

**George Fedotov and His Predictions  
On The  
Future Fate of the U.S.S.R.  
and  
Of Its Enslaved Peoples**

By Arnold D. Margolin

---

UKRAINIAN WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION  
Scranton, Pennsylvania

---

Price: 20 cents



[diasporiana.org.ua](http://diasporiana.org.ua)

*This booklet is devoted to the memory of Georgy P. Fedotov, the great Russian patriot and genuine humanitarian thinker. It represents the summary of the address delivered by Arnold D. Margolin on March 20, 1955, in Toronto, Canada, under the auspices of the Ukrainian Workingmen's Association in the U. S. A. and the Ukrainian Workers' Organization in Canada.*

## GEORGY FEDOTOV AND HIS PREDICTIONS ON THE FUTURE FATE OF THE U.S.S.R. AND OF ITS ENSLAVED PEOPLES.

It is a very difficult venture to make any predictions about the future fate of any country or of any people. The only way warranting some approximate correctness of such prognostications is the possession of some knowledge of the history of the respective countries and peoples, and of the present situation and political, economic and social trends of the population within those countries.

Equally important is the understanding of the human psychology which primarily requires knowledge of purely biological facts. There prevailed in this field in the eighteenth century of our era the views of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1717-1778) which influenced the authors of the American Declaration of Independence, and also of the French Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen. The essence of Rousseau's views was in his belief that the brain and the heart of the children at the very time of their birth are a "tabula rasa" — a smoothed tablet, and that all depends on facts which will be written into these tablets after the child's birth during the lifetime of every child. In other words, Rousseau believed that the main factors in the development of human psychology and human character were conditions of the environment, of the "milieu" within which a child lived and developed into maturity.

Later, however, due to the progress of natural sciences, this Rousseau theory evoked most serious doubts. So the present prevailing scientific belief is that *fundamental* features of human character are *inborn*. It is enough to watch the newly-born children to become persuaded in the predominant influence of heredity on human character. A good-natured healthy child usually smiles and displays friendly feelings to all the surrounding living beings. On the contrary, a gloomy, though even healthy newly-born child, must as a rule develop into a not too-friendly, and a rather pessimistic adult.

Rousseau himself, however, was not very consistent in his above belief on "tabula rasa." As stated by the Russian-born French sociologist, Professor G. D. Gurvitch of the Strassburg and Sorbonne Universities, Rousseau denied that great scientific knowledge necessarily influences human beings toward the goodness of their character and to their altruistic disposition. And it is absolutely correct that even the knowledge of truth in some special field does not change the inborn character of any person, and that there is also among the outstanding scientists quite a number of bad persons, of hunters for a personal career by any price, etc.

Recently, Adlai Stevenson expressed this same thought in the following words:

"The only knowledge is not sufficient; the knowledge must be inspired by magnanimity before knowledge becomes wisdom."

It seems that there are among the scholars in general, and among the historians in particular, three categories, three types of human beings:

1) *Not very scrupulous carrier hunters who attempt to present history in the light agreeable to the government of the respective country.* So, for example, Russian historians of Czaristic time Karamzin, Soloviev and especially Ilovaisky glorified the autocratic regime of Russian Czars and presented in an absolutely falsified way the position of the non-Russian peoples in the Russian Empire.

2) *Historians who are objective and honest in presenting and interpreting the facts of the past history.* To this category belonged the greatest historian of the Russian Empire, V. O. Kliuchevsky. Also, the well-known Russian scholar Paul N. Miliukov represented more or less correctly the political history of the Czaristic Russia.

However, all the predictions of Miliukov *regarding the future fate of the Russian Empire* were always imbued by his purely imperialistic feelings and semi-conscious but powerful inclinations for the preservation of the multinational Russian Empire, including his ardent desire of converting the Black Sea and the Straits flowing from there to the Mediterranean Sea — into a purely *Russian Black Sea* and *Russian Straits*, with the entire disregard of the respective similar interests of Turkey in the Black Sea and Straits.

It is true that imperialists also exist in England, France and other colonial empires. Churchill also did not want until the not too remote time to see India as a free and independent country. France, Belgium, Holland still continue to display imperialistic feelings but already realize the approaching end of the possibilities to keep the colonies under their control.

3) *Scholars who not only present objectively in their writings the facts of the past, but who also try to be quite impartial and objective in their predictions of the future fate of countries and peoples, based on their knowledge of the past.*

This third category of thinkers is very far from being numerous among the Russian scholars and among Russians in general. Their best and most outspoken representative was the late Professor Georgy Fedotov, to whose memory this little booklet is devoted.

Being a great Russian patriot in the best sense of this word, Fedotov did not identify Pushkin or Tolstoi with the Russian Empire. He understood that even if England gave to the world the great Shakespeare (1564-1616), this did not mean that therefore British colonies in America or elsewhere should not have the right of their aspirations to become free and independent. So, Fedotov thought that also all non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. should have the right of deciding their fate up to secession from Russia proper after the forthcoming downfall of the Soviet Government.

Fedotov visualized from his knowledge of history that all the great artificial Empires built by military conquests and subordination of the enslaved peoples cannot exist eternally. Neither the former Roman Empire nor the former Spanish Empire survived after their enslaved peoples succeeded in their

uprisings to secede from them. Fedotov also visualized the beginning of the recent unrest in almost all of the colonies of European powers; as he stated in his writings, the U.S.S.R. seemed to be the *last great Empire*, stubbornly trying to continue to keep under the Communist rule all its enslaved peoples and peoples of its enslaved satellite countries. In his opinion, the doom of this "last colonial Empire" is unavoidable.

This Empire would disappear in the course of the 3rd World War. If, however, this terrible world tragedy the new World War should be avoided, then there would later occur general uprisings of the peoples *within the U.S.S.R. and within its satellite countries* resulting either in a temporary suppression of these uprisings by the iron hand of some new unscrupulous, brutal dictatorial rule, or in an immediate partition of the U.S.S.R.

All this is clearly and persuasively explained by Fedotov as can be seen from the contents of numerous quotations from his book: "The New City," reprinted in this booklet.

May I also add that Fedotov remembered very well the outcome of the great American Revolution. Fedotov undoubtedly knew that Lord Mansfield, the greatest jurist of his day in England, most eloquently supported the belief of the British King George III that "British colonies in America will *never* secede from England." Fedotov also knew, however, that there were at that time in England much more clairvoyant statesmen like Edmund Burke who from the very beginning of the American Revolution foresaw its seriousness, and unsuccessfully insisted on a conciliation policy and substantial concessions on the part of England.

Fedotov displayed an identical clairvoyance in his predictions about the future of the U.S.S.R. and its peoples, and all his prognoses were founded on the thorough knowledge of the past history of the Russian Empire, and of the present situation in the U.S.S.R.

Let us now mention a few biographical data about this man.

Georgy Petrovich Fedotov was born in 1886, in Saratov, one of the largest and most important industrial and commercial cities of the Volga region. His studies in the Petersburg Technological Institute were interrupted by his banishment by the Czaristic Government to Western Europe for his participation in students' protests against some unlawful acts of the Government.

During his brief stay in Germany he studied history in Berlin and Jena Universities. When he was permitted in 1908 to return to Petersburg he continued the study of history at the Petersburg University, and in 1914 he passed the examination as Master of History and was appointed Docent of Petersburg University. At this period he began to be interested in theology, and to take part in religious-philosophical circles.

In 1920 he was appointed professor of history in the Saratov University. However, the Soviet regime already was firmly established in Saratov at that time, so Fedotov soon decided to leave his work in the University, and to

escape at the first opportunity from Russia to Western Europe. In 1925 he succeeded to reach Paris where he devoted himself to writing articles in Russian liberal magazines, and also in French, English and German scientific reviews.

In 1931-1940 he edited together with Bunakov-Fondaminsky a Russian magazine, "The New City." Simultaneously, he became Professor of the Theological Orthodox Academy in Paris.

In 1941 he migrated to U.S.A. and became a professor at the Theological Orthodox Academy in New York. In 1946 the Harvard University Press published his book: "The Russian Religious Mind."

Fedotov died in September 1951 in Bacon, New Jersey.

In recognition of his great scientific and literary achievements, the Russian Chekhov Publication Society of the East European Fund published shortly after his death his book: "The New City" containing his numerous articles in the magazine of the same name.

This book is a very important document. It contains about 400 pages, and it is divided into three parts. The first part embracing one half of the book deals with Russia and with the West; the second part presents Fedotov's articles on Russian literature and poetry, whereas the problems of religion and philosophy are considered in the third part.

Of special interest for everybody is the first part of this book in which there is given a very objective picture of the aspirations of the peoples living under the totalitarian regime of the so-called Communist Russian Party.

The most valuable in this part of the book are pages devoted to the predictions of Fedotov regarding the future fate of the U.S.S.R. and of its peoples. As already stated above, the reader will find on pages of this booklet numerous quotations containing the views of Mr. Fedotov. As a matter of fact, his views in many aspects coincide with the views of the Ukrainian, Caucasian, Bielorussian and other non-Russian historians. It would be wrong, however, to think that Fedotov was under their influence. As a matter of fact, he was mainly surrounded in the course of all his life by Russians, and he did not have any close personal contacts with the scholars or political leaders of non-Russian peoples neither in the Czaristic Russian Empire nor in the U.S.S.R., nor in the emigration.

Whereas political leaders usually try to persuade their audiences to accept and support *their own views and programs*, Fedotov and similar objective and independent scholars try to find out what is not only desirable, from their own point of view, but what also is *or is not possible and attainable in a certain period of time under the existing circumstances in a certain country or countries of the world*.

In conclusion, one is tempted to express the great regret that Fedotov was prevented by his death from possible predictions of *still further developments in Eastern Europe and in parts of Asia after the eventual establishment*

*of several free and independent States on the gigantic territory of the present U.S.S.R.*

One can assume, however, that Fedotov would predict a great possibility of a genuine, real confederation or even federation among some or all of these free states, *after* they would succeed in establishing a genuine democratic regime within each of them with the aid of the United Nations. And as we know from the precedents of Fascist Spain, and even of Tito's Yugoslavia, it is quite possible for the United Nations to influence comparatively small countries which are not yet members of this great international organization — for leaning toward the United Free Nations and even finally becoming its members.

Anyhow, this task is much easier than almost hopeless attempts of persuading the totalitarian Moscow regime or its eventual dictatorial successors that they should abdicate, and let the people of the U.S.S.R. convert this colossal Empire "at once" into a genuine great free democratic confederation or federation. *Even Clemenceau and Lloyd George did not accept Wilson's propositions to liberate all the enslaved countries and peoples of the world, and to recognize them as free and equal partners of the world's family of peoples. And Hitler would reject with indignation in 1933, and especially in 1939 and a few following years, some project of German-French free confederation, as two equal partners.*

As an old Russian proverb asserts, "to each fruit — its own time for becoming ripe."

\*

\*

P. N. Miliukov

## OUTLINES OF HISTORY OF RUSSIAN CULTURE (1909) (Translation from Russian)

### PART I

*Page 149:* Since the end of the 15th century Moscow becomes the real military camp, the main staff of the Army leaning upon the northern peopled half of Russia, in order to conduct step after step conquests and military colonization of Southern Russia.

### PART II

*Page 254:* Southern Russian Society was more prepared than inhabitants of Moscow state . . . The medieval program of the middle and highest schools was transferred by Jesuits in the 16th century from Western Europe to South-western Russia.

*Page 256:* The Kiev Ecclesiastic Academy, founded at the end of the first quarter of the 17th century, accepted the full program of "free sciences." In the absence of other similar institutions, the Kiev Academy remained for a long time the nursery of ecclesiastic persons who possessed the highest theological instruction. "Do not read many books," said Moscow people; and they named as an example someone who "became insane" because of reading books. *Page 257:* In 1640 the very reformer of Kiev Academy, Peter Mohyla, proposed to found in Moscow, a monastery from the monks of Kiev Monastery.

However, this proposition was not accepted in 1640. Only later, the Czaristic government of Aleksei Mikhailovich began to promote the publication of school books.

*Page 262:* Finally, in 1687 there was created in Moscow the Slavo-Graeco-Latin Academy.

*Page 264:* The historian Soloviev, however, calls this Academy "the dreadful inquisitional tribunal."

*Page 307:* Only at the end of the 18th century was there laid down some foundation for general-educational school not limited only to the nobility.

\*

**P. N. Miliukov**

**THE NATIONAL QUESTION (1925) (Translation from Russian)**

*Page 159:* After the assassination of Alexander II and during the whole reign of Alexander III the nationalism becomes the official doctrine and there began the first in Russian history official governmental persecutions against the Jews and the Finns. Also Armenian schools in the Caucasus were closed in 1897.

*Page 160:* Relations with Poland and Ukraine are spoiled. Thus, at the beginning of the 20th century the Russian nationalism succeeded to deteriorate up to the roots the relations which had begun to be created in the midst of the most conscientious nationalities by Russian statesmen in the course of one century.

\*

\*

**G. P. Fedotov**

**THE NEW CITY, Collection of Articles, 1952.**

**CHEKHOV PUBLISHING HOUSE, New York (Translation from Russian)**

## PART I

*Page 60:* One has to look into the eyes of the truth: it is impossible to resurrect the corpse.

*Page 85:* We can consider that for the present day of Russian culture the intellectual type has entirely disappeared.

*Page 105:* The Kiev Rus -- the epoch of the highest cultural development of the ancient Rus -- was not a State, but it was only a system of states and bound only culturally, religiously and dynastically and nevertheless of independent states.

*Page 106:* The last two Czars educated by Slavophiles tried to Russify the Empire and incurred against it a multitude of its peoples. Nationalism became one of the poisons which decomposed the Emperor's Russia. The Empire is incompatible with the principle of a national state; the Empire either brings a super-national culture or depersonalizes small peoples and converts them into black earth for the rearing of one nation.

*Page 140:* The past history of Russia seems not to give foundations for optimism. In the course of many centuries Russia was the most despotic monarchy in Europe. Its constitutional regime (and what a sick one it was!)



lasted only eleven years; its democracy (and rather in the proclamation of principles than in their realization) lasted only some eight months. Hardly after the liberation from the Czar, the people – though not voluntarily and not without fight – was subjected to the new tyranny in comparison with which Czaristic Russia seems to be a paradise of freedom.

*Page 142:* In the Kiev epoch, Rus had all the preliminary conditions on which there appeared in the West the first rays of freedom.

*Page 143:* There was here not only any Emperor (Czar) but also any King (or even Great Prince) who could claim for his power over the church. The church had *its* Czar also in Rus, its anointed sovereign, but this Czar lived in Constantinople. And his name was the ideal symbol of unity of the Greek Orthodox World for Eastern Slavs – not more than a symbol. The church was not mixed with the State and stood high above it. So the church could demand the bearers of Prince's power subjugation to some ideal principles not only in personal life but also in political life; to be true to treaties, to peaceful tendencies, to justice. Metropolitan Nikifor could declare to the princes: "We are sent by God to restrain you from bloodshed."

*Page 144:* Naturally, something else is also important. The ancient Rus prince did not embrace the fullness of power. He had to share it with the Boyars, also with military drujiny, also with the vicche. Least of all could he consider himself the master of State's land.

*Page 145:* Altogether, we see in Kievskaja Rus as compared with the West no less favorable conditions for the development of personal and political freedom. Later Free Rus became for centuries a slave and a tributary to Mongols. The two-centuries Tatar yoke was not the end of Russian freedom. Freedom perished only after the liberation from Tatars. Only the Moscow Czar as the successor of Tatar Khans could liquidate all social power limiting the absolute Czar's power.

*Page 147:* However, the old Rus did not capitulate to Moscow without struggle.

*Page 149-150:* Nevertheless, the whole process of historical development in Rus was reverse to Western European: This was development from freedom to serfdom . . . only by extreme and universal strain, by terrible sacrifices could exist this pauper, barbaric, endlessly growing State.

*Page 153:* For the masses of people remaining strangers to European culture, the Moscow way of life lasted until the liberation of peasants (1861).

*Page 155:* So it is astonishing that in the art of word – that is in the deepest and intimate from the creations of national genius (however, also in the music) Russia gave all its measure only in the 19th century. If Russia would perish as a nation still during the Napoleonic wars, the world would never know what he lost with Russia.

*Page 169:* Only in intercourse with the West, Russia in Empire's era was contaminated by the ideal of freedom and started to rebuild its life accordingly.

This seems to mean that if the totalitarian cadaver can be resurrected to freedom, then the vivifying water will be again looked for in the West.

*Page 173:* The growth of State signifies the enlargement of the zone of peace, the concentration of powers, and consequently the success of materialistic culture. But the ruin of small or weak peoples swallowed by big States kills, sometimes forever, the possibility of flourishing of other cultures, sometimes promising much, and qualitatively higher in comparison with the victorious rival.

*Page 177:* As the result of two World Wars, the old Europe and all its system of international relations went away to eternity. There perished or perish all its Empires, except Russia. There is no more Austria-Hungary. Turkey went away from Europe. Italy lost all its colonies. Germany - naturally, temporarily, does not even exist as a state. France is brought into the level of a secondary state which makes powerless attempts to save its falling-to-pieces overseas Empire. England, though twice victorious in two World Wars, and capable for heroic struggle, is weakened by heavy blood-letting and is compelled itself to begin the liquidation of Empire.

*Page 178:* In general, almost all powers of "resistance" in Europe which fought with Hitler, gave away now their homelands to the new Eastern conqueror. As if the aim of all this struggle was to change one tyrant to the other one. The culture or the lack of culture of contemporary nations becomes more and more cosmopolitan and hopelessly uniform. National traditions serve more for decorative glorification of innerly void technical civilization.

*Page 179:* Thus, in the meantime we see above the ruins and chaos of Europe's two giants, two victors elevated to the unprecedented altitude by the second World War.

*Page 179:* Struggle between these two Empires is already conducted by methods of diplomacy, economics, propaganda. Even direct war is going on, though under cover of foreign flags.

*Page 180:* America, however, is not refraining from the thought of world unit. Americans tried to incarnate it in the bloodless phantom of United Nations . . . The loss of national sovereignty frightens. The 19th century keeps the consciousness of ruling circles of Anglo-Saxon allies imprisoned. However, Churchill has already the daringness to speak about the United States of Europe.

*Page 181:* All probabilities speak in favor of the prediction that the new World-State, or the new Universal Empire, will be born -- like all former Empires -- as a result of war but not of peace . . . The Geneva League of Nations presented the last chance. Since then, as the result of two terrible world wars, the political morals of European peoples became so low as it has ever happened in the whole of Christian history. The political phraseology is now in crying contradiction with political realities.

*Page 182:* It is easy to imagine how the world will look in case of Russia's victory. Spreading of Communist system throughout the whole earth's globe. Destruction of higher classes and of all bearers of culture who breathed with the air for freedom and did not want to discontinue it. Mass executions during first years, penal servitude camps for an entire generation.

*Page 183:* The other variation of the Empire: Pax Atlantica, or rather Pax Americana -- is less clear but bright. In case of victory of America, England and their allies the unity of the world must be realized in the form of real but not fake federation. So real are the very structure of the United States, and of the British Commonwealth.

*Page 184:* There is no foundation to fear that peoples will be enslaved in case of America's victory . . . And European fears of American exploitation are tremendously exaggerated. In the meantime, America spends billions for the restitution of Europe and it does not look that America will receive something in return.

*Page 185:* It is impossible to forget the third variation: the possibility that there might be not a victory of one of the two Empires, but the universal destruction and perdition if the collision should occur in the conditions of approximate equality of forces and armaments.

*Page 185:* Which can be Russia's fate in case of its defeat? For the majority of its population the downfall of the hated power even for the price of temporary foreign occupation will be liberation. Americans do not intend to colonize Russia like Hitler, or to destroy Russia's "lower" races. The complication is that Russia is not a national state but a multi-nation Empire; the last one which remains in the world after the liquidation of other Empires.

*Page 187:* As to the Russian intelligentsia circles of 19th century, they were disgusted with the forcible russification or about the baptizing of aliens. They were disgusted, however, about the methods but not about the aims pursued by these methods. The assimilation was considered as the unavoidable follow-up of the civilization.

*Page 191:* Already in the middle of the 19th century the Ukrainian movement accepts a political character in the Cyrillo-Methodian Fraternity. Moscow with its eastern despotism was strange to Ukrainians. When religious motives induced the Ukrainian Cossacks to the Union with Moscow, bitter disappointments expected them about this union . . .

*Page 192:* The new period in the creation of the Ukrainian nation begins with the second half of the 19th century. Senseless persecutions of Ukrainian literature transferred the center of the national movement from Kiev to Lvov, Galicia, which was never bound with Moscow nor with Petersburg . . . As before, we stubbornly continued to consider the Little Russian language only as a regional dialect of Russian language, though the Slavists of the whole world including the Russian Academy of Sciences long ago recognized this dialect as an independent language . . . On our eyes there was born in the world a new nation, but we closed our eyes to this fact.

*Pages 193-194:* It is difficult to say something against the federation. This is an excellent, reasonable program. It can be that if the federative form of Russia should be realized in 1905 with the victory of the liberation movement, it would prolong the existence of Empire for several generations. Unfortunately, however, the peoples -- at least in our time -- live not by reason, but by passion. They prefer carnage and hunger under their own colors.

*Page 194:* In 1917 the democratic intelligentsia who ruled over Russia half a year declared a federative self-government for some of Russia's peoples. But in the circumstances of disorganization and of the decline of Russia's military power, federation already did not satisfy. And when Bolshevism conquered in Great Russia, federation was avoided as if it were a pest.

*Page 194:* By the force of arms, the Bolsheviks collected the Empire and kept its failing composition by terror as by an iron hoop. The absence of political freedom was covered by great connivances to the vanity of nationalities. The eleven Soviet Republics of that time (later additional five Soviet Republics were created) live "under their own flags!" Under the Constitution they even had the right of cessation.

*Page 195:* This bloom did not last long. Since then, national movements were chased underground. This means that the centrifugal powers are again gathering on the borders, ready to explode the fake federative Empire. And the more they are squeezed by the press of the N.K.V.D., the more effective must be their explosion after the liberation . . . The Bolshevik regime is hated also by the great majority of Great Russians. However, the general hatred does not bring to one unit the peoples of Russia. The turning away of all national minorities from Bolshevism is accompanied by turning away from Russia which gave birth to Bolshevism.

*Page 195:* Bolshevism established itself without difficulty in Petersburg and in Moscow. Great Russia almost did not have civil war; the border nationalities exercised a desperate resistance against Bolshevism. There probably was something in the traditions of Great Russia which fed Bolshevism in greater measure than the other parts of the Empire: the servitude of peasants, the village commune, the absolute monarchical regime.

*Page 196:* The iron curtain of totalitarian lie prevents us from seeing clearly what is going on behind the limits of the universally known torture chamber. There are, however, three facts which compel us to presuppose the growth of separation in the U.S.S.R. According to testimonies of refugees who have escaped from the U.S.S.R., the "nationals" present a significant percent of the population of concentration camps. Their presence there is not equi-balanced by representation of political movements or parties of Great Russia, because there are no such in existence.

*Page 196:* And finally, we see ourselves in our midst what is going on in the emigration. Among all groups of Russian emigration, representatives of other nationalities of Russia are absent. They build their own organizations, and even do not try to establish some contacts with Russian colleagues in fight, or confreres in fate.

*Page 197:* More than that --- we do not meet from any part such a hatred, as on the part of Ukrainians whom we -- erroneously -- considered as quite

ours. How far away are we from the old emigration when in the expectation of forthcoming revolution, the leaders of all peoples of Russia united in the struggle "for our and your freedom?" It is not difficult to foresee that in case of military defeat of Russia there will occur not only the fall of the Soviet regime, but also uprising of its peoples against Moscow. Bolshevism will die as National Socialism did. But who knows which new forms will accept the Russian fascism or nationalism for a new Russian expansion? If there would not be any separatisms in Russia, they would be created artificially; the partition of Russia would be anyhow predestinated. The factual situation will make possible to fulfill it in accordance with the will of the majority of its peoples, in the conditions of democratic justice.

*Page 197:* Theoretically, there is still one chance -- it seems the only one chance -- to prevent the new war; this is the downfall of the Bolshevik power in Russia.

*Page 198:* We think that its chances are almost nil. As long as the Russian people will take accounts with its executors, the majority of nationalities, just as in 1917, will demand in the course of the general unavoidable chaos the realization of their constitutional right for cessation. Probably, there will occur a civil war of approximately equal parts of former Russia. Even if Great Russia would win and would retain by force within its limits the peoples of the Empire, its triumphs can be only temporary. There is no place for Austria-Hungaries in the present world . . . The liquidation of the last Empire will become a question of international law and justice.

*Page 198-199:* Finis Russiac? The end of Russia or a new page of its history? Naturally, the last one. Russia will not die as long as there will be alive the Russian people, as Russians will live on their own land, will speak their own language. Russia will lose the Donetz coal, the Baku oil (naphtha), but France, Germany and so many peoples never had naphtha. Russia will become poorer but this will be only potentially because that misery in which Russia lives under the Communist system will then become the matter of past history.

---

## CONTENTS

1. Georgy Fedotov and His Predictions.....	1-6
2. Quotations from two books by Paul N. Miliukov.....	6-7
3. Quotations from Georgy P. Fedotov's Book: "The New City".....	7-12

