

NIKIFOR HRYHORIJIV

Former Professor of

UKRAINIAN INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY, PRAGUE

# DEMOCRACY

Its Channels and Tasks

Translated from Ukrainian

By C. H. ANDRUSYSHEN

1940

Published by the  
UKRAINIAN COMMUNITY COUNCIL  
Detroit, Michigan

**NIKIFOR HRYHORIJIV**  
Former Professor of  
UKRAINIAN INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY, PRAGUE

**DEMOCRACY**  
Its Channels and Tasks

Translated from Ukrainian  
By C. H. ANDRUSYSHEN

1940

Published by the  
UKRAINIAN COMMUNITY COUNCIL  
Detroit, Michigan

## THE ESSENCE OF DEMOCRACY

1. **Essence of its form.** Literally, democracy means "government of the people, by the people and for the people"; (Lincoln) a national self-government of the people on the principles of liberty, equality, cooperation, mutual control, justice, trust, tolerance, culture, progress; government on the basis of acknowledging each person as a separate unit; government in which are possible: personal worth, tolerance of every thought and conduct which are not detrimental to anyone, non-existence of hate and violence, solution of all difference by means of discussion and understanding in which wisdom and not sentiment is to prevail, and which is to be directed with the view of establishing justice and mutual advantages.

In international relations democracy demands respect for a worthy nation, tolerance for its culture, rights, customs and vital needs, preservation of its liberty and right to establish independently its relations with others on the basis of equality, justice and mutual advantages.

The signs, manifestations and institutions of international democracy are the conferences and treaties of interested sides; boards of conciliation, international conferences, treaties, courts, alliances, etc.

2. **Its Cultural and Sociological Essence.** Democracy is a product of culture. The more cultured the people, the more perfect their democracy.

We live in a period in which the development of democracy has been checked. This was caused by the violence of the First World War and by the Bolshevik Revolution.

The foundation upon which democracy may flourish is peace and development of industry and commerce, which both foster culture.

Humanity gains all its means of live'ihood in two ways: by plundering and robbing what is already made ready for use either by nature or man himself; or by individual and collective labor.

Plunder needs no thing, except might. Labor requires wisdom, knowledge, experience, education, skill, talent. All this, in turn, requires peace in order to thrive.

Different ways of gaining the means of livelihood created two different systems of social order: plunder (conquest)

caused autocracy, absolutism—dictatorship; labor created democracy.

During the primitive period of human existence, when humanity was not developed enough to manufacture the necessary means of livelihood, it gained them by plundering the neighboring areas. During that period autocracy prevailed, because it was the best instrument of consolidating the physical strength so necessary for the purpose of conquest and plunder.

With the gradual development of industry and commerce (free exchange of manufactured products and natural wealth), democracy came into being, in proportion to man's progress.

**3. Historical Development.** The pastoral and plundering tribes of Egypt, Palestine, Assyria, Babylon, and Persia produced the first patterns of autocracy. The industrial and commercial Phoenicians and Greeks initiated democracy, which was, to a certain extent, inherited by Rome.

The onslaughts of the more primitive (and for that reason, poorer and more violent) Egyptians and Assyro-Babylonians destroyed Phoenicia. The Persians weakened Greece, and the Germanic nomads ruined ancient Rome. Thus was democracy destroyed, and with it—culture. For long centuries following its downfall, autocracy, despotism, absolutism prevailed, and in their train came ignorance and poverty.

The revival of industry and commerce on the ruins of Rome, in Holland, England and France, and their translation to America, brought about a rebirth of democracy. The English Revolution of 1649, the French Enlightenment, the American Revolution in 1789, which were caused by the progress of industry and commerce, brought about a transformation of social principles. Instead of Louis XIV's statement "L'Etat c'est moi" (I am the State), the conception of Milton, Locke, Spinoza, Diderot, Dalambert, Rousseau, Voltaire, Montesquieu that "the State is the creation of the sovereign people" was disseminated throughout the world.

Regardless of the reaction following the French Revolution, the democratic movement soon became world-wide. In the second half of the 19th century limited absolutism already existed in the constitutions of England, Austria-Hungary, the German principalities, Greece, Bulgaria, Turkey, Italy, Japan. A republic was instituted in Spain; it was strengthened even more in France, Switzerland, and the United States. Even in Russia and China social reforms were effected. In the beginning of the 20th century Russia and Persia reformed their

constitutions. Many an enslaved nation gained freedom, national rights, and some even their independence.

Development of industry and commerce spread the principles of democracy, and democracy, in turn, culture and industry. The former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, said that almost every important advance, which increased the welfare of humanity in the last century, began in those countries which enjoyed freedom. Steam engine, electricity, automobile, telephone, aeroplane, radio, public schools, and the immense progress in biology first began in those countries where liberty prevailed and where people could think freely; namely, in those countries where democracy was cultivated. Mr. Hoover's words ring quite true. The best example is the United States of America. Where is there a greater development of industry and commerce to be found than in the United States which is the world's greatest and strongest democracy?

**4. Victory of Democracy in the First World War.** During the World War in 1914-1918, the belligerent sides, in order to gain the means for their existence, took two opposing historical stands. Germany and Austria-Hungary quite openly desired to conquer the territories and wealth of other nations for the satisfaction of their needs. Thus they represented the side whose chief concern was to plunder and conquer. The opposing side, which consisted of Great Britain and France, and later Italy and the United States, raised the idea of "war to end war" and the hope of ensuring a lasting peace and the establishment of international democracy; namely, the institution of freedom and equality of all nations and peoples, the liberation and independence of small nations on the basis of self-determination, voluntary alliance of all nations with the view of satisfying their vital needs by means of mutual agreements, and, finally, the formation of an international center for the purpose of solving all difficulties arising among various nations by peaceful means.

The democratic watchwords brought to the side of the Entente not only the majority of its population but the majority of the world population. That is why the Entente emerged victorious. The German-Austrian representatives of the idea of plunder and conquest were shattered. The ideal of international democracy flourished victoriously.

The Treaty of Versailles established a new democratic system of international relations. Before the First World War every nation considered itself a self-governing entity, a world in itself. International relations had been established by each

nation separately, on the basis of individual pacts and individual responsibility.

The Peace Treaty limited the individuality of nations, induced them to a collective conduct and understanding, placed each under the control and sanctions of all, set the beginnings for collective pledges, established a durable basis for a collective system of action.

As a guarantee of international democracy the League of Nations was instituted, of which more than fifty nations became members.

The League of Nations was meant to be the collective government of all nations, the ruler, the judge, the mediator, the overseer, the defender of those to whom injustice has been done, the advisor, and the chastiser of those guilty of attacking others.

Every nation which entered the League of Nations promised 1) not to war against any other nation until all means of settling the differences in a peaceful manner have been exhausted. The means to be taken were: mediation, pacts, mutual understanding, international court of justice, decision of the League of Nations itself, etc. 2) the boundaries established by peace conferences were not to be altered, and 3) the nations were not to injure or seek to destroy the political independence of the existing nations.

All differences among the members of the League of Nations were to revert to the League of Nations for examination and final decision, in case the quarreling sides failed to solve them.

Such was the constitution of international democracy.

5. **The Present Types of Democracy.** Democracy is the product of culture and history, and for that reason possesses various forms, outlooks and extensions, which are dependent on the people, times and circumstances.

The main forms of internal democracy are the constitutional monarchy, as in Great Britain, and the republic.

The meaning and the extension of democracy, both in the constitutional monarchy and in the republic, depend on the social composition of the people in question. The wealthy classes, identifying their interests with the interests of the people and nation, in reality try to narrow democracy to their own circle. Such a democracy is conservative. The middle classes increase the scope and meaning of democracy likewise to suit their own interests. Such a democracy is liberal. The working classes strive to place democracy in a position where its scope would coincide with its real purpose and meaning,

so that all classes would be able to take an equal part in the system of self-rule. .

Historically, therefore, three types of democracy have thus far revealed themselves: 1) the democracy of the wealthy classes, as in Great Britain, France, and the U. S. A., where it is, to a greater extent, conservative; 2) the democracy of the middle classes, as in Switzerland and in former Czechoslovakia, where it is, or was, preponderantly liberal; 3) the nucleus of the democracy of the working classes, such as existed in the Ukrainian People's Republic, as well, as in the White Russian and Georgian Republics in 1917-1920, in Czechoslovakia, in Great Britain and France at the times when the Labor or Socialist Parties were at the helm of their governments. That is the radical democracy.

The last type of democracy is different from the first two in that it strives to gain not only political but also economic equality.

Before the First World War the democracy of the wealthy classes, the conservative type, prevailed, at times even with a liberal flavoring. The working classes, although possessing certain political rights and electing their representatives to the legislative bodies, nevertheless, were in such minority that they were hardly able to bring any influence to bear upon those bodies. They were completely debarred from the government.

The First World War and revolutions extended the influence of the workers on social life and thus widened the scope of democracy. Not only in the countries through which revolutions had passed, such as Russia, Germany, Austria, and in the newly created national entities, such as had risen as a result of the War and revolutions, the examples being Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia, and Czechoslovakia, but also in France and England, the working classes gained certain influence in the national matter of self-government. Everywhere democracy began to gain a deeper, more radical and extensive meaning.

**6. Causes of Dictatorships.** The Bolshevist Revolution and the failure to fulfill the principles of international democracy during the drawing up and realization of the Treaty of Versailles, evoked distrust with respect to democracy, and caused many to become enamoured of the ideals of dictatorship, as a result of which communism, fascism and nazism came into being and have so weakened democracy by constant attacks upon it that it now appears to be in its death throes.

Dictatorship was born and strengthened mainly on

account of two reasons: 1) weariness caused by war and unwillingness to seek to discover new ways whereby to satisfy one's vital needs, and 2) the strengthening of the plundering and thievish instincts during the period of the War. Not only the soldiers but the wide masses of civilian population had become accustomed, under the circumstances of a military atmosphere, not to think of new means of gaining their livelihood, but solely to fulfill the orders of military authorities who were to see to it that they had all they needed; moreover, they grew accustomed not to produce things necessary for their existence but to get them by force from those who had them ready-made. This manner of psychology became one of the elements in the foundation of the communist movement, the Treaty of Versailles, fascism and nazism. That is the psychology of the spirit of conquest, superiority, "messianism," overlordship, violence, force on the part of certain groups, and wholesale passiveness on the part of others.

Groups accustomed to wars and struggle are wont to solve everything by means of force, while the weary masses, sick and tired of thinking, uncritically accepted the ready-made thoughts, especially those which were loud and bright. That undermined the foundation of democracy, labor and self-government, and created favorable conditions for spreading all kinds of autocratic systems, collective and individual dictatorships.

## II

### CHANNELS OF DEMOCRACY FOLLOWING THE WORLD WAR

1. **First Losses of Democracy.** In winning the War, democracy lost peace. The cause of it was the psychology of the spirit of conquest thriving within certain groups on the one hand, and on the other, the passiveness of the wide masses of society grown tired of the War and revolutions.

The first and the most telling blow to democracy was administered by the Russian Communist-Bolsheviks. Under the alluring cries of emancipation of all workers, they destroyed by force the liberty and democracy in Russia, and established the dictatorship of would-be proletariat, in reality, the dictatorship of the leaders of the Communist Party, which later was transformed into the dictatorship of one person. Following that, the Bolsheviks attacked the neighboring democratic republics—Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia—destroyed them,



and finally cast into the world "21 pacts" which divided the workers into two camps, according to their attitude towards "dictatorship or democracy."

European democracy viewed everything passively and in no way helped the Ukrainian, Russian or any other democracy in their struggle against the onslaughts of communistic dictatorship. The working classes, deluded by communistic promises, in ever increasing numbers joined the side of the "proletarian dictatorship," and if they did not join it themselves, they condoned the inhuman crimes of bolshevik dictatorship, justifying them by the argument that "such is the only measure possible in the East; the Asiatics cannot expect anything better." The conservative-liberal democracy, frightened by the expansion of the social problem, deserted democracy but assisted the reactionists, who fought for the rebirth of absolutism and autocracy in Russia, Generals Yudenitch, Kolchak, Denikin, etc. It did not help the democratic Ukraine, but assisted the nobility-infested Poland of General Haller.

Democracy in Russia, Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia, etc., finding itself pressed from two sides by the communists and reactionists, who were assisted by the European conservative democracy, was forced to fall. In one sixth part of the entire globe the fiercest of dictatorships prevailed, which spread its net of propaganda throughout the world, and sought to disintegrate democracy by the cries of "world revolution" and "communist paradise."

That was the beginning of democracy's weakening throughout the world.

The second painful blow to democracy was administered by democracy itself, especially by its conservative part which held the reins of power in England, France and other democratic countries.

Instead of seeking to establish, during the drawing up and the putting into effect of the Versailles Treaty, a new world order in which all the nations and peoples might be free and equal, the conservative democracy divided the world into the conquerors and the conquered, while the chief organ of international democracy—the League of Nations—was made to serve a certain group of English and French imperialists. The conservative (the ruling) democracy of the conquerors did not take into consideration the demands of the democracy of the conquered, it did not even seem to be aware of these demands. It did not pay attention to the fact that Germany was no longer governed by an Emperor together with his generals and military industrialists, but by the people

themselves under the leadership of a worker, a cooper and a socialist-democrat, Ebert. It did not take into consideration that the new Germany had no army, no navy, no war aims, but that, being ruined by the war, like others, it lived in poverty, hunger, misery, want, and sought only peace and good neighborly relations, in order to satisfy her vital needs by means of its own labor. The conquerors did not come to an understanding with Germany, but imposed their will upon her. They did not seek to assist democracy in Germany but strove to extend their rule over her.

That is the reason why the prestige of democracy was so critically undermined in all the conquered countries.

Moreover, the conquerors did not cling to democracy even in their own camp, in the League of Nations itself. Several great nations were given there the position of masters and rulers, while the remainder played the simple part of underlings. These great powers decided all problems, while the small nations were expected to comply in silence with those decisions. The latter were not always consulted. On many an occasion they were forced to reckon with accomplished facts brought about by the great powers or even anyone of them. Peoples without the national status, and national minorities were allowed no influence in the League of Nations. Democracy insulted itself.

The third blow to democracy was the exit of the United States from the European scene. American democracy, having in fact won the war by giving the Allies not only money and arms but also manpower, and that, at the most critical moment, and having suggested to Europe the idea of the League of Nations, abandoned Europe after the signing of the Peace Treaty, and refused to become a member of the League of Nations. Instead of insisting that the Allies fulfill all their promises with regard to the reconstruction of the world on the principles of democracy, the United States became estranged and concealed itself behind the Ocean. As a result of such an action, the conservative democracy of the Allies, finding itself freed from the control of the more liberal American democracy, did whatever it wished in Europe. Not only did the Allies lay a heavy hand on the conquered, they also began to quarrel among themselves, as soon as they felt a renewal of the competitive urge within them. The authority of a judge, a controller, a defender of the more liberal democratic principles was no longer there to check them. That is why the democratic Entente was broken, and

in its stead, under the wing of the League of Nations, which was supposed to represent democracy, separate imperialistic egoisms prevailed, launching the dictatorship of the more powerful.

The fourth blow to democracy was the destruction of the Labor Movement by the Communist propaganda. A substantial part of the working class became the supporter of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," while even a great number of those who clung to the democratic principles hesitated, thinking that the bolsheviks will really better the lot of the working class. The remainder had neither enough strength to pursue its own course, nor was it strong enough to restrain the conservative democracy from diverting to the path of real group dictatorships. It wandered around two pillars: Communism and Capitalism.

In such circumstances and on the background of the struggle of two extremes—Communism-Bolshevism and the victorious conservative democracy—appeared a new, anti-communist, but at the same time, anti-democratic power: Italian fascism. It began a systematic struggle not only with Communism but with all forms of democracy. On its pattern was organized the German Nazism. That was the fifth and the greatest blow to democracy.

During the first five years following the Great War (1918-1923), democracy lost most by the onslaughts of the bolshevist dictatorship and by the fact that the democratic principles were not fulfilled by the conservative government of France (Poincare-Clemenceau) and by the Liberal-Conservative government of England (Lloyd George-Curson).

Bolshevism established a dictatorship in almost one sixth part of the globe, while democracy discredited itself by such actions as the exit of America from the European stage; differences of views as to the means of defense (the more liberal government of England was for a "collective defense," while the more conservative government of France stood for "separate treaties"); the egoistic war of the great powers (England, France, Italy, and the United States) in Turkey, which resulted in the united Turkey's taking advantage of the differences existing among the great nations and finally forcing them out of her territory; flirtation of England and France, then at odds with each other, with the dictatorial U. S. S. R. (Urquhart's concessions in the Ural region, and Herriot's visit to Moscow); failure of the conferences at Cannes in 1921 and at Genoa in 1922, which were to establish normal conditions for international relations; the treaty of Rapallo, in which

Germany figured with the U. S. S. R.; indifference to the fact that the German democratic government tried to suppress the Hitler movement and to the advice given by Ebert, elected President of Germany for the second time, to settle all disputes by peaceful means; pressure exerted upon ruined Germany to pay her reparations; Poincaré's appeal not to give way to Germany on any condition; occupation of the Ruhr and Essen; ruin of German economy (in January 1923, a dollar was worth seven thousand Marks, in August—about five million Marks), which was the reason why Social-Democrats were forced to give up the reins of government; separate pacts of France with Poland and Rumania, by which she acknowledged the former's right to hold Galicia and Voïhynia, and the latter's right to possess Bessarabia. All that undermined the authority of democracy to such an extent that it forced the appearance of Italian fascism which propagated dictatorship.

2. **The First Efforts of Radical Democracy.** The coming into power of the Labor Party in England and of the Radical Socialists in France in 1924 more or less set aright the mistakes made by former conservative governments: the conference of Premiers—McDonald and Herriot—in Chequers, and the London conference of the great powers of the Entente with Germany led to an understanding: a new plan of reparations was agreed upon; Germany was granted a loan for the reconstruction of its economy (although the American and English bankers were opposed to it); Germany made the reparation payment which was due; France recalled its army from the Ruhr.

All that strengthened democracy in Germany. In the election to the German Parliament the extremes were given a setback (the communist representation was reduced from 62 to 45, the Nazis from 32 to 15), while the Democrats increased their representation (Liberals from 96 to 103, and Social Democrats from 100 to 131).

Unfortunately, the Labor democracy of England made a mistake. It began to seek closer relationship with the dictatorial U. S. S. R. That so frightened the English that in the election to Parliament in the same year, the Labor Party's representation was reduced from 193 to 152, the Liberal from 158 to 42, while the Conservatives, who were opposed to any relationship with U. S. S. R., increased their power from 259 to 415 seats.

3. **Slyness of the Conservatives and Liberals.** The second period of the Conservative government in England,

and the half-Liberal government in France (1925-1929) distinguished themselves by revealing new facts of their failure to fulfill the principles of international democracy as well as by revealing how insincere and cunning they were. At the time when France, under the influence of the Liberal, Briand, tended toward a "collective pact of defense," Conservative Great Britain did not even want to hear about it, but continued to muse about her "splendid isolation." It was with difficulty that they came to some sort of a compromise at Locarno in 1925. Several pacts were drawn up, in which even Germany had a part on the basis of equality. Germany entered the League of Nations, but felt herself a stranger there, although France had withdrawn some of her troops from the Rhineland. The U. S. S. R. was left isolated. Both England and France had severed all connections with the U. S. S. R. The naval conference in London and the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, however, failed. Every nation consented to limit only those armaments which it lacked in great quantity. And although sixty-two nations, among them Germany and the U. S. S. R., signed the Kellogg Pact in 1927, in which they condemned war as criminal, and promised to have their differences settled in a peaceful manner, nevertheless, at that very time, even in the U. S. there began an even greater race of rearmaments. At the session of the League of Nations in 1928, Briand, a Liberal, representing powerful and rich France, which was then armed to the teeth, told the Chancellor of the economically-weakened and disarmed Germany, Mueller, a Social-Democrat, that France is willing to limit armaments only on the condition that Germany guarantee France's security. To which Mueller replied: "And who will guarantee it to us, who are unarmed?" He even wanted to leave the League of Nations, as he spoke bitterly about the League's imperialistic tendencies. Only Briand's persuasion checked him in his decision. But the League did not cancel the reparations as requested by Germany.

The same session of the League revealed its indifference regarding the fate of the national minorities. Not only France, but Poland and Czechoslovakia, which were but recently themselves minorities, rejected their demands. Only the German, Austrian, and Swedish Social-Democrats supported their claims.

4. **The Second Attempt of Radical Democracy.** In 1929 the Labor Party came into power in England for the second time. In the same period, the Liberal government, under Briand, gained strength in France—Liberal-Labor democracy proceeded at once to stamp, in its international relations, the

seal of democracy. In the first place, England came to an understanding with France. Then she agreed with the United States regarding "naval parity." Following that, an easier plan of reparations was drawn up; the Belgian army was withdrawn from the Rhineland; an international Court of Justice was established at the Hague, to which even the U. S. subscribed thus marking its willingness to cooperate with Europe; England, France, the U. S., Italy and Japan signed a naval agreement; England ceased her occupation of Egypt and brought to a successful conclusion the conference of the "Round Table" with the representatives of India (Conservative government later nullified it); sixty-nine British Labor Members of Parliament published a memorandum directed to the Government regarding the satisfaction of the requests of the national minorities in Europe especially of the Ukrainians in Poland; one hundred eighty-six French and one hundred ninety-nine German intellectuals published a declaration about the need of international friendship; a new plan (Hoover's) of reparations was accepted, and a loan of one hundred million dollars was granted to Germany; the French army was withdrawn from the Rhineland; England signed a naval agreement with Italy; Mussolini declared that he does not want to fight with anyone; the Pan-European Conference took place in Paris; the League of Nations was presented by Briand with the plan of the "United States of Europe," and elected a committee to study this plan and seek to develop it.

5. **The Reasons for the Failure of Democracy.** The Labor Government of Great Britain with the support of the laboring class, and the Liberals of France set the world on the path leading directly to real democracy.

Unfortunately, radical democracy was not strong enough to realize fully its wishes; and, in the second place, lacking its own plan for world reconstruction, it was threatened with disintegration and discredit on account of its approach to the U. S. S. R. It believed in Russian progressiveness and in its amelioration of the social status of the workers.

That, on the one hand, gave the Communists an opportunity to strengthen themselves within the laboring ranks and to seek to destroy democracy from within, especially in Germany; on the other hand, such a course estranged from the cause of democracy not only the wealthy, but also the middle and the laboring classes, which all were frightened by the extremity of the Communistic dictatorship.

At that very time, democracy was being weakened by

certain clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, which had nothing to do with democracy; namely privileges of the conquerors, and especially the matter of reparations. Democratic Germany, exhausted by the war and revolution, and being in no position to pay reparations, begged to have them cancelled. France declared that she is willing to do so if the U. S. will not demand the payment of war debts, because these debts were said to be in reality compensated by the income which the United States had from the sale to the Entente of various goods during the War years.

The United States, under the presidency of H. Hoover, refused to cancel these debts, and only assisted in making easier the plan of reparations (Moratorium along certain lines, and an extension of payments to the period of fifty-nine years, etc.)

Owing to such a situation the matter of reparations became in Germany the main basis for the development of the extremes—Communism and Nazism. Especially after the Court at the Hague refused in 1931 to permit democratic Germany to establish a customs union with democratic Austria for the purpose of facilitating commerce between the two. England and France recognized such a union as the first step to the "Anschluss"—union of the German people—and prevented it. That refusal embittered the German masses which had nothing in common with the extremists, and forced them to join the extremes. Nazism began to develop slowly but surely.

Its growth was also favored by the obstinate insistence of France on the fixity of the principles of the Versailles Treaty, although many of them revealed themselves not only undemocratic but also highly unpractical. Conservative democracy, defending its group interest, did not allow them to be re-examined, while radical democracy was not strong nor bold enough to force the issue. As a result, the "saviours of nations" became those who preached the ideals of dictatorships: Communists, Fascists, and Nazis. In not revising the clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, democracy found itself in a false position, that of "traitor of national interests," "executioner of liberty," etc. Exhausted by misery, the German masses joined the Communists or the Nazis, because Anglo-French democracy failed to satisfy the vital needs of the German people within their democratic republic. The disillusioned masses were left no other alternative but to try the promises with which the agents of the dictatorships were so lavish.

In spite of these signs, Conservative France, instead of

going to the assistance of German democracy, began to strengthen her own reaction against the German reaction. In 1929 France removed the Liberal—Socialist government and placed in its stead the Conservative government of Tardieu, and in 1931 did not allow Briand, a Liberal, to be elected to the presidency of the French republic, and assured the election of the Conservative Daumer.

The British people, frightened by the closer relationship which the Labor Party tried to bring about between Great Britain and the U. S. S. R., likewise refused to place its trust in the Labor Movement. In the elections of 1931, the Labor Party received only fifty-two seats out of its former two hundred eighty-seven, while the Conservatives secured four hundred seventy-one in comparison with two hundred eighty in the former Parliament.

**6. Victory of Conservatism helped Dictatorships.** Radical democracy, being thus weakened, international policy was forced to take the path of reaction. In England and France conservatism gained strength, while Nazism grew in Germany. German Rightists, and even the Centrists, competing in patriotism with the Nazis, began to abandon the Social-Democrats. The German General, Greener, who did not belong to any party, as a result of the failure of the Disarmament Conference and the actual increase of world armaments, demanded the reestablishment of the German army, while the head of the National Bank, Schacht, a Rightist, came out with a statement to the effect that the democratic government in its internal and external policies, leads the nation to economic ruin.

Frightened by this, France again turned to the United States with a proposition to have the debts cancelled, and, as a result, even the reparations. She was supported in this by Great Britain and other European nations. The United States answered that the debts are to be distinguished from the reparations, since they are not one and the same thing. Between Europe and America there deepened an abyss. The democratic countries drifted apart. Each began to seek its own channel of safety. Conservative France, refusing to come to an understanding with democratic Germany, in which reaction was gaining ground, began to seek a closer relationship with the dictatorial U. S. S. R. The latter, relieving Chicherin of his post and appointing Litvinov in his place, began to insinuate itself among the democratic nations, deceiving them with "democratization." And so the democratic countries found themselves in the camp of the father of the present



dictatorships.

All that favored the strengthening of the reaction in Germany. In the election to the Reichstag in 1931, Social-Democrats were elected to one hundred forty-three seats (formerly they held one hundred fifty-three), and the Nazis increased their representation from fifty-four to one hundred seven. The Minister of the Rightists, Treviranius, declared that European peace is to be despaired of unless the Treaty of Versailles is revised. On the streets of Berlin there began an open struggle between the two extremes—Communists and Nazis—both of which, although their programs differed radically, none the less sought to destroy democracy.

Only at this moment did the Conservative and Liberal Democrats of France become aware of the issue at stake, and hastened to seek an understanding with Hindenburg. Laval and Briand visited him personally. English Conservatives at this time did not even try to strengthen German democracy. On the contrary, they condoned the Nazi Movement. Lord Rothermer even praised Hitler quite openly.

The wait-and-see attitude English Conservatives adopted towards the Nazi Movement; the playing-up of the Conservative government in France to the dictatorships of Italy and the U. S. S. R., and to France's own Fascists (Laval's subsidy to the 'Fiery Cross'); the differences between Europe and the United States, as a consequence of which the United States did not even utter a syllable in response to the decisions of the Lausanne Conference in 1932 regarding the need of cancellation of war debts; the lessening of ties between Great Britain and the United States following the Ottawa Economic Conference, which took place as a result of the obstinacy of the United States in insisting on the matter of debts; the Pact of non-aggression between France and U. S. S. R.; the final failure of the Geneva Disarmament Conference; the distrust shown by the small nations in the value of union with great powers, and their seeking ways and means of self-preservation—all these events, together with the extremities of the Communists, and especially the exhaustion of the German people as a result of the economic and political unrest, paved the way to Hitler's dictatorship.

It must not be forgotten that, in his victorious access to power, Hitler did not use violence. At that very time Communism was strengthening its dictatorship by shedding seas of blood, while Mussolini had seized the reins of government by the bloodless march on Rome. Hitler, to be sure, became dictator by the most democratic means. The people

gave him their votes in order to empower him to do whatever he thinks fit for the amelioration of the lot of the nation. The conditions created by war and post-war policies of the victors led him to despair of all hopes of any amelioration within the framework of democracy. The victors, as though purposely, did everything in their power to discredit German democracy. To its continuous cries for help and relief the democracies answered only with one merciless refrain: "Pay or perish."

And it was democracy that "perished."

The German national masses, broken by the burdens of war, exhausted by the lasting under-nourishment and other economic limitations, unnerved by political unrest, embittered by the stubbornness and exactions of the victors, and losing all hope of gaining any concessions from the victors, in a mass voted for dictatorship. Out of sheer despair they seemed to voice their command: "Go and rule us, rule us as you will but give us a change, any change, even a change for the worse provided it gets us out of the rut, because to continue further in the present state of nervous agitation and constant unrest is impossible."

Hitler became a dictator. The German people made him their dictator.

In the presidential elections of 1932 Hitler received thirteen and a half million votes. Hindenburg barely squeezed through on the second ballot, receiving nineteen million votes. Almost four million of Hindenburg's votes were lost to Thaelmann, the Communist candidate. This loss represented the Communist gain from the democratic bloc. Radical democracy felt itself so weakened that it did not even offer its own candidate, and supported Hindenburg as a lesser evil, in preference to Hitler or Thaelmann. In the election to the Reichstag the extremists gained: Communists increased their number from seventy-eight to eighty-nine, and the Nazis from one hundred ten to two hundred thirty. Social-Democrats lost only three seats, but were now unable to influence the Reichstag with only one hundred thirty-three members. The Reichstag became deadlocked.

The classical example of how two dictatorships, while seeking to destroy each other, in reality worked together for the destruction of democracy, is here plainly to see.

In France, in the meantime, the people, influenced both by the internal economic crisis caused by financial magnates, as well as by the gains of German reaction, turned to the Left, to radical democracy. (The Socialists, in the election of 1932,

increased their representation from one hundred to one hundred thirty-one, and Radical Socialists from one hundred seventy-nine to two hundred twenty-six). The government was formed by Radical-Socialists and Socialists, who were now willing to come to an understanding with Germany, but it was already too late. The Nazis persuaded the Rightists to join them, and in 1933 Hitler became Chancellor.

Although he came to power by democratic means, he immediately destroyed democracy and instituted dictatorship. He dissolved the Reichstag, even burned its building, dissolved local self-governments, the Socialist-Democrat Party, the "Stahlhelm"—the military organization of his Rightist partners—and began to persecute the Jews. Entering the international arena, he demanded the return of the Saar, the colonies, and the Polish Corridor. Finally he refused to pay reparations and war debts to the United States.

The democratic countries, even at this point, could not arrive at an understanding. At the time when radical France, supported by the French General Staff, demanded a united action against the destroyer of democracy, Conservative Great Britain viewed Hitler almost with sympathy. Even such a Liberal as Lloyd George, after a visit to Germany, assured the British that the Germans like Hitler and that it is not advisable to interfere with the internal reforms of Germany.

7. **Growth of Dictatorships.** Seeking to take advantage of the situation, Mussolini proposed a "Pact of the Big Four"—England, France, Italy and Germany. These four, according to his proposition, were to become the real rulers of Europe, and perhaps of the entire world. Thus did Mussolini wish to kill two birds with one stone: to check Hitler and to subject England and France to his control. Confused by the events, the creators of the League of Nations and the leaders of international democracy agreed. In other words, they renounced democracy and assumed the position of a dictatorship. It is true, that they almost immediately became conscious of their mistake and forgot the "Pact of the Big Four," but the small nations had an opportunity to convince themselves once more that the "democracy" of the great powers is ineffective.

Meanwhile, under the influence of the growth of dictatorship in Germany, the French financial magnates and the French Fascists ("Fiery Cross") began to demand a revision of the Constitution with the view of placing the Nation closer to dictatorship. They caused a riot in Paris by parading the streets with arms in their hands. The "democratic alliance"

was barely able to suppress it. While in England the Fascist group of Mosley began to stir.

Viewing all that and appreciating these events as signs of French and British weakness, Hitler announced Germany's withdrawal from the League of Nations, and in the beginning of 1934 signed the ten year non-aggression treaty with Poland.

The child of France and England, Poland, deserted them at the most critical moment, thus strengthening their opponent.

Following that, Hitler declared that he will not govern himself according to the principles of the Versailles Treaty, and began to arm Germany and to press Austria with Nazi propaganda.

Instead of coming to an understanding with the Social-Democrat opposition and thus oppose the Nazis, the Austrian Catholic government, relying on Italy, formed its own "Austrian Fascism," forcibly destroyed the Socialist opposition in the beginning of 1934, and established the dictatorship of its own party (Dollfuss).

The French government proposed that England come to assistance of Austrian democracy, were it for the sole reason that it would be in the national interests of both England and France. The Conservative government of England refused, and the French feared to act alone, because Dollfuss had behind him none other than Mussolini.

Democracy in Austria vanished. Dictatorships gained strength. Only the small nations and the United States tried actively to preserve and defend democracy in international relations. The Balkan countries—Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia and Rumania—signed in 1934 the "Balkan Pact" of mutual friendship, safety, to serve as a guarantee of their borders, while the 11 republics of South America and the United States of America signed the "Pan-American Pact" opposing war. At the same time the United States finally announced its willingness to postpone the debt payments.

France, which formerly was not willing to grant any concessions to democratic Germany, was now forced to consent to a plebiscite in the Saar. But this did not save the situation.

The German Nazis assassinated the leader of Austrian Fascists, Dollfuss. Hindenburg died. Hitler became the unlimited master of Germany and sent 10,000 agents to the Saar.

Seeking to save themselves from the pressure of Hitler, France and England thought of nothing better than to invite

to the League of Nations the begetter of contemporary dictatorships—the U. S. S. R., and forced thirty-seven nations to accept him. Only ten small nations did not vote for that measure. Thus was democracy buried in the League of Nations itself.

Hitler, encouraged by the success of the Saar plebiscite (97, 94%), declared in March 1935, that he refuses to recognize the clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, and renews the military service for the purpose of creating a German army.

8. **Hegemony of Fascism.** The democratic nations—England and France—instead of putting Germany in its place by means of combined action, hastened to seek assistance first from Italian dictatorship, (Idea "Triangle") and when that proved to be in vain, they placed all their hopes on another dictatorship, that of the U. S. S. R. Even Eden forgot about the old Anglo-Russian differences and hastened to Moscow. He asked a thief to help him against a robber. France, in order to get ahead of England, secretly signed with the U. S. S. R. the pact of non-aggression. Laval himself visited Moscow. Insulted by such a race, England declared that Franco-Russian treaty does not bind her to assist France, and signed a naval treaty with Hitler (100:35).

The democratic countries found themselves associated with dictatorships. France bound herself with Red Russia, and England inclined towards Brown Germany. At the same time both sought to guess what was in the mind of Black Italy. Mussolini became, so to say, the black pope of international relations. Towards the end of 1934, and in the middle of 1935, "Canossa" was visited by Goering, Litvinov, Hitler, Laval, Eden, not to mention the various ministers of Austria and Hungary.

As a consequence of such a state of affairs, Japan invaded China, and Italy attacked Abyssinia.

England proposed that France check Italy. Conservative France, headed by Laval, being dissatisfied with the naval agreement between England and Germany, and wishing to have Italy on her side on account of the problem of Tunis, refused to assist England. The dictatorship of Italy rose above the world. The differences in outlook regarding the naval question (France wanted parity to which England was opposed) undermined even more the authority of the democratic countries.

When France confirmed her close relationship with the U. S. S. R., Germany, on March 7, 1936, declared that she no longer feels herself bound to abide by the Locarno Treaty,

and sent her army to occupy the demilitarized Rhineland in order to defend herself 'from bolshevism.'

The French General Staff demanded decisive measures. But England did not support these demands; she was embittered because France wanted parity on the seas. Italy then had her troubles in Abyssinia, and the U. S. S. R. justified its stand by declaring that it was not a party to the Treaty of Locarno. As formerly England did not dare to attack Italy, so now France did not dare to attack Germany. The Locarno Treaty was shattered. France was forced to capitulate. Before the General Staffs of England, France and Belgium reached a decision, Hitler had got what he wanted and declared that Germany is now satisfied and desires nothing more.

When in 1936 Radical democracy, headed by the Socialist Leon Blum, came to power in France, and began to strengthen democracy by effecting the necessary social reforms, Germany and Italy signed a treaty which resulted in the "Rome-Berlin Axis," and sent their volunteers to Spain to help the dictator General Franco, simply to hold France in abeyance.

The people in England and France had no single thought. In England the group of the state-minded politicians demanded a decisive opposition to the conquering urge of Japan, Germany and Italy, which threatened the national power of England; while the capitalistic group, which had granted large loans to Japan and Germany, was against such a move. In France, one group demanded an understanding with Germany, another with Italy, and still another with the U. S. S. R.

The U. S. S. R. pulled wool over the eyes of England and France by boasting of its "parachute detachments" and by Litvinov's assurances that the U. S. S. R. is a mighty fortress of democracy and liberty.

Under such conditions the attempts of the democratic nations to detach Italy from Germany by recognizing her conquest of Abyssinia, which the forty-four nations of the League of Nations were forced to do, only undermined their authority. Italy showed no signs of thankfulness, and grew even more unfriendly. Furthermore, such a gesture of democracy frightened the small nations. Poland and Belgium declared their neutrality. Other nations began to think only of themselves, striving their best not to become involved in the policies of England and France, which themselves had no single thought or a stable aim, and too indifferently sacrificed the interests of their lesser partners.

Germany broadened her military service, refused to be bound by the Treaty of Versailles, signed a treaty with Yugo-

slavia, and strengthened the "Rome-Berlin Axis." Italy, on the other hand, having settled her affair with Abyssinia, turned her eyes to the Mediterranean, which she said, was only a short route for England, but to her meant her very existence. She threatened that while she will not interfere with anyone who wishes to use this route, she will never allow herself to be stifled on the Sea which was once Roman, and will fight to preserve her rights on it.

The threat of war filled the air.

At that time a few nations again reminded themselves of the advantages of international democracy. Turkey, Yugoslavia and Greece renewed the "Balkan Agreement"; the heretofore inimical Bulgaria and Yugoslavia signed the pact of "lasting friendship"; Czechoslovakia feverishly began to settle her internal relations with her minorities, and even consented to the realization of autonomy of the Carpathia (Carpatho-Ukraine); while the American nations assembled for a new "Pan-American" conference, at which President Roosevelt stated that the borders of the United States are in Europe, and Secretary Hull emphasized that sword-rattling does not frighten the free nations, because they are always ready to cry "halt" to anyone who, yearning for power, might threaten the peace of the world.

In conjunction with this, England came to an agreement with Italy regarding the Mediterranean and Abyssinia. All this brought good results. Hitler declared his willingness to come to an agreement with France, but not with the U. S. R. England and France even called a conference at Geneva for the purpose of levelling the matter of the "haves" and the "have-nots," and to arrive at an agreement regarding the division of spheres of influence, commercial possibilities, raw materials, etc. But Germany and Italy, revolving on the "Rome-Berlin Axis" refused to attend that conference. Instead, 10,000 Italians attacked Madrid.

The radical government of France sought to persuade the Conservative government of England to assist the republican Spain. England refused, and the Committee of non-interference, which was formed by her, only served to favor the cause of General Franco, especially after 1937, when Chamberlain became Premier.

9. **The Third Attempt to Preserve Democracy.** In France, the Government of L. Blum resigned, but the new government formed by Radical-Socialists, with the assistance of L. Blum as Minister of Foreign Affairs, continued to seek an understanding with Germany. The French and German

war veterans, assembled at a congress, manifested their desire for peace: French warship "Jeanne d'Arc" paid a courtesy call at Kiel; the German Minister Schacht came to Paris and signed a commercial treaty with France. Just then France was horrified by the U. S. S. R., which had "purged" many of its generals, and among them—Tukhachevsky. In Spain, the "Rome-Berlin Axis" had its way, and on the Mediterranean "unknown" undercraft plied their game of piracy.

All that finally forced the democratic nations to put an end to such lawlessness. England and France, having come to an understanding, called a conference at Nyons for the purpose of establishing a control on the Mediterranean. They invited both Germany and Italy to attend. When these refused, the democratic nations themselves, without the dictatorships, established a control on the Mediterranean, dividing this Sea into spheres of supervision and sent their warships to guard these spheres. The undersea pirates vanished. Italy capitulated. Mussolini's hegemony in Europe ended.

10. **Hegemony of Nazism.** Unfortunately, the unity of the democratic nations was short-lived. When Mussolini, having sensed the danger of the English and French fleets in the Mediterranean, resorted to Hitler and, together with him, drew up a new plan of attacking democracy, when Italy withdrew from the League of Nations, and Germany, after having signed a treaty with Poland, profited by the Italo-French quarrel in the Mediterranean, and invaded Austria. Conservative Britain did not heed the advice of L. Blum and refused to go to Austria's assistance together with France. Britain did not agree even to the plan of coming to an understanding with France, the U. S. S. R., Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Italy with the view of preserving European peace. England did not support Blum's action "to arm democracy so that it would not be weaker than the dictatorships." The French Conservatives, as a consequence, removed L. Blum from the cabinet, and became masters of France.

Hitler, knowing that the Conservatives are afraid of any war on account of the danger of internal radicalization it might cause, went to Rome and came to an understanding with Mussolini regarding a new attack upon democracy. He struck at Czechoslovakia.

The Czechs brilliantly rebuffed the first German attempt to invade Czechoslovakia by placing their army on the border before the Germans had time to arrive there. Following that, the Germans tried to assure the Czechs that they did not intend



to attack them. But at the same time they began to divide the opinion of the English Conservatives by means of propaganda, questioning the wisdom of sacrificing even a single English soldier in defense of Czechoslovakia. England and France, fearing war, pressed Czechoslovakia to give way to Germany. The most disintegrating part in the whole affair was played by Lord Runciman, sent to Czechoslovakia by Chamberlain.

When Hitler was convinced that Britain will not fight for Czechoslovakia, he again ordered an overwhelming army to be ready at the borders of that small democratic island. The pains Chamberlain took in flying several times to Hitler only encouraged the dictator. The Munich Conference ended with an unheard-of betrayal by the great powers (conservative democracy) of their faithful but small ally (the Liberal-Radical democracy). Likewise was Czechoslovakia betrayed by the U. S. S. R.

Hitler became the master of Europe. At first he detached from Czechoslovakia large areas inhabited by the Germans; then, in 1939, he detached Slovakia and made it a would-be autonomous republic, while upon Czechia he imposed his "protectorate," and gave Carpatho-Ukraine, with Italy's understanding, to Hungary.

Conservative democracy justified itself by claiming that at that price it preserved peace. But in the autumn of 1939 a new bolt struck the world. Dictator Hitler and dictator Stalin fell into each other's arms. The democratic England and France, which for so long, and quite needlessly, placed their hopes in Stalin, were sorely disillusioned. Germany struck at Poland and shattered her, while the U. S. S. R. seized the Western-Ukrainian and White Russian territories.

Only now did conservative democracy become aware that the greed of dictatorships has no limits, that all its former concessions to them were unjustified and in vain. It began to oppose German dictatorship, but as yet did not touch the Soviets. It continued to think that with the latter it would yet find grounds for mutual understanding, until the U. S. S. R. made Latvia, Estonia its satellites, and struck at the "disobedient" Finland. That finally, although gradually, forced England and France to alter their relations with the Soviet dictatorship.

The world then became divided into two clear ideologic camps. On the one hand, dictatorships continued their violence, and on the other, democracies began to organize their defense.

11. **The Fau'ts of Democracy.** From what has been stated above, it is clear that world democracy has not always

been of one constitution, and for that reason, did not pursue a single course. The more radical democracy clung more to the democratic principles, while the conservative democracy was less inclined to favor them. Conservatism was disintegrating democracy, weakening it from within, discrediting it from without, thus facilitating the advance of the dictatorships.

The democratic principles of the Treaty of Versailles were not fulfilled as they should have been. In them, at the very outset, was to be detected a potential stream of dictatorship: the sway of the conquerors over the conquered. But even the conquerors among themselves did not cling to the democratic principles specified therein. They competed with each other, betrayed the weaker, completely disregarded the interests of people without a national status, and were indifferent to the needs of the minorities. Even such new creations in the camp of the conquerors as Poland, Yugoslavia, and partly Czechoslovakia, feeling arrogant on account of their alliance with "great lords," did not follow the democratic principles with regard to their weaker neighbors and their own national minorities.

And that was the reason why among the defeated, the dissatisfied, and the humiliated there was created a fertile ground for the growth of dictatorships.

But the main fault of democracy, both conservative as well as radical, was that it did not possess its own stable outlook, its own plan and aim. It continually roamed around two pillars—Communism and Nazi-Fascism. It danced attendance either on Stalin, Hitler or Mussolini. Under such circumstances the national masses could not trust democracy, because its leaders clearly demonstrated their lack of independent thought, plan and aim. Because democracy did not fulfill the principles of equality, liberty, and brotherhood of nations, and because it did not reveal a clear-cut purpose, democracy weakened and thus made possible the development of dictatorships. That is why the democratic countries lost peace. Democracy helped them to win the war; their abandonment of democracy destroyed peace.

**12. Dictatorship or Democracy?** If democracy revealed itself weak, imperfect, if it shattered our former hopes, if it became untrue to its principles, wavered this way and that, failed to realize the ideals of liberty, equality and brotherhood among nations, does it, then, follow that it is not worth the trouble of cultivating, and that it is useless to renew, develop, revive, and perfect it? Would it not be better to abandon it and follow the lure of dictatorships?

Let us imagine that we have abandoned the imperfect democracy and gone to meet and join the dictatorship. What more have we to gain? All that evil for which we blame democracy the dictatorships have in an even greater measure.

If the Treaty of Versailles did not realize the promise of liberty and of well-being of nations, if it did not preserve the principles of international democracy, if it did not calm the conquered, but, on the contrary, embittered them and thrust them into a new struggle, then, the Communist dictatorship, which was meant to be something better than the Versailles Treaty, completely destroyed liberty and economic welfare in one sixth of the globe, sowed unrest by its cries of "world revolution," and made impossible normal international relationships because it isolated the Soviet economy from the rest of the world.

The dictatorship of Nazi-Fascism, which was also meant to be something better than democracy and communism, basing itself on the principles of superiority of a few nations and races, did not ameliorate the economy of those nations where it prevailed, and completely ruined their political relations with others.

If the Treaty of Versailles in some matters betrayed democracy and, in some respects, limited liberty, the dictatorships everywhere systematically worked towards the destruction of liberty and democracy. In the U. S. S. R. alone there were more Communists executed than were arrested in all the democratic countries in the whole world.

If the Treaty of Versailles and the democratic countries in the League of Nations failed to establish better economic conditions among the nations of the world, the dictatorships stopped all progress, ruined their economy, and brought their peoples to the brink of misery.

In the countries where dictatorships prevail—the U. S. S. R., Italy, Germany—the conditions of humanity in comparison to those which prevailed before the First World War, and which obtain in the democratic countries, grew immensely worse: liberty was destroyed, culture slighted, economic welfare ruined or reduced. The conditions in the dictator countries are vastly worse than in America, England and France. From these three countries no one tries to emigrate in order to gain his livelihood in the U. S. S. R., Germany or Italy. What more, millions would leave those latter countries if they were allowed to do so.

If the Conservative Democrats at times did not abide by the democratic principles but pursued the ideas

of imperialism, the dictatorships made imperialism the main basis of their existence. The U. S. S. R. conquered, conquers and dreams of conquering the world under the guise of "messianic Communism." It argues that it was destined to bring happiness to the entire world by means of Communism. Fascism dreams of a rebirth of the "universal Rome," and Nazism maintains that the world must accept the rule of the most cultured nation of the world—the German nation.

All dictatorships have as their main principle imperialism and subjugation of other nations.

It is true that England and France did not grant to some of the nations they rule those rights which those nations demand. Yet India has a greater autonomy than Czechia or the "autonomous" Slovakia, not to mention Ukraine. Are Ukraine, White Russia and Georgia allowed to hold such free elections to their parliaments as India? Does their self-rule and freedom compare with those of Canada, South Africa, Australia?

Although in the democratic nations the Conservatives care little for small nationalities, betray them, oppress them and expose them to the mercy of the ruling class, nevertheless we do not find that India is at all terrorized by mass executions as is Ukraine.

Among all the regimes under which the Ukrainians lived in the Czechoslovak Republic they enjoyed more rights than under any other domination.

It, therefore, follows that under a dictatorship, such rights as are to be enjoyed even under a conservative democratic rule simply do not exist.

If democracy limits liberty and withdraws from its principles, a dictatorship does precisely the same, and even worse, for the sole purpose of realizing its own principles.

It is, therefore, clear that however imperfect democracy may be, yet it is a much better system than dictatorship, because it has committed its errors as a result of its withdrawal from its principles. By seeking to make democracy more perfect, it is possible to redeem it from the evil into which it has fallen. To convert a dictatorship is impossible, because evil is its second nature, its very essence, and violence is its apotheosis.

The victory of Germany and the U. S. S. R. would mean the establishment of dictatorships in the world, the establishment of lawlessness, GPU, Gestapo. Therefore, they who desire liberty, equality, brotherhood, and economic well-being

must cease to follow the lure of dictatorship, and organize a powerful opposition to combat its evil and destroy it. All who desire to live in peace and prosperity must seek to renew democracy, cultivate it, perfect it.

The watchwords of democracy must be voiced more clearly, more honestly, more fully, if the democratic principles are to be realized.

### III

#### THE PRESENT INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

**Imperialistic War.** The world is now passing through a new stage of various imperialistic warfares, which became more acute towards the end of the nineteenth century, when all the free expanses of the globe were divided among modern nations.

The World War, revolutions, and the efforts of the twenty-year-old peace did not solve the old quarrels. The errors of the victors, and the dictatorships of Communism, Fascism and Nazism only made them more acute. The dictatorships, having united, began their advance against the neighboring countries, while the democratic nations began to organize their resistance. Germany and Russia, with Italy at their side, found themselves in one camp. Although they are not all united in an equal measure one with the other, none the less they are all in the camp of the invaders. In the opposite and defensive camp we find England and France.

**Russo-German Pact.** The Russo-German Pact confused many. Even to this time there are some who doubt its permanence. But these doubts are groundless. For this Pact was induced, and will remain firm, by reason of serious and fixed political, geographic, economic, cultural and historic causes. First of all, political advantages are at the root of it. In an imperialistic warfare it is to Germany's greater advantage to be united with Russia rather than with England, for an alliance with England promises Germany nothing, except a free hand in the East which it would be necessary to subjugate with a certain degree of risk. In compensation for that alternative, Germany would be forced to abandon her hopes of naval expansion. In other words, Germany would have to cease dreaming of parity with Great Britain and even of world hegemony. In alliance with Russia, on the other hand, it is possible for Germany to gain, by pacific means, the untold Russian markets of raw materials, and the extension of her trade from the Baltic to the Pacific; and following the defeat

of Great Britain to regain the lost colonies, become the master of the seas, as well as the ruler of the Old World, for Russia, being deprived of important ocean ports, can never hope to become a first-rate power. To Russia, an alliance with Germany is likewise more advantageous than were she to cast her lot with England, because Russia could gain nothing from England. Neither from Germany does Russia stand to gain anything, but her alliance with Germany is alluring on account of the perspective it offers for Russian expansion in Asia at the expense of England.

Germany is drawn to Russia for economic reasons as well as by her over-population. Germany cannot hope to press the surplus of her population towards the West, because the West is more cultured and more densely populated than the East. The only outlet, therefore, is the East, Russia, where the population is not so dense, and less cultured. Russia, to be sure, has no necessity to oppose the German colonization, because she has enough space and needs the services of the "kulturtaregers" (carriers of culture).

German industry has nowhere such free access as to the East, to Russia, because the West produces overwhelmingly more than it needs, while the East produces almost nothing, in comparison.

The historical and cultural bonds between Russia and Germany have existed for centuries. Czar Peter I, who not only married a German lady but invited a great number of Germans to Russia for the purpose of reforming his country, established this connection. After Peter, all Muscovite czars married only German ladies, who brought with them their relatives and friends to whom were given the chief positions in the Russian czarist court, in the army, civil service, industry, commerce, etc. With the beginning of the eighteenth century Germany supplied Russia not only with colonists to settle the wide, uninhabited spaces but also skilled laborers of various kind, and with organizers of the nation's economy, education and culture, with lower and higher administrators, and even with those who could take the helm of national policy and government into their hands. The Russian men of learning themselves admit that the House of Romanovs was more German than Russian. The Russian language was brought to order by **Grotes**, its science was organized by **Muellers**, its army by **Kleigleses**, its administration by **Kaulbarges**, while the "Russian national countenance" was polished by **Struves**.

The czarist Russia was more Germanic in character than Slavonic. Such Slavs as Ukrainians, White Russians and Poles

were only enslaved by Russia.

With the connivance of Germany, Russia used all her power to suppress the national effort of the Ukrainians. It was Joseph I who advised Peter I to get rid of the Ukrainian danger by transferring the Ukrainian Cossacks to the regions of the North and Siberia, and in their place admit German colonists. Catherine II signed a pact with Joseph II in 1767, which had as its consequence the planned and deliberate colonization of the Ukrainian Zaporoggian lands by German colonists. Before the Great War, the German colonists in Ukraine, numbering over half a million, possessed nearly ten million acres of the Ukrainian fertile soil. Each time, when Russia, as a result of a war, found herself in a critical situation, Germany frightened her with the Ukrainian movement of liberation, and by that means gained in Russia more and more concessions. That happened in 1792, 1854 and in 1887.

In their teachings, the Makers of Germany, Frederick the Great and Bismark, advised the Germans to remain in close friendship with Russia. Every German understood its purpose, because he saw how much Germany gained and stands to gain from that friendship.

During the First World War Russia found herself opposed to Germany not because the czar willed it so but because she was forced to that position by the progressive Russian element which opposed the czarist absolutism, the German advisors to the czar, and Russian orientation on Germany, which last gradually gained more ground, following the Revolution of 1905. The movement against Russian absolutism was at the same time the anti-German movement. The czar continually attempted to bring about a reconciliation with Germany in order to gain Germany's support against the people's movement toward freedom.

The bolshevist despotism likewise sought to gain German support. (The Brest and Rapallo treaties.) The advent of Hitler, with his anti-communistic outlook, shattered this friendship for a while, but mutual imperialistic interests of Germany and Russia forced the two dictators to clasp hands almost immediately.

Any imperialistic Russia, as well as Germany, will be forced sooner or later to form a union. Any imperialistic government in Russia needs and will continue to need German skilled labor, organizers, technicians, and obedient executors of her will in order not to be dependent on her own people. It is to Germany's greater advantage to gain Russia to her side by peaceful rather than belligerent means. For this very

reason it is also more advantageous for Germany to have a "united, inseparable" Russia from the Baltic to the Pacific, which would wholly and entirely fall into the sphere of German influence, rather than to have a number of separate nations which would only cause her more confusion and difficulty. A "united and inseparable" Russia is necessary for Germany in her peaceful colonizing and commercial expansion in the East. That is why Germany supports Russia against other nations.

The present Russo-German Pact is not the invention of Stalin. It is the realization of old traditions. There are more grounds for solidarity between Germany and Russia than between Russia and England, or between Germany and England. With France Russia has no quarrels, but neither has she mutual interests with that western democracy. For that reason France does not interest Russia.

**Two Types of Imperialism.** In the present European turmoil we see the manifestation of two types of imperialism: 1) Anglo-French; 2) Russo-Italo-Germanic.

The first is a passive type which is not greedy for new conquests. It is concerned merely with protecting what it already possesses. It even grants concessions to its neighbors, dominions and colonies.

It is sufficient only to remember that England consented to naval parity with the United States, granted a greater degree of freedom to Ireland, Egypt, India, etc.

The reasons for the passiveness of the Anglo-French imperialism are several: 1) Satiety: they have plenty; their metropolises have reached marked prosperity, do not lack for food and comfort, and are therefore unwilling to make further sacrifices for what they consider as superfluous; 2) Restricted space of the metropolis in England, and the small number of male population in France, which limit the number of the native English and French in their armies, and for that reason make their staffs, which cannot entirely depend on colonial forces, hesitate in their eagerness to strike; 3) the fact that their dominions and dependencies are scattered throughout the world, which situation makes, on the one hand, impossible the concentration of powers for the purpose of attacks, and, on the other, increases the number of dissatisfied and dangerous neighbors; 4) division of individual and commercial action between the metropolis and its dominions and colonies, as a consequence of which some native English and French have greater connections with the latter than with the metropolis itself, and for that reason cause the metropolis to hesitate in



its aggressive measures with regard to its dominions, colonies or neighbors; 5) cultural, economic and political self-administration of the dominions and colonies, by which these dependencies not only theoretically but also practically limit the metropoly in its armed measures, reserving their own judgment regarding these measures.

All these reasons are not temporary but durable. For that reason their existence makes certain the further weakening of Anglo-French imperialism and its "pacification."

Of a completely different nature are the imperialisms of Germany, Italy and Russia. They are active, voracious, assailing. And that for several reasons. What they have in common is the tradition of conquest in the nature of the Muscovite senseless adventure, German Prussianism, as well as Messianism; the czarist Russia believed that she was destined to be the "third Rome," while the Communist Russia argues that the Fates made it her lot to be the instrument whereby the world might enjoy the blessings of the Communist dictatorship; the Italian Fascism justifies its conquest by maintaining that it is destined to renew, "for the good of humanity", the glory of the ancient Roman Empire, while the German Nazism attempts to persuade the nations that the German nation alone must rule the world because it is "the most cultured."

There are yet other reasons. The Italo-German imperialism has certain economic reasons, as well as the question of their over-population, to consider: the density of their populations, the lack of raw materials and markets for their exports are their pressing problems.

Springing from, and expanding upon, the criticism of the flaws in the Treaty of Versailles, the Italian and German imperialisms have long ago crossed the boundary of merely seeking justice, and have planted themselves firmly on the necessity of conquest. They demand redistribution of world wealth not among all the nations, but merely for the satisfaction of the German and Italian needs; they demand the expansion of their own "living space" at the expense of other nations, regardless of the latter's vital needs.

Russian imperialism is purely political. It has no economic reasons, nor is it pressed by the problem of over-population. Its territory is vast, its natural resources untold, its population is sparse, and the possibilities of its own industry, agriculture and commerce are unlimited. And yet the Russians dream of new conquests. Why? Such is their tradition of conquest, inculcated into them by the Muscovite czars, the

Tartars, and the Germans. The Germans inspired the Russians with the lust of conquest ever since the times of Peter I, who, with the assistance of the Germans themselves, became enamoured of German culture. Peter I and Catherine II (a German who persuaded her paramour, Count Orlov, to murder her husband Peter III in order to usurp his throne), with the aid of German generals and advisers, laid a wide foundation for Russian imperialism by conquering the Baltic nations, the Azov region, by subjecting Ukraine, dividing Poland, annexing the Crimea, etc. Following that the "new Russia" conquered Finland, the Caucasus, Turkestan and other territories.

The Minister of Militia of Czar Nicholas II, General Kuropatkin discovered that during the two hundred years of her existence (17th and 18th Centuries) Russia enjoyed only seventy-two peaceful years, the rest, one hundred twenty-eight, she spent in warfare, thirty-eight of which were external and only two internal; twenty-two wars in the period of 101 years were waged for conquest of foreign territories.

Imperialism became such an attitude of Russia that even that progressive Russian poet, A. Push'kin, wrote during the conquest of the Caucasus: "Humble thyself, O Caucasus, Yermolov comes." But the Ukrainian poet T. Shevchenko encouraged the Caucasians with such words: "Bold knights, unforgotten by God, resist and you shall emerge victorious. God himself is behind you. Power, liberty and sacred truth are on your side."

The Soviet government exploited and continues to exploit the historic Russian imperialistic yearning for its own purpose, namely, to spread Communism. The Red Army had been encouraged in its attacks upon Ukraine, Georgia, Poland, Finland not by the ideals of Communism but by the greed to annex to Russia new areas with their natural resources, thus to enable Russia to become the master of nations.

Under the guise of Communism, as the former ministers in the Kolchak government, Professor Kl'uchnikov, Ustrialov and others, admit in their collection "Smiena Viekh" (1921), the Communist government became a veritable Russian national government, concerned mainly with establishing a "united, inseparable Russia." It takes advantage of the world proletarian movement for the benefit of the Russian national purposes, realizes the Russian historic duty, and prepares its way to India. It has renewed the policy of a first-rate nation, which policy places Russia in the place of a

Tartars, and the Germans. The Germans inspired the Russians with the lust of conquest ever since the times of Peter I, who, with the assistance of the Germans themselves, became enamoured of German culture. Peter I and Catherine II (a German who persuaded her paramour, Count Orlov, to murder her husband Peter III in order to usurp his throne), with the aid of German generals and advisers, laid a wide foundation for Russian imperialism by conquering the Baltic nations, the Azov region, by subjecting Ukraine, dividing Poland, annexing the Crimea, etc. Following that the "new Russia" conquered Finland, the Caucasus, Turkestan and other territories.

The Minister of Militia of Czar Nicholas II, General Kuropatkin discovered that during the two hundred years of her existence (17th and 18th Centuries) Russia enjoyed only seventy-two peaceful years, the rest, one hundred twenty-eight, she spent in warfare, thirty-eight of which were external and only two internal; twenty-two wars in the period of 101 years were waged for conquest of foreign territories.

Imperialism became such an attitude of Russia that even that progressive Russian poet, A. Push'kin, wrote during the conquest of the Caucasus: "Humble thyself, O Caucasus, Yermolov comes." But the Ukrainian poet T. Shevchenko encouraged the Caucasians with such words: "Bold knights, unforgotten by God, resist and you shall emerge victorious. God himself is behind you. Power, liberty and sacred truth are on your side."

The Soviet government exploited and continues to exploit the historic Russian imperialistic yearning for its own purpose, namely, to spread Communism. The Red Army had been encouraged in its attacks upon Ukraine, Georgia, Poland, Finland not by the ideals of Communism but by the greed to annex to Russia new areas with their natural resources, thus to enable Russia to become the master of nations.

Under the guise of Communism, as the former ministers in the Kolchak government. Professor Kl'uchnikov, Ustrialov and others, admit in their collection "Smiena Viekh" (1921), the Communist government became a veritable Russian national government, concerned mainly with establishing a "united, inseparable Russia." It takes advantage of the world proletarian movement for the benefit of the Russian national purposes, realizes the Russian historic duty, and prepares its way to India. It has renewed the policy of a first-rate nation, which policy places Russia in the place of a

powerful world ruler. Professor Kliuchnikov emphasized that the bolsheviks made of Russia "the nation of soviets, of Moscow the capital of the international, and of the Russian moujik the agent of world culture." Professor Ustrialov said that "bolshevism, with its international influence and its far-reaching connection is now becoming an efficient instrument of the international policy of Russia is renewing the former urge to become a powerful first-rate nation, the ruler of nations. Bobrishev-Puschkin pointed out that "although the internationalists are at the helm, nevertheless, they openly pursue a national aim. It is enough to point out the fact of annexation to Russia of Ukraine, Georgia, etc. The day of occupation of Warsaw would be to the majority of Russians the day of festal solemnities."

"The Third International begins to become a powerful means of attaining the national purposes of Russia. Depending on the Red Army and on the international masses of the lower classes, as well as on Asia, Russia commences a new period in her history. Turkey, Persia, Afganistan are her highways to India."

As such has Communism revealed itself. It has become a purely Russian imperialism. The instinct of the Muscovite imperialism has made Communism the instrument of realization of its aims.

The basis of the imperialism of the Russian people is also their lack of willingness to work, as well as their lack of constructive endeavor; and their destructive capacities are well known, and the Chinese had long ago given the Russians the epithet of "lodaylo"—"destroyers." On account of the vast areas possessed by Russia, the Muscovite nature is noted even to this time for its instincts of nomadic urge from which rises the spirit of conquest and not the spirit of work. Even the Russian peasant is apt to neglect the cultivation of his property; very willingly does he abandon his wife and children to go off seeking easier means of livelihood. Communism has not frightened the Russian\* as much as it did the Ukrainians. because the Russians, quite in keeping with their tradition, took advantage of the idea of communal work in such a manner as to impose the more difficult and onerous work on other nationalities, while they themselves have chosen easier and more profitable occupations. The Russian Communist is the same international exploiter of other nationalities as were the czarist generals. The pointed cap of the Red soldier, the symbol of old conquerors, reveals clearly the conquering spirit of the Muscovite people, even during the period of Communism.

In addition, the imperialism of the Russian people is fostered by the idea of their Messianism. The Russian people whose standard of culture is one of the lowest, and who attached themselves to the cultural world only in the seventeenth century by drawing most of their cultural elements from Ukraine, following the signing of the Treaty which established a union with the latter in 1654—the Russian people believe that they being the greatest in Europe in numbers, must shower the blessing of their rule on the rest of the world. They consider themselves the best, wisest, etc. Many communist workers believe even now that the lot of the Russian workers is much better than that of the workers in other countries. According to them, Russia possesses the best system in the world and must therefore, seek to establish this social order throughout the world, it being her moral duty to seek the common good of humanity. Because other national governments do not allow this idea to gain ground in their countries, they must be destroyed, and their nations conquered, and forced to accept the system of Communism, the center of which would be Moscow, the capital of the entire world. That is the dream and aim of Communism.

Such is the Russian imperialism. It is created not by the economic but by political reasons; it is not natural but artificial. Russia has enough space and natural resources to assure the living needs of her people. It is not necessary for Russia to take anything from others by force, because she is able to exchange her own products for whatever she needs. The Ural region and Siberia are by no means exhausted and, in places, offer the development of new and as yet untouched sources of unlimited quantity of raw materials. These untouched resources are of fabulous value. Instead of organizing the development of these resources, Russia forces her way into Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia, in order to get what she wants without expending her energy in an initiative of her own. There she finds everything ready for her use.

Lately, Russian imperialists began to justify themselves by saying that Russia needs other lands for "strategic purposes." First of all, "strategic needs" are in no way a convincing argument, because every nation, every country can use it in order to justify its violence. because all nations have their specific "strategic needs." But the fact remains, as history clearly shows, that neither these countries which Russia had conquered, nor their neighbors have, for 200 years, thought of attacking Russia. Nor do they even dream of attacking her now. Therefore, Russia has nothing to fear from any of these

nations. They do no endanger Russia's position; on the contrary, Russia endangers theirs, whether they be her closer or further neighbors.

Russian imperialism is, like German imperialism, active, violent, insatiable and incisive.

The Russian emancipatory movement and the revolutions in 1905 and 1917 have for a time checked this imperialism, but the bolsheviks, under the guise of Communism, have renewed it. The Communist Russia, like the czarist Russia, dreams of world dictatorship of Moscow. The old Muscovite imperialists, disguising themselves at times with the cloak of democracy, assist the Communists with attempts to convince the world that Russia "has a right", to Ukraine, the Black Sea, Dardanelles without which she "cannot exist." In various forms the Muscovite imperialism reveals its ancient greeds, which are: to gain, through Ukraine, a foothold in the Balkans and an access to the Adriatic and the Mediterranean; through Ukraine also Russia wishes to gain access to the Black Sea, Dardanelles and the Mediterranean, Suez, India and through the Caucasus she seeks a way into Turkestan, Persia, Afganistan, India.

Where this imperialism will land depends on its power. Its desires, however, are unlimited.

As long as these desires exist there can be no peace in Europe.

Like the German, Russian imperialism is one of the main reasons for the European unrest.

## IV

### THE TASKS OF DEMOCRACY

1. **Destruction of Imperialism.** The chief task of Democracy is to free humanity from the present turmoil and misery and to establish such conditions of international existence as would enable every nation to be free and have opportunity to satisfy her life needs by means of unhampered labor as well as by exchange on the basis of mutual pacts. Thus made free to pursue her own existence each nation must not obstruct other nations from pursuing theirs. There must be no subjugation or exploitation of one nation by another.

For the amelioration and assurance of continued human welfare, it is necessary to make the greatest effort to put production on the highest possible level. And it is obvious that this effort cannot achieve success in the atmosphere of

war, plunder, attacks, destruction. Such an effort needs peace.

And peace is impossible as long as imperialism exists with armed force ready to grab foreign areas, wealth, markets and highways leading to them, etc. Therefore, in order to ensure peace and the possibility of unhampered labor, it is imperative, in the first place, to destroy imperialism, its causes, power, and sources; in other words, to check the aggressors; make wars cease; remove the causes of enmity between nations; establish a new order in which there would be no grounds for imperialism; to assure favorable conditions of peace and calm without which normal labor and development of humanity are impossible; yet in other words, to create a power to preserve the new order of things, peace and labor.

Whereas the imperialisms of Germany, Italy and Russia are more active and aggressive, it is necessary, in the first place, to check and weaken them, to destroy their might and the source of their expansion, to divide the areas and nationalities now under their rule in order not to allow their powers to concentrate for new conquests, because every concentration of this kind is the source of encouragement for these imperialisms to proceed in their invasions of yet other nations.

It is imperative that Germany and Russia be put at least in the position of Great Britain which cannot attack anyone without the consent of her dominions. The dominions are not always willing to grant her such consent and for that reason, restrain English imperialism from further progress.

It is necessary to place Russian and German imperialisms in the position in which English imperialism was placed in 1776-83. Had the New England States not separated from England, English imperialism would today be the master of the entire world. Such a democracy as now exists in the U. S. A. and Great Britain would be out of question. On the contrary, England would now be the absolute master of the world and impose her will upon the entire world. The secession of the United States from England weakened English imperialism and forced it to make concessions both in external and internal matters: and further, this secession caused English imperialism to take the path of democracy. Although such a course was not to her liking, nevertheless, England felt herself too weak to proceed any longer down the path of dictatorship.

The same must be done with German and Russian imperialisms. They must be deprived of those lands which have been occupied by them, and which formerly possessed their own sovereign national organization: Austria, Czechia,

Slovakia, Poland must be taken away from Germany, and Ukraine, White Russia and the Caucasus from the U. S. S. R.

Both outspoken and cryptic imperialists attempt to argue against such a course by maintaining that the disintegration of the great powers and the creation of smaller nations would create an atmosphere conducive to constant unrest, because these smaller nations would continually quarrel among themselves regarding their borders, which it is difficult to establish precisely. The "Balkanization", they argue, would invade the greater part of Europe and become the constant source of unrest and wars.

The groundlessness of that argument is apparent from the fact that small nations in spite of their petty quarrels regarding their boundaries, have not, following the Treaty of Versailles, disturbed the European peace. In Europe wars were always started by great powers: Russia, Italy, Germany. Even the "Balkan" nations have gradually come to an agreement and formed the "Balkan Pact." Even Bulgaria and Yugoslavia signed a pact of "lasting friendship." It is, therefore, evident that it is the great nations and not the small ones which are the source of wars. And that is quite understandable: the smaller nations are more afraid to risk a war than are the greater ones. Great powers, as is only too plain, are the more eager to further expansion the greater their power becomes. Feeling themselves mighty, they are more apt to take risks and attack others.

If they will not form their own bloc of independent nations, and be annexed to some great power, the smaller nations will not be able to give effective assistance toward establishment of the European equilibrium, but, on the contrary, will only serve as instruments of imperialism of this or that power. Only by preserving their independence and by forming a union among themselves will these nations be able to defend their independence endangered by Germany and Russia, and thus check them both by maintaining an equal division of powers in Europe.

Greater nations endanger the peace more than do the small ones. Therefore, the reduction of Italy, Germany and Russia to the status of average nations, equal in power to others, will weaken their aggressive urge, and will help to preserve peace.

Some, especially Russians, while justifying the separation of Abyssinia and Albania from Italy, and Austria, Czechia, Slovakia and Poland from Germany, refuse to justify the necessity of separation of Ukraine, White Russia



and the Caucasus from the U. S. S. R. To support their assertions they produce "strategic" and economic arguments, especially those regarding the Black Sea.

The groundlessness of "strategic" arguments has been discussed above. As regards economic arguments, it is necessary to point out first of all that the U. S. S. R. does not in itself present, as Russian imperialists are wont to argue, a "united economic organism." The economic "unity" of Russia with Ukraine is not greater than that of Germany with Czechia or that of Russia with China. If one argues that Ukraine must not be separated from Russia because Russia needs Ukrainian coal, sugar, etc., one must also argue that Czechia must not be separated from Germany because Germany, too, needs the Czech coal and sugar. If Ukraine is of "vital interest" to Russia, then, Czechia is also a "vital part" of the German organism.

Moreover, economic needs are in no way an argument to serve as a valid reason for one nation to subjugate another. If one justifies it, one must also justify robbery, because a thief also needs that which he steals.

Economic needs may and must be satisfied by means of mutual agreements and compensation rather than by means of robbery.

Who says that, in order that German imperialism may be destroyed, Austria, Czechia, Slovakia and Poland must be separated from Germany, but does not consider it necessary to separate Ukraine, White Russia and the Caucasus from the U. S. S. R. in order to destroy Russian imperialism—such a one either does not bring his thought to a proper conclusion or purposely conceals for Russia's benefit the possibilities of the monopolistic development of her imperialism. If Germany were deprived of Austria, Czechia, Slovakia and Poland, and Russia was allowed to keep all she has, in that case, with the downfall of German imperialism, there would remain in Europe an open field in which Russian imperialism might expand without any competition whatever.

Russian imperialists having before them an open field, and feeling strong enough, would never hesitate to strike at the weaker democratic nations and claim them for Russia on the basis that the "vital interests" of Russia demand the security of her "strategic" boundaries, let us say, in Jutiand, the Alps, Pyrenees, Gibraltar on one side; and on the other, in the Suez (not to mention Dardanelles), India, and China. After all, who can best set limits to the "vital needs" of Russia than Russia herself? And when she will feel strong enough,

she will begin to realize them. Therefore, it is impossible to ensure peace without destroying the source of Russian imperialism. And its source is that strength which Russia accumulates from her possession of Ukraine, White Russia and the Caucasus, which serve her as highways to the Balkans, Black Sea, Suez, and the Gibraltar.

Today, Russian imperialists are quite outspoken about Russia's need of the Black Sea and Dardanelles. If she would become the master of these, she would demand Suez, Gibraltar and a "free outlet to the seas."

In the meantime, it is possible for Russia to have these outlets without recourse to conquest, simply on the basis of appropriate treaties and for certain compensation. But she will not avail herself of such possibilities until she will be in a position to take them by means of force. She will step on the path of democracy only when she will be so weakened as not to be able to lay her claws on anything. Therefore, it is imperative to deprive Russia of that to which she is not entitled, and which is in reality the source of her imperialism.

Otherwise, the great "united and inseparable" Russia will always remain a source of imperialism because, being so vast, she will always be tempted by her adventurous elements to further measures of conquest in order to enlarge her territories.

In her interior, for the same reasons, Russia will always be dictatorial, despotic, because such must inevitably be a government set on conquest.

Deprived of those lands which do not belong to her, Russia will cease to be imperialistic, and will be compelled to take more interest in the betterment of her own economic matters and in the development of her natural wealth. Thus will she become democratic and will strive to preserve the peace. Against such a background, Russia will resume common interest with her neighbors and together with them, form a barrier against all imperialistic greed on the part of others. She will then become a strong anti-imperialistic power.

Russian imperialists express fears that were the "united, inseparable" Russia to vanish and her place taken by a number of new nations among which Russia would find herself within the boundaries of old Muscovy, such a state of affairs would lead to German domination of Europe, and to Japanese domination of the Far East. This assertion is without foundation. An independent Ukraine, defending her independence against Germany, as well as her colonial possibilities in Siberia and in the Far East, where Ukrainian colonies already exist, would with greater determination assist Russia, her ally, against

Germany and Japan than she would were Russia, her oppressor ruling over Ukraine with might and main. Defending herself and her interests (and not only Russian interests), Ukraine would assist Russia and not weaken her.

Who is against the independence of Ukraine, White Russia, and the Caucasus it at the same time against the independence of Czechia, Slovakia and Poland, because Russian imperialism, having swallowed the former, will not hesitate to extend its arms for the latter. Who will check it, when German and Italian imperialism will be subdued?

To separate certain countries from Germany and Italy and then to allow Russia to remain "united and inseparable" would mean that the "collective pact" would be abandoned and the undemocratic system of "individual advantages" permitted to prevail. Only a "collective pact" is able to preserve Europe from war.

In order to make peace "indivisible" it is necessary to divide the sources of imperialism and to create a single system of protection from war. Such system is possible only on the condition that the countries subscribing to it are more or less equal in power, united one to the other by means of mutual control and mutual defense against all imperialisms.

Without the dismemberment of U. S. S. R., the dismemberment of Germany would only assist the imperialistic designs of Russia.

**2. The Democratic Organization of the World.** Shattering the imperialisms and their sources, democracy must at the same time form its own plan of solving the problems of a new free life of the world, and organize its own democratic forces for the purpose of its realization. Above all, it must not waver between black and red dictatorships.

In the first place, democracy should bring together its more radical elements in order to restrain the moderate and the conservative from repeating their old errors; to establish real liberty, equality and brotherhood of nations.

New democracy must definitely renounce all imperialistic dreams about world hegemony. England and France, in their role of eminent nations and democracies, ought especially to consider this point. They must be conscious of the fact that the assurance of their high position among free nations is made possible by the latter's cultural and economic condition. Any attempt to gain world hegemony will inevitably evoke the dissatisfaction of the others, prompt the creation of a "defense bloc", and sow the seeds of enmity and suspicion, which will destroy peace. Great powers have a greater

opportunity to preserve their position as Empires by reasonable understanding with others.

New democracy should realize full equality of peoples. There must be no division such as would make some nations small and others great, some with a national status, others without it. Such a division is the trait of dictatorships. No nation has a right to arrogate to itself the right of superiority or hegemony, or the right to destroy, subjugate and annihilate others. However small a nation, it is an integral body and has an equal right, with even the greatest, to satisfy its vital needs, as well as the right to its national sovereignty whereby to enjoy its individual liberty.

It is imperative that such division of nations as would make some conquerors and others conquered be done away with. In peace time all are equal. In the League of Nations there must be no privileges for the greater and the mightier. The neutrals are entitled to the same rights as are those who took part in the war. Every nation, regardless of the fact whether it possesses a national status, should have a place in the League of Nations equal to that of others. Even the smallest nation or people should have an opportunity to form its own destiny and seek out its own means of international relations with others, and its moral and judicial weight should bear equally in the council of nations as that of even the greatest. Although peoples and nations will have in such a council their own individual importance, depending on their respective area, greatness, culture, wealth, etc., none the less, no nation will have the right to employ all these acquisitions for the purpose of gaining hegemony over others.

Special care should be taken to establish nations within their rightful boundaries and to ensure their national sovereignty. The mistakes of Russian democracy with regard to Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia must be righted. Their negative relations to each other with respect to the establishment of their respective independence, enabled the bolsheviks to attack them one by one. Bolshevism saved itself from utter destruction in 1919 only because Denikin, having reached Orel, instead of directing all his efforts against Russia, began a war with Ukraine by attacking Kiev. That gave the bolsheviks an opportunity to gather strength and defeat both Denikin and the Ukrainians, both weakened by senseless battles with each other. Demanding forthwith a "united and inseparable Russia", the "non-separatists" were disillusioned, and at the same time prevented Ukraine from preserving her independent democratic order.

Russian democracy must distinctly separate itself from Russian imperialism, as had been done by Herten, Bakunin and others, and not compete with its rightist circles as to who is the greatest "slaveholder" and cling the more obstinately to its possession. By falsely concealing Russian imperialism with patriotism the apologists will gain nothing. Russian democracy must as soon as possible show that, in relation to other nations, it is different from the Romanovs, Hohenzollerns, Habsburgs, Lenins, Stalins, Hitlers, Mussolinis, etc., that it does not seek to deprive other peoples of their liberty under the guise of "patriotism" or "strategic" and "economic" needs. Such a disguise will fool no one, and there is no need to assume it.

The greatest lack of logic, the greatest dishonor which democracy shows, and for which one has to blush, lies in the fact that it demands equality for itself and for its own people while refusing this equality to other nationalities. The greatest manifestation of democracy's blindness, especially that of great democracies, is the belief that conquered nations are not aware of there being any discrepancy in all that. The truth of the matter is that this very discrepancy is the chief reason why peoples which are without national status, become estranged from democracy. Suspicion and enmity are the result of such an injustice, and are taken advantage of by reactionary powers against the interests of both sides.

Russian democracy should manifest in no uncertain terms its positive relation to the national liberation of Ukraine, White Russia, Georgia and other nations which wish to be free, in order to create thereby psychological conditions of mutual trust, without which no neighborly relations are possible. Only independent Ukraine, White Russia and Georgia are able to become sincere allies of Russia and, together with her, form a strong and trustworthy union for the defense of their common interests.

The fate of Russia depends on Russian democracy. If she will continue to compete with her reactionaries in her "inseparability", she will fail to establish a new force for her defense. Reactionaries will always be ahead of her with their chauvinism and imperialism. She will only assist them in antagonizing and rousing the Ukrainians, White Russians, Georgians, etc. against Russia.

But if she will leave the matter of "inseparability" to the reactionaries, as imperialistic and chauvenistic, and herself follow a new path of friendly relations with independent Ukraine, White Russia and Georgia and others, she will create

a new, fanatic power of neophytes who, while defending their own independence, will at the same time defend their ally, Russia.

The Ukrainians are not at all eager to fight for that Russia which oppresses them, under the bolsheviks no less than under the czars. But for that Russia which would be Ukraine's ally, they will fight with obstinacy and eagerness, as if in defense of their own interests.

Russian democracy must immediately resolve whether it is more advantageous for it 1) to keep within her bosom nationalities which are continually dissatisfied and only waiting for the proper moment to profit by the opportunity to weaken it in order to break open the hateful prison; or to acknowledge the right for these nationalities to be independent and thereby gain their sympathy and willingness to assist Russia as an ally; 2) whether it would be more profitable for Russia to keep these nations in subjugation until foreign powers, taking advantage of the dissatisfaction of these oppressed nationalities, will divide Russia in spite of herself, and turn these emancipated nations into instruments of continual warfare against her; or to allow the nations, which are oppressed by the bolshevist tyranny, to become independent and even help them to establish themselves firmly, and by this human method, gain the sincere alliance of Ukraine, White Russia and Georgia.

In other words, before the Russian people, as well as before all other peoples of the U. S. S. R., there stands the question: whether they ought to part from each other in a brotherly manner, as Abraham parted from Lot, and divide their territories in such a way as to satisfy their respective national needs and with a view of preserving friendly ties with each other, or to wait for a foreign power to come and divide them in its own manner and place each nationality at its own service. Poland failed to be aware of this, and for that reason fell. Does Russia wish the same fate to befall her? And it must always be remembered that a friendly division of territories is always possible on the principle of liberty, equality and independence.

All arguments about "federation" are superannuated, and discredited by the very fact that even the reactionaries used them to conceal their imperialistic and chauvinistic portentions which had nothing in common with autonomy. "Alliance" is a term which might be the basis of an understanding. The reach of its realistic meaning would depend on the degree of trust existing between two nations, especially between democracies.

Polish democracy must likewise renounce its historic imperialism and cease eyeing greedily the Ukrainian territory, Volhynia, Polisia, Kholm, Pidliasha, and Galicia, are not to tempt Poland. Neither must she reach out for the White Russian or Lithuanian lands. Otherwise she will always have the Ukrainians, White Russians and Lithuanians on the opposing side, and will weaken thereby her defense measures against her common enemies—Russian and German imperialisms. The Polish nation must be limited by its ethnographic boundaries. Then Ukraine, White Russia and Lithuania might even join Poland in an alliance for the purpose of defending their common interests against Russian and German imperialisms.

Czech democracy must also renounce all dreams about a national republic together with the Slovaks and Germans. A national Czech republic can exist only within the ethnographic limits of the Czech territory. But such a nation would be too weak. It is to the greater advantage both of the Czechs and the Slovaks to have a common state, not as an inseparable unit but as a federation of the Czech, Slovak and German nationalities. To fuse the Czechs and Slovaks artificially into a single people is impossible. They are two distinct units, and that must be taken into serious consideration. However, these two peoples may form a common state on the basis of equality.

Serbian democracy likewise must renounce the thought of overruling the Slovenes and Croatians, and must together with them form a federation on the basis of equality.

A great part in the reconstruction of Europe on the basis of democratic principles can be played by Jewish democracy, which does not enjoy a national status in Europe; scattered among nations, it is in a position to bind them; and having no grounds for imperialism, Jewish democracy can criticize these nations and set them on the better path of democracy. For that reason, Jewish democracy should renounce its heretofore opportunistic principle, which is to support the rule of the mightier and thus help keep in subjugation the weaker. Jewish democracy, as all others, must be on the side of those to whom injustice has been done, and together with them build a new order of the complete national independence and equality of peoples. On the Ukrainian territories, Jewish democracy should function together with the Ukrainian, and combat Russian, Polish, Rumanian and Hungarian imperialisms, and together with the Ukrainians form a democratic Ukrainian republic in which the Jewish people could fill the same position as the Ukrainians. A similar Jewish policy should also prevail

on the Lithuanian territory. It is a fact that the Ukrainian, White Russian, and Lithuanian territories are inhabited by the Jews in great numbers. Up to this time the Jews have supported in those countries the Russian, Polish, Rumanian and Hungarian governments. And what have they received in return for their services? In czarist Russia—pogroms, in bolshevist Russia—"purgings"; in Poland—pogroms, and in Rumania and Hungary—humiliation and persecution.

If it is added that in Germany, in the ranks of whose patriots and anti-Slavic propagandists were such giants as Karl Marx, the Jews received the hardest blow; if one takes into consideration that it is not possible for all Jews to settle Palestine, where their settlements are strictly limited,—it becomes particularly clear that it is inevitable that the Jews should change their opinion regarding the creation of independent states of Ukraine and White Russia. Together with the Ukrainians and White Russians the Jews are also to create these states, where they will have more rights and possibilities than in Palestine. And forming an integral unit of national democracy in Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Rumania and Russia, the Jews will have a greater opportunity to use their influence in bringing about better international relations among those countries and in the entire world.

The Ukrainian, White Russian, and Georgian democracies should renounce all hopes of receiving foreign help, cease to be lured by foreign ideologies and seek a way out of alien orientations; they should distinctly detach themselves from the chauvinistic nazi reaction; instead they should form their own democratic doctrine, cling fast to it, and organize their own powers in order to defend the ideals of self-government and international liberty.

While seeking to destroy imperialism and dictatorship, democracy must at the same time lay the foundations of liberty and voluntary association of nations. Destroying the oppressive systems of social order within and among nations, democracy should not seek to destroy these nations and their well-being; on the contrary, it should always and everywhere seek to establish better and more convenient conditions of neighborly relations and welfare among these nations.

Detaching certain countries from Germany and the U. S. S. R. in order to destroy the imperialisms of these powers, it is imperative that these separated nations be consolidated into a new independent democratic power, which might offer an effective resistance to those imperialisms which are continually liable to show their ugly head again. The separated nations



must be united upon democratic principles into a voluntary association which would then unite with similar associations of other democratic countries into a European alliance of such associations.

Taking into consideration the geographical, cultural, economic, linguistic and other natural ties which closely bind the European nations with each other, we think that the most effective system of European pacification and assurance of lasting peace and democracy would be the following:

1) An Association of the Central-European Slavs, namely: Ukraine, White Russia, Slovakia and Czechia. That is a natural nucleus for a bloc of nations which can present a barrier against the German-Russian imperialism. These nations are those which suffer most from the effects of this imperialism.

These nations are very closely connected with each other by bonds of language. The Ukrainian language is the nearest to Slovak, then to Czech, and then to White Russian language. Only after the White Russian language can the Ukrainian language be said to compare with Russian. These nations likewise resemble each other in their social structure: aristocracy is practically nonexistent and high nobility is quite extinct among them; they are diligent and industrious; they have persevered through the age-long subjugation and persecution by other nations; they serve as a geographic continuation to each other and complement one another economically (Czech industry, and agriculture of others). They do not covet the wealth of other nations. Czechia would serve as a check to German imperialistic influence, and Ukraine to the Russian.

It would be well if Poland, recreated within her ethnographic boundaries, would join such an alliance. But her social structure is different; she has a very great number of the reactionary nobility. Therefore, she is apt to hinder such an alliance.

2) An Association of the Baltic nations—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania. Perhaps Poland would sooner join this Alliance, since she is interested in the Baltic.

3) An Association of the Balkan countries—Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia, Greece, and perhaps Turkey.

4) Austro-Hungarian Association.

All these Associations can form a single Central-European Association, the nucleus of which would be the central nations, Ukraine and Czechia, which have never threatened the world with imperialism, and have no imperialistic aims and, therefore, no grounds for hegemony over others. The Central-

European Association together with the Western-European Association (England and France), the Scandinavian Association, that of the small countries neighboring Germany (Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Switzerland), as well as with Germany, Russia, Italy and the Iberian Association, can form the Pan-European Association of states and peoples.

It is impossible to be concrete at a time like this. These are but signs. Yet if one is not concrete, it must nevertheless be remembered that real peace and order cannot reign in Europe while conditions such as these exist:

1. The causes, bases and possibilities for growth of the German and Russian imperialisms.

2. Distrust among other peoples; their misconception of common interests together with their strife for local advantages and for pieces of territory, all of which interferes with the strengthening of forces for the protection of their greater welfare and sovereignty.

3. The oppression, limitation, degradation and exploitation of any and all peoples, which continually forces these peoples into battle with others for their liberty and equality.

To remove all this, it is imperative to build a new Europe on these principles:

First, the guarantee of complete freedom and independence for all peoples.

Then, an understanding and union of those peoples which have common neighborly interests.

Further, the union of all small European peoples against the threat of any imperialistic designs on the part of one or another more powerful neighbor.

Finally, the union of all European states for purposes of settling their economic, cultural and political needs.

These are the main tasks of that kind of democracy which should be equally applied not only within nations but also with respect to relations between nations, states and governments.

The dissemination of these tasks of democracy is incumbent upon the democratic forces of all peoples which suffer most under present conditions of international force.

Printed in U. S. A.

Printed by Cosmos Publishing Co.

---