes; from March arrested ministers, excluded 78 deputies |
b. May 28, elections; June 27, Soc. Dem. merged |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. 1948 Feb. "People's Democracy" |
b. 1949 Jury trial abolished; 1950-52 purges of leaders; 1952 July, Zapotocky became Premier |
### Technique of Indirect Aggression (con't.)
(How to “Win Elections before Elections”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN</th>
<th>EAST GERMANY</th>
<th>HUNGARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scene</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scene</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scene</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Entry of Soviet troops</td>
<td>a. 1945, under Zhukov</td>
<td>a. 1944, Oct., Soviet occupation; Allied Control Commission, headed by Voroshilov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. selected tool of the Kremlin</td>
<td>c. Walter Ulbricht, Wilhelm Pieck</td>
<td>c. Matyas Rakosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. leaders to be liquidated</td>
<td>d. Grotewohl (Soc. Dem.)—yielded in 1946.</td>
<td>d. F. Nagy (Sm.); Peyer (Union leader); Tildy, Bela Kovacs, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step I</th>
<th>I. Coalition</th>
<th>I. Coalition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Com. control of interior and justice</td>
<td>c. Com. control of interior, propaganda, youth</td>
<td>c. Rakosi, min. interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. control of press, propaganda and unions</td>
<td>d. control of radio stations, heavy censorship</td>
<td>d. Com. lost factory workers’ elections, but forced half-control; Peyer fled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step II</th>
<th>II. Terror before elections</th>
<th>II. Terror before elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before elections,</td>
<td>a. 1945-46, dismissed opp. leaders, house-to-house intimidation by people’s police</td>
<td>a. 1947, May, Nagy removed from office; 1946-7, arrested and deported Small Farmers Party; utilized ex-Nazis; 1947, Feb., Bela Kovaks abducted; expelled Nagy from office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. arrests, jailing of opposition leaders, deportations, scratching names off ballots</td>
<td>b. wrecking printing plants of opp.; denied facilities and censorship of paper; forced editorials; controlled radio stations</td>
<td>b. 1947 June, broke up opp. meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. silencing of opposition press</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step III
- a. forced liquidation of opp. parties
- b. rigged elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. 1946 Apr. 21, forced absorption of Soc. Dem.; proclaimed Socialist Unity Party (SED)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step IV
- a. colonial gov. established
- b. stepped up terror, complete elimination of opposition, colonial government responsible to Moscow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. terror by restored Wehrmacht and concentration camps under former GESTAPO leaders in SSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Elections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 1947, Aug. elections; more purges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1948 June, Tildy forced out from Presidency; July, absorbed Soc. Dem. after expelling leaders; Hungarian Workers Party founded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 1949, Aug. 18, totalitarian constitution established; Mindszenti condemned; Jews deported under Arrow Cross Nazi law; Oct. 15, Laszlo Rajk hanged; deported “kulaks”; 1950 June 6-7, arrested 200 Socialists, 4000 Unionists; 1951 Rakosi dictator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Technique of Indirect Aggression (con't.)

(How to "Win Elections before Elections")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERN</th>
<th>RUMANIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scene</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scene</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Opposition parties</td>
<td>b. Peasant Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. selected tool of the Kremlin</td>
<td>c. Vishinsky's pressure on King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. leaders to be liquidated</td>
<td>d. Maniu (Peasant)—died 1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step I</strong></th>
<th><strong>I. Coalition</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. &quot;Democratic&quot; Front</td>
<td>a. &quot;Fatherland Front&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Coalition government</td>
<td>b. 1945, Vishinsky forced new cabinet dominated by Communists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Com. control of interior and justice</td>
<td>c. control of interior &amp; justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. control of press, propaganda and unions</td>
<td>d. unions dominated by Communists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step II</strong></th>
<th><strong>II. Terror before elections</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before elections,</td>
<td>All under Soviet Military Authority and &quot;people's&quot; security police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. arrests, jailing of opposition leaders, deportations, scratching names off ballots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. silencing of opposition press</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step III</td>
<td>III. Abdication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. forced liquidation of opp. parties (1947, Dec. 30) King Michael abdicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. rigged elections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step IV</th>
<th>IV. Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Colonial govt. established 1948, Apr. 13, &quot;People's Democracy&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. stepped up terror, complete elimination of opposition, colonial government responsible to Moscow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ble. It is interesting to point out that Mao Tse-tung demanded exactly Communist control of the ministries of the interior and justice which means control of the polls and police and the courts and prisons. General Marshall was exasperated by the "unreasonableness" of the "Kuomintang clique" in refusing to accept Mao’s terms. At this time, Mao had already said in one of his speeches to his comrades, "We need just two or three years of stirring up and the victory will be ours." "Stirring up" in Leninist-Stalinist terms could only have meant STEP II, after which, without a doubt, STEP III would follow.

So many different governments in the different continents are worried about Communist agitators in their respective countries. Some are quite willing to open their doors to Communists, like Sokarno who cannot possibly have learned about the Leninist formula, or he might just as well predict the date of his own funeral. Others do not cooperate with the Communists in their own countries, but are in the naive, gullible state of General Marshall of 1945-6. In either case, it is good to be warned. People like Sokarno should study the history of the October revolution better: he would have learned the fate of the left-wing Socialist Revolutionaries like Maria Spiridonova who joined the Bolsheviks as a political strategy and whom Lenin ruthlessly destroyed after his ascent to power. Even Communist top people like Vice-Premier Kostov and Anna Pauker lost out the moment they dared to doubt Moscow's leadership. Any number of examples could be given of Social Democrats and Peasant leaders who were invariably shot or hanged by the Communist Party in power. Others like Nehru who pride themselves on being socialists should take proper note of the fate of the socialists in all the countries of Eastern Europe.
In each of the six European countries under review, the victims of "Socialist" Russia are exactly the Socialist leaders, the Peasant party leaders, the Small Farmers party leaders and the Unionist leaders. These men with a long record of fighting for the working class and the poor peasant were supposedly imbued with the same high ideals, but became nevertheless the natural enemy of the Communists—that is if it makes sense at all. But the record is there. Their aims and the aims of the Communists are diametrically opposed.

It is not always easy to distinguish between a colonial and a semi-colonial government. The difference is one of form rather than substance. A colonial government is directly administered by an imperialist power; a semi-colonial government is nominally independent, but is actually responsible to a foreign power or extremely sensitive to its pressure, political or economic. The six so-called "satellite" countries are, in actual fact, directly or indirectly administered by Soviet Russia, sometimes through the Cominform. Let Moscow shake its little finger and what is at present Secretary of Communist Party or Premier in one of these countries can be shot, hanged or deported (examples: Rakosi, Imre Nagy). This is particularly the case of Hungary today. The rulers of these countries receive orders from Russia and can be removed any time with the same ease with which a letter from Jacques Duclos, French Communist Secretary, can change the whole policy of the American Communist Party.

Economically, too, these puppet governments are colonial governments held in subjection and exploit their countries for the imperialist power. One-fourth of the Lithuanian population was deported for labor to help
work at the Russian mines for coal, iron and gold. Lithuanian people are predominantly Catholics, but that was not the only reason why they were deported to Siberia. Over a million Poles were deported to work in the slave camps of Siberia. When in 1945, Stalin wanted to help hold the Communist regime in Poland, he felt it would be a good policy to let those who had not yet died in Siberia return, and they did in July of 1946. There were also deportees from Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. They all provided cheap labor to help build up Russia’s industrial empire. Russian-owned joint companies control and operate all the big industry and resources of Rumania, and the first thing the Russian army did in Hungary was to dismantle the plants the way they plundered the plants in Manchuria, and take control of its railways, its largest coal mines, and 40% of its bauxite.

In other words, imperialist Russia is just trying to do what British and other European empires were trying to do in the nineteenth century. That does not make any difference. Stalin ousted Trotsky, then took over and carried out Trotsky’s own industrialization program; he punished the “Trotskyites” for the heinous crime of collaboration with the Fascists, then collaborated with the Fascists himself. Why shouldn’t he try to copy white imperialism? When the Hungarian puppet government under Rakosi wanted to liquidate the Jews and kulaks (well-to-do peasants), he did not use their slave labor for Hungary, but reserved them for Great Russia, where he deported them. Where else would the vast industrial empire of Siberia and Central Asia administered by GULAG, a special department of the NKVD, get its millions of cheap labor with no demand for food and
housing and living at a subhuman level—where else except from the slaves of conquered races conceived in Pharaoh’s style and Roman style, from the east European conquered territories and from the Kazakhs, Tadzhiks, Kirghis, Mongols and some Chinese? The speed-up of industrialization of a country in twenty to thirty years demanded that an inexhaustible supply of cheap human labor be made available; otherwise the industrial empire would not have been built at all.

Russia had to make a choice between two roads, imperialism, or brotherhood of international proletariat as a means of world revolution. She could not have both. Stalin chose the former, thereby wrecking the Marxist concept to pieces. Russia has made her choice and cannot turn back. International proletariat has ceased to ring true and has become an empty, jejune phrase with no real meaning.

Russia today has got itself into a “fix” where the British Empire was. The English political genius recognized the inevitable and made the best of it; the French, having too much logic and too little sense, made a mess of it. The liquidation of the British Empire was almost bloodless; that of the French Empire has bled France almost white. Actually, the removal of Russian control of its puppets will, from Russia’s standpoint, outweigh the scrapping of the U.S. Strategic Air Command ring of overseas bases around her. The continued effort to hold East Europe in subjection will in time let off such fireworks as the world has not seen before. That today is Russia’s principal fear and principal problem as an imperialist power, for a Marxist appreciates well the contradictions in imperialism.

Why do men fight? How do revolutions break out? Always there is something wrong which calls forth the
elementary emotions of an entire people. Of these things, nationalism and hunger, or economic distress, are two of the most elemental forces. The whole historic movement of Asian peoples for national freedom and independence illustrates the validity of this principle. In the course of time, it cannot be stopped. The contradiction of imperialism consists in this, that I love my country, but you must not love yours. But if love of one's country is a universal, basic human trait, imperialism must sooner or later go on the rocks. Even Christian ethics presuppose self-love and take it for granted. It is stated as "Love thy neighbor as thyself," and not "Love thyself as thou Lovest thy neighbor." In the case of international Communism, the case is made worse. It becomes "Love thy neighbor country better than thine own"—specifically "Love Russia more than thou Lovest thine own country."

Soviet Russia has consistently demanded this of foreign communists. Wladyslaw Gomulka, the good Polish Communist, was ousted as General Secretary of the Polish Communist Party for "insufficient appreciation of the role of the USSR," expelled from the Central Committee in December 1949, and jailed in August 1951. In Hungary, Laszlo Rajk, a patriot and a national Communist like Tito, was "hanged for a traitor" for the same reason—his re-burial ten years later nevertheless was the immediate occasion for the Hungarian Revolution. Though hanged as a theoretical "traitor" to international Communism, Rajk lives in the hearts of Hungarian men and women as a Hungarian patriot. In Bulgaria, Georgi Dimitrov had been Russia's trusted tool for years, but when he proposed a federation of Balkan Communist states with Tito, his health failed; he went to Moscow, was persuaded
And They Have Colonies

to have an operation and just happened to die. Vice-premier of Bulgaria’s Communist government Traicho Kostov was tried for “treason” and executed in 1949 for withholding information on Bulgaria’s foreign trade from Moscow. The kind of Communists Russia wanted was Marshal Konstantin Rokossovsky who replaced Gomulka in Poland. He proved his Russian loyalty above Polish loyalty by standing still with his army outside the suburbs of Warsaw in 1944 during the heroic but desperate uprising of Warsaw, and watched for sixty-three days the Poles heroically resisting the Nazis until 200,000 men and women had been slaughtered without lifting a finger and without feeling like a Pole. This is the man whom Stalin installed as his Polish Minister of Defense. These are the puppets, the Gottwalds, the Rakossis and Kadars—men like Quisling and Laval—the type of men which Russian Communism approved.

Djilas sees this point clearly. Toward the end of his book, he devotes an entire chapter to “National Communism” and comes to the definite conclusion that “No single form of Communism, no matter how similar it is to other forms, exists in any way other than as National Communism” (p. 174); that “Today national Communism is a general phenomenon in Communism. To varying degrees all Communist movements . . . are gripped by National Communism” (p. 181); that Stalin himself was “a great Russian”; and that the “aspirations toward national independence will grow” (p. 177); “a yearning for independence and for protection of ‘their own people’ from Soviet hegemony will rise among them” (p. 175); and “so can clashes between Communist states result in war” (p. 177).

We have in fact come to the last of the contradictions
between Marxism and human nature. Just as the human desires for power and security and material comforts have beaten Marxist theorizing on its own ground, so Marxist claim of international Communism, built on an inadequate appreciation of the vital force of nationalism, will eventually be crushed by it. In every case, human nature triumphs over Marxism because Marx neglected to study Confucius, or to equate his Utopian theory with human nature itself.

"Truth may not depart from human nature; if what is regarded as truth departs from human nature, it may not be regarded as truth," says Confucius. Nationalism as a human trait and human habit is deep-seated and universal. Here it may be pointed out that the last World War was not fought on an ideological basis, but was fought on a nationalist basis across ideological frontiers, capitalist countries fighting hand in hand with a communist country to destroy a common enemy. The Russians themselves were not fighting fascism; they were fighting the Germans. Throughout the whole war, Stalin never appealed to ideology, but to the simple fact that Russian houses were being destroyed and Russian men, women and children were being slaughtered. The brotherhood of mankind is one thing; love thy neighbor's state better than thine own is another. Inevitably, international communism must flounder. In other words, of the two, ideological loyalty and racial, national loyalty, the latter is a far stronger, vital force. It is this simple force among her subjected peoples which Russia will have to reckon with and which will rise to crush the Russian Empire as surely as the sun rises in the morning.

Perhaps a Western reader will readily grant that the proud people of Germany, of Poland, of Czechoslovakia
and the Baltic states cannot permanently submit to a foreign yoke. What I wish to point out is that this nationalism or love of one's country is universal and has nothing to do with the educational level of a country. If the presence of U.S. soldiers sometimes arouses resentment in a friendly country like England, it can easily be imagined what bitter hatred the sight of Russian prowlers in the streets of Budapest, Warsaw and Prague must arouse, and it is the same with the Turkic, Tartar and Mongolian races.

People, I am afraid, often make a mistake about Asia. They think that this love for one's country, this yearning for national independence, depends exclusively on the educational level of the people. Walter Lippman once made a fatal mistake in understanding the force of the Indochinese war against the French. If I understand him right, he said in effect that the majority of the Annamese, being illiterate, were waiting and watching, indifferent to the matter of kicking the white man out. In this he shows less insight than usual.

It merely betrays our ignorance of the human heart to say that the Poles and the Czechs and the Hungarians and Bulgarians probably want their independence back, but the people on the Pamir plateau, being illiterate—what do they know? It happens that these Turkic races are among the proudest peoples on earth. The Chinese empire had been trying to subjugate the Kirghis and Kazakhs and Tartars and Huns and Mongols and Tibetans for two thousand years and still have not done a job of it. Periodic wars between Chinese and these ethnic groups of Turkestan burst out again and again, involving the wholesale slaughter of hundreds of thousands of people at one time. We are grievously wrong when we assume that Rus-
sia has to worry about ten enemies in East Europe but has not to worry about the numerous ethnic tribes in Central Asia.

Arab nationalism has arrived, and of course cannot be stopped. The trouble with Nasser and Nasserism is not that it is nationalist, but not nationalist enough. He has failed signally to talk about the national independence of the Moslems in Central Asia—the Uzbeks, the Kazakhs, the Tadjiks and the millions of Moslems in Communist China. An Arab war of revolt has been going on the last two years among the Uighurs and Kazakhs, ruthlessly suppressed by Krushchev, but no one seems to care.

The disintegration of the Russian Empire began in 1953. One need not go into the Berlin strike of September 1948, the general strikes of June 1953 of Czechoslovakia and East Germany and the simultaneous first manifestations of national revolutions of very great proportions in Poland and Hungary in October 1956, and the stirrings among the people of Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia at the same time. Of course they were held back and crushed by armed force. But if Russia had nothing but force with which to hold these foreign colonies and dependencies down, she has a lot to think about for the future. In Poland, it certainly reached the point where the army itself with proper leadership could have gone over to the side of the revolutionary people. There will come a time when the revolutionary sentiment has come to such a point that guerilla warfare may emerge and support itself on the people, and the Russian army will find no army to fight against and will not know where to direct its gunfire.

That is why, for Russia, the status of the East European countries must unconditionally remain a closed topic at any summit conference. If at such a conference,
Russia could have U.S. blessing upon the dependent status of these countries, she would be very pleased, but if she could not, no discussion of this topic could be permitted because they know, if the Western world does not, that is where their Achilles' heel is. Without saying so, Russia is much more occupied with obtaining the Free World's blessing on her colonies than she dare say. It is so in the nature of things.

Meanwhile, another matter, the lowering of standards of living in Russia's occupied territories is insoluble. A well-fed slave might be made a contented slave. A full stomach might under certain circumstances make up for lack of freedom. Where the slave or a subjected people have neither freedom nor bread, the situation is not healthy. But Russia absolutely cannot do anything about it: it would be foolish to ask Russian workers to work harder and eat less than the workers of the dependencies. In every measure of repression of labor like compulsory overtime and penalty for lateness, the labor laws have been introduced into the subjected countries. Consequently, Russia must also pull down the higher standards of living of the dependencies, especially those of Czechoslovakia and Germany, which have known better days, to the level of her own working class. The slave economy of cheap labor and cheap accommodations is extended wherever the Soviet rule goes. From this impasse, Russia has no escape.¹

The result is, economic privations will breed labor unrest. The strikers of Poznan were fighting for freedom, but first and foremost for bread and against hunger. The students of Warsaw had for their slogan: "No Bread

¹ See the study of international wage comparison in Schwarz's book, p. 238, for exact figures.
without Freedom; no Freedom without Bread." They might have gone into an analysis of the cause and written: No NKVD without Hunger; no Hunger without NKVD. The pity of it is that the two are causally related; the greater and more widespread the hunger, the more all-enveloping, all-seeing and all-controlling the NKVD must be. These are the inner contradictions of the Russian empire which are inevitable and insoluble if Marxist materialistic laws are regarded as valid. The problems of Russia's satellites are, as I say, chronic.

It is easier to reach the heart of the matter through the voice of the Polish poet quoted at the beginning of the Introduction of this book.

There are people tired of work,
there are Polish apples unobtainable by Polish children,
there are children scorned by criminal doctors,
there are boys forced to lie,
there are girls forced to lie . . .
there are people who have been waiting for a long time.

Polish apples are not obtainable by Polish children, and Hungarian wine is not obtainable by Hungarian women, as one of them questioned Khrushchev in his April (1958) tour of Hungary. Evidently, Polish apples and Hungarian wines go to Russia.

Sad people write sad songs. They will continue to write sad songs until the Polish Army hear them, and the Czech Army, and the voice of their thunder shall wake the world once more, to the complete surprise of the western preachers of Condonement, Containment, and Contentment. At least in military strategy, it is the first law to hunt out the weaknesses of the enemy and exploit them. But, *Honi soit qui mal y pense!*
It is a strange sight, a strange and sad sight, to see the governments of the Free World afraid to make an issue of the freedom of the satellite countries. Somewhere in the diplomats' minds is the idiotic notion that we must not talk about the liberation of these countries unless we are prepared to go to war with Russia about them. But believe it or not, the peoples of Hungary and Poland and Czechoslovakia will talk and think of nothing but their national liberation, with or without encouragement. Some democracies like to think that if a Pole or a Hungarian can learn to think of national independence, it is due entirely to their encouragement. It is enough to make a diplomat scared to talk even of Polish freedom or of Czechoslovak freedom! Others can only think of encouraging such freedom "to pull them over to our camp." It never occurs to them that Polish patriots might want freedom and independence for their own sake! It is on this low level that the diplomats of the Free World are thinking and groping, failing to see the greatest reservoir of human force which will eventually crush the Russian Empire.
9 At the Crossroads

“Nowhere is there such a realization of human dignity as in the Soviet Union.”

MANUILZSKY
Head of Comintern

“Are things all right? Yes. I suppose they are all right. *Merde!*—Do you think I am a hypocrite? No. But someday I will blow my brains out. Everybody is a swine!”

MAYAKOVSKY
Moscow's well-paid official poet, who carried out his threat of suicide

“I doubt whether in any country of the world, even Hitler’s Germany, is thought less free, more bowed down, more terrorized [than in Soviet Russia].”

ANDRÉ GIDE

We have come to the conclusion of a four-dimensional tour of the Soviet Union, more or less making some sense in human, intelligible terms out of the complex facts and terrible confusion caused by the inversion of meaning of words explained at the beginning of the book. We have had a brief glimpse behind the Iron Curtain, with the words “Solidarity of the Proletariat” painted large on it, and we have come back to the original point, the crossroads, where the bright young man, hands folded behind his back, presumably idealist and radical, is gazing at the
gates of the Workers’ Paradise and listening to the sharp, shrill melody of the Pied Piper of Kremlin.

The drama enacted behind the Iron Curtain in three acts, time stretched across four decades, is really a comedy, but it is too sad for a comedy; a tragedy, sometimes too touching, bringing tears to the eyes of the audience, but some of the scenes are entirely too preposterous and farce breaks in too often. The play would have been unendurable without these touches of unconscious humor, though none of the characters showed any real wit. Almost all the lines are too heavy, windy, repetitious and pompous. Even Radek’s burlesque confession, written by himself and meant to be preposterous, was too closely veiled to be readily perceived. At times, it was excruciating; the audience didn’t know whether to weep or to laugh. The silent ones were the most effective—those in the backdrop whose backs you could dimly see through the fog, long lines of men, women and children trudging the bleak steppes in snow, their heads bent, silent, pulling their coats about them, and carrying bags across their shoulders. The most unforgettable scene was where the working class shouted vociferously, demanding lower wages and higher production. The part in Act II, where Stalin collaborated with the Fascists, fell rather flat. It was grotesque without being funny. The part where women preferred digging coal in Siberia to prostitution was better, and pregnant women fighting for a chance to work till the last month and earn an extra pittance, was really touching. All in all, as a comedy it was too sad, and as a tragedy it was too monstrous to be enjoyed. Then all of a sudden, one realized that the whole show was meant to be a satire on Marxism, and its playwright-producer was Josef Vissarionich Stalin.
That the real essence of the Soviet regime is a satire upon Marxism can be best illustrated in the following extracts from *Izvestia*, Aug. 15, 1936, beginning with the message of the sailors of the *Marat*:1 “Our dear and beloved Vissarionich! Sailors, officers and political collaborators of the vessel of the line, *Marat*, we send you the militant salute of the Red Fleet. Object of Your tenderness, animated by Your Fatherly love and Your Fatherly solicitude, the men, etc.”

The best comes from the Central Asiatic slaves, Turkmens, Tadjiks, Uzbeks, and Sarts working on the Karaganda desert in Kazakhstan, one of the most dreaded camps for the hunger that rages there. Appearing in the same issue as the above message from the *Marat* sailors, this message breaks out in dithyramb toward the close:

“Under the leadership of our great and glorious communist party, under Your leadership, Comrade Stalin, we are successfully building up a new mechanized basin. We are building up a new, free, happy, and civilized life. We shall make of Karaganda the city of coal, of coke, of verdure, of flowers, one of the fortresses of the defence of our socialist fatherland. The hearts of all the workers of these mines overflow with a burning love for the fatherland, with a great pride in the socialist victories, with a boundless love and devotion for our dear communist party and for You, our dear teacher and leader, Comrade Stalin.

“The bard Kazak Djambul has expressed our feelings in these words:

Stalin! Thou hast annihilated the fortress of our enemies!
Beloved! Thou art the dweller of my soul!
The tellers of tales no longer know with whom to compare thee,

1 This and the following paeans of praise of Stalin are from Victor Serge, *Russia Twenty Years After*, pp. 127-131, Pioneer, N. Y. 1937.
The poets have not enough pearls with which to describe thee!"

"Beloved, Thou art the dweller of my soul"—sometimes you think the tribute is real, sometimes you think it is a deliberate satire written in Moscow and not by the hungry prisoners in the Karaganda desert. In sentiment it fairly matches Krushchev's tribute to Stalin—"Thou creator of Soviet culture . . . careful gardener rearing the human beings in his charge"—which is almost as poetic, if not quite so religious.

The satirical intent of Izvestia is quite evident, however, from its August 2, 1936 issue (two weeks from the murder of Kamenev) in its report of the speech of Kaganovich, in which, according to actual count by Victor Serge, in 200 lines the phrase "our great Stalin" is quoted 17 times and almost every time with several lines of eulogy. These paeans of praise, were designed, covertly of course, to overthrow the Marxist theory denying the role of "great men" in history. Nobody said so openly, but substantially, the editor of Izvestia, or Kaganovich himself, must have meant it. It is in this vein of reductio ad absurdum that we must appreciate the song by an Uzbek poetaster, which could have been sung by a chorus of pretty Uzbek girls (Pravda, August 28, 1936):

O great Stalin, O leader of the peoples,
Thou who broughtest man to birth,
Thou who fructifiest the earth,
Thou who restorest the centuries,
Thou who makest bloom the spring,

Thou, splendour of my spring, O Thou,
Sun reflected by millions of hearts. . . .
The conclusion is inevitable: *Stalinism is a satire upon Marxism.*

This thing, Communism, is with us. It cannot be laughed off. It casts its long shadows already over some twenty countries on its border. The Russian Bear is growing fat around its loins, but its paws are still powerful and its appetite insatiable.

Inescapably, we are driven to the question, What is the human destiny for the future of the world, and what is the future of human culture? This is a question which concerns us. It would be more correct to state it differently, not what the future of the world and of human society is going to be, but what we, as free men, shall want it to be. As we act individually according to our respective beliefs, we help to make the shape of things to come for those who come after us. The problem is complex, involving an increasingly complex economy and its effect on the role of the individual in that economy. Shall state control increase to a point dominating the personal life of the individuals, or is it worth while always to guarantee the sanctity of individual freedom against the encroaching power of the state machine? What is our human destiny? Shall there be more autocracy, or more freedom? Both communism and fascism place the state above the individual. Is this going to be the flower of the future culture? And can there be a human culture at all or creative art or philosophy with all individual thinking reduced to conformity with the orders of the rulers of the state?

The communists beg the question by arrogating to themselves the term *progressive* and labeling those opposed to them as *reactionary*. But to decide what is progressive and what is reactionary depends on their relation to a de-
fined goal. If the goal is more autocracy, more absolute power, more slavery and subjugation of human freedom, under whatever label or pretext, then the communists are truly progressive with respect to that goal; but if the goal is more freedom of self-respecting individuals, more human dignity and more equality of men before the law, and more constitutional restrictions of the rulers, then the communists, like the fascists, are already moving back toward the era of the Pharaohs and reactionary. Let us call a spade a spade. I submit that the use of these two words should be re-examined.

We are living in a world of flux and uncertainties, of great readjustments made necessary by rapid technical progress. There are many doubters and penthouse communists believing that the whole monied economy of the U.S. is corrupt like themselves, stifled in drinks and mink coats. There are many scholars, intellectuals and university professors who believe that the trend toward planned economy is inevitable, that the present world order is dying in favor of more and more state control and less and less personal liberty. And liberty, in contrast to stern discipline, sounds decadent; it can sound dangerously like dissipation in the futile life of the penthouse communists.

No doubt this free and unfettered criticism of the bourgeois way of life by the intellectual bourgeoisie is in itself healthy and wholesome and as it should be—this excursion of the intellect in search of a better world always is. But somewhere down the line, the values of human freedom are lost. The tragedy of the modern world is that economists are incapable of evaluating human values, and thinkers who believe in human ethical values cannot stand economics . . . Somewhere, somehow, per-
haps Russia's planned economy represents the future of human destiny and human culture. We can no longer see the human life whole, the distinguishing factor which is human, which makes us different from animals, the centrality of human dignity as a goal of all progress, and its greater importance over production. When questions of future society are concerned, our thinking is dominated by economics—otherwise it is considered too vague. Who would dare write an article in the London Economist or the New Statesmen without showing some familiarity with statistics? The choice has to be made somewhere, in a formula rather too simply and too rigorously put as follows:

\[ \text{(A): More production and better distribution, but with less human dignity} \]
\[ \text{or (B): More human dignity, but less production and less equitable distribution.} \]

Of course, the question is too simple. But a hypothetical equation has to be given that way and the choice made.

The real situation of the matter is that idealism and materialism, human values and material production, are all mixed together in this world. It may surprise many to hear that in its origin Communism is also idealism, the idealism of universal brotherhood and equality and anarchism. It is the most ideal of all ideals, this anarchism. And it is exactly the ideals of Communism which have attracted so many intellectuals, particularly the scientists. The scientists are eminently susceptible to Communism for the following reasons: (1) as scientists, they have a natural contempt for money and capitalism; (2) they like what is logical and what is mechanically conceived and planned; (3) some are completely ignorant of the real
world politics; (4) a few have a narrow, unbalanced education, having no appreciation of human values or the humanities, and some think it is "cute" to disagree with the common herd. Ignorance in one thing makes them "specialists" in another. Obviously, those who are pro-Russia would repudiate any charge of approving of the secret police or a police state. But they have no patience to listen to these sordid details. (It was different when the label was Fascism.) What they fall in love with is not Communist Russia, but a worthy ideal of brotherhood, equality and a better, more just world.

For mankind in general, this idealism must be satisfied. Clearly, all want to see a classless society, a society without exploitation of one's fellowmen, a society where the poor have a chance, and best of all, where the poor do not exist. If that society could be realized, where the working class is not exploited and the farmers are free individuals governing themselves without the state and without police, if such a state could be realized without secret police methods, I would be for Communism any time, as a goal of the future world. What better world than one in which we can say "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs"? But I am not idiotic enough to subscribe to the second half of the sentence. Very soon Mrs. A. will "need" a mink coat, and Mrs. B. will "need" an orchestra at her dinner, and Mrs. C. will "need" to go to Main Chance, Arizona, for a beauty treatment. Has there ever been a more childish formula stated by one who calls himself a social philosopher?

It is the idealism of Communist doctrines, of the equality and brotherhood of man and absence of poverty, which attracted a man like André Gide. Perpetual dissatisfaction with life as it is is a fine thing. The world is
always better for men who have dreamed and who have dared to criticize what is sick and unhealthy in their times. But the best of them are those who temper their idealism with a searching, ruthless honesty and who permit no self-delusion.

André Gide is such an idealist. To me, he is important. Soviet Russia was to him like a dream come true, but Gide’s was also a searching, honest mind, a mind of unquestioned integrity. He was inspired by Soviet Russia and had always defended it. Four days after his arrival in Moscow in 1936, he declared once more in his speech in the Red Square on the occasion of Gorky’s funeral: “The fate of culture is bound up in our minds with the destiny of the Soviet Union. We will defend it.” His Return from the U.S.S.R. (Knopf, 1937) shows a mind beset with fears and doubts, struggling still to keep a dream alive, with the hope that what he saw there was only temporary and would soon pass. That is the kind of strong spiritual integrity and ruthless honesty and fierceness of spirit that we associate with the pioneers of progress and with the word “culture.”

Gide himself was pre-eminently occupied with the question of human culture, and therefore what he wrote has the perspective of a deep thinker who is concerned with the future of mankind. He called himself a bourgeois critical of the whole bourgeois way of life. What pained him was to see the indifference to suffering in Soviet Russia, the haughtiness of the privileged, the toadyism of the Communist party officials singing identical hymns to the great leader Stalin which nauseated him, and above all, the deadening conformity, the compliance, the smell of a new aristocracy and the return to animal comfort which
he hated in the bourgeoisie of France. Of course, the whole mistake of the Communists in planning his tour was to show him the great palaces and sanatoriums and the luxurious hotels of which he had seen more than enough in his home country, France. His observant eye was concentrated on the dirty shacks and crowded rooms in which the poor lived right next to a fantastically clean model chicken farm the Communists wanted to show him, in which every chicken had a ring on his leg and the floor of the chicken yard was disinfected with a special powder. The sight made him sick.

Gide was above all bothered by a strange phenomenon, the rise of the spirit of the new bourgeoisie:

"I feel that a new and satisfied workers' bourgeoisie may soon arise . . . which will come to resemble all too closely our own petty bourgeoisie. I see everywhere the preliminary symptoms of this. . . . It disquiets me very much to observe, in the U.S.S.R. today, that these bourgeois instincts are indirectly flattered and encouraged by recent decisions that have been alarmingly approved of over here. With the restoration of the family (in its function of "social cell"), of inheritance and legacies, the love of lucre and of private ownership, are beginning to dominate the need for comradeship, for free sharing, for life in common . . . And we see the re-appearance . . . of a kind of aristocracy; I am not referring here to the aristocracy of merit and personal worth, but only to the aristocracy of respectability, of conformity, which in the next generation will become that of money . . . "There are no more classes in the U.S.S.R.—granted. But there are poor. There are too many of them—far too many. I had hoped not to see any—or, to speak more accurately, it was in order not to see any that I had come to the U.S.S.R. . . .
"This petty bourgeois spirit, which I greatly fear is in process of developing, is in my eyes profoundly and fundamentally counter-revolutionary."

Gide was occupied with the central problem of human freedom in relation to culture. Speaking on the subject of the creative arts, he defended the freedom of individual as a prerequisite for culture to exist at all. "In our form of society, a great writer, a great artist, is essentially non-conformist," whereas in Russia, "all those who do not declare themselves to be satisfied are to be considered 'Trotskyites.' So that one begins to wonder if Lenin himself were to return to earth today. . . ." Talking about the Soviet distinction of form and content in art and condemnation of formalism, he said that this distinction "may have been useful politically . . . but then stop talking of culture. Culture is in danger when criticism is not free."

Culture is not something encased and embalmed. Culture is that free play of the mind, that perpetual dissatisfaction and refusal to accept the present as God-given. Culture is doubt. Much better is it to be torn by doubt and despair than to be smugly self-assured with a bowl of pottage. For of such stuff is culture made—the eternal capacity for self-improvement, with society as with individuals. To doubt, to dream, to stretch out one's arms and not fold them, to set out in eternal quest and to doubt one's own dream—these are the qualities that make for progress. Culture, as Gide suggests, is the refusal to conform. The dreamer is ever greater than his dreams.

What Gide expresses in his book *Return from the U.S.S.R.* is the short sharp pains and gnawing doubts of
an idealist at the dissolving of his dream as the Bolshevik Revolution got under way. What Gide expresses is to a certain extent also a spiritual struggle going on in the ranks of the communists. Djilas twice refers to the duplicity, servitude, toadyism, jealousy, personal ambition of careerism which eats up the soul of the communists, and the outbursts of alcoholism.

Victor Serge draws a picture of two of Russia’s best post-revolutionary poets, Yessenin and Mayakovsky, who both committed suicide. He knew every one of them personally, many of them intimately, their sisters and daughters. This one was a heroic fighter in the Kronstadt Rebellion, that one served ten years in exile under the Tsars, all brave and noble idealists, all sacrificed their ideals, all recanted and disavowed themselves and knelt before Stalin. In that loss of human dignity, they lost that which alone was worth while. I have already quoted what the poet Mayakovsky said to Victor Serge at the beginning of the chapter. Here was Yessenin, thirty years old, at the height of his fame, married eight times. He had been drinking. He considered his own plunge into the abyss. “Where has your rashness led me, O my head?” he cried. “I have been dishonorable, I have been wicked—but only to burn more brilliantly.” And this is what he wrote about his own moral abyss: “I am a stranger in my own country . . . and I myself am in the way . . . I am not a new man, I have one foot in the past—and yet, although I stagger, although I limp, I would join the cohorts of steel once again . . .” One day his friends found him hanging in his room, a suitcase strap around his neck, his forehead bruised by falling in death against a steampipe, and on the table were his last lines: “Au
revoir, my friend, au revoir . . . There is nothing new about dying in this life, but there is surely nothing new about living."

Is there then no road open for idealism? The answer is not easy, but the idealistic impulse in man must have an outlet in action. All youth is idealistic, in all countries East or West. All youth is radical. All youth demands something to fight for and sacrifice for, and especially something to fight against, to tear down and destroy, something which calls for danger, adventure, blood, sweat and tears and camping in the open. Why talk to Asiatics about Simmons beds? Why preach to the Indonesians, the Burmese, and the Turks and the Arabs about enamelled bathtubs and electric shavers and push-button Cadillacs? I saw how the youth of China, girls and boys, go leftist, how their spirits were convulsed by having something to destroy and being promised a share to build a new heaven on earth, how they loved adventure and danger and self-sacrifice. Girl revolutionaries in Asia and Africa would like home permanents and Chanel No. 5, but they can forget about them if necessary. Isn’t there something they can tear down? Some way in which they can revolt, some thing they can cry "Down With" to? These were the feelings of Chinese boys and girls who went to Yenan, particularly happy to obey the order to disobey their parents. Such must be the feeling of all youth in countries now impatient to become modern and talk equality with the more advanced countries of the West. The instinct for vandalism is a deep trait in mankind, coming up to the surface when there is a chance, when social continuity is broken, and especially something resembling a Holy Cause looms up over the horizon. While camping in the open with the stars above
them, it was gay, *sans souci*, adventurous and wonderful. With the cold gray dawn of autocracy and privilege and the mad personal fight for survival now going on in Communist China, many of them are regretting the dissolution of a mad summer night’s dream. But it was the same youth who turned to Russia ten or twenty years ago, who heard a voice militant, aggressive, promising to destroy. The dream is no more. It has evaporated into thin air. But conform they must. It is either that or the corrective labor camp.

As I write, the Chinese papers publish the story of Miss Ting Ling, a veteran Communist woman writer who won the Stalin novel prize. Because she failed to conform absolutely to the party line (actually only being brusque with a Party leader), she has been disgraced and is now doing a housemaid’s work scrubbing floors. I remember also a young man, Wang Shih-wei, who years ago used to contribute to one of my literary magazines in Shanghai. When I was back in Chungking in 1944, something had happened to him. There were rumors that he was dead—anyway he had not been seen again. He had written a fairly long article entitled “The Wild Lily” in Yenan criticizing the differentiated menus of the three classes of Communist cadre and protesting against the licentious living of the upper echelons. About the time of my visit in Chungking, a group of foreign newspaper correspondents had asked and been given permission to visit Yenan and the Chinese journalists took advantage of this occasion to go along. One of the mysteries they wanted to solve was the whereabouts of this man Wang. The Chinese reporters inquired and the Communists of Yenan replied that he was well and alive. They asked to see him, and the request was rejected, but the Chinese journalists
insisted. Finally the Communists agreed to show them Wang. He came along, thin and quiet, and took his position on a bench. To every question the Chinese reporters put to him, he answered in the correct manner. Everything was fine and wonderful in Yenan. Finally there was a slip. One of the Chinese reporters asked him what he was doing and his reply was that he was now occupied in pasting matchboxes. They permitted him to produce for the state. This is the kind of things I mean, the impossibility of having both Communism and human dignity of independent thinking.

Go left, young man. Your instinct is right; your heart is in the right place. But be sure where the left is. That is almost the whole point of this book. Go and see where the poor man has a chance; find out where the laborer in the field and the worker on his bench are not oppressed. Seek the place where the workers can talk back to their managers, where unions protect their interests and air their complaints and grievances, where labor is not submissive as a lamb led to slaughter, and where the laborer proudly raises his head to demand a legitimate share of the product of the sweat of his brows. Left is the place where the laborers can unite in strikes, and the press of the nation dare not be unfair to them; where the congressmen and the senators and the president himself cater to them and their families, being afraid to lose their votes and the votes of their women in the family. Search and find out where the poor and the lowly are not despised, where classlessness is a social thing and where the employer and the employee shall mix socially outside their place of work without condescension and without snobbery. But use your head and avoid the snares and tempta-
tions of the Pied Piper. Follow not his steps and dance not to his tune.

But if your idea of the future goal of human progress is more autocracy and more state control over the individual, go right! Go to Russia! If your idea of socialism is more production and less human dignity, go to Russia. If you are ready to conform to those who rule over you, if you are contented to follow where they lead and surrender your rights of thinking and dissent, in a society where dissidence is a crime and only obedience is expected of you, go to Russia. Go where the accumulation of capital is greatest, and the agony of toil and deprivations weigh down heavily upon the men and women, where the tax on cotton is 100% and on silk 50%, where the rich shall laugh and the poor shall weep. Go where the prophets shall deceive you with sweet promises of the future and take the lion’s share of your harvest which you shall earn with the sweat of your brow and the strength of your groins. If you are for class and privilege, where freedom exists only for the few, where the workers have no rights and the people have no voice, where the sweatshop exists, go to the USSR. Go right!

For a silent revolution has taken place since Karl Marx wrote a century ago. In northern Europe, in Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, England and in the U.S., a social revolution has taken place, where labor has steadily gained its rights without the bloody class struggle which Karl Marx predicted as necessary and inevitable. It has grown on the basis of law and of public enlightenment. Karl Marx died when Henry Ford was a young man of twenty and he had never had a chance to see the social revolution produced by the economics of mass produc-
tion. He had seen only the pitiable conditions of the working man in Europe in the 1840's, and he would never have dreamed of labor unions who own and command hundreds of millions of dollars and buy real estate and transact government bonds as in the United States. He had no chance to see this, and according to what he saw a century ago, he could not have believed it possible without a very messy and bloody class struggle.

The economics of mass production introduced a new material relationship for the distribution of wealth, as distinct from the economy of the carriage trade, catering only to a small aristocratic rich class. Today, an American manufacturer goes into the doldrums as soon as signs indicate that the masses of the laboring public are beginning to lose their purchasing power, for on the purchasing power of that public the sales of his goods depend entirely. Woe to the capitalist who thinks that the public will buy his goods when they will not, or have not the money wherewith to pay for it. Henry Ford started an economic revolution of the first order when he aimed for mass consumption and raised the wages of his employees. Today, for a manufacturer to cut wages below a certain level would be to cut his own throat.

The curious thing about the United States is the absence of a Labor Party. The growth of a labor party becomes impossible when both the Republicans and the Democrats direct their campaigns on the securing of farm votes and labor votes and do their best to cater to their welfare. The fact that an administration spends annually two billion dollars on all sorts of farm subsidies including the Soil Bank to compensate the farmers for not planting on their acreage should be denounced by Khrushchev and Company from Moscow as shameless and naked Com-
munism. The fear of losing the labor vote and farm vote hangs like a sword over both parties alike, both during and after the elections—during the campaigns because they are competing for the workers' and farmers' favor, and after their ascent to power because they are afraid of losing their votes again. No American administration can issue one of those Soviet Labor Decrees and hope to stay in office and no American Senator or congressman can afford to stand up and be counted as favoring any one of the Soviet labor decrees (Ch. 5) and hope to survive politically or be re-elected. How can there be a third labor party when there are already two labor parties in the United States? Either party, Republican or Democrat, must without fear of contradiction be looked upon by Moscow as shamefully clear Communist. Furthermore, the anti-trust law is not a dead letter; in recent years there has been federal prosecution of some of the most powerful corporations in the United States, including the giant Du Pont Company and the International Business Machines. With a billion dollars turnover per year, they can not buy the "Wall Street" Government of the United States. On the basis of this record, either party, Republican or Democrat, has the right to denounce Moscow as unashamed monopoly-capitalist. But as recently as 1957, Khrushchev still talked of the "monopoly-capitalist United States." It would seem that the Kremlin is hardly the most suitable place from which to cast such stones.

Arthur Koestler makes an appropriate remark à propos of this: "The left Babbitt assumes that there is a continuous spectrum stretching from pale pink liberals to deeper red socialists and so on to purple communists of the extreme left. His idea is based on the confusion of the political direction 'left' with the geographical direc-
tion 'East.' It is time that he got into his head that Moscowl is not to his left but to his East. The Soviet Union is not a socialist party, and Cominform policy is not socialist policy . . . So let us bear in mind that 'East is East, and left is left,' and if the twain sometimes still meet, the meeting is purely coincidental."
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"The best defense is attack."

SUN TSE
Chinese strategist, 500 B.C.

This is the eleventh hour. It is approaching midnight. The sentry posts are drowsy. It is comfortable to believe there is no war going on, since all is quiet on the front. Peering into the night, many are even inclined to believe that there appears in the dim darkness what looks like the enemy’s white flag, that he is getting reasonable and desires peace. What is the war all about? Hardly anyone seems to remember. Why can’t we live together as peaceful neighbors? Peace, of course, is an object to be devoutly desired and prayed for. One sentry keeps his eyes open and alert, but another’s eyelids constantly droop and his voice is hoarse with sleep. Others assert, with gladness in their voices, that there is indeed a white flag on the horizon, that the enemy indeed desires peace . . .
Of course, there is no war, only a continuation of politics. If there is a war, it is a cold one, and who cares about the cold war? I have not seen any evidence of the western leaders having done some sustained thinking on the cold war; if there are hurried measures to counteract it, they are not part of a well-thought-out, consistent world policy. It is not that the sentry posts do not wish to doze off, but that the enemy, like soldiers on the front, continually love to play little pranks to prevent the sentries from enjoying peaceful slumber. Take the Suez crisis. American action during the crisis was based on a sound appraisal of the importance of keeping the goodwill of the Arabs. Granted—but it had also the appearance of precipitate action, of working at cross purposes, of unbalance of judgement, and of somebody stomping the floor for half an hour in pique at British arrogance. It showed all the strength of a weak man during a sudden flare of angry determination. That is so different from the strength of the silent man. The silent man does not hit at random, at his allies.

To me, the cold war is as important as improving the military defenses of the Free World. If the cold war is lost, and the populations and resources of two-thirds of the world are gone over to the Soviet Union, a hot war is inevitable. At some point just before that, comparable to the point where Hitler marched into Poland, the democracies will once more be thoroughly aroused and get into a fighting mood. By losing strategic advantages in cold war through neglect, one does not make war less likely, but more inevitable. It is fairly apparent that the Soviet strategy in the last decade has been to concentrate on speedup of maximum development of arma-
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ment, of the world's largest fleet of submarines, heavy
tanks and artillery and intercontinental missiles, to hedge
about disarmament discussion while she is doing this,
and at the same time to carry on the cold war on the
Asiatic front, aimed at increasing her manpower and re-
sources. Without forcing a war, she believes she can wait,
and time will be on her side.

Without a basic program to meet the war of ideas, the
West once more has found itself embarrassed and losing
friends in the yet uncommitted countries. Once more,
through neglect, the West has let the Soviet score triumph
after triumph. Either one recognizes that a cold war exists
and is being actively carried on by Russia, and therefore
one sets about to meet the challenge, to win over the minds
of the revolutionary leaders and intellectuals in Asia and
Africa; or one ignores the existence of a cold war and
waits to parry the blows punch by punch. But if one
recognizes that the cold war must be won, then a thorough
examination of the strength and weaknesses of the enemy,
based on a fundamental analysis of the world conflict of
ideas as such, is of the first importance. The Free World
has nothing approaching a Comintern to lay down the
outlines of an international strategy; there does not
seem, to my knowledge, to be an anti-Communist in-
nernational organization of importance—much less a com-
mon united strategy.

The outstanding features of world politics are (1) that
there does not exist a united Free World international
policy, and (2) that the democracies have been constantly
on the defensive. That world policy is zero as far as the cold
war is concerned. The NATO, the SEATO, the Baghdad
Pact are instruments of policy in the realm of military
defense, not in the realm of ideas, and the cold war is a war of ideas, a battle for the minds of Asia, especially young Asia.

Neither can the foreign aid program of the U.S. be considered a substitute for the basic war of ideas. Foreign aid is a timely political measure, but as an instrument for checking immediate Communist onslaughts, it is futile. First, whereas the Communist threat is immediate, one cannot through foreign aid raise the standard of living of Asia in less than 30, 40 or 50 years. Second, the raising of standard of living is always a matter of relative degree, and at what point poverty itself provides, or ceases to provide, breeding ground for Communism, it is impossible to say. Third, through foreign aid the standard of living is not necessarily raised—so much depends upon the economic policy and the local administrations of the countries which receive such aids. Fourth, lending and borrowing of money is normally bad for friendship between nations as between individuals. Lastly and most dangerous of all, foreign aid creates self-delusions, the illusion that you can buy friendship with dollars, the illusion that this is all we need to do and can think of doing in the cold war, and there is no need to do anything else. It is easier to give away dollars than to try to understand what the other man is thinking.

Foreign aid must be considered in the light of temporary measures of relief, almost like famine or emergency relief. Long before visible results are shown in raising the standard of living of countries like India or Pakistan to make the people less susceptible to Communist propaganda—for that is the basic assumption behind foreign aid—the West cannot wait and see Communist propaganda win friends and allies by ideas and ideologies. In
the final analysis, the problem of poverty must be solved by the continuous efforts of the Asiatic countries themselves through economic policies spread over decades and determined by the character of the individual governments. It cannot be solved by some one nation throwing around hundreds of millions of dollars here and there.

Is it not simpler and much more effective, to espouse the cause of the hungry and downtrodden right now and tell the uncertain countries coming up rapidly to achieve national independence that, exactly because of the protection of the poor and the liberation of the working masses, they must fight Russia? Poverty is the best breeding ground for theoretical Communism; poverty is also the best ground to fight the battle with Russia, for Russia after forty years has done nothing for the poor and has degraded and dragged down the working class. The case of poverty is, I believe, readymade for the Free World and not for Russia.

One cannot fight a war or sign a peace on illusions. Consistently, the democracies have been on the defensive. They are on the defensive because the West never had a consistent, imaginative and creative propaganda program. Faced with the confusion of ideas in the minds of the public and the total absence of ideas on the leadership level (outside the "massive retaliation" of Dulles, the "containment" of Acheson and the "non-aggression pacts" of Macmillan), the Free World is losing out in the cold war. The cold war is a war of propaganda, of words and ideas, and the ideas of the gentlemen are not ideas as such, but are rather tactical concepts. They are not social or political concepts. Such tactical concepts are certainly of no help in the war of ideas. So today we are faced with the strange phenomenon that in this world
conflict where all Asia and Africa are seething in a fer-
ment of thought, the democracies are tongue-tied. They
are tongue-tied because they really have nothing to say.
If they have a case, they do not seem to be aware of it.

Communist propaganda has always followed a line care-
fully thought out and mapped by the Comintern decades
back. It has made propaganda into a science, subtly play-
ing on the psychology of the people it wishes to convert.
Wherever Communism won new friends, it has done so,
first, as a champion of the masses against an oppressing
class and second, as a champion of national independence
against oppressing foreign countries. That is briefly the
Communist arsenal in the cold war of propaganda. And
often it is terribly effective. The enslavement and ex-
ploitation of labor and the liberation of countries under
an imperialist yoke are exactly the kind of topics to
arouse the idealism and revolutionary ardour of young
students and intellectuals.

Will the West merely remain on the defensive and ex-
plain that it is not an oppressing class or a group of op-
pressing nations? All youth is idealistic, as I have pointed
out in the preceding chapter. All youth is radical and
impatient; and all youth likes to have a cause to fight for
and something to fight against. It is even more important
to have something to fight against than fight for. Com-
munism calls for action and sacrifice and the more de-
mands are made on their sacrifice and adventure in the
face of danger, the more the youth likes it.

In contrast to the Communist call for heroism and
sacrifice, the American call, an appeal to prosperity, is a
call to lie in Simmons beds with Simmons box-spring
mattresses. The Communist call is like a call to burn down
a house or a bridge, the American approach to propaganda is practically an exhibition of Simmons mattresses and an invitation to look on the screen at a kidney-shaped swimming pool in Hollywood. The Americans do not realize that such propaganda leaves the Asiatics cold because it is so remote and unreal. If American propaganda tells the Asiatics the story of a shoeshine boy in downtown Eastside who gets an even chance in schooling, the Asiatics understand it and will like it. But if somebody tells me that the air of Banff is like champagne, I may say fine, I would like to go there someday, but for the present the foul city air of Manhattan is good enough for me.

What can the Americans say? The word “democracy” at once comes up to mind, but it has been stolen and appropriated by the Communists for propaganda purposes. The Communists continually deride American democracy as false democracy, but the Free World dare not deride the burlesque of democracy in Soviet Russia—just to “help relax tensions.” There is the word “freedom.” But “freedom” is a word like water or air, and it can be a most insipid subject until one talks of poisoned air or polluted water. Can the Free World think of something for the young students to fight against? Are there enslavement, chain-gang sharecroppers in Soviet Russia? Is there exploitation of labor? Where? In Russia? Are you sure? . . . We of the Free World have a high regard for facts; we do not wish to tell others what we are not sure about, you know. . . . Besides, we want to live in peace with Russia. We have no faults to find with Russia and we are a peace-loving people. We will let them live in peace if they will allow us to live in peace. We are for justice, freedom, democracy and equality of all nations. . . .
By this time, your Asiatic audience should have fallen asleep. One cannot fight the Communist call for revolution and sacrifice with schoolma'amly ideas.

The fact of the bankruptcy of leadership in the war of propaganda has to be frankly admitted. Consistently, Soviet Russia is on the attack; consistently, the democracies try to "explain" themselves. The youths of Asia do not want to listen to tired voices and apologetic voices. They prefer something gladdening, and heartening and strong. And not only youth, but all the world can be awfully tired of a man who is "explaining" all the time. The world cannot believe a man who is all the time protesting his innocence. At the conference of the Baghdad powers this spring, Russia attacked, the Free World excused itself. At the conference of the SEATO powers, Russia again attacked, the Free World again begged everybody's pardon, apologizing for holding the conference at all, and protesting that their aims are entirely and solely defensive. At the Baghdad conference, for example, they would not allow themselves the indecency of mentioning what happened to Russia's neighbors on the west and that her neighbors on the south (Turkey, Iran, Saudi-Arabia) would not like to find themselves turned into semi-colonies like Hungary and Rumania. At the Russian announcement of unilateral suspension of atomic tests, President Eisenhower again explained; he explained he had known of it two weeks before, that he had thought of stealing the thunder, but of course under the circumstances in a free democracy, you know . . . He did not say that Russia had completed her series of tests and the U.S. hadn't, and if such tests were an evil, Russia had set the lead in evil. Dulles' speech in reply was deliberate, well-considered, very "educated" and very professorial.
He quoted chapter and verse from the United Nations Charter, and he defended the U.S. very successfully by enumerating the numerous U.S. proposals, with dates, for suspension of atomic tests with supervision. The fact remains that Dulles defended and did not prosecute, and felt himself on the dock. And what is the world to think? The world looking on is thinking that both Russia and U.S. do not intend to disarm, do not wish it, that this is essentially a conflict of two national interests, that both are playing a game of propaganda and on the whole Russia plays it better than the U.S.

I have all respect for Dulles. He is probably the only world leader who is deeply concerned with mending the fences against Russia's onslaughts and who is never confused. He has to remind Russia and Macmillan himself of Russia's "broken word." As far as Macmillan is concerned, he does not show any evidence of knowing anything about Russia's record for breaking a dozen non-aggression pacts. The spirit of Munich is reasserting itself, on the dangerous premise that Soviet Russia is better than Hitler or has more respect for treaties. Dulles is for taking up the discussion from where the Geneva conference of 1955 left off. He is for following up the question of reunification of Germany, which Russia promised at Geneva but chose to forget. He is for discussing the situation of the Eastern European countries. But he suffers from the absence of a united international policy of the Free World. Each problem is taken up by itself because there is no basic program to go upon.

So it has been very embarrassing for the West. The spectacle of either Dulles or Macmillan having a tilt with Khrushchev always gives me the hilarious feeling of watching a gentleman wearing a bowler hat and striped
pants and carrying a cane, having a bad time of it at the market square against a crowd of village drunks and broads. He does not talk their dialect; he uses the wrong words and has a wrong accent.

Whatever is wrong about the tactics of rabble rousing, there is in it a ground principle of all oratory—the speaker must be imaginative, he must be able to put himself in the place of his listeners and talk their language. One should not enter the cold war of ideas unless one has a fighting program and unless he has an imaginative understanding of the minds and psychology of the foreign peoples caught in a wave of revolutionary fervor and wavering at the moment at the crossroads. This is what the West hasn't got. This psychology of the uncommitted countries is a completely neglected field. If one tenth of the genius of the hidden persuaders had been applied to this problem, and results checked in the same way as a business firm buying advertisement checks them in sales results, they could not possibly have gone on in this foolish fashion. At least they would have to change some of their slogans and sales talk. Then they feel grieved and quite justifiably that their motives have been misunderstood by the other peoples.

The issue is misstated when the conflict is regarded as one between the U.S. and Russia. Then of course the Asiatics understand why the U.S. is willing to pay blackmail to save her own skin, and no gratitude is called for. It is once more misstated as a conflict of social systems between socialism and capitalism. The analysis of the Soviet record, particularly in Chapter 5, leads one to the only possible conclusion that the present Soviet society is a true capitalist society and it is not a figure of speech. When both systems are capitalist, the throwing of epi-
thets like "monopoly capitalism" is entirely meaningless, and only confuses the issue. It is a third time misstated when people talk of "peaceful co-existence," something like the peaceful co-existence which can well exist between the Catholic and Protestant churches. This means that fundamentally, in theory as well as in practice, there is no conflict in the interpretation of man, in his role in society, and in the value of human existence.

The first condition for the evolution of an anti-Communist program is the removal of a psychological block and a complete change of psychological attitude from the defensive to the offensive. What is required is the removal of fears and inhibitions on the part of the West in making counter-charges against Russia.

Once the psychological block is removed, it will be possible to engage in some creative, clear-cut thinking. It is even conceivable, though not probable, that an Anti-Communist International can be created among the Free World nations to lay down the grand plan, not for military matters, but strictly in the realm of social ideas, to reveal to the world the essential points and the true nature of this world conflict.

The nature of the war of ideology has been ill understood, or not understood at all. The ideological war is related to political, economic and military war, but is different from them in function, scope and objective. For instance, in politics one can compromise or compose differences; in ideology, one cannot. In a military war there may be a stalemate; in ideology, none. The ideological war is of paramount importance in the next ten years, more important than a military one; this is where Russia is concentrating now. The principles are:
On the Negative Side

(1) A war of ideology, unlike a political conference, is not to settle issues, but to raise them. An agreement to bury the issues is to call the cold war off. But one can only pretend that there are no fundamental issues between the Communist and the Anti-Communist world, which would be to delude oneself. Even if, for instance, the disarmament issue is settled, ideological conflicts will remain which can be resolved only in favor of one side.

(2) A purely defensive war in ideology is a war lost already.

(3) A war of ideology should not be conducted with the hope, or even the idea of "relaxing international tension," or it reverts to (2) and should not be conducted at all.

(4) An ideological war is not, and should not be presented as, a war for the interests of any one particular country, such as the United States.

(5) An ideological war should show the utmost respect for national feelings, or it defeats its own purpose. A war of propaganda for "showing off" one country inevitably leads to resentment by another.

On the Positive Side

(6) A war of ideology should be so conducted as to seize and retain the initiative in choosing the issues to be fought about, and in timing these issues.

(7) An ideological war should have a universal message which is not the exclusive possession of any one
country. The separate nations of the Free World are united only on common aims and ideals, against forces which threaten the foundations of civilization and a return to savagery and the suppression of all human rights.

(8) An ideological war should be instilled with a high moral passion against evil and against all forms of oppression. It should have a faith which can stir men's souls. It should have a direct, immediate appeal. The voice of propaganda should be the voice of conviction in certain eternal principles, and of certainty (like Communist faith in the materialistic evolution of history). Unlike diplomatic talks, it need not flinch at evil, or avoid mentioning it, or shut its eyes to it. The more Soviet Russia denies oppression, the more it becomes an international issue to talk about.

(9) An ideological war should closely identify itself with the people of the area and express their national aspirations, especially for national independence. It should have a natural place in the people's national program.

(10) A war of ideology should show that the nations having the common ideals are united and strong. All ideological talks are nullified when nations politically on its own side are treated cheaply like satellites (as Ben-Gurion was addressed by Eisenhower during the Suez crisis), while fence-riders playing for blackmail are given preferential treatment (like Nasser). Immediately, it loses its universal character, and the conflict is seen as one of national conflicts which do not bind the neutral countries.

It will be seen that where the Free World has floundered or failed in winning the goodwill of the peoples, it has violated every single one of the foregoing principles.

There is no reason why in the war of propaganda
Russia should have all the advantages. Quite the contrary. The aim of Communist propaganda has always been to embarrass the West at a timely moment, and Russia might be surprised to find that she could be woefully embarrassed, too, if the West so chose. The fact that the West has so far refrained from doing so creates a cocksure impression that Soviet Russia is ever-confident, ever-progressive, and free from moral or political blemishes. If so, she is due to find out a great many things about herself. There is no need of smears; what is needed is merely the willingness to call things by their right names.

(A) An Anti-Communist International united policy must take a firm stand on the liberation of nations subjected at present to Russian imperialism, both in Eastern Europe and in Central Asia. The principle of national liberation must be affirmed sincerely and unequivocally. If Russia agrees to the principle, so much the better; arguments as to whether Hungary or Poland, etc. is independent now can come later. The more arguments, the more will Russia be exposed. The greatest contradiction which threatens the structure of the Russian state is its rule as imperialist power holding at least twenty independent peoples in subjection, and in any one of these are sparks which may kindle into a flame.

Actually today, Russia is the world's No. 1 imperialist, and is in a more vulnerable position than Great Britain. She should be put on the defensive, and not be permitted to go about peddling anti-imperialist talks like a champion of national liberties. She need not look so comfortable and we need not assist her to look comfortable. The West will protest, for instance, that the Polish Government is not independent but obeys the behests of Russia. Russia will deny it, and the West will protest again. Russia will vehe-
mently deny it again, and the West will insist that it is a puppet government. That generates an issue. That is the whole point of psychological warfare. Again, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania are as much entitled to free elections as Poland and Hungary, and so are Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. Russia will say angrily that free elections have been held, and the West will say that they have not. That brings out another issue and creates discussion. This is psychological warfare *par excellence*.

The Western democracies have consistently missed this point. They will not even talk about national liberation of these countries unless, they say, they are prepared to go to war with Russia over the question of these countries. The West has consistently forgotten that national independence is a vital principle, very much so, that we are for Polish national independence, not because we are against Russia, but as a matter of principle, and not for our benefit, but for the Poles. Only then can the outside world respect Western leadership. Even Krushchev cannot quarrel with the principle as principle.

As matters stand today, if we accept in theory that Algeria is a French province, then Great Britain, France, Holland and the western democracies in general may be on the whole cleared of the imperialist charge. The situation is ready for an all-out crusade against imperialism of any sort. It will hurt Russia more than the western democracies.

(B) An Anti-Communist International policy must include exposure of *oppression of the masses*, which in Russia is carried out with every form of skulduggery; every form of beastliness and prostitution of human dignity and degradation of human nature. For the second great contradiction of the Soviet rule is its necessary and
inevitable oppression of the masses and enslavement of the working class, and the use of despotic methods and rigid control of thought for this purpose. These methods have been carried to extremes beyond the Tsars, and they show that a "perpetual civil war between the government and the people" exists. It is a highly unstable and unsound situation. The West should call upon Soviet Russia to stop the inhuman enslavement of labor and to encourage the freedom of opinion which her constitution promises. If Russia does not like it, so much the better.

Russia and Poland in 1956, and Red China in 1957, have tried liberalization of censorship and have found it necessary to clamp it on again. They cannot afford to hear what their people say. It is likely that even a slight relaxation of censorship may be dangerous to Communist rule wherever it may be. As in Poland, once the people have a foretaste of freedom, they are likely to demand more. It cannot be helped because it is human nature. The perpetual civil war between the people and the government must go on for ever. Here Russia's position has already become untenable. We will be doing the Russian people a service if we can help to relax some of their tension.

(C) The Anti-Communist campaign must educate the people about Soviet subversive tactics. It must be pointed out that Soviet methods of infiltration and propaganda include two elements, conciliation and intransigence, used successively or even simultaneously according to the psychological mood of the chosen victim at the time. Communists are more dangerous when they are conciliatory. Conciliation, in the form of United Front or "peaceful coexistence," or "peaceful evolution," has only one
single aim, to disarm opposition. Subversion, by its very nature, is stealthy, double-faced and conspiratorial, and is afraid of exposure. Russia hates, above all, exposure of her double-faced tactics. Her technique of indirect aggression in European countries (Ch. 8) must be exposed and popularized until every schoolchild knows it, because she is bound to repeat the same standard technique in every country where communism is not yet strong enough to take over. She will talk only of "peaceful evolution" and democratic parliamentary struggle. But it is exactly when the Communists are talking that way, as those in India today are doing and as Gottwald did in Czechoslovakia before the coup d'etat, that these countries must be warned.

There is no question but that the talk of "peaceful coexistence" is a measure of convenience, a tactical move to disarm the West in a well-thought-out long program for world revolution. Officially, Russia is committed to the doctrine of World Revolution. World revolution and peaceful coexistence are by definition mutually exclusive. On Russia's choice of these alternatives depends ultimately whether there is going to be more or less world tension. The democracies have every right to demand to know, when Russia talks about "peaceful coexistence," whether she means to renounce world revolution. The West's terms for peaceful coexistence are Moscow's official recantation and renunciation of world revolution. All else—the suspension of tests, inspection zones, disengagement zones, disarmament—merely touches the surface.

(D) Above all, the Russian Soviet rule is decadent, reactionary, anti-Marx and anti-labor. By her own admission, she is not communist; by the facts of her record, she
is not even socialist. This is the most important truth which takes decades to reveal itself to full clarity and certainty. In common, popular terms, she has revealed herself as an oppressor of the masses and as the enemy of the working class. At every international conference, she should be put to defend herself against this charge, to prove that she does not oppress the poor and does not degrade labor. The coat of Communist ideology has been wearing threadbare and her armor is full of holes. A sham is always afraid of exposure. In fairness to the facts, she should not be allowed to get away with calling herself "socialist" and should be so challenged at every step.

It will be noticed that Khrushchev has been talking and boasting a great deal about Russian "productivity," but Khrushchev cannot and will not talk about the sweatshop conditions of the Russian workers and the means by which such "productivity" is brought about. A Spanish galleon rowed by chain-gangs can challenge another ship to a race, I am quite aware. That in itself does not entitle the Spanish ship to call itself "S.S. Classless." I strongly fear that Khrushchev's recent bid to "beat" the capitalist countries in the production of consumer goods will be the new pretext for another wave of cracking of whips and lashing of backs of the Russian workers in the grotesque Stakhanov fashion. We will not permit it. The galley slaves will once more row hard, very hard, under the lashings while Khrushchev sitting on the aft-deck with a glass of vodka positively gloats over the speed the ship is making. In the same breath in which Khrushchev makes this boast, Moscow announces the increase of work quotas for the workers and prevention of ruinous costs of labor. Khrushchev ought to be ashamed of himself. The West
should demand that Khrushchev order lower work quotas and higher pay for the workers. We might like him better for it. The first condition of such a race should be a direct challenge to Russian production on the basis of free labor—any time anywhere she chooses, first by restoring free labor unions.

And this is the central core of the cold war, which, it must be realized at once, is a war against oppression of nations and peoples. The core is not capitalist versus socialist, but the question, who is the oppressor of the masses and who is the enemy of the working class? Let Russia never admit it, but let the debate go on to eternity until Russia is forced to mend her ways regarding labor. For in the evolution of mankind, there can be no doubt that it is a trend towards elevating the position of the poor as against the rich, of the under-privileged as against the privileged, and of the oppressed against their oppressors. Whoever believes that the common people have as much right as the élite and is willing to fight for them and against their hardships, injustices and indignities, will and must win in the end.

Below is an outline of Russia's anti-socialist and anti-labor record and a summary of the points which have been made in this book. I have indicated the chapters where the documentation may be found. Before the court of world opinion, she has a good many questions to answer and a good many points to explain.

1. Russian Communism is decadent, anti-Marx and anti-Socialist and therefore counter-revolutionary:
   a. As “Socialism” it stands for “inequality of pay” in principle. (1) (7)
   b. As “Socialism” it is “opposed vehemently to production for use.” (7)
c. In every country where Russia’s rule extends, socialist and peasant leaders and unionists have been shot, hanged, deported or jailed. (8)

d. This general decadent anti-Marxist counter-revolution (2) (7) is further shown below:

2. Russia is not composed of Soviets:

a. Soviets are councils of representatives of industrial workers or other classes. Free trade unions do not exist. Workers’ Councils do not exist. (4) (5)

b. Labor unionism is formally and repeatedly repudiated by Lenin, by party congresses and by union leaders—the latter being “running-dogs” of the capitalist rulers. Their sole function is to increase productivity, not to represent the interests of labor. (5)

c. Russia has from the very beginning repudiated the principle of “workers’ control of industry” and decreed “central management of industry”; managers and union leaders are appointed. (5)

3. Russian state capitalist totalitarianism is in the hands of a self-perpetuating small circle:

a. All power is theoretically invested in a “vanguard,” “fortress,” “collective leadership.” (4)

b. Collective leadership has never been practiced since Lenin and is always replaced by one-man dictatorship. (4)

c. Weeding of party opposition includes murder of \( \frac{2}{3} \) of party congress (17th) and of its Central Committee, and gangster tactics. (4)

d. Interval between holding of Congresses reached a record 13 years; neither the pact for collaboration with fascists, nor the war with Hitler required calling of Congress. (2)

e. “Democratic Centralism” is dead; leadership is not responsible to Congress, but Congress to leadership. (4)
4. As capitalists, Russia has exploited and enslaved labor to an extent unknown in the West.
   a. Labor has no rights to strike; "collective bargaining" when nominally restored, asked for lower wages through union leaders. (5)
   b. All labor is compulsory. (5)
   c. There is job-freeze; work book follows worker for life. (5)
   d. There is periodic raising of work quotas without raising pay. (5)
   e. Penalties include penal servitude and dismissal for lateness of 20 minutes, or tardy return to work after lunch (some of these harsh features have been repealed after Stalin). (5)
   f. Dismissal from jobs includes forfeiting of food rations and peremptory eviction from homes. (5)
   g. The workers are hungry. (Introd.) (9)

5. As capitalists, they have done nothing for the poor.
   a. The living standard of the common man, in spite of great industrial advance, is on a par with Tsarist days. (7) (9)
   b. Beautiful sanatoriums, new apartments are available to new bourgeoisie only, not to workers. Some luxurious "Workers' Clubs" can be reached only by owners of automobiles. (7)
   c. There is much evidence of complete indifference to suffering, and haughtiness on the part of those who have climbed up the party hierarchy. (7) (9)

6. There is a new luxury-loving, luxurious-living, materially "extremely comfortable," "coupon-clipping" ruling class—the new bourgeoisie.
   a. New bourgeoisie rises as in Tsarist days by supporting the powers that be, especially by toeing the Party line implicitly. (7)
   b. This new bourgeoisie of 12-14% of the population
lives off the 86-88% of labor, peasant and slaves, being non-productive themselves. (7)
c. This capitalist class has passed an income tax law favouring the rich, with a flat 13% above 1000 rubles a month. (7) Turnover tax on cotton goods is 100%, but on silk goods 50%.
d. It has restored private property and guaranteed inheritance by the Soviet Constitution. (7)
e. This new bourgeoisie has all the mental characteristics of the old—bureaucracy, compliance, arrogance, toadyism, corruption, patronage. (7) (9)
f. This new ruling class is also an "ownership" class, "using, enjoying and disposing of" the material goods created by labor. (7)
g. This new ruling class has villas, summer houses, yachts, access to special stores (for Parisian perfumes, mink coats, etc.). (7) (9)
h. The new ruling class maintains itself by power and must destroy what it does not possess (independent farmers). (7)

7. The Russian government is like any old despotic government, and is inclined to tyranny.
   a. It is indistinguishable from other autocracies of the past (state ownership of land and labor is known to the Egyptian Pharaohs). (7)
b. It has features of secret police terror similar to the fascists. (4)
c. It has exiled critics and dissidents like the Tsars. (3) (6)
d. It has deported whole nations. (6)
e. It "integrates" cheap, slave labor as part of its national economy. (6)
f. It has no independent judiciary, and therefore cannot have a lawful government. During trials, the distinguishing feature is the complete agreement of police,
investigator, prosecutor, defense, judge and the accused himself. Its trials approach skulduggery. (4)

8. Its moral code is sub-standard, below what is expected of a self-respecting modern government:
   a. It has broken every single treaty signed with other nations, often within a year, or half a year of its signature. (8)
   b. It believes every means—murder of comrades, framing of witnesses, tortures, perjury, abduction of opposition leaders (like Bela Kovacs, Imre Nagy)—is justifiable by the Holy Cause. (4) (8)
   c. Fundamentally it believes in force, not compassion; hatred, not goodness; ruthlessness, not mercy—and is in this sense morally retrograde. (2)

9. As an imperialist, Russia is insincere and hypocritical in championing “liberation” of peoples.
   a. She has set up by fraudulent elections and supported by brute power about 20 colonial or semi-colonial puppet governments. (8)
   b. She has developed an enormous appetite devouring almost every neighbor on its periphery and has done all this in sheep’s clothing. (8)

10. Russia has committed crimes against mankind, against the rights of man, and against the laws of civilized man.
   a. It has condemned children of twelve to capital punishment. (4)
   b. It has sent, and boasted of sending, women to work at under-surface jobs in coal mines. (6)
   c. It has made overtime work not dependent on worker’s consent. (5)
   d. It has used medieval tortures as a method of extracting confessions. (4)
   e. It has made confessions, without supporting evidence, the sole basis for passing sentences. (4)
   f. It has massacred war prisoners. (2)
g. It has made use of love of one’s dear ones, in the form of hostages and threats to their safety, as the “most effective means” of forcing confessions and compelling good behavior. (4)

h. It has encouraged and sometimes forced testimony of wife against husband, children against parents, brother against brother, servant against master, teacher against fellow-teacher, friend against friend. (4)

i. Russia has committed genocide outlawed by the United Nations. (4) (6)

Any fair examination of the facts in the above categories must lead to the conclusion that the progress of Soviet rule must be considered a retrograde and reactionary episode in the evolution of mankind, that instead of being the pioneer of a new social order or a new and higher conception of man, it is a harking-back to forms of despotism and tyranny in the earlier epochs of human history. Furthermore, it will be noted that there are striking similarities between Communism and Fascism apart from ideological labels. There is no worthwhile distinction between the two of any real significance. Finally, one must come to the conclusion that while in a military sense the present conflict of power lies between the U.S. and Russia, it is a fundamental error to regard it as one of national conflicts.

What is involved is a conflict in the philosophic interpretation of man. The war against Russia has already assumed a universal character concerning every man, woman or child, be he Arab, Hindu, Chinese or Malay, because what is being attacked is not any social system but the philosophic value of man and the foundations of modern civilization itself. Every nation must make its choice for its future and for the good of its own people. What is involved is a
conflict of two moral conceptions, two different and directly opposite interpretations of man.

The Russian philosophy of man is most charmingly and effectively expressed by the intellectual trapeze artist, Bernard Shaw, in his radio speech to America, October 1931, which Pravda took care to print with silent approval, without comment and without contradiction for the Russian people to read:

(Soviet Russia) has established a new correlation between the state and the individual from which the false and superstitious notion of the intrinsic value of human life has been removed and replaced by the sober and utilitarian approach to human life. . . . A considerable share of the secret of the success of Russian Communism consists in the fact that every Russian knows that if he will not make his life a paying enterprise for his country, then he will, most likely, lose it. An agent of the GPU will take him by the shoulder and will conduct him to the cellar of this famous department and he will simply stop living. And his relatives will be politely informed that they need have no anxiety about him, because he is not coming home any more.

The diametrically opposite interpretation of man is equally absolute. It is contained in the inexpressibly beautiful saying of Jesus: “Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.” The “least” is a child, and it can be the poor and lowly, the under-privileged, the despised and downtrodden. It is the doctrine of the poor man, and it is also the doctrine of the free man and the universal man.

It is seen thus that, in the final analysis, the world conflict is simply a war between good and evil. One cannot but be sure that, however the ebb and flow of
fortunes of war and currents of power politics change, man will aspire toward the good and spurn evil in the long run. Therefore it is inevitable that evil must pass and good must win.

If we wish to make the future a world evolving toward making man "a paying enterprise for his country," reduced to a tool, we can. If we wish to make the future one in which the poor and the lowly shall not be repressed, we can, too. The world must make its choice.
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