



**MOSCOW'S
DRIVE
FOR
WORLD
DOMINATION**

Nicholas Pryhodko
Foreword by *Willson Woodside*

Jokes are Revealing

These are jokes being currently told
in the Soviet Union

ADAM AND EVE

Question: What country did Adam and Eve come from?

Answer: The USSR, of course.

Question: Why?

Answer: Because they had no clothes to wear, no butter or meat to eat, and yet they were told that they lived in paradise.

* * *

NO DIFFERENCE

Two comrades were walking along a boulevard in Moscow. "Do you know the difference between Stalin and a donkey?" asked one.

He was suddenly seized by the collar and the voice of a secret police officer thundered at him.

"Allright, tell me. What's the difference?"

"No, no, no difference. No difference at all," he stammered, frightened to death at being caught red-handed.

* * *

TOO HIGHLY HONORED

When a group of deputies of the Supreme Soviet were returning from a session their coach was filled with gay banter and laughter—the delegates were happy over the fact that they each had received a gift from the Kremlin: one a record player; another, a bicycle; a third one, 20 yards of cotton material; a fourth, a pair of new shoes with galoshes.

Two deputies however, were silent and dolefully stared through the windows—they had been honored with complete sets of Lenin's and Stalin's works!

N. Prychodko

*Moscow's
for
World Domination*

Foreword by Willson Woodside

Copyright by N. Prychodko

FREE WORLD Publishing Company publishes books and pamphlets written by people who have lived long years behind the Iron Curtain and have also spent some time in the Soviet concentration camps. These people have had the opportunity to know the true meaning of a Communist state which falsely advertises itself before the rest of the world as a peace-loving democracy.

We consider it our moral duty to make our experiences and our convictions known to the English speaking public to warn them of the dangers from the East.

If our readers consider our publications valuable and have faith in them, we hope that they will pass them on to others.

Free World Publishing Company

Published by
Free World Publishing Company
Box 462, Terminal A
Bay & Front Sts., Toronto, Canada
1951

Foreword:

THE SOVIETS may well live to regret that they arrested Nicholas Prychodko on a false accusation, and kept him three years in prison and in Siberian forced labor camps. For by this action they turned a quiet junior professor, whose only writing was on the new farm machinery which the Soviet Union needed, into a political pamphleteer who has pledged his life to the breaking of the tyrannical Soviet regime and the freeing of his Ukrainian people.

In this, his second booklet, Prychodko opens up a subject of which a great deal is going to be heard during the next two or three years, whether or not we have by that time come to war with the Soviet Union. This is the question of actively supporting opponents of the Soviets *within the USSR*, developing an anti-Stalin Fifth Column there, as Stalin has developed an anti-democratic Fifth Column all through the rest of the world.

Prychodko is convinced that the weak joint or Achilles Heel of the Soviet Russian Empire is the long-suppressed craving for freedom among the minority peoples, such as the Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, the Georgians, the Kazakhs and others. The Western democratic nations, the author believes, should encourage the hopes of these minority nations by promising them support in securing their independence; and when

war comes, as he believes it inevitably will, we should give active aid to the native underground movements which would then come into the open.

This might seem to be so much to our advantage, as well as being in accord with our principles of freedom for all peoples, that there could be no argument against it. There is, however, an argument constantly raised against such a throwing of our support to the minorities of the USSR, and that is that it would lose us all possibility of an anti-Soviet movement amongst the *Russian* people, the majority people, who control most of the important posts in government, industry and the armed forces. Some on our side argue that here is where we should encourage revolt, and point to the big Vlasov Movement of World War II, under German sponsorship.

Prychodko deals very severely with this argument, believing that it is fostered by *Russian* emigres, who while anti-Soviet, are still in favor of *Russian* domination of the other peoples of the USSR. Personally, I would find it hard to believe that there are *no* Russians at all who would agree to freedom for the minority peoples of the Russian Empire. But Prychodko has gathered together a mass of material to prove his point; he comes from the spot; and an association of nearly two years has convinced me of his complete sincerity.

Willson Woodside

Foreign Editor, "SATURDAY NIGHT.", Toronto.

"Our enemy gives us no alternative other than victory or death . . ."

George Washington

RUSSIAN JANUS

To a great majority of the people in the Western World, Russia has always seemed—and still seems—a sort of an unsolved sphinx. Even such a seasoned politician as Winston Churchill has called Russia "a riddle wrapped mystery inside an enigma."

This is hardly surprising. For Russia has always scrupulously hidden her true face from the rest of the world. She has never hesitated to employ falsehood, shameless lies and evasion to shield her crimes and to gain the sympathy of public opinion abroad. While carrying out a colonization program she managed to appear in the role of a peace promoter; while seeking strategic bases for new conquests she donned the mantle of a crusader.

Today's Russia—the Soviet Union—has improved on the backward Tsarist methods and tactics in masking herself. It is for this purpose that she created the Iron Curtain through which penetrates only that which will benefit the interests of Russian imperialism.

On this side of the curtain—the benign mask of the Janus—promises of paradise; on the other

side, the pockmarked monster of terror and slavery.

The world is not to see the true face of the Janus. If it did, Russia would lose all chance of conquering the world. Were it possible to expose this face, it might be possible to check Russia's expansion without the atomic or the hydrogen bomb, for she would lose all her sympathizers abroad, duped as they are by the false propaganda of a "workers' paradise" in the USSR.

It is impossible to know Russia—and more so Soviet Russia from her official proclamations in the international forum. It is impossible to know her from her falsified history books or her biased literature. It is also impossible for the tourist or visiting delegate to know her. Her own people, who have lived long years under her rule, have had the best opportunity of knowing her, as have also such alert ambassadors as William Bullitt and Walter Bedell Smith.

It is a pity that millions of people in the Western World are even today more inclined to believe Moscow's propaganda troubadours than those who, through bitter experience, have an intimate knowledge of the internal and external tactics of Russian imperialism and can reveal this "great enigma."

Let us compare the promises of the Commu-

nist ideologists (Marx, Lenin and, if we may be permitted, Stalin) with Russia's present state.

(1) Under Communism the state as an instrument of force is to grow steadily weaker and eventually wither away. In the USSR, however, as nowhere else in the modern world the state apparatus has been made more oppressive. It has taken everything under its control, and its implements of compulsion—police force, prisons and concentration camps—surpass in their scope and brutality even those of Hitler Germany. Indeed the Soviets learned much from Hitler, as he did from them. This state apparatus goes so far as to attempt to control not only human actions but human thoughts as well.

(2) The promised dictatorship of the proletariat has become a stern, undisputed dictatorship of the Politburo, which consists of a small group of hardened professional politicians. The proletariat is granted only a miserable existence and the right to boisterously applaud every decision of the Politburo. It cannot fight for a betterment of living conditions, through strikes for example, as is done in the democratic countries. The punishment for the slightest attempt at organizing a strike is death. Even being twenty minutes late for work is punishable by a one-year prison sentence.

(3) Communism promised freedom of speech and thought, freedom of religion and as-

sembly, and the Stalin Constitution of 1936 "guarantees" these. And what is left of these promises in the USSR? Complete subservience of the press to the state; fifteen million political prisoners who may have harbored a critical thought; churches torn down or turned into shops or amusement centres, while thousands of bishops, priests and the faithful have been murdered.

(4) Communism promised true democracy and free elections. Instead, the USSR is ruled by a totalitarian dictatorship of the Politburo and at elections the voters are presented with a one-slate ticket, the names on which are chosen by this same Politburo.

Today's Russia is an imperialist nation to the *nth* degree, with an all-embracing monopoly of state capitalism and a totalitarian police regime. She is the true heir to the imperialist policies of the Tsars, but on a grander scale, with aspiration to dominate the entire world. The propaganda of Communism is only a mask for her true aims, and a clever scheme to dupe people throughout the world into helping to achieve them. Communist ideology is cleverly designed to have a universal appeal, and build up a worldwide Fifth Column.

The idea of creating and using a Fifth Column abroad is not original with the Politburo. It goes back, of course, to the wooden horse of Troy.

And other Russian regimes have used such tactics since early times. In this same way Russian expansion was always cloaked with ideological pretenses.

The seizure by Tsar Ivan Kalytta and his followers of free non-Russian lands was prepared and carried out under the slogan "Unifying Russian Lands."

The brutal conquest of the Don Cossack lands, the Ukraine, the Crimea and the Caucasus — was explained by a noble wish to "liberate" these Slav "brethren" from the domination of their rulers, to take them under the wing of "Mother Russia" and to protect them from a possible aggression.

When setting out to seize the Turkish Straits, the entrance to the Mediterranean, Russia presented herself as the protector of all Orthodox Christians. She marched on Constantinople on the pretext of wanting to plant an Orthodox Cross on the mosque of St. Sophia. But she also explained her aggressive policies in the Near East as protection of Islam from English imperialism!

Preparing a war against the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Russia proclaimed herself the "defender of all Slavic peoples." That was her ideological slogan for the First World War.

But in the "liberated" territories Moscow always set her own appointees to rule, enforced

her own laws, and used terror and liquidation to assimilate the population. Resistance leaders, then as now, were beheaded or slowly tortured to death on Solovietski Island, or in the dread dungeons of the Fortress of Peter and Paul at St. Petersburg.

Moscow, then as now, launched her aggressions only when she saw a chance for victory and when she already had well in hand all territories gained through previous aggressions. She was always very cautious in the face of superior force and firm policies.

*“Not straits, nor shield nor cross—
It's now a planetary plan!
The rush of Moscow's treachery
Will spill across the ocean.”*

S. Malanuik

Red Moscow still continues these tactics today, with shrewder and more flexible devices however, working on a world-wide scale.

Having little military strength or a ready fifth Column, after the 1917 Revolution, Red Russia not only put on the mantle of a peace-loving nation but agreed at Brest-Litovsk to surrender vast territories conquered earlier: (Finland, the Baltics, Poland, Bessarabia, Armenia). Having suppressed all national and social resistance, having destroyed all that could lead to the weakening of the Russian Empire, by 1939 she

commenced her aggressive war with Finland (population three million) and as usual called it a defensive war.

Apart from this open aggression and the bloodless Fifth Column conquest of Mongolia, there was the "liberation" of the Balts, Czechs, Rumanians, Bulgarians and Hungarians from their governments, as well as the "liberation" of the Western Ukrainians from Polish rule.

Occupying these countries Red Russia did not deviate, in general, from the tactics of White Russia. First of all, she appointed her own people to take charge of those nations: Beirut in Poland, Gottwald in Czechoslovakia, Ana Pauker in Rumania, Kirchenstien in Latvia, and so forth. These bosses are Russia's representatives, graduates of Moscow's political school. They occupy their posts only as long as they blindly carry out all orders of the Politburo. The slightest suspicion of disobedience will at the best find their ashes placed in an urn in the Kremlin wall, next to the urn of Dimitrov, Moscow's erstwhile representative to Bulgaria.

Moscow is adept at hoodwinking the population of newly-occupied countries; everything is done on the pretext of bettering the living conditions of the working class. In such cases she has never yet suffered from want of shrewd and masterly propaganda.

There is no hope that Moscow will surrender these territories as a result of diplomatic discussions. Only force can oust her, an eventuality from which she has been continually saved by the irresolute politics of the West. Nor does she intend to stop with these immense acquisitions. She is now reaching out for world domination, reach-out for our freedom.

For this phase she used a different tactic. The old slogans of Moscow's imperialism are now out-of-date. The slogan calling for the World Revolution of the proletariat and the establishment of the so-called people's democracy, is just one of the new slogans, wholly contrary though it may be to the nature of anti-democratic Moscow herself.

But, in case of necessity and when convenient Red Moscow resurrects the slogans and tactics from the archives of White Moscow. For example, to rectify her almost disastrous situation at home during World War II and to make a good impression abroad, the Soviets re-introduced the officers' epaulettes which, in 1917 - 20 the Communists had cut off the shoulders of White Russian officers—along with the skin underneath.

Even before the outbreak of the Second World War Communist Moscow changed its tune on the Tsars. They became the "unifiers of Russian lands." This glorification of the most brutal names of Moscow's imperialism—Ivan Kalytta,

Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, etc., still goes on. For Red Russia is the successor and perpetuator of the imperialist traditions of those Tsars. She has surpassed all of their conquests, and dazzled by her success will keep right on going.

In the same spirit she boldly proclaimed "freedom" of religion and organized a patriarchy which is an agency of the Kremlin not only in the USSR but abroad. Though one has only to read the Soviet newspapers to be convinced of the absolute lack of freedom of religion in the USSR, nevertheless the patriarchy remains; it is still useful for Moscow's propaganda purposes.

Also extracted from the archives is the slogan about "Pan Slavic Unity" which makes possible such things as American-Slav Congresses. In one of his public statements, Watson Kirkconnell, president of Acadia University, Canada, gave documentary proof that the organizers of the "Slavic Congress" in Canada (and apparently in other countries) were Communists. This role is also played by "Peace Congresses". There is no reason to doubt that they organized these congresses on Moscow's instructions. It seems incredible that the governments of the Western World, particularly the U.S.A. and Canada, should permit such undermining tactics to be employed against them. The argument that democracies must insure freedom of assembly

should not apply in this instance because such meetings are instigated by Moscow to subvert the democracies.

Moscow's ideological preparation to rule the world does not rest with this. She never passes up an opportunity to show herself in the role of a benevolent protector of the wronged. Having imperialistic designs on Iran and Iraq, and other countries in the Near East, Moscow proclaims herself a close friend and protector of the Moslem world against "Anglo-American imperialism", even though on her own territories she has constantly carried out a liquidation policy towards Moslems. I know of this from Moslems who were with me in Siberia.

In order to gain wider support among world Jewry Moscow played the role of a defender of the Jewish nationalist idea even though at home she combats this idea. She liquidates Zionists, the Jewish Zionist press, religion and, in general, every symptom of Jewish nationalist movement. Here defence of a Jewish national home in Palestine was motivated solely by a desire for military and espionage bases. Now that this plan has failed Moscow courts the Arabs.

Moscow professes herself a most fervent defender of all enslaved peoples, in order to assure a Fifth Column in India, Indonesia, among the American and African negroes, and other colonial natives, while on her own terri-

tories she ruthlessly stifles all evidence of nationalist liberation movements among the minority of the peoples of the USSR. Which of the colonial countries has exterminated 7,000,000 people through a famine organized for that purpose as was done in the Ukraine in 1932-33? In which colony were there 9,432 workers, peasants and intellectuals shot in the back and secretly buried in a "Park of Culture and Rest" as was done by Moscow in 1937-38 in the town of Vinnitza in the Ukraine? From which of the colonies were 5 million people carried away to slave labor in concentration camps? Moscow's hypocritical and cynical policy, concealed under an ideal of brotherhood and freedom of all nations, is only an imperialist game which furthers her drive for eventual world domination.

One who is gullible has only to view Soviet films which are exported to the American continent, to peruse Soviet publications for foreign consumption, to hear the phonograph records of melodious songs and music, made especially for export, to listen to Moscow's radio broadcasts, and lastly read Stalin's "interview" in "Pravda," Feb. 1951, to come to the conclusion that the USSR is the most peace-loving nation in the world, standing on guard for the highest ideals of humanity!

MOSCOW'S "LOVE OF PEACE" AND HER "DEMOCRACY"

Moscow expends millions for this propaganda and I have been astonished to see the results it achieves in the trusting democratic world; and not only among common people—she often succeeds in winning zealous supporters among people in high positions—as Alger Hiss. Back in 1943 a top government official in the U.S.A. made a public statement that never, in all her history, was Russia guilty of aggression; on the contrary she herself had always been the victim of aggression from outside.

Such a statement is either a sign of complete ignorance of Russian history, or of a pathetic desire to pay Russia an unmerited compliment. Even a casual knowledge of Russian history leads to wholly different conclusions, for Russian history is a series of bigger or smaller aggressive wars aimed at the acquisition of territories and markets, or for the purpose of spreading Moscow's influence.

After all, even Karl Marx knew this. In 1853 he wrote in the New York Tribune, basing his facts upon the territorial gains of Russia after the reign of Peter the Great, that the Russian boundaries had been advanced towards Berlin, Dresden and Vienna by 700 miles; towards Stockholm by 630 miles; towards Constantinople by 500 miles; towards Teheran by

1,000 miles. These new acquisitions doubled the territory she formerly held in Europe.

In his speech last April before the American Publishers Association, Herbert Hoover, former president of the U.S.A., recalled different phases of Russian history which reveal continuous aggression by Moscow's imperialism since the days of Peter I. He also stated that since the conclusion of World War II, Moscow has taken a dozen countries and subjugated 600,000,000 people.

Here is the historical record of Russia's aggressive conquests:

- 1487: Subjection of Greater Novgorod by Ivan III and expansion of Muscovites to the Arctic Ocean.
- 1553: Conquest of Khazan.
- 1556: Conquest of Astrakhan.
- 1558-61: Expansion through White Ruthenia to Latvia and conquest of Smolensk.
- 1582: Beginning of expansion into Siberia.
- 1617: Peace of Stolbowo and partition of Karelia between Moscow and Sweden.
- 1667: Peace of Andrusiw and partition of the Ukraine between Moscow and Poland.
- 1689: Advance to Komchatka, in far eastern Siberia.
- 1696: Conquest of Azov.

- 1700: Treaty with Turkey to settle cession of Azov and adjacent territory.
- 1703: Founding of St. Petersburg in Ingermanland, conquered from Sweden.
- 1721: Peace of Nystadt with Sweden. — Acquisition of Latvia, Estonia, Oesel, Ingermanland and West Karelia with Vyborg.
- 1723: Acquisition from Persia of western coast of the Caspian Sea with Derbent and Baku.
- 1739: Cession of Azov by Turkey.
- 1743: Peace of Aabo. Annexation of other areas of Finland, to the Kymene River.
- 1773: First partition of Poland and occupation of the greater part of White Ruthenia.
- 1774: Peace of Kutschuk-Kajnardschi. Annexation of Black Sea coast from the Don to the Bug and the Karbada.
- 1775: Suppression of the Cossacks in the Ukraine.
- 1783: Annexation of the Crimea.
- 1791: Peace of Jassy. Settlement of the Dniester frontier.
- 1793: Second partition of Poland and occupation of all Ukrainian territory, with the exception of Eastern Galicia, and of the remainder of White Ruthenia and Minsk.
- 1795: Third partition of Poland and occupation of Lithuania, White Ruthenia and Courland.

- 1801: Annexation of Georgia.
- 1809: Peace of Fridrikshamm. — Sweden cedes the whole of Finland and the Aaland Islands.
- 1812: Peace of Bucharest. Cession of Bessarabia by Turkey.
- 1815: Congress of Vienna. Incorporation of Poland in Russia.
- 1828: Peace of Turkmentschai. Acquisition of Erivan and Nachitschivan from Persia.
- 1829: Peace of Adrianopolis. Annexation of the Danube Delta and the greater part of the Black Sea coast of the Caucasus.
- 1858: Annexation of Amur territory in Siberia.
- 1860: Annexation of Assuri.
- 1864: North Caucasus finally subjugated and Circassians expelled to Turkey.
- 1868: Beginning of advance to Turkestan and conquest of Samarkand and Bokhara.
- 1873: Occupation of Khiva-Turkestan.
- 1875: Acquisition of Sakhalin Island, northern Japan.
- 1876: Occupation of Kokand (Turkestan).
- 1878: Congress of Berlin. Annexation of Southern Bessarabia, Batum, Kars and Ardahan.
- 1881: Subjection of all Turkestan.
- 1898: Lease from China of Kwangtung with Port Arthur and Dairen.
- 1900: Occupation of Manchuria.

- 1939: Annexation of Western White Ruthenia.
- 1940: Annexation of West Karelia with Viborg and other parts of Finland. Annexation of Bessarabia and North Bukovina. Annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.
- 1944: Attack against Finland from Leningrad and capitulation of Finland.
- 1944: Renewed occupation of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania by the Red Army. Occupation of the Western Ukraine. Occupation of the Balkan states: Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary.
- 1945: Occupation of Poland.
Annexation of all Ukrainian territories into the Soviet Union. Founding of "People's Republics" in Czechoslovakia, Albania and Yugoslavia under the influence of Russia.
Eastern Germany drawn within the sphere of Soviet influence.
- 1945: Occupation of North Korea and Manchuria.
- 1949 - 50: China under Bolshevik influence.
- 1950: Russian-inspired attack on South Korea.

In his book, "Towards the Understanding of Russia", a Polish publicist W. Bonchowski confirms, on the grounds of documented historical facts, that during the last 200 years Moscow has been at war for 128 years, only four of which

were a defensive war. Yet, in spite of everything, Moscow has always succeeded in masking her aggressions as unavoidable acts of defence.

At the beginning of her war with Germany Moscow cried crocodile tears because Germany had broken the Nazi-Soviet friendship pact and without warning attacked the USSR. It is true that Germany attacked unexpectedly and at the beginning was unduly successful in the east without enduring many losses. But it is also an established fact that Moscow had planned to do exactly the same to Germany, only a little later. Before the German attack came she had concentrated along her western frontier 150 divisions, several tank corps and many Air Force units. She awaited the time when her partner—Germany—and the allies would wear themselves out so that she might step in and “liberate” Europe and the whole British Commonwealth.

It is a grave misconception that Russia fought the last war, against Nazism, for democratic rights. As is known she had concluded a friendship pact with the Nazis, and supplied Hitler with an enormous amount of food, oil and war materials, and only an unforeseen turn of events forced her to fight on the side of the Allies—which gave her an opportunity to appear as a defender of democracy.

The Russian Empire, however, has nothing in common with democracy. Democratiza-

tion of it is inconsistent with its very existence. By adopting a democratic order Russia would have to grant a free voice to all the nations subjugated by her and in that event the Russian Empire would cease to exist. This was evident in 1917, after the liquidation of Tsardom, when nine independent republics arose on its territories.

During parleys between the newly formed Ukrainian Republic and Kerensky's government, the Russian representative, "democratic" Tseretelli, announced that to save a great whole they would not hesitate to annihilate the small, (meaning the Ukraine). There is no reason to believe that the views of Russian "democrats" about democratizing Russia are different today. It can also be said with certainty that in the event of a defeat of the USSR the present Russian Empire would disintegrate and free democratic republics, of the now enslaved minority nations, would be created on her territories. Russia would be left with only her ethnographic territory, a population of no more than 70 million and a relatively small economic potential.

Red and White Russian "democrats" are well aware of this fact and for that reason they strenuously oppose any manifestation of nationalist-liberation movements on the part of the other nations in the USSR. They call this

“fanatical nationalism”, “insane fanaticism”, “foreign intrigue”, etc. At the same time they present themselves as humane cosmopolitans, benevolent guardians of the “free family of nations”, in the role of elder brother.

MANIA OF MOSCOW'S MESSIANISM

Under cover of Communist “humanitarianism”, the Red and the White Russian imperialists preach, whenever convenient, Russian Messianism.

In the new satellites, for example, the Russians are introducing a compulsory course in the Russian language. This step is explained by saying that the Russian language will open doors for them to the achievements of Russian culture, science and technology, the “highest in the world.” They stalwartly maintain that everything Russians do is best. Not only in propaganda but in lectures at universities the Russians claim to have invented the steam engine, internal combustion, the electrical generator, the telegraph, radio, aeroplane, printing, and practically all major inventions in all branches of science. It is not surprising that Moscow should cap these claims with one that America was discovered, not by Columbus, but by seamen from the northern shores of Russia, away back in the eleventh century!

Rusians have never hesitated to take credit for other people's accomplishments. For instance, the famous composer Tchaikowsky was not of Russian but of Ukrainian and French stock. The sculptor Antykolsky and the composer Rubinstein were Jews; the composer Bortniansky was Ukrainian, and Hlynka was a Byelorussian. Tolstoy was a descendent of Russified Germans; Dostoevsky, Pushkin and Zhlukovsky were not Russians either. Yet, Moscow proclaims them to the whole world as the leading representatives of Russian culture.

Here is what the White leaders of Russian Messianism are saying abroad:

"Russia, not of today but of the future, will prove to be a refreshing wine which can revive an exhausted world. The Russian superman, bearer of a new solidarity, alone can deliver humanity." (Calendar of the Russian Nationalist-Workers Association, Munich, 1948).

And further:

"Through the ages we have produced a higher cultural type, not found anywhere else in the world—a type with a universal yearning . . ."

It is as a result of this "yearning" that Moscow has expanded the territories under her rule, from a modest Tsardom to one-fourth of the entire earth's surface; and now dictates her will to almost one billion people?

Is it as a result of this "yearning" that people of this "higher cultural type" threw into their concentration camps 15 million people?

Is it as a result of this "universal yearning" that Moscow desires to dictate to the whole world?

The wild idea of Russian Messianism is not a product of the Red Kremlin. It was born in Moscow's White Tsardom and expanded its pretensions with the expansion of the Russian Empire. Even some White Russian emigres share it: seduced by the glamor of Russian victories, and seeing in the restoration of prestige to the Army and the Church a revival of Imperial Russia, 6,000 Russian emigres returned "home" from France after the Second World War, to serve the new Tsar Stalin.

Red Moscow today is only carrying on the old imperialistic policies of White Moscow. The Socialistic appeals of Communism are only used as a smoke-screen for her political game.

Not realizing this, Hitler played into Moscow's hands by seeking advisers among Russian emigres. As a result he forfeited the best trump-card he had in the East—the anti-Russian ferment of the enslaved nationalities.

RUSSIA'S PRESENT AGGRESSION

"We do not want foreign lands . . ." Stalin.
Today, after gaining control over a great

part of Europe, Moscow's Messianism is reaching its height. She now calls herself the workers' capital of the world. Since the main barrier to the realization of her aim is the U.S.A. her attack is directed mostly against that country.

In the face of American power Moscow is forced to maneuver. In her official declarations she claims that the idea of "the possibility of peaceful co-existence of the two systems — Communist and Capitalist — is the leading principle of Soviet policy abroad", (Pravda, 1950—official commentator for foreign affairs, A. Leontiev).

Is that what Stalin thinks? In his letter to M. Horky, a prominent Russian writer, Stalin once wrote: ". . . We are not exactly against war. We are against an imperialist war because it is a counter-revolutionary war; but we are for a liberation war against imperialists, notwithstanding the fact that such a war, as we know, is not devoid of horror and bloodshed. It will even be full of horror and bloodshed."

Such a formula makes a good cover for any aggression. The world already knows what consequences are evoked by Stalin's "liberation war."

The current statements made by Stalin, Molotov, Gromyko, Wyshynsky and others are all a part of the game. This becomes obvious when we observe Moscow's policies in the satellite states, in the U.N. and elsewhere. Moscow feels

that she is not yet adequately prepared for an intercontinental war, and only for that reason talks of her peaceful intentions. How reliable such expressions are is evident from President Truman's statement that the Soviets had broken 39 out of 40 agreements they had made with the U.S.A.

Back in 1936 Stalin told Roy Howard, the American publisher, that: "Export of revolution is folly." Yet at that very moment Moscow was seeking by all means to export revolution to Spain, including aviation equipment, tanks and thousands of agents. Now she has accomplished a similar feat in China, and continues to "export" revolution to Korea, Iran, France Germany and even to the American and African continents.

Having gained control over a vast territory in China, Russia—so warns the American High Commissioner in Germany, John J. McCloy—is now concentrating a great deal of attention on preparations to seize all of Germany. The Korean experiment is obviously only a trial effort.

What Stalin calls a revolution is actually the anti-democratic domination by Moscow of other nationalities. It is interesting to note that his teacher, Lenin, was more frank in his remarks when he announced that he wouldn't hesitate before the destruction of two-thirds of the world's people to secure the triumph of Communism.

Russia is looking forward to disagreements between the democratic countries and an economic crisis in the U.S.A. When one of the Soviet's most distinguished economists, Eugene Varga, announced, on the basis of his analysis of economic factors in the U.S.A., that no crisis could be expected there at present, the Politburo called his announcement hostile and relieved him of his high post. Now, however, their faith in him has been restored for he has been appointed economic dictotor of Hungary.

MILITARY PREPARATION AND "ANTI-DEFEATIST" PROPAGANDA

"We will fight the enemy on his own territory . . ." Marshal Voroshilov

Russia not only awaits an appropriate moment for assault, but her preparations for it are in full swing wherever she has gained control or influence. According to P. Shandruk, a Ukrainian general, in "Svoboda" No. 61, 1950, Russia has the following military power at her command: 7 fully equipped Armies, 17 Mechanized Corps, 219 Artillery Divisions, 11 Mountain Brigades, 7 Cavalry Mechanized Corps, 119 Special Battalions, 3 Air Force Divisions, 127 Air Force groups and 11 Parachute Brigades.

In other words, while reassuring the world with peaceful declarations, and spreading "Peace Petitions" Russia has equipped and ready for action, around 4,000,000 soldiers, 27,000

planes, 40,000 tanks, and 350 submarines. Besides, she has a dependable NKVD army of about 400,000. Finally, according to the editor of the British "Intelligence Digest", Kenneth De Courcy, Russia is now manufacturing 4 atom bombs per month.

Such preparations can only mean aggression on a world-wide scale. They clearly show the reliability of Stalin's announcement: "We do not want foreign lands."

Taking into consideration that in case of an armed clash Russia can also utilize the manpower reserves of her European satellites, Mongolia and China her strength is certainly formidable; it could even lead one to believe that Russia is invincible.

Russia herself fans the myth that she is indeed unconquerable. The psychological effect of this plays an important part in her aggression policy abroad. This kind of propaganda is also widely spread in the USSR itself. During the long years that I lived in the Soviet Union there was not a day that I did not either hear on the radio, see in the movies, or read in the newspapers propaganda that the Red Army was unconquerable. I often heard or read on posters, the over-confident words of Marshal Voroshilov: "We will fight the enemy on his own territory, wherever he appears."

Under the influence of this incessant propaganda, I too once believed that nowhere in the world was there a force strong enough to defeat the Red Army. I was dumbfounded to see it roll back in panic from the first blows of the German army. It took two years for it to recover sufficiently to advance again, thanks in part to American aid.

The USSR with all its military power is in many respects a Colossus with feet of clay. It has shortcomings and contradictions which do not jibe with its propaganda of invincibility any more than with the feeling of defeatism in the Western world which it is trying to stimulate. There are any number of arguments against this "Russian invincibility."

1. German war documents show that Germany, with 8,800 fighter planes, almost wiped out 20,000 Soviet planes; with 7,000 tanks the Germans' overpowered 40,000 Soviet tanks. Obviously two factors were concerned here: the Russian planes were of inferior quality, and Russian fliers and tankmen had not the technical skill of their enemies. Perhaps the greatest of all Soviet weaknesses in modern warfare is the lack of skilled operators and repairmen.

I heard from escapees from the Red Army that often at the front when parts for tanks or

planes were ordered tractor or combine parts would arrive in their stead, or parts would be of the wrong size. This is due to the constant disorder which reigns in Russia; though in some instances it could be sabotage.

2. The reserve man power of the Soviet Union and its satellites is not nearly as great as the reserve man power of the Western world. The USSR and its European satellites have a population of 270 millions, while the nations of the Atlantic Pact, plus anti-Communist Turkey, have 384 millions. The reserve man power of China, far removed from the European field of action, cannot play a major role, especially with its low technical skill and the transportation difficulties of the USSR which can be defined in this way:

Soviet weaknesses in transport could a factor of great importance. In proportion to her territory Russia has only one-tenth the railway network of the U.S. The USSR production of trucks is barely one-tenth of that of the U.S.A. Russia's transportation system has always been, and still is, its weak point and might be further weakened by attacks from the air.

In all her past wars Russia has never shown any regard for the cost in human life. The loss of 7,500,000 killed and many millions wounded in the Second World War is a good illustration of the utter disregard for human life in the Soviet Union.

Past and recent history tells us that the old Russia as well as present day USSR were successful at war only when:

(a) their physical strength was overwhelmingly superior.

(b) they were at war with an opponent who was disorganized on the home front.

(c) when their opponent was unarmed in political and social ideas and propaganda.

Under any other circumstances Russia has always lost. In 1904, starting a war with Japan, Russia boasted that she would "defeat the Japs with caps", but ended with an ignominious defeat for herself.

In the First World War Germany actually destroyed Russia's military forces and administered a severe defeat (just as she would have in the Second World War) had not the Allies come to Russia's defence and had not the Germans themselves adopted their stupid politics in the East.

At the beginning of the "defensive" war with Finland the Kremlin had repeatedly boasted of the ability of the armies from the Leningrad area to smash the "Finnish fascists" in a few days. But, as we already know, the huge Soviet armies after six months of fierce fighting were still unable to break the resistance of heroic little Finland, which had taken an immense number of Soviet prisoners.

From the very first days of the war the Red Army rolled back in panic and in first seven months 3,900,000 Red soldiers and commanders gave themselves up to the Germans. The factories ceased to function. On the collective farms and state farms the commissars poisoned or burned millions of tons of grain and destroyed farm machinery. Factory equipment, farm products and different other materials earmarked for removal into the interior lay in piles rusting and rotting because all transportation was paralyzed by the bombings and the disorganization of labor.

Queues outside the shops grew into thousands and the populace eagerly awaited the Germans expecting with their coming democracy and national freedom. The Kremlin myth of invincibility vanished into thin air. Russia was saved from certain defeat only by Germany's stupid policies, by the 11 billion-dollars of Lend-Lease aid from the U.S.A., and the Allied bombing of Germany.

A Third World War might see this experience substantially repeated. The Soviet Russian Empire could be completely disintegrated if the democratic world were prepared for all-out participation in the war of ideas. These are the slogans the West could use with devastating effect:

1. Liberation for the subjugated peoples of the USSR.

2. Assurance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

3. Restoration of the land to the peasants; free retail and wholesale trade, but industries to remain nationalized.

These slogans answer the wishes of the majority of the population inside the Iron Curtain. It is for these slogans that UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) and insurgents of other nationalities are continuing their bitter struggle against the Kremlin, amid unbelievable terror. In spite of over twenty years of violent effort, Moscow has been unable to crush this liberation movement. This movement undoubtedly played a role in the disintegration of the Russian front at the onset of the Second World War, and it could very well be the decisive factor in bringing defeat to Moscow in a future conflict.

Many Red tanks, planes and artillery pieces are in unreliable hands. This can be corroborated by the fact that since the conclusion of the war at least 150,000 Soviet soldiers and officers have deserted and taken refuge in Western Germany. One of such deserters is W. Shapochnikov, son of the Soviet marshal and former Chief-of-Staff B. Shapochnikov.

A strenuous liquidation of leaders of nationalist resistance, as well as Communist leaders, in the satellite countries confirms the fact that even here the USSR is uncertain of support in her

plans for conquest. The extensive purges in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria and the mass executions in China are further proof of this. An overwhelming majority of the people in the satellites, who have experienced Moscow's domination in practice, will rally to the side of the Western powers.

Even Russia's economic potential confirms defeatism as groundless. For illustration let us consider these figures:

Production for 1950:

Steel: U.S.A., 96,700,000; USSR (maximum estimate), 29,700,000.

Coal: U.S.A., 548,000,000 tons; USSR 290,000,000 tons.

Oil: U.S.A., 1,973,000,000 barrels; USSR, 217,000,000 barrels.

Many other analogous figures could be quoted in comparing other branches of economics of the USSR and the US.

While there is no valid reason for defeatism or fear of the USSR, its cunning and shrewdness should not be underestimated. It may be wholly expected that while making loud protestations of peace offers, and other trick maneuvers, Stalin could be at that very moment giving orders for a surprise attack on Europe and America, without a formal declaration of war.

On the other hand Stalin may go on organizing new "Korean wars" in Iran, Germany, Yugo-

slavia while seemingly preserving neutrality until the time is ripe for a perfect assault.

ERRORS IN THE EAST AND OUR NEGLECTED ALLIES

In spreading her propoganda of invincibility, Russia makes a big play of her victories in the past.

It is true that Charles XII of Sweden, Napoleon and Hitler suffered distastous defeats on Russia's vast territories. However, these were not due to Russia's military superiority. There were more important causes which should be considered. In all three cases, lack of a sound political policy was the basic reason for failure.

In the Oxford History of Eastern Europe, it is emphasized that the sole practical political combination of Charles XII in his march on Moscow was his alliance with Ivan Mazepa, a Ukrainian hetman. Apart from this Charles neglected the necessary political measures. Hence, even though at that time, 1709, Russia was on the verge of collapse, Peter I won the war, simply by exploiting the existing political antagonisms to his own advantage.

With Napoleon's seizure of Poland and Byelorussia, and his invasion of the Ukraine, the morale of the Russian army dropped to a low ebb. If at that time Napoleon had proclaimed the independence of these subjugated nations and an end to serfdom in Russia, he might have under-

mined Russia's military might. Instead, he fought the peasant uprisings against Tsardom. Later, as a result of fierce Russian propaganda, those forces turned against Napoleon. He then realized his mistake but it was too late.

Hitler, it seemed at first, had a better understanding of the significance of the intense antagonisms between Russia and the peoples enslaved by her. When he first pushed east he seemed to be in favor of independence for those nations and for that reason was very successful. Later it became evident that that policy was only a false maneuver. To Hitler's misfortune his maneuver was quickly recognized by the national minorities. Hitler had no intention of allowing freedom to the population of these areas which he reserved as "Lebensraum for the German people." He unscrupulously destroyed all nationalist-liberation movements which spontaneously sprung up everywhere in the occupied territories, and in this manner incurred the wrath of the insurgent forces in the Ukraine, Poland, and Byelorussia. Hitler's desire to gain the eastern territories for colonization, regardless of the interests of the native population, and his mass liquidation of prisoners-of-war, were important reasons for his defeat in the East.

Hitler's later reliance on General Vlasov and his Russian liberation army was sheer political nonsense. Under no circumstances could it have

been effective against Russian imperialism. For not too many Russians were found to be eager to fight against Stalin. They take pride in his conquests and his aspirations to world domination. During the Second World War *there were no Russian anti-Communist partisans*, whereas the partisan struggle against Russia was very active in the enslaved nations, the Ukraine, Poland, Byelorussia, the Baltic states, the Northern Caucasus, and the Crimea.

Nor were there any Russians among those partisans. Wallace Carroll is mistaken when he advocates; "Fight a Russian with a Russian," in *Life*, Dec. 19, 1949. It would be more precise to say "fight the Russians with the people they have enslaved." It may be that when Mr. Carroll said "Russian" he had in mind people of other nationalities whose lands are occupied by Russia. In any case it seems to have been left to conjecture, a practice that may well lead to misunderstanding and even a repetition of the catastrophic mistakes which others have made in the East.

It may be well to mention this fact (and it can be attested to by well informed people) that Party circles in Moscow were very happy over Hitler's decision to remove Gen. Von Brauchitsch from his post in the East because he was in favor of giving independence to the submerged nations. The adoption of such a policy might have resulted in a catastrophe for Russian imperialism.

It would have made millions available for mobilization against the Muscovite Empire.

Russia strove with all her power to help confirm Hitler in his policy of repressing the minority peoples of the U.S.S.R. She even managed to infiltrate members of her Intelligence, Sevriuk and Opperput, into the closest circle of Hitler's advisers on Eastern politics. They were later discovered and shot but that was already in 1943 when the German army was retreating.

One may even be suspicious as to whether Vlasov was not actually an agent of Russia's game to divert German policy in a direction most profitable to Russia. There are several suspicious facts about Vlasov. He had been given the most responsible assignments, such as commander of the First Front at the beginning of the war, and of the defence of Moscow. At one time, with Stalin's personal approval, he was assigned to a special mission in China. He emerged without a hint of any suspicion against him from the big army purge of 1937-38. He had never been wronged by Moscow before his defection. And if he was indeed executed after the war it might have been to safeguard a secret of a scheme so that it might be repeated in the future, should need arise.

The Vlasov affair, in any interpretation, even though it may seem paradoxical, only has-

tened Hitler's defeat in the East because it banished the hopes of the enslaved nations and demobilized their huge potential forces.

Therefore, looking at Russian victories from a historical aspect and taking into consideration facts stated previously, there are no grounds to assume that Russia is unbeatable.

MOSCOW'S GAME BEHIND THE SCENES AND THE ACHILLES HEEL OF THE USSR

As an illustration of Russia's game behind the scenes, we should mention here the "underground" organization, Trust, which was created by the NKVD itself. This organization operated in 1922-27 and its purpose was solely propaganda.

At that time the Russian Empire was politically, economically and militarily weak. It was afraid of outside intervention which at that time might have brought it to ruin. An "underground" organization, "the Trust", was operating inside the USSR and was organizing a revolt.

Moscow's tactic was to place experienced NKVD agents in this "underground" Trust — alongside prominent monarchists. The head of Trust was the assistant chief of the NKVD — Artuzov.

Trust contacted the executive body of Russian emigres and through them the governments of several European countries. Its message

was not to undertake an attack on Russia because she was on the verge of internal upheaval! (Similar rumors are circulated today. So writes, more or less, of a possible revolt in the USSR D. Dallin in his new book "New Soviet Empire"). They appeal to monarchist emigres that outside intervention would split up the Russian Empire, and hence should not be attempted. This argument was effective, as it is the common cause of all Russians to preserve the Empire intact and undivided, come what may.

Even Alexander Kerensky, one of the most eminent leaders of the Russian emigres, wrote in "Vestnik", in 1946, that he would bow before Stalin if Stalin would safeguard Russia's interests from Leningrad to the Dardanelles and Sakhalin, and give the people freedom.

Trust leaders operated so cunningly that they enticed W. Shulgin, well-known leader of a Russian monarchist organization abroad, to visit the U.S.S.R. He stopped in Kiev, Leningrad, and a few provincial towns and was profoundly impressed by the "might" of Trust, as it was demonstrated to him.

He had not the slightest inkling that its leaders, as well as the members of the conspiratory gatherings faked especially for his benefit, were NKVD agents.

Returning abroad, Shulgin enthusiastically related his observations of Trust and its activi-

ties and scoffed at warnings that it might be an NKVD game. Furthermore, on the advice of those agents, he wrote a book entitled "Three Capitals". The contents of the book were actually dictated by the NKVD and in order not to hurt the "underground organization" through carelessness, Shulgin sent the copy for approval to the "underground" headquarters of Trust in Moscow! The corrections were made by the deputy commissar of the NKVD, Artuzov.

The NKVD Trust not only influenced western policies, but also drew into its "Underground" work (and later liquidated) the few active monarchists who were still at large in the USSR.

One of the most active members of Trust, Opperput, lured W. Savinkov, a prominent leader of Russian emigres, in to Soviet territory. Savinkov was dangerous to Communist Russia and so had to be liquidated. When he realized that Opperput led him into an NKVD trap he committed suicide. This same Opperput, under another name, became Hitler's adviser on eastern politics and, as mentioned earlier, was discovered and shot, in 1943, when Hitler had already lost decisively in the East.

No doubt Moscow's super-agents are working today, through methods yet unknown, to steer western politics in a direction most favorable to Russia, just as they in Alger Hiss an agent in the

American delegation at Yalta. In the past they have always tried hard to bring about conflict between her opponent and the nationalist movements of people dominated by her, who constitute her greatest danger.

Today, while continuing her game behind the scenes, Russia has built up her military strength to a greater degree than at any time in her history. Her Fifth Column abroad is stronger than ever before. But at the same time her internal national and social antagonisms are more intense. She tries to conceal these from the eyes of the world behind the Iron Curtain and even tries to create an illusion of good relations between the government and the people, and between the different nationalities.

One method of hiding those antagonisms is to falsify elections. How could 99 1-3 per cent of the people vote for Satlin when the USSR has about 15 million slave laborers, plus all their relatives, among the voters? This is nothing but a lie to fool the West, and it has succeeded to some degree. In this the Russian emigres also lend a helping hand, because although opposed to Communism, they will nevertheless always try to hinder any attempt to dismember Russia.

“Better a wicked dictator than cut up Russia’s live body,” said Kerensky who, it seems, enjoys the confidence of American political cir-

cles. A leading Russian emigre publication, the "Socialist Journal", Feb. 20, 1950, ran an article by a well known leader of theirs, I. Abramovich, in which he writes the following about the Kremlin leaders: "They are despots and tyrants, dictators and executioners; they are guilty of many crimes against the people except one; they are not dismemberers of Russia." That "one" is evidently the most important "one" in Abramovich's opinion.

It is no wonder, then, that the Russian and Ukrainian "Voice of America", being under the influence of people near to the "Socialist Journal" builds its programs from the point of view of an undivided Russian Empire. Those programs do nothing to stimulate the Ukrainian and other national minorities struggle against Russia.

These and other facts leave little doubt that the main concern of Russian emigres is Russia and not America. Too much faith and trust in their advice can only lead to more blunders in Eastern politics.

Here is a brilliant example of the success achieved by the Red and the White Russians: Analyzing the line of politics of the council of "experts of European politics", Walter H. Wagoner wrote in the New York Times (March 12, 1950) that in the opinion of this council, the Russian people (obviously what is meant is the

population of the USSR) have felt the effects of more than a generation of thought control and Communist party orientation. The people, as a result, more often than not identify themselves with the Government and identify this, more often than not, with Soviet Communism.

Apart from being wrong this point of view is harmful to the U.S.A. How can we talk of identification of the people with the Government in a country which harbors 15 million political prisoners, especially if we take into consideration that those prisoners are comprised of peasants, laborers, intellectuals; that is — the plain people. Landlords, manufacturers, high officials and officers were all liquidated in the first years of the Bolshevik Revolution. Again, each of those 15 million slave laborers has at least four relatives or close friends who are still free, who foster the same thoughts and feelings as those prisoners. According to this simple calculation there are at least 75 million potential enemies among the Soviet masses.

Where then is the logic of thought of identifying the people with the Government?

While the Russian people constitute about 40 per cent of the population of the USSR their numbers in the concentration camps do not exceed 5 to 8 per cent. I know this from personal experience, having spent some time in a Siberian concentration camp. The vast majority of these

prisoners consists of nationalities subjugated by Russia: Ukrainians, Kazakhs, Byelorussians, Poles, Balts, Caucasians Azerbaijanians, etc. They found themselves in these concentration camps because in one way or another they had protested against Moscow's colonial policy in their country. In some cases where they did not actually protest it was suspected that they would protest under certain circumstances.

Who can argue, therefore, that the population of the USSR identifies its nationalism with Soviet Communism? It could only be someone who is consciously acting on behalf of Moscow, or one who is completely misinformed.

Having lived under the Soviet regime for 24 years I have had thousands of opportunities to learn that the mass of the population there, especially those who are not of Russian nationality, has waited in the past and will continue to wait in the future for outside intervention. It sees in such intervention the only salvation from Kremlin rule. For under the conditions prevailing there, under an all-embracing terror and spy-system, it is impossible to conceive of an internal revolt. Walter Lippman is badly mistaken when he declares that when Stalin dies there will be an immediate revolt and the satellite states will free themselves. This could happen only if simultaneously with the death of Stalin the all-powerful NKVD, with its immense appa-

ratus consisting of several millions and controlling not only the population but the Government and the army, were to mysteriously liquidate itself.

For this reason it is more likely that, as some writers have asserted, a new dictator to replace Stalin will be installed by none other than the leader of the NKVD. The fact that this will not correspond to the will of the people is beside the point. Perhaps this is not readily comprehensible to the people of the Western World who are used to electing their leaders by democratic processes. There, behind the Iron Curtain, such a possibility is precluded, and that is why the population awaits a blow from outside. Only then will it be able to express its true aims and desires.

I witnessed the events of 1941 when the masses of the Soviet people impatiently awaited the coming of the Germans expecting that this would lead to the introduction of a democratic order, the abolition of slave labor and the miserable income of agricultural and factory workers, and finally the establishment of the right of national self-determination.

During the first seven months of the German-Soviet war three million nine hundred thousand officers and men of the Red Army gave themselves up to the Germans. I witnessed the fact that thousands of Red Army soldiers hid anywhere they could near the front line in order to be able

to give themselves up. It wasn't because they were cowards; they simply did not want to fight in defence of Muscovite slavery. I saw how the German leaflets dropped from aeroplanes, promising the abolition of Communist regime and the re-establishment of national freedom for the peoples of the USSR, had a thousandfold greater effect upon the army and the population than bombs dropped from the same aeroplanes. In those areas where such leaflets were dropped the NKVD and the local Communists used the most drastic methods to have these leaflets collected and destroyed. The reading of such leaflets was forbidden under penalty of death.

The world press brings reports from time to time about the struggle for liberation going on in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, in the Baltic countries, and in the Caucasus. Five years after the war these partisan activities still continue despite the most drastic efforts by Moscow to suppress them.

Although the Government in Moscow has thousands of times the military strength available to these partisans, yet it cannot liquidate them. The reason for this is that a nationalist-liberation movement fights for an idea. Its roots draw life from the very depths of the national masses which give it every encouragement and support. Without such support these movements would be doomed from the start.

Since the very inception of the Communist regime Moscow has conducted periodic purges in the national republics, and particularly in the Ukraine. These purges are practically a yearly occurrence and usually end with mass deportations of potential opponents of the regime. What do these mass deportations of national groups from the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, the Baltic states, Kazakhstan, Crimea, etc. signify? Surely not that the peoples of the USSR identify their nationalism with Soviet Communism.

Even in the most severely censored press of the Soviet republic you will find reports which testify to the fact that a continuous struggle is carried on by Moscow against nationalist-liberation movements (the Communists refer to them as "bourgeois nationalism") in the various Soviet republics. In order to screen this chronic ailment of hers from the world, Moscow has recently stopped the supply of these newspapers to foreign correspondents and to subscribers abroad.

One could quote many analogous facts which betray the many deep antagonisms existing between the people and the Government of the USSR. To anyone who lived many years in the USSR the assertions made by "experts on European politics" that in the USSR the population identifies itself with the Government and also

identifies its nationalism with Soviet Communism, are completely incomprehensible.

It also seems obvious that General Bedell Smith, who made a somewhat deeper study of internal conditions in the USSR during his stay there as American Ambassador, would not agree with such an assertion. In his book "My Three Years in Moscow" he points to the antagonisms which exist between the people and the Government of the USSR and confirms the existence of powerful national separatist feelings, especially in the Ukraine.

One might partially agree with these "experts on European politics" if one assumed that the population of the USSR consisted exclusively of Russians. For it is true that the Russian people, who have the privileges of the ruling race, are generally better disposed toward the Communist regime. It is a well known fact that even during the war there was hardly any anti-Soviet activity in the ethnographic Russian territory. No wonder then, that, upon the conclusion of the war, Stalin proposed this toast at a banquet in the Kremlin, on the 24th of May, 1945: "I drink to the Russian people, the foremost of the nations of the USSR. The faith that the Russian people had in the Soviet Government was a decisive force which assured us of victory. My thanks to the Russian people for their trust." Obviously Stalin had no reason to say the same thing of other

nationalities who make up 60 per cent of the population of the USSR.

These millions of subjugated peoples are in fact the great potential force which may become a priceless ally in any struggle with the Russian imperialism. One of the main reasons why Communism won in Russia following the First World War was that the Allies ignored this force, in spite of the fact that nationalist liberation movements in Russia had played a big roll in the downfall of the Russian empire. Instead of supporting this potential the Western powers supported the misguided restoration of "one-and-un-divided" Russia.

No one thought of exploiting the nationalist-liberation revolts throughout Russia. Denikin, Kolchak and Wrangel, who had the support of the Allies, fought against the nationalist movements more vigorously than they did against Lenin's Red Guards, thus rendering Communist victory secure.

Unfortunately one cannot say that today the Western World has adopted any thing like a serious attitude towards this vital problem of Eastern Europe. One finds frequent sympathetic references to the nationalist-liberation movements of the peoples of Asia and Africa but hardly any reference, on the part of the American press or American official political thinkers, to the colonial

subjugation of almost a score of nationalities on the territories of the USSR.

It would seem to me that the policy makers of the Western World, notably those of the United States, might very well take an interest in some of the documents presented at the Convention of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, which took place in Edinburgh June 12, 14, 1950. Under the present strained conditions, created by Moscow throughout the world, it seems somewhat naive to object that action in support of the liberation movements within the USSR would be tantamount to "interference in Soviet internal affairs".

Where are the internal affairs anywhere in the world in which the Soviets do not meddle? Whenever the smallest nationalist liberation struggle becomes evident anywhere outside of the Iron Curtain the USSR immediately becomes the aggressive defender of those who are "enslaved by Capitalism". Why should not the Western World seize the same weapon which is so energetically wielded by Moscow? Apart from other things, this would strengthen the moral authority of the West before the majority of the people of the USSR, and would provide the basis for a valuable alliance in case of a military clash with Moscow.

There is more than one instance of this type of duplicity in Moscow's foreign relations. Take

the Korean conflict for example; Moscow provoked it; Moscow placed the ammunition in the hands of the Korean Communists and told them to go to war; then immediately organized meetings throughout the USSR protesting American aggression in Korea. Communist Fifth Columnists carry on similar activities in all other countries for such tactics are a basic part of Moscow's international policy.

Moscow begins her anti-Western propaganda with the children in kindergarten. The Western World, and particularly the U.S.A., are represented as cynical and soulless shopkeepers who dream only about changing the people of the USSR into their colonial slaves and to restoring the mighty land-owners and the old serfdom.

"Everything in the USSR is superior to everything in the West." With this motto, plans are laid for preparing the population for a conquest of the Western World.

AGGRESSION BY PROPAGANDA

"Slaves cannot defeat free people."

Ernest Bevin

This logical idea was expressed by the late Ernest Bevin at a conference of ministers of the four great powers in 1950, when he considered the possibility of a conflict between the USSR and the Western World. But before we accept this idea we must take into account that since 1917

the powerful propaganda apparatus of the USSR has used every method to drive into the heads of its slaves that they are the freest people in the world, and that their noble duty is to become instruments of destruction of slavery in the Western World and thus fulfill the mission of the Russian people. Even though this propaganda is disgustingly monotonous and annoying it has brought results, primarily with the younger generation which knows only the Soviet way of life. In addition, it is impossible to carry on any sort of counter propaganda. Any attempt at doing so is penalized by long-term imprisonment or death.

On the other hand this powerful Soviet propaganda machine preaches about the workers' paradise and unheard of freedom of the Soviet people, throughout the Western World almost as freely as it does at home. It is aided and abetted by its Fifth Columns: its "Peace Congresses" and "Slav Congresses", etc. When we consider that the USSR has millions of sympathizers in the West, even among intellectuals, we cannot really say that this false propaganda has been wholly ineffective.

It is obvious that this state of affairs requires that the West take appropriate, systematic and decisive steps to combat this undermining work, otherwise a paradox may come about: slaves may convert free people into their slaves.

The Russian Empire is not only preparing a military conquest of the West; it has also set in motion weapons of destruction which cannot be measured in material terms but which may play a decisive role in a future conflict of the two worlds. This weapon is ideological propaganda and Moscow exploits it methodically and with determination everywhere, including the United Nations forum.

So far this instrument has been quite successful in Moscow's hands. Through the use of it, coupled with Western inertia, she has seized control of a large part of Europe. When the Marshall Plan checked further Soviet expansion westward, Moscow shifted her attention eastward and there gained control of China with its 450 million people with little, if any, use of its military resources. With the aid of China she is preparing to "liberate" Burma, Malaya, Indonesia and Indo-China, and no doubt in due time India and Pakistan.

Lenin, Moscow's Mohammed, declared in his time: "Russia, plus Germany, plus China and India, would assure the victory of the Communist ideal in the whole world." Stalin, the disciple of Lenin, is fulfilling his master's creed. Thus he has neared the borders of India and continues to sow the false seed of Communism in Africa, South America, and in the fields of the U.S.A., Canada, and Iran.

By means of such conflicts as the Korean affair he wants to distract the attention of the outside world from the fundamental danger; his desire to weaken it with minor conflicts in order to prepare for the knockout blow.

At one time, when Lenin was dispatching several regiments to the occupied Ukraine he gave the following order to the Commander Antonov-Ovsienko. "You are to promise to the Ukrainians literally everything they may ask for; once we are established we will act in our own way."

Stalin has fully learned these "noble" political tactics and will promise peace while preparing for the most gruesome of international and civil wars; will promise freedom while concealing behind his back the fetters of slavery; he will speak of democracy while desiring to subject the world to Moscow's totalitarianism; he will collect signatures petitioning the abolition of atomic weapons while he makes every effort to increase his production of atom bombs.

INDISPENSABLE ANTIDOTES

What should the Western powers do under the circumstances? It seems that without delay they should adopt the following defensive measures against Moscow's aggression:

1. *Without delay they should strengthen and insure the battle-readiness of all possible military forces of the Atlantic Pact and the United Na-*

tions. Even a superficial analysis of Moscow's policy since the Revolution of 1917 indicates that her imperialistic drive can be stopped only by military force. Moscow has always taken aggressive steps where she was stronger and sure of victory. As a result of a compromising policy, and in some instances with the tacit support of the Western World, Moscow has now become more brazen than ever. She may even decide to provoke a World War. It might begin in Europe or in the East, combined with submarine, air and parachutist offensive against the American continent. The West must be on the alert and without hesitation adopt preventive measures in the East which could forestall any surprise attack from Moscow.

The early phase of the war in Korea showed the Western Powers to be almost as unprepared for surprise attack as at the time of Pearl Harbor. As is proven now, it was a great mistake to start immediate demobilization after the war, in the hope of proceeding with peaceful reconstruction, when faced with an enemy such as Moscow. Immediately following the war, while coaxing others to disarm, Moscow undertook to reorganize her own military power.

It would be impossible to find reasonable arguments to justify a new Pearl Harbor or a new Dunkirk. Under the circumstances it is not possible to speak of defence alone. It is a well-known

axiom of strategy that defence alone cannot win. One must be prepared to counter-attack.

In its military preparation for self-defence the West should not overlook the possibility or the advisability of mobilizing divisions of troops of different nationalities from among the political refugees who have lived under Communist subjugation and who are impervious to Communist propaganda. Such divisions fighting under their own national colors, side by side with Western soldiers, would be invaluable in supporting the struggle for liberation in their homelands. Neither can we overlook the fact that it is impossible to close the defensive circle of Europe by excluding Western Germany and Spain. This fact becomes especially important when it is recalled that in spite of the agreement to demilitarize Germany Moscow has already prepared in her zone of Germany considerable armed forces which would be used in the first lines in case of conflict with the West. It is therefore imperative that anti-Communist formations should be brought into being in Western Germany.

2. *Tactics of compromise should be dropped completely.* For some unknown reasons there are still politicians in the West who believe in the possibility of reaching a compromise with Moscow. Moscow compromises only when it suits her own interests, without the slightest regard for democratic ideals. We have had proof of this

over and over again. Neither will Moscow honor her treaties, unless compelled to, if they interfere with the execution of her general plan for world domination. It is useless to hope that obsequious trips to Moscow will ever solve the problem of peace. Such actions only lower the prestige of the Western World in the eyes of the Soviet people and encourage further Moscow aggression.

3. *There should be a determined drive against the activities of Moscow's Fifth Columns in the West and the Government apparatus should be thoroughly cleansed of Moscow sympathizers.* The great benefits of democratic freedom ought to be enjoyed only by those who are prepared to defend them and not by those who for one reason or another would exchange them for Red Fascism. The activities of Fifth Columnists, functioning under the unified direction of Moscow, are aimed against their own country and countrymen, thousands of whose lives may be sacrificed as a result.

What guarantee is there that the atom-bomb espionage affair will not be repeated with the hydrogen bomb or some other instrument of defence prepared by the West, so long as Communist sympathizers are allowed to sit in responsible positions? Western governments should give serious thought to the fact that at the decisive moment such persons may cause irreparable damage or even bring catastrophe upon their

people. Do democratic governments have the right at this point, when their own people are falling in battle against Communism, to tolerate Communist traitors in their midst?

Can the West still afford the continued influx of Moscow's propaganda and films, support for Communist foreign-language papers, and the organization here of various subversive "Peace" and "Slav" congresses? The fiasco of American Far Eastern policy should serve as a fair warning of the consequences of following the advice of officials who are sympathetic towards Moscow.

4. *The ideals of Democracy should be posted clearly on the battle banners, and cooperation with Moscow at the UN should be discontinued.* Although Moscow signed the Atlantic Charter during World War II, she had no intention of honoring her signature, which was appended simply to ensure greater supplies of American Lend-Lease. The Western World was not able to fulfill the wonderful promises of the Charter. For the quarter of the earth's surface which has fallen under Soviet rule these promises have perished in the dust.

The forthcoming inevitable war with Moscow imposes upon the West the need for ideological weapons, without which there can be no victory. These ideals are already recorded in the Atlantic Charter. They should be posted now as slogans

in the chambers of the UN, and tomorrow on the banners of the defenders of freedom.

When the Western powers raise their voices in protest against slavery, oppression and totalitarian methods, should they sit in council at the same conference table with representatives of the Soviet regime which is the greatest practitioner of slavery, coercion and totalitarian methods? The United Nations will be able to cope with aggression only when, following Hoover's advice, they purge themselves of Communist participation which simply exploits the UN for its own false propaganda. In the light of Moscow's 39 breaches out of 40 treaty obligations with the U.S., her 38 vetoes in the UN and her demagogic tactics at all international gatherings, further Western cooperation with the USSR means only additional sacrifice of principle.

It is now apparent to most people that the Nuremberg trials lowered the dignity of Western justice because Stalin's criminals were allowed to sit on the bench, to judge Hitler's criminals. It should be apparent today that for the same reason Moscow's participation in the UN lowers the prestige of that body in the eyes of those who know Moscow's regime for what it is, and who are struggling for the realization of the ideals of the Atlantic Charter. These ideals should have the uncompromising support of United Nations.

5. *Communist parties should be outlawed and the true face of Moscow and her Fifth Columns thoroughly exposed.* The so-called liquidation of the Comintern during the war was wholly fictitious and only calculated to extract greater assistance from the West. In this respect Moscow succeeded notably. It is, after all, a fact that Allied armies were ordered not to proceed beyond an agreed line in Europe, which enabled Russian hordes to flood vast areas of Europe which the Allies could have occupied. Can there still be any thinking persons who doubt that this achievement of Moscow's false propaganda, the supposed suppression of the Comintern, brought great advantages to the Soviets at the expense of the Allies? The victory which had been gained over German totalitarianism by the noble sacrifices of Western soldiers was, thanks to Communist sympathizers in the West, offered to Stalin on a platter.

Stalin's affairs throughout the world are looked after by the Cominform. The subversive network of the Cominform, thanks to the exaggerated tolerance of democracy, enjoys far too great a freedom of action against democracy. With the aid of a free press and through the medium of free speech it is still able to poison the minds of millions of people. It is high time this was stopped! Sound logic and the instinct of self-preserva-

tion demand that the activities of Communist parties on behalf of Moscow should be suppressed.

But what is even more important, we should use every possible means to expose to the masses of the Western World the true face of the "workers' paradise" in the Soviet Union. The democratic press for some reason has so far approached this question very cautiously and superficially, while Moscow on the other hand begins the process of indoctrinating the minds of its people with hatred of the West at the kindergarten level. It is not suggested here that we should follow suit and instill hatred of other people in the minds of our people, but it is essential that Moscow's smiling Janus be unmasked.

Today it is virtually impossible for those who have lived many years behind the Iron Curtain and who have been imprisoned in Siberian concentration camps to gain the opportunity to express themselves on the pages of the larger American newspapers. They should be given an opportunity to say more to the Western World about the true state of affairs under Soviet tyranny. Perhaps these narratives would not be as thrilling or as well written as the masterpieces of mystery or adventure, perhaps they would even be horrible at times, but they would tell the truth which Moscow so jealously guards from the rest of the world. The Western World should

know about it in order to realize the type of "freedom" that Moscow has in store for it. This is also vital in order to increase the moral resistance of the free nations who as yet have not displayed a proper awareness of this danger from Moscow.

I can only repeat what I have already said: if the people of the Western hemisphere saw the USSR as it really is, and roused themselves, the extreme danger of Communism would cease to exist in its present form.

6. *Every form of propaganda activity should be launched against Moscow on the territories of the USSR and its satellites.* There is no doubt in the minds of refugees from the USSR that in case of military conflict the greatest threat to the power of the Kremlin will arise inside the territory of the USSR. This is the force of dissatisfaction of the greater part of the population of the national republics of USSR against the Russian policy of domination, and the Soviet regime as a whole. While engaged in organizing Fifth Columns throughout the world the USSR has, right on her own territory, in her own dissatisfied minorities, an open field for the most dangerous of Fifth Columns.

Some indication of the possibilities of this Fifth Column within the USSR came to light at the Nuremberg trial: during the first seven months of war on the Eastern front almost four million Red Army officers and men became Ger-

man prisoners-of-war. These were the best armed front line soldiers, but they were also the typical representatives of the Soviet civilian people. Nor would the Soviet civilian population have reacted differently to the question of defence of the "fatherland" had not the stupid policies adopted by the Germans changed their whole attitude.

It should also be noted that following the first German blows unbelievable panic and disorganization reigned deep in the Soviet territory, hundreds of kilometres away from the front. This applied primarily to industry, agriculture and transport. Under this panic and disorganization numerous instances of sabotage were concealed by those who wished the defeat of Moscow and her gross ineptitude of Communist administration.

After thirty years of severe oppression, spying and terror the people of the USSR have learned to be exceedingly careful and would therefore undertake mass anti-Communist actions only if they saw that the system of control imposed by the NKVD and the Communist party was breaking down. Their caution is quite understandable under the circumstances because open activity without arms and organization would only lead to a complete annihilation of the revolutionists.

Unfortunately the Western World has completely neglected its allies in the USSR. Not only

the potential forces, but the active ones who are presently operating as insurgent units, do not receive the necessary encouragement, to say nothing of material support, from the West. Perhaps the Western powers do not realize the importance of this potential ally in case of war. Perhaps they do not realize that without the participation of that ally, and without decisive action directed to his support, it is virtually impossible to overcome Russia's vast territory.

For this reason it is essential now to undertake an energetic counter-attack of propaganda against Moscow on her own territories if only to give moral support to our neglected allies and to strengthen their belief in eventual liberation. It is not to be expected that such propaganda would bring about an internal revolt in the USSR. It would, however, build up a most valuable potential for the Western World in the event of war. It would save the lives of vast numbers of people in the West and would be one of the most important elements of victory.

Western action of this kind has so far been limited to the insignificant attempts of the "Voice of America". In this connection it must be noted that the outlook of the people of Eastern Europe, and particularly the population of the USSR, is completely different from that of western people. Whereas here public opinion is influenced by

straight news (which is what the "Voice of America" seeks to give), behind the Iron Curtain that is not enough. There the desired propaganda effect can only be achieved by substantial and sharp commentaries regarding facts and events.

I should like to quote one interesting example of this: while in Europe I once heard a report over the "Voice of America" that, I think it was in the state of Minnesota, many teachers were leaving their profession and going into the factories. There was no further comment. A few days later I heard Moscow repeat this report of "Voice of America" word for word and comment in the following vein: "The frightful conditions of capitalist exploitation are forcing American public school teachers to quit teaching and take up hard labor in order to save themselves and their families from starvation."

Such a comment was easily understandable to a Soviet person because a factory worker in the USSR gets 100 to 200 more grams of bread daily than does a school teacher. I have no doubt that most of the Soviet listeners imagined that American teachers undertook hard labor to get for their starving families those additional one or two hundred grams of bread.

This kind of "objective" report by the "Voice of America" served little purpose, in any case; but having decided to include it some effort ought to have been made to explain that the average

American teacher makes \$200 per month for which he could buy in America 5,000 pounds of fat pork (almost prohibitive in the USSR), or about four suits of clothes, or 20 pairs of good shoes, or 4 new bicycles (available in the USSR, with some difficulty, only to Stakhanovites or delegates to the Supreme Council) etc., and all this without permits or ration cards. And that in spite of this teachers go to work in factories, obviously to earn more.

That is more or less how facts should be objectively commented upon for the Soviet listener. As far as economic propaganda is concerned this would enable him to understand and realize more readily what a beggar he is in comparison with the "enslaved" inhabitants of the West.

So much for the significance and influence of a commentary; as far as the content of the propaganda is concerned, it should be so varied as to reflect upon all those problems and interests which occupy the minds of the majority of Soviet inhabitants. Such questions are not discussed there because participation in such discussions might conceivably mean death. They lie hidden in the depths of the human soul and occasionally come to light only in the immediate family circle or in the intimate gathering of closest friends.

When at times I, too, closed the doors and windows and tuned to a low-tuned foreign station

I wanted to hear about the activities of our emigres abroad. I wanted to hear sharp criticisms of Soviet internal policies and her press. I wanted to hear protest from abroad against terror and slavery, and finally a voice which would bring hope of national and social liberation from Soviet servitude.

These are the interests of the Soviet listener and the source of his necessary moral support. Such support alone can eventually ensure the services of these people towards democratic ends. Broadcasts about Peter I and Ivan the Terrible and other determined defenders of Russian imperialism, which are to be heard over the "Voice of America" in Ukrainian languages will not induce a Soviet national minorities citizen to run the risk of listening to the foreign radio.

In view of the enormous potential strength of the nations enslaved by Moscow, broadcast time should be made available to emigre leaders of these nations. It should be realized that it is not for the benefit for Western democracies to have Russian emigres placed in charge of Ukrainian broadcasts over "Voice of America" for it tends to weaken the most persistent nationalist-liberation ferment in the USSR.

Well informed people believe that there are about two million short wave receiving sets on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Of course most of them belong to highly placed officials,

members of the Communist party and the NKVD. Ordinary people, especially in the villages, do not have the possibilities to hear short wave broadcasts. They have greater access to medium wave receivers tuned to powerful and nearby stations, especially those which can be received by the so-called detector sets.

Thus to insure the widest possible radio penetration of the Soviet Union, stations must be used which can be tuned in on the simplest receivers. To this should be added balloons which would scatter over Soviet territory propaganda leaflets, appeals, brochures, etc. Such propaganda action would reinforce radio since leaflets can be passed from hand to hand.

Moscow has been powerfully aided in conquering large territories and spreading her Fifth Column network throughout the world by an aggressive all-embracing propaganda. As a matter of self defence the democratic world should undertake similarly active counter propaganda against Russian imperialism and its lies. This should be undertaken without delay. Neither should such counter propaganda be hampered by diplomatic etiquette or any hesitations about interference in Russian internal affairs. Moscow herself does not take these things into consideration.

In the same way a stop should be put to the subversive activities of the Fifth Columnists,

having first made it clear to them that democratic rights do not apply to their clandestine activities. There is no time to lose. These things should be done today; tomorrow may be too late.

THE FLOOD SHOULD BE CHECKED

It is said that when an ostrich is faced by extreme danger he hides his head in the sand. What other picture can one draw of those who are seeking to compromise with Moscow? This quest for an illusory peace by covering one's eyes and asking others to do the same ought to be rejected because it could have dire consequences. The Red imperialism of Moscow will never give up its ambition to rule the world. No one can safely close his eyes to this.

Russian imperialism will always be directed towards this end although in the face of powerful resistance it might vary its tactics. It might withdraw in one place to strengthen its position in another only to return to the first objective eventually. Such is the situation in Germany, China, Greece and Korea. Moscow will continue to provoke, and inflict upon the Western powers, greater or lesser military conflicts operating, in most cases, through the military forces of its satellites in order to drain the military resources of the West and thereby gain time to prepare herself for the decisive blow in due course.

Such provocative activity will be accompa-

nied as usual by widespread propaganda about how peace-loving she is until such a moment when she can place her Muscovite jackboot upon the neck of her victim.

The dark forces of Moscow are similar to a flood which threatens to inundate all of the continents. It cannot be stopped either in Germany or Korea, for its source is in Moscow. Only a united, determined and uncompromising military action of the whole free world, combined with the Fifth Column within the USSR, can stem that flood; this action must be directed against Moscow, the fountain head of this flood.

The policy of appeasement and compromise, which was prevalent in Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and China, has resulted in the fact that whereas Stalin entered the war with a population less than 200 million he now has under his control almost a billion people, and is reaching out for the second billion. He is straining every effort to realize a way of life graphically described by George Orwell in his book "Nineteen Eighty-Four"; this is no fantasy, but a clear preview of what is entirely possible.

Read that book and decide for yourself whether you want to be included in that second billion to fall on your knees before the throne of Stalin!

DATE DUE

DATE DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

Psychodko, N.

Mosco's Drive for World
Domination

THE NKVD GET THEIR MAN

During a literature exam in a Soviet University the examiner turned to a non-party student and sternly asked, "Who wrote 'War and Peace'?"

"I didn't," answered the student, alarmed.

Appalled at such a display of ignorance he hastened to report the incident to the dean.

"Don't fret so Ivan Ivanovich. Maybe he really didn't do it," The dean was sympathetic.

This was too much for Ivan Ivanovich and he rushed from the dean's office in great consternation. On his way home he met an acquaintance of his from the NKVD who asked why he looked so worried. Ivan Ivanovich related to him the incident about "War and Peace". The NKVD officer asked him the name of the student and told him not to worry. The following day the dean and the student were absent from the University and a few days later Ivan Ivanovich received a telephone call from his friend in the NKVD.

"I told you not to worry," he announced with pride. "They've both confessed."

* * *

NOT FAR ENOUGH

A Soviet judge had just sentenced a peasant to ten years in a concentration camp in the Far North and asked the prisoner if he had anything to say.

"Yes," the man answered, "Is that place also under Soviet rule?"

"Oh, of course," the judge readily replied.

"Well then, if it isn't too much trouble, please send me a little farther away."