

# SOVIET RUSSIA

Official Organ of the Russian Soviet Government Bureau

Ten Cents

Saturday, October 16, 1920

Vol. III, No. 16

Issued Weekly at 110 W. 40th Street, New York, N. Y. Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, Publisher. Jacob Wittmer Hartmann, Editor. Subscription Rate, \$5.00 per annum. Application for entry as second class matter pending. Changes of address should reach the office a week before the changes are to be made.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS:

	PAGE		PAGE
THE AGRARIAN POLICY IN UKRAINE, by <i>A. Manuilsky</i> .....	369	EDITORIALS .....	380
MOSCOW IN 1920 ( <i>Third Instalment</i> ), by <i>Dr. Alfons Goldschmidt</i> .....	371	CHICHERIN'S NOTE TO BARON AVEZZANA .....	382
MILITARY REVIEW, by <i>Lt.-Col. B. Roustam Bek</i> .....	376	POLISH-LITHUANIAN RELATIONS, by <i>A. D.</i> .....	384
THE GRAVE-DIGGERS OF WHITE POLAND, by <i>Karl Radek</i> .....	378	THE CONDITION OF WORKING WOMEN IN SOVIET RUSSIA .....	385
		EASTER IN MOSCOW, by <i>Dr. Bohumir Smeral</i> .....	387
		WIRELESS AND OTHER NEWS .....	390

## The Agrarian Policy in Ukraine

By A. MANUILSKY, *People's Commissar of Agriculture in the Ukrainian Soviet Republic.*

IN NO country is the agrarian question as important as in Russia, in general, and in Ukraine, in particular.

Owing to the fact that Ukraine served as a field of war operations for almost three years of continuous civil war, the agrarian question has not been definitely solved. The shifting of regimes created among the peasant population a feeling that their possession of the land of the former estates was not secure. It resulted merely in the break-up and spoliation of the cultivated estates, stock farms, and sugar refineries, in the destruction of forests, in the reduction of the cultivated area, which in some of the Ukrainian provinces declined forty per cent, in the fall of labor efficiency, in short, it caused the retrogression of Ukraine and brought her to an economic state from which she can be redeemed only by years of hard toil and the exertion of an iron will. The German occupation, Petlurism, Skoropadskyism, Denikinism, Makhnoism,—all these followed each other chronologically and brought about such a state of affairs that not a single law passed by the Soviet power during its rule in Ukraine was ever fully enforced. We must candidly admit that in Ukraine all our laws touched merely the surface of things, and that before they could reach the peasant masses they were swept aside by the swooping down of a new ataman, hetman, or White general.

Coming for the third time into Ukraine under such conditions, the Soviet power faced the task of settling the land question in accord with the full implications of the November Revolution, that is of abolishing the private ownership of large

estates which still persisted under various disguised forms despite the previous decrees and acts. The mistake which the Soviet power committed last year consisted precisely in this, that new social forms of farming—agricultural communes and Soviet farms—were inaugurated before the remnants of feudalism in land relations had been removed. Last year, with large scale land-ownership still in existence, the peasants looked upon the attempts to socialize farming as a new form of communist state enslavement. Of the 15 million dessiatins (40.5 million acres) of arable land which had been owned by the churches, monasteries, and landlords, the Soviet power last year set aside 2.5 million dessiatins for sugar plantations and 634,000 dessiatins for Soviet farms, and this was enough to make the rich peasants in the villages vociferous against the "Communists taking the land away from the peasants." The fact that the Soviet power turned over 12 million dessiatins of land to the peasants of Ukraine was overlooked. The resulting wave of insurrections showed how far the peasants were from the Soviet power, how little they comprehended the Soviet land measures. And the Soviet power had to take this experience into account. The new land law of the All-Ukrainian Revolutionary Committee of February 5 and the instructions of the People's Commissariat of Agriculture which were issued later differed from the former land policy in that, first, they broke away from the practice of a too hasty, mechanical institution of Soviet farms and agricultural communes, and set themselves the task first of all of sweeping out all the remnants of feudalism; and, secondly, that they left the prac-

tical enforcement of the law to the activity of the masses themselves, entrusting to the local land departments the task of attracting the peasants to the work of land distribution. Reviewing now the results of our land policy after four and a half months of the land distribution campaign, we can say with a clear conscience that the course taken by the Soviet power for the settlement of the land question was a correct one. The author of these lines has before him a pile of reports from local military and civil authorities as well as reports from the party organizations to the Central Committee of the party. In not a single one of them is there any mention of local dissatisfaction with our land policy. And yet these reports come from the districts where the insurrection wave of last year was at its worst. Hundreds of provincial and county non-partisan peasant conferences gave their whole-hearted approval to the new land law.

Indeed, this attitude of the peasants toward the new land law was but natural. If we recall the fact that the four and a half million peasant farms of Ukraine aggregated about 20 million dessiatins of land, we find that as a result of the new land law the land portion of the Ukrainian peasants has almost doubled. In some provinces, as, for instance, in the provinces of Taurida, Ekaterinoslav, Kherson, this increase led to the creation of strong peasant farms of from ten to fifteen dessiatins of land. In such regions as the provinces of Podolia, Volhynia, Chernigov and Kiev, where the scarcity of land was felt most keenly, the peasant farms will now have on the average from five to ten dessiatins of land. At the same time, the fears, expressed when the land law was being drafted, that the present land policy would ruin our sugar industry and lead to destruction of the model cultural centers of agriculture, have been proved unjustified. The new land policy made the allotment of land required for sugar plantations and experimental Soviet farms conditional upon an understanding with the peasant masses, and this produced very favorable results. About one and a half million dessiatins of land have already been secured for the sugar refineries and for the Soviet experimental farms. An average of 200 dessiatins was voluntarily allotted in each volost by the peasants for model farms and experimental stations. In a large number of counties in the provinces which have more land, as, for instance, in the province of Ekaterinoslav, the norm per volost was raised, on the initiative of the peasant congresses and conferences, to 500 dessiatins.

The comrades who found fault with our new land policy, arguing that it meant too abrupt a change from the extension of "agricultural factories", which was our policy last year, to land parcelation and to individually owned peasant farms, committed the self-same error as the immoderate admirers of the law of February 5, who saw in it the final stage in the land policy of the workmen's and peasants' rule. They forgot that the law of February 5 in Ukraine, just as in its day the land law of November 10, 1917, in Great Russia, were

but certain milestones in the land policy of the Soviet power, having as their sole object the welding of the whole peasant mass, during the primary stage of the Revolution in villages, in the fight for the abolition of large land ownership. The November period in land construction in Great Russia was followed by the so-called "Committees of the Poor Peasants" period in the Soviet land policy in the spring of 1918, which marked the beginning of the division of the peasantry along class lines. We are now approaching this division among the Ukrainian peasants. We must not overlook the fact that besides the solid usurer section (the "fist", strong arm peasants), there is in Ukraine a numerous agricultural proletariat, poor peasants possessing no horses nor agricultural implements, who, unless united for a merciless struggle against the rich peasants, the "fists", are doomed to economic enslavement by the "fist" elements who have become enriched during the war and the Revolution. Before the Revolution, Ukraine had about a million agricultural laborers and workmen in the sugar refineries; forty per cent of all the peasant farms had no horses, cattle or agricultural implements; the distribution of the land was monstrously unequal. The landless peasants who owned only their homes constituted fifteen per cent of all the peasant population of Ukraine, the owners of puny farms of about one dessiatin constituted five per cent, peasants who owned from one to three dessiatins—twenty-five per cent, and those who owned from three to five dessiatins constituted twenty per cent. We may assume without exaggeration that the poor peasants formed the vast majority of the peasant population. The real "fist" elements who owned from ten to twenty-five dessiatins of land formed only from eight to ten per cent of the peasantry and were lost in the general mass of poor and middle peasants. Of course, the war and the Revolution effected considerable changes in the proportion of the various groups in the villages, but the small peasant farms did not become stronger even after the general redistribution of land which accompanied the Revolution of November, 1917.

Last year we defended the poor peasantry by the organization of Soviet farms and agricultural communes; we helped them by transferring to them the land and the agricultural machinery of the former large estates; we did our best to unite and to organize them around the 1,500 Soviet farms and 300 agricultural communes which were scattered throughout Ukraine. After the Denikin campaign the Soviet farms were left without agricultural implements and without cattle, and they would have been doomed to a parasitic existence. To defend the interests of these poor peasants, who have been still more impoverished by the civil war and for whom additional land is but dead capital, is the next task of the Soviet power. Having completed in the spring of this year the campaign for the distribution of land, we will have to devote the fall of this year and the spring of the next year to a campaign for agricultural implements



and cattle; we will have to organize the poor peasants on economic lines for this struggle against the "fists". Under the existing scarcity of agricultural implements and cattle, the workmen's and peasants' government is unable to get new implements and cattle for the masses of the poor peasantry. But it can and should facilitate a more equal distribution of the stock on hand. And it can carry out this task with the aid of "Committees of the Poor Peasants." Only a network of such committees covering Ukraine will be able to uphold the economically unarmed poor peasant.

The wearing out of the agricultural implements, the extermination of cattle, the depreciation of currency and the insufficient supply of manufactured goods in the villages have caused the reduction of the cultivated area in Ukraine, which suffered, in addition to all these evils, from the civil war. Already during the imperialist war, beginning with 1915, the area of cultivation was reduced each year by six per cent. Under Denikin the land of the former manors remained almost untilled. The area of untilled land and of winter crops which have perished forms sixty-five per cent in the province of Kharkov, thirty-five per cent in the province of Chernigov, forty per cent in the province of Ekaterinoslav, and fifteen in the provinces of Poltava, Taurida, and Kherson. With regard to spring tilling in Ukraine we may

figure on a shortage of about thirty per cent. And if the reduction of the area of cultivation will continue at this rate, it may be expected that Ukrainian agriculture will not produce any surplus, that the Ukrainian peasants will sow just enough to provide the needs of their families. At the same time the phantom of world famine which is threatening Europe, the reports that this year's European crop was but forty-five per cent of the pre-war average prove that the reduction of the area of cultivation has become a universal phenomenon, that the struggle for the production of grain must become as vital a task as the struggle for the production of manufactured goods, as the struggle for transport. The recovery of impaired agriculture must be included in the general plan for the economic regeneration of the country. We are preparing for commercial relations with Europe, and our grain is our gold, our best medium of exchange. To secure economic victory over the European capitalists we must prevent the disappearance of this gold and must increase its production. We must not tolerate parasitism, laziness, and inertia among the producers of grain, the peasants. For only thus can we conquer capitalism most strongly entrenched—among the small property owners of the rural districts.—*Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn*, June 11, 1920.

## Moscow in 1920

By DR. ALFONS GOLDSCHMIDT

(Continued from our last issue)

IN THE winter of 1919, during a lecture which I was giving at the Lessing College in Berlin, on various problems of Socialism, the question of dress under a socialist society came up. One lady asked anxiously: Would everybody dress alike? I reassured her. The fear of monotonous standardization is exaggerated, I told her. If she had no other objections against Socialism, she could become a Socialist today.

So far, there is no trace of a change in dress in Moscow. Of course, there is really no Socialism in Moscow; Socialism is only just beginning. Of Communism there is still less; there is a Communist Party, nothing more. But even in a finished Communist Society (if it could ever be called so) dress revolutions would hardly be characteristic. An extraordinary variety of color and style is even conceivable. However, the fate of the world will not depend on it.

At any rate, the Russian Revolution has not been a dress revolution, so far, although one of its results has been an increasing scarcity of clothing. For the army needs immense quantities of cloth, and there is a decided lack of tailors for civilian purposes. Cloth there is in abundance. One billion arshins are already on hand, and 700 million arshins could be finished in a short time. But the step from the yard to the finished suit is consider-

able. This problem is especially well-known to the Marxian student, who has tackled the Marxian theory of value. If the step from yard to suit were short and easy in Russia, the entire population could be dressed in new clothes.

I was told that the workers of Russia are better dressed now than they were in peace times. I had no means of comparison, as I did not see Moscow in peace time. I can bear witness, however, to the fact that the clothing of the workers whom I saw appeared to be far from hopeless. I never saw a single workman in rags. The workers in the factories, which I visited, were well dressed without exception. I saw immense numbers of workers in great organizations, especially meetings. Not one of them came in rags; neither did the women. The wife of a workman in Russia still wears the well-known head covering. She is dressed very simply, but her dress is neat and clean. The Revolution has accomplished a good deal in this respect.

The problem of clothing for the workers is first of all being taken care of by the system of clothing rations. In times of peace, the Moscow worker made an average daily wage of 79 kopecs. During the war the wage scale rose, prices rose also. The average was so insignificant, that good clothes were never even thought of. This was true also of

living quarters with even the most rudimentary sanitary necessities. The average wage barely sufficed for the rent of a cellar, for some inferior bread, and a bit of vodka. Even in peace time, the price of a room in the heart of Moscow was at least fifteen to twenty rubles per month, and that of a cellar about three to five rubles. A worker hardly ever afforded himself the luxury of a room above ground. He was glad to be able to live in a factory tenement. Today the housing problem is practically solved for the worker. There are still a great many difficulties, but the worker's housing troubles are a thing of the past. The contention that the worker has driven the bourgeois from his home is incorrect. As a rule families were allowed to remain in their homes, but were compelled to submit to the per capita housing regulation, and to take in their quota of homeless workers. I was in one "bourgeois" home in Moscow, whose space was entirely adequate. It was the old home of that particular family.

The wages of the Moscow workman of today (on an average of 6,000 to 7,000 rubles per month, without bonuses) would not cover the expense of new clothing. At least they would not suffice to acquire them in the open market where the price of a suit is about 50,000 to 60,000 rubles. The worker is dependent upon clothing rations. Of course, he is furnished with very few street clothes; working clothes must be the first concern in the official apportionment. These working clothes are made according to one standardized pattern. I saw several standard patterns in the Clothing Department of the Textile Trade in Moscow. But this is only a beginning. The official distribution is not universal as yet, by any means. The demands of the army eat up most of the necessities. For instance, when I was in Moscow I was told of a gigantic order of overcoats which had been filled for the army at the Polish front.

Clothing in the Soviet stores and bazaars is very cheap. But buying it is a troublesome affair. The way to such a piece of wearing apparel leads through miles of red tape, and even after a successful passage along this road one does not obtain the desired article at once. Women Soviet workers complained bitterly to me of the lack of clothing, and my women translators in Moscow begged me to give them clothing instead of money. Among other things, they took my bathrobe, which they intended to convert into flannel waists. They also suffered from a scarcity of stockings. One of my translators told me that she was forced to patch together two stockings to make one. Of course Russian women as a whole are extraordinarily clever with the needle. Most of them make their own clothes, and very often even their own shoes. To be sure, they are cloth shoes, the leather soles of which must be left to the shoemaker to supply.

The lack of knitted wear for hose, and the scarcity of dyes, has resulted in the most remarkable styles in some cases. For instance, many women wear white socks, which extend only a little way above the shoe tops. Otherwise the leg is naked.

This nakedness disturbs not a soul in Moscow, however, and occasions not the slightest erotic commotion, nor does it appear indecent. At first I thought it to be an old custom due to the summer heat, but was informed later that it was due to the scarcity of knitting materials.

There was no sign of a clothing famine in Moscow. Although there are beggars in rags, as in other cities, Moscow is far from being in tatters. To be sure, the question of how it is possible for a city with at least one and a quarter million inhabitants to be so well dressed in times like these goes unanswered. Not even the Russians in Moscow are able to answer it. Or they say simply: Life helps itself. Just as Moscow eats and looks well nourished, so also does it clothe itself.

Dress distinction in Moscow continues to exist. There is still carelessness, simplicity and luxury of dress. Ladies continue to arrive at the theater amid the soft swishing of silken gowns, sweet fragrance still breathes from delicate blouses, young dandies swarm daintily as before in elegant tailors' confections, or in bright Russian jackets. And as always, there are the industrious ones, unconcerned with raggedness or tatters. And there are the shabby and unambitious, who are neither pushing nor on the lookout for bargains, satisfied with anything. I saw unblushing trouser holes, unblushing coat fringes, and shoes from which the unblushing corns stared haughtily at an inquisitive world.

As for shoes; I have never seen in any other city such elegant foot gear as in Moscow; such elegant men's shoes, high shoes reaching well up over the calf of the leg, and especially elegant ladies' shoes, not quite so high. There is still much leather for uppers in Russia (I believe it is even permitted to export it), but there is a lack of sole leather, and yet these elegant shoes are well soled. I have seen most distracting Kirghiz boots, worn by ladies. I saw high shoes, low shoes, bright colored slippers, shoes with ribbons and shoes with rosettes, and patent leather shoes. The women of Moscow cannot complain of a shoe famine. Officially speaking, there is a serious lack of shoes, but the unofficial shoe situation is satisfactory. At least this was the case during my stay in Moscow. It goes without saying that there are exceptions, hardships and scarcities. Also I have seen shoes down at the heel and other shoe atrocities. But it cannot be said that Moscow is down at the heel any more than it is out at the elbow.

#### *Beggars*

One would think that a Socialist Society has no beggars, and that therefore begging would be unnecessary and prohibited. But Soviet Russia, the Soviet Russian people, are not a Socialist Society as yet. The Communist Party of Russia has done away with property rights in regard to the means of production, and has thus prepared the ground for Socialism. But it is a far cry from that point to an accomplished Socialism. That is why social insurance is not as successful as it

should be, and even if it functioned successfully, there would still be beggars in Moscow. For beggars beg from sheer laziness as well as from poverty and need. There are whole beggar families, who inherit their street corner along with their profession from generation to generation, just as the Paris speculators inherit their profession with their seats on the Bourse. There are very wealthy beggar families, and whole beggar dynasties, as well as beggar princes, beggar dukes, and beggar kings. It is very often quite a profitable calling, and so long as the profitable business opportunities are not completely done away with, so long we will have beggars. Soviet Russia had hardly the rudiments of a practical policy before the November Revolution, and admired the German official model, which was after all so far from admirable. It is no small matter to steer a practical social course in Russia. The program of the Communist Party in Russia says: "The Soviets have legally full and complete social maintenance, in all cases of incapacity to work, or loss of work, for all workers who are not exploiting the labor of others."

That is true, fundamentally true, and yet maintenance is not sufficient. For it is simply impossible so far to care for the workers as one would like. The maintenance will finally come up to the planned intention, but it cannot be done today. And even if it could be done, the beggars would not die out at once.

The beggars of Moscow are not like the beggars of other cities. At least not like the beggars of Western Europe. They are beggars with a semi-asiatic patience, at least. Beggars with a definite stand, who never leave their place; moving beggars, who weave back and forth between two fixed points, from morning till night; mandarin-beggars, who bow their heads before each passer-by; religious beggars who cross themselves incessantly; murmuring beggars, who whisper to themselves all day long, as though they were reciting an endless chapter of the Koran.

You sit in the Theater Square in Moscow. A beggar passes—a tall man, somewhat bent, a long, grey beard. His coat is shabby, torn, felt boots are on his feet, or only one foot is in a felt boot, the other in a dilapidated shoe. The right hand is missing. The stump of an arm is hidden by a sleeve. As he reaches your bench, he draws the sleeve back and holds the naked stump of an arm close to your face, mumbling the while. You give him a few Bolshevik rubles. He passes on, without changing his tempo, from bench to bench, everywhere mumbling and showing his stump of an arm. You think, now he is gone, for the day at least, finally gone. But you are wrong. A quarter of an hour, and he is back, repeating the same beggar performance. He never scolds, never becomes impatient if you give him nothing. He simply returns every quarter hour, and knows well that finally you will give him another ruble, or else the bench may have a new occupant.

A woman stands at the corner of the general post office, near the boulevard entrance, with her

head sunk low upon her breast. Opposite stands a church with a green dome. She is singing softly to herself, and bows incessantly like an automaton. You think she is praying. Perhaps she really is praying to God to make those who pass generous. At any rate praying and begging are all one to her. So she stands, for many hours, slowly moves her bowed head up and down, and mechanically extends her hand. Many pass by without giving, but now and then there is one who leaves the great stream of passers-by in order to give.

Women, their heads monotonously moving up and down, stand in front of the Iberian madonna, who stands guard at the Red Square. Women with palms outstretched, not without fervor—beggars women. When several ruble notes have accumulated, they vanish into the skirt pocket. One or two ruble notes remain as a kind of bait. They stir the emotions. They say, these rubles notes: You see, there are some kind hearts still; won't you be kind to us, too? They have stirred me again and again, these ruble notes, although my constant companion advised against it. For he was a rationalist, and a rationalist in Moscow gives nothing to beggars. Begging must be abolished, root and branch. If you give to beggars, they continue to beg, refuse to work while they are able-bodied, and when they are incapacitated, they will not take the trouble to obtain the necessary social insurance. I was acquainted with this theory from my university days. I used to defend it, I defend it still, but I violate my own principle. One should not violate one's own principles. When you go to Moscow do not give to the beggars.

Furthermore, there is the genteel beggar, a kind of society mendicant. This form of begging is abominable. They are usually not beggars from poverty, but from sheer laziness. Helping those who are willing to work, but who are temporarily in need, is not supporting beggars, it is a duty. If society is not yet able to take care of its people, our fellow men must come to our assistance. For society, even a beginning socialist society, is a beast. Genteel begging, however, is disgusting laziness, is turning human compassion to a profit, full of hypocrisy and brazen insolence. Such beggars should be thrown out of the house and the dogs sent after them, even though they may come with diamonds on their fingers. For such beggars often wear diamonds. They can afford it.

But there are also beggars in Moscow who are beggars by conviction; proud beggars, people who have lost everything, who have nothing, and yet who will not submit. People who once were great figures, people of position, people of brilliance. Not tinsel brilliance, but brilliance of diligence and application, brilliance of family or of daring. They sell their last possessions, refuse to take advantage of the parasite allowance, scorn to play the role of the obsequious government clerk, and beg.

One evening I saw, in front of a well preserved old house on the boulevard, a tall and stately old man in uniform. He only spoke to the well dressed



men and women. I inquired about this man, and was told that he was a former Czarist general turned beggar. Every one to whom he spoke must have given him no inconsiderable gift. I saw this man several weeks later, in the Theater Square. Again he only spoke to well dressed people. He did not address them with a servile air, with the air of a beggar. He begged just as one would exchange greetings with an acquaintance. He accepted the gift as a tribute, and always he received a gift. No one knew the exact details, but I thought to myself: Here is a man who begs, not from laziness, or from gentility, but from principle. A beggar from pride and from conviction. Many Czarist generals have put themselves at the disposal of the Soviet Government. Brussilov heads them all; he had been a kind of people's general. I believe they did this from conviction; not perhaps from communist conviction, but from patriotic conviction, because they think that the Russian Communists will save the country. But this general, this begging general, did not place himself at their disposal. He would rather beg.

I do not like people who are able to change front suddenly. I do not like dishonest people, opportunists, people with a turn-table heart. I know, too, what might be said against the begging general. But he struck me as a man.

#### *Churches and Chapels*

Moscow boasts forty times forty churches and chapels. Forty times forty says the Russian when he wants to signify a great number, when he would express their power, their variety, their teeming multitude. I do not know how many churches and chapels there are in Moscow. Perhaps there are more than 1,600—perhaps less. It really matters not at all. Every one who visits Moscow knows that it is a city of churches, a city bedomed and bespired, a city of a thousand church bells, a hundred thousand devotees, and ten thousand popes or more.

This is true even today. The churches and chapels are still standing. Many facades are crumbling. They lack the scrupulous care which they received under the Czarist papalism. Their walls have been gnawed a bit by the revolution. But still they stand, and few of them are closed. They stand in streets and corners, on stony hills, on city squares, surrounded by convent walls; they are everywhere. Their bells still call the faithful to prayer; here and there a devotee sits or stands on a roof, as on the roof of a minaret, semi-asiatic, careless and indolent, making an uncle of his God.

I saw chapels where prayers were said from morning till night; I saw churches which were empty during the day. There are still Eastern processions in Moscow, there are still churches and chapels where the images of the saints are fervently implored for miracles. There are still pictures and picture frames in these churches, heavy with gold and encrusted with many precious stones. No one knows exactly how these churches and their popes are being supported. But they are being

supported, in spite of the state, which has washed its hands of them.

However, the state is not satisfied with the separation of the church from the state, and the separation of the school from the church, but is making every effort to sever "the connection between the exploiting classes and the organization of religious propaganda, by means of a widespread organization whose task it is to enlighten and finally free the working masses with the help of scientific and anti-religious propaganda. Great care must be taken to avoid any injury to the sensitive feelings of the faithful, as such injury would only result in a strengthening of religious fanaticism." As may be seen, this is not tolerance, but a fight to the finish. It is not merely to be a separation from the church, but the church is to be fought tooth and nail. But the churches in Moscow seem to pay small heed to this fight, or to the posters of enlightenment, to the slurs against the old, decayed, pope-ridden regime, which so many Russians have fought long before the Bolsheviks; Leo Tolstoy first of all.

I have spoken of the Chapel of the Iberian Madonna in the Red Square. There the flickering light of candles, gold and precious stones mingle constantly, and prayers never cease, even at night. Here the most fervent miracle fetish of Moscow is centered, a fervor which reached a climax of religious jubilation when religious insignia on one of the towers of the Kremlin miraculously escaped the gunfire of the revolution. Often I have stood in front of this chapel with its small, time-worn, somewhat elevated, stone court, and its begging women standing guard. More people cross themselves in front of this chapel than anywhere in Moscow. Constantly one sees people passing these churches and crossing themselves, or standing still a moment and murmuring a prayer. The Revolution has not killed the church, or at least not yet. And there are a great many people in Moscow who predict a much longer life for the church than for the Revolution. There are still poor-boxes in these churches, by no means empty. The popes no longer strut confidently, it is no longer a majestic strutting, but they go about unmolested. I have seen laughing popes, popes praying in the streets, slinking popes, dirty popes, and even smartly dressed popes, priests such as the French novelists love to describe. I even saw a sort of Rasputin, a pope flaunting his peasant vigor, with high boots, immense black beard, and seductive eyes.

There is that wonderful Cathedral, with the great, golden dome, which absorbs the sun in the evening, and which expels it again during the day, which throws out fire that blinds and consumes. This church grows up out of a lovely landscape, its great square stones rising up free and powerful. It is a wonderful church, an inspiring church, even for those who do not worship the God of this church. When you walk along the wall of the Kremlin, look for this church; you will find it if you look for it in summer, on an evening full

of the warm gold of the evening sun, and the glowing tints of a hot Moscow sky, an evening that makes the heart restless and yet strangely quiet.

But the great marvel, the real marvel is the church of St. Basil. It is not a church, it is a phantasy, a mosaic of domes, an undreamed fairy tale, a riot of colors, a color illusion. It is hard to believe that a man, an architect can have built this church. It changes constantly, in the morning it is different from the evening, afternoon different from noon. If you approach it from the Moskva bridge, it looks like a great ship with many bulbous masts. If you come upon it from the Red Square it is like a castle made of toy blocks. It has bewitching little windows, gratings and crumbling corners of incredible antique charm. It has really no symmetry, and yet it is an organism. It looks as though it were built piecemeal, and yet it is a harmonious whole. Sometimes it seems a massive heap, and again delicately scaled. Sometimes it looks large, sometimes small. It moves the soul, it charms, it shocks the eye, it is a delusion. It is the most wonderful thing that I have ever seen; the entire forest of domes of the eternal Kremlin fades out before this church. No one visited it, an old scaffolding embraced one of its towers, when I was in Moscow. I did not see the interior, and yet I saw it, because I saw the outside. It is an epic, a small lyric poem, a ballad, a toy, it is a mother and a fresh young girl, it is all that your heart desires. If you do not go to Moscow to look at the beginning of Socialism, go there and look at the church of St. Basil.

They say that an architect under Ivan the Terrible built this church, and that the Terrible Ivan had killed the builder, to prevent his building another church of equal wonder and beauty. That is what they told me. I don't know how true it is, but it is possible.

#### *The Great Opera House*

When the English delegation arrived in Moscow I received an invitation from the Bureau of the Third Internationale to attend the Grand Opera, an opera with ballet. They were giving Prince Igor, an opera whose music my friends praised very highly. All my friends tell me that I know nothing about music. For I hate opera, and I am quite frank in saying so to my friends. I wonder at those who can enjoy the opera, who are able to hear and to see at the same time. It is impossible for me to watch a dramatic performance, and at the same time hear the orchestra. I can not get over that conflict. There is only one opera whose music takes hold of me to such an extent that I can bear the dramatic action: *Carmen*. Read Tolstoy's criticism of Wagner's *Rheingold*\*. That is my criticism too. It leaves me untouched.

Hence the opera, Prince Igor, was of no importance whatever to me. It was the audience which drew me to the theatre. A new audience. The

\* This criticism, which differs considerably from that of most musical persons, will be found in Tolstoy's book, "What is Art?" (1897).—*Editor*, SOVIET RUSSIA.

six gigantic rows up to the very top abundantly sprinkled with the proletariat. The parquet almost entirely filled with workers, in the boxes many workers. There was a sprinkling of Red soldiers. Also Soviet women secretaries, Soviet officials, women officials. Any one wishing to go to the theatre must be organized, else he receives no ticket. For instance, tickets are issued by trade unions. Of course, not all theatres in Moscow are city theatres or people's theatres. The Korsh Theatre, for instance, where I saw a most horrible play, is still a kind of private theatre. In this theatre there is no trace of a proletarian influence. Nor in the Great Opera House, where the stage is still working with its old material, is a proletarian influence to be noticed, although it is patronized mainly by the proletariat. There is no trace so far of a new art, an art of the people, of a socialist art, or hardly a trace.

But the audience, such an audience! Today it is made up of proletarian children, thousands of children, dressed in white from tip to toe, from the parquet to the very topmost gallery. Childish awe, childish whispering and applause from little hands. A new world is in the making here. This is the nursing future, drinking its fill, this is flame and fire, the great hope of Russia.

Then again they are trades organizations, an audience still colored by the past. But always it is a public made up from the ranks below, a proletarian foundation, a proletarian majority, working men, working women.

Trotsky had arrived in Moscow from the Polish front, in order to receive the English, to attend to parades and to war affairs. The public was quieted with difficulty. It stood up, it shouted, it went mad with applause when Trotsky appeared in his box. He bowed as he seated himself near the railing, with Mrs. Snowden, the coldly intelligent, wet-blanket-like English woman, at his right, and the remaining English delegates ranged to the right and left. With a gallant bow to the English lady, who was only half a comrade, he took his seat. A gallant bow, for there are such things even in Soviet Russia. For almost a quarter hour the people continued their ovation to Trotsky.

The performance was sumptuous. It was the play of a bourgeois composer, played before red draperies and red minds. Enjoyed with enthusiasm and great applause. It was a touching flame to flare up for this opera, which has so little fire, which is so full of yearning, of melancholy and sentimental love. But it is Russian, and the artist, the singer, the actor is loved in Moscow still. He is called again and again, he beams, he needs applause. That is true everywhere, but especially is it true in Russia, it is more true than ever before. I believe that it is even more so in Soviet Russia than it was in Czarist Russia. For art finds new receptive grounds here, the most delicate appreciation, a promise of fruitfulness never dreamed of before. Unfortunately it is still the

old art, representative art, academic art, silly art, and not an art of the people.

I did not come to see Prince Igor, I came to see the public, and the ballet. After a period of hard scientific work I wanted to see a Russian Ballet: Nizhinskis, Pavlovas, butterflies, yellow wagtails (a la Kerr), humming birds (a la Kerr). They gave us a savagely sumptuous women's scene, with heavy animal skins, richly embroidered cushions, and inconceivably beautiful Russian costumes; with brocades, semi-oriental slippers, rug fantasies, tent mysteries. Katherine Geltzer appeared; she is forty-eight; forty-eight, and a vigorous fawn, fleet-limbed, with firm white flesh, unspeakably graceful. Wonderful muscles on the limbs of a Diana. Little covering. She appeared and the house stormed. She danced little. She made long bounding leaps like a setter, she crouched down like a shamefaced peasant girl, she strode majestically like a queen. She is madly beloved in Moscow. Every workman knows Katherine. She is fragrant with perfume, she wears rings, she is fashionable as always. She is a ballerina for the proletariat too. She dances happily, she grows happy with her dance, joy flings her high as if caught by the wind, she is a sprite, she turns her toe upon your heart, she whirls herself into your soul, she is a great artist, at forty-

eight. A fawn—at forty-eight. With the years of a grandmother and yet a fawn.

It was fearfully hot in the theatre. But every one remained to the very last tone. And then came the wonder, the surprise, the thing that did not belong to the play at all, the proletarian thing. For now it was no longer the stage who was singing, it was not alone the orchestra, the people were singing. They stood singing, they left singing, they crowded singing through the exits. They marched down the stairs singing. The house sang from the gallery to the pit. The song rose up, the song grew, the song threatened, swore, pounded, that proletarian song, that song of humanity, the song made up of awkward words, that uncouth, that fighting song, that primitive, rallying, uniting song:

Arise ye pris'ners of starvation!  
Arise ye wretched of the earth,  
For justice thunders condemnation,  
A better world's in birth.

No more tradition's chains shall bind us,  
Arise, ye slaves! No more in thrall!  
The earth shall rise on new foundations,  
We have been naught, we shall be all.

'Tis the final conflict,  
Let each stand in his place,  
The International Party  
Shall be the Human Race.

## Military Review

By LT.-COL. B. ROUSTAM BEK

**T**HE readiness of the Soviet Army to meet the coming winter campaign on the Western Front produced a decisive effect upon the Polish policy towards Russia.

The Polish General Staff, in spite of all its bellicose sentiments against the Bolsheviki, has at last realized that Trotsky is right in his declaration that the whole Russian nation is ready for new sacrifices, and that the Red Army is strong and vigorous enough to continue the war.

The Polish victory over the Soviet forces which tried to capture Warsaw was greatly exaggerated, and now we can see that the Russians have finally won the war against the Poles strategically in spite of the fact that they lost their last battle tactically.

Soviet Russia fought imperialistic Poland in order to obtain a suitable peace. This the Soviet Government openly declared at the time when in March, 1920, the Poles so treacherously attacked the weak Red forces, and peace negotiations were so abruptly broken off by Pilsudski. Let us recall the declaration of the military leader of the Polish army, that Poland would never make peace with Russia unless the Soviet Government were dismembered.

Therefore, Polish strategy had to carry out the policy fixed by the Polish Government, namely,—to defeat the Red Army, thus opening the gates of Moscow, and by force of arms, and with the support of the counter-revolution, to put an end to Bolshevik rule in the Russian Republic.

The policy of the Soviets was far different. The Russian Soviet Government never thought of dismembering Poland. The Soviet peace delegates on several occasions met with the Poles in order to come to a possible understanding. The Russian policy toward Poland never was based on the policy of conquest and annexation of Polish territory. On the contrary, Russia at first adopted the most peaceful methods of forcing the Polish Government to withdraw its troops from occupied Russian and Ukrainian territory. When it became clear that it was impossible to reason with the aggressive Polish leaders, the Soviets prepared to meet any possible surprise on the western frontier of the Republic, and began to concentrate their forces in the west only when the Poles had completed the concentration of their military forces and unexpectedly attacked the Russians.

Summing up all that has happened since March, 1920, we come to the conclusion that Soviet Russia attained its political and strategical aim during the Polish war. Soviet Russia won peace, and won it at the most important moment, when her southern part was seriously threatened by counter-revolution supported by the capitalistic coalition of the world. Polish strategy, on the contrary, failed to accomplish the gigantic political plan concocted in Paris.

The efforts of our enemies to create a powerful military alliance of the Scandinavian states, Baltic republics, Lithuania, and Rumania, failed com-



pletely. The moral and material support of the Allies, and the counter-revolutionary movement of Baron Wrangel, to a certain extent, only helped the Polish shlakhta to exist longer than would have been the case if Poland had been left to her own fate. With great fear and prejudice the Polish political leaders approached the new Russian adventurer Wrangel. They knew very well that each success of the Polish army over the Bolsheviks was also a victory for Wrangel, that such victories were very dangerous not only for the Polish shlakhta but for the very existence of Poland as an independent state.

In reality a victorious Wrangel would have been more dangerous to the Poles than was Denikin, whose defeat was partially due to the obstinate neutrality of Poland at that time. But in spite of realizing the danger of reestablishing a strong monarchical Russia, the Poles, thanks to military circumstances and, to a great extent, to the insistence of their French advisers, were forced to enter into an alliance with the Crimean baron, who, after all, supported them at the most critical moment. Let us not overlook the fact that Wrangel began his active offensive at the time of the recent attack of the Soviet Army against Warsaw.

This dangerous alliance of Poland with one of the worst Russian reactionaries produced a very strong effect on some small European states, which in spite of the alleged collapse of the Red armies, not only did not join the Poles in their campaign against Soviet Russia, but hastened to establish friendly relations with the latter. This was the case with Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland. Rumania, holding Bessarabia, a part of the late Russian empire, also looked suspiciously on the Wrangel-Polish cooperation, and remained neutral in spite of all efforts of Polish and Allied diplomats to force her to attack Soviet Russia. Had the capitalistic coalition succeeded in enticing all these nations into a war with Soviet Russia, there is no doubt that Wrangel would have reached Moscow, and the old regime, with all its terrible consequences for the states formerly constituting the Czarism of Russia would have been established. France and the other capitalistic supporters of Poland, in case of a decisive Wrangel victory over the Soviets, would undoubtedly have deserted the Polish shlakhta, leaving Poland to her own destiny. France, first of all, needs a strong military and financial Russia, a Russia that will repay all the debts of the Czars. In reality, what does Poland alone mean for France? Poor, burdened with debts, with an unstable government on the eve of an unavoidable political crisis and social revolution, exhausted by war, such a Poland, with Russia hostile, would never be a support for France in case of the restoration of German militarism. The real aim of France is to strengthen Russian counter-revolution, and the Poles, finally understanding the real aim of their protectors, have rejected all further military assistance, preferring peace with the Bolsheviks to the danger from

Wrangel's victory.

Therefore, unable to defeat the Russian army in the field, and to overthrow the Soviet Government, driven from the territory of the Soviet Republic by the force of the Red Army, the Poles are now forced to sign an armistice, and to enter into peace negotiations with the representatives of the Soviet Government, leaving their ally Wrangel to his own fate, namely, to complete destruction.

Can such a situation be considered a victorious end of war for the Polish shlakhta?

The victors, politically as well as strategically, are the Russian Soviets. Never was the Soviet Government so strong and stable as at this moment; never was the Red Army so enthusiastic and ready to fight the foe as it is now. The Russian dash on Warsaw, though a failure from a tactical standpoint, brought the Russian people to a great strategical victory—to peace with Poland. Had the Red Army occupied Warsaw, the war with Poland would have been prolonged, and the Russians would perhaps have been forced to move their armies farther to the west, thus complicating the gloomy political situation in Europe. The set-back of the Red Army prevented this dangerous movement, and there came the possibility of stopping the war. Now both belligerents are frankly seeking peace, and peace must come. Even the reactionary bandits understand the real situation of the war and are deserting Wrangel. Only a few days ago, it was reported that the famous Petlura captain, the leader of the Ukrainian nationalists, Makhno, succeeded in joining the advance of Wrangel's cavalry twenty-five miles south of Yekaterinoslav, and that these united bands were moving on Kharkev.

According to the *Associated Press*, on the following day, Kharkev, this very important center in South Russia, was captured by Wrangel. To determine the truth of such news, it is sufficient to look at the map; Kharkev is situated 120 miles northeast of Yekaterinoslav.

After having carefully studied the situation on the Crimean front, I consider that all the news referring to the fall of Kharkev and to the alleged danger to Odessa and Kiev, is nothing more than the usual fabricated stuff of the capitalist press agencies and is not even worthy of discussion. But the important fact is this: that Makhno, according to a dispatch published in the American press on October 7, has left Wrangel and joined the Bolsheviks. Now it becomes clear that under such circumstances, it is quite possible that Makhno entered Kharkev with his troops.

This extraordinary Ukrainian adventurer changed sides on several occasions during the civil war in Russia. First, with the Bolsheviks, he fought the Germans, then he joined Denikin against them, and at the most critical moment of Denikin's retreat, after his defeat at Orel, he, together with Petlura, betrayed their ally, attacking his left flank and his rear, thus aiding the Reds to finish Denikin's army.

During the Polish campaign, Petlura, as is known, led the Ukrainian nationalists and the Poles, while Makhno stood at the head of the so-called insurgent parties. These parties, mostly recruited from rich peasants ("fists") and Cossack landlords who had lost their property to the poor peasantry, were armed by Wrangel and financially supported by him. The most important of these bands are led by the very well-known bandits, Yazenko, Savchenko, Grishin, and Prokhan, whose names are inscribed with the blood of innocent victims in the history of the Russian Revolution.

The forces of Makhno are not numerous. He had under his command about 30,000 horsemen divided into many small parties which were instructed not to come in contact with the Red Army. On the contrary, they had to raid behind the battle front of the Soviet forces, and to penetrate, as far as possible, in the rear of the Reds. Not being in immediate danger, they traveled from one village to another, distributing printed pamphlets and manifestos printed by Wrangel. The main idea of such raids was to stir up the peasants of South Russia, as well as the Don Cossacks, against the Soviets. But as far as we can see, this plan failed completely. Makhno himself realized that, in case of peace with Poland, it would be an easy task for the Reds to put an end to the existence of Wrangel's army, and being a practical man, he again joined the side which is destined to win.

This last step of Makhno's, from a strategical point of view, is very important. Once more the left flank of the reactionary army is absolutely open for a counter-attack of the Reds, and a part of its rear is also threatened. On the other hand, the name of Makhno is very popular among the Ukrainian nationalists, and especially among the insurgents, and his decision to join the Bolsheviki will certainly produce a great moral impression upon the Ukrainian reactionaries.

Finally, our enemy in the south is confronted with precisely the same situation in which Denikin found himself a year ago.

Such deplorable conditions of Wrangel's armed bands produced great anxiety in Paris, and General Weygand, the famous "savior" of Warsaw, was ordered to proceed to the South Russian front immediately, in order to take supreme command of Wrangel's forces.

But even the reactionary press of France is suspiciously watching developments in South Russia. *Le Matin*, for instance, is bitterly attacking England for her treacherous Russian policy, and energetically denies that the French fleet intends to attack Black Sea ports, although such a discovery was recently made by the Revolutionary Field Staff of the Red Army.

The approaching peace of Poland with Soviet Russia was met by French military experts with great dissatisfaction, and according to despatches from Paris on October 7 (*The Evening Post*), military circles in France "are concerned over the effect the conclusion of an armistice between Rus-

sia and Poland will have on the campaign of General Baron Wrangel in South Russia. They assert there is no doubt that the Bolsheviki will at once send reinforcements to the Crimean front." The most remarkable part of the report in the French press is that it denies that "the Soviet regime is nearing its end; for, despite the gravity of economic conditions, certain gains of the revolution have been consolidated.

Thus, one of the most irreconcilable of the enemies of Soviet Russia has begun to recognize the failure of its fruitless adventure. Then why continue these useless experiments? Would it not be better to keep hands off Russia, and at last allow her alone to settle with the enemies at home?

### THE GRAVE-DIGGERS OF WHITE POLAND

By KARL RADEK

White Guard Poland is fighting to the death. She realizes this fact, and asks herself if ruin, which she is experiencing, and from which there is hardly any escape, is unavoidable? She points her finger at the Commander-in-Chief of the army, Marshal Joseph Pilsudski, as upon the person guilty of having brought this catastrophe upon Poland, and reproaches him with having followed a romantic illusion, the dismemberment of Russia, and the liberation of the border countries, and for the sake of this illusion having refused a favorable peace.

The White Guardist press bases its similar assertions simply upon facts commonly known, facts of which the documents made public in the "Red Book" of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, speak. But there are documents which compromise White Poland even more than do the documents which are to be found in the "Red Book".

We have reference to the negotiations carried on in October of the past year in the name of the Soviet Government by General Machlowski, and Captain Ignace Berner, the representative and personal friend of Joseph Pilsudski, in the town of Miklashevichi. Machlowski was at that time in the territory occupied by Poland, attending a formal conference dealing with the affairs of the Red Cross. Independently of these conferences, and under their cover, political conferences were also carried on.

When Captain Berner was reproached with the fact that the Poles were directly aiding Denikin and Yudenich in invading Russia, and that the latter, in case of victory, would seize independent Poland, Berner tried to prove, by analyzing the military situation, that, in their advance upon the southwestern front, the Poles were not moving against Soviet Russia, but on the contrary, against Denikin. He explained that, despite the fact that the Poles had been compelled by the Allies to negotiate with Denikin, these negotiations were merely carried on for the sake of appearances; and as to the matter of taking joint action with Denikin, that was out of the question. He pointed out the line which the Polish army would not cross, if the



Soviet Government would abandon the revolutionary propaganda on the Polish front. This line corresponds precisely to the line which the Soviet Government had officially promised not to cross, on January 28, 1920.

Captain Berner assumed a majestic mien. He asserted that it was not Pilsudski's purpose to treat with the Soviet Government; he dictated the front line. But General Machlowski was perfectly right in ignoring the knightly and commanding posturings of Pilsudski's representative, because these attitudes were assumed to cover up a very ugly fact—the fact that Pilsudski had sold us to Denikin and the Allies.

The Allies did not create the Polish army in order to have Marshal Pilsudski clank his sword, single-handed, but in order that the White Guardist Polish army, cooperating with the White Guardist Russian armies, should destroy Soviet Russia. The Polish bourgeoisie, led by the National Democrats, were for an alliance with Denikin, whose imperialist ambitions against Poland they hoped to render harmless, with the help of the Allies.

Pilsudski, like any other narrow provincial, hoped for the death of Russia, but feared the method that would lead thereto, and shrank from an alliance with the Russian White Guard. He sought the aid of the Allies, but wished to be more than their vassal—he sought to carry on an independent policy. Being the narrowly provincial nationalist that he was, he hated Denikin no less than Soviet Russia, out of hatred of everything Russian. Despite the fact that he was in the power of the Allies, and could not exist for a day without their aid, he knew, nevertheless, from the time when he had been a Socialist, that the Allies were not to be trusted. As a result of this distrust of the Allies, as well as of Denikin, he sold out both the Allies and Denikin to Soviet Russia. He not only allowed Russia to rest, because she was threatened with grave danger, but went so far as to enter into a military treaty, with reference to the front line fixed by her, which was directed against Denikin and the Allies. And it is because he is a narrow provincial that he was unable to keep consistently to a fixed course of action. Pilsudski was only capable of betraying the Allies and Denikin, but he was incapable of reaping the fruits of his betrayal.

When Machlowski proposed to Pilsudski the drawing up of a treaty of peace, Russia was in the direst possible straits, all her powers were strained to the utmost to vanquish Denikin. But Pilsudski could not make up his mind to make peace with Russia, for despite the fact that he did not trust the Allies, and in fact had betrayed them, he nevertheless and at the same time feared, as befitted the provincial that he was, the wrath of the Allies. Pilsudski declined to make peace with Russia.

When the Allies lifted the blockade of Russia, and began to negotiate with Litvinov, only then did this provincial in the coat-of-mail of the Polish Commander-in-Chief decide to treat with Russia. Pilsudski took the typically adventurous path—

he tried "corriger la fortune"; with the view that the hesitancy of the Soviet Government to enter into peace negotiations at Borissov meant nothing less than refusal to sign the peace treaty under the command of the cannons of Pilsudski, he determined to surprise the Soviet Government by an invasion of Ukraine.

This narrow provincial, Pilsudski, swinging from the extreme of pessimism to the extreme of optimism, was convinced that the Soviet Government was made of the same metal, and that having once learned to know the power of the Polish army in battle, it would not try it again. Like the provincial he was, Pilsudski was incapable of weighing and judging the relative strength of the two nations; he did not perceive that in case of a Russian-Polish war, after the Denikin adventure had failed, the lapse of time would operate in Russia's favor; he did not take into account the international situation, which had not permitted the Allies to support Poland in her war with Russia with the same energy they had given to the support of Denikin and Yudenich.

#### RUSSO-RUMANIAN NEGOTIATIONS

BUCHAREST, August 12 (*Damon*).—The Rumanian Government has answered the note of the Soviet Government concerning peace proposals as follows: Rumania is not in a state of war with Russia and, therefore, can not begin any peace negotiations for the purpose of terminating a war which has not been waged. Inasmuch as a state of peace actually exists between Rumania and Russia, this fact needs only to be recognized, which can be done between their governments by means of plenipotentiaries.—From *Die Rote Fahne*, Vienna, August 15, 1920.

#### RUSSIAN-LATVIAN TREATY OF PEACE IN THE NEXT ISSUE OF "SOVIET RUSSIA"

Complete peace treaty translated from the Latvian text. A study of this treaty will show the actual peaceful aims of the Soviet Government towards its neighbors, its desire to right the wrongs committed by the Czarist regime, and even more, its regard for the interests of the broad masses of the people in the country with which the treaty is made.

SOVIET RUSSIA will also publish the Lithuanian peace treaty in the near future.

## SOVIET RUSSIA

*Official Organ of the*

RUSSIAN SOVIET GOVERNMENT BUREAU  
110 West 40th Street New York, N. Y.



This weekly will print articles by members of the Russian Soviet Government Bureau as well as by friends and supporters of Soviet Russia. Full responsibility is assumed by the Bureau only for unsigned articles. Manuscripts are not solicited; if sent in, their return is not promised.

**A**NOTHER long news item of October 2 from Washington, telling about what are the present objects of the "attention of diplomatic observers", appears in the *New York Times* of October 3. The subject is the refusal of the Chinese Government to continue to pay the Boxer indemnity to the representatives in China of the no longer existing Russian Czarist Government. What the "diplomatic observers" say to the *Times* on their fears of the consequences of such discontinuation of payments, is the subject of the following paragraph:

"For some time there has been reason to expect that China would attempt to use the temporary disability of Russia to forcibly repudiate the international obligations into which she entered with the government of the late Czar. The coup that has just been executed, however, has come rather suddenly and is occasioning the more concern because it affects directly one of the basic principles on which the development and welfare of European and American activities in China are founded—the so-called right of extra-territoriality, or, as it is sometimes called, the capitulations."

Now, although this "right," as the "diplomatic observers" go on to say, "has been established gradually by consecutive treaties between all the white nations and China," it is a "right" which flies directly in the face of any pretense of self-determination of nations, for, as the "diplomatic observers" put it, it provides that:

"Subjects of European powers and American citizens, as well as European and American corporations and institutions doing business or engaged in trade with China, are exempt from the direct application of Chinese law and from the administration of Chinese officials."

This means that the Chinese cannot rule their own country, but must consult foreign governments instead of being permitted to enforce their own laws.

Should the Chinese declare their unwillingness to allow the capitulations to remain in force, the diplomatic informants of the *Times* would be beset by the following fears:

"Thus such a course by China would be a new blow at the principle of the inviolability of treaties and would exemplify anew the old German maxim that *Might makes Right*. Above all else it is felt here to be essential that the principle be well established that treaties can be changed only after proper reconsideration and

agreement by all parties, and that if one party to an international compact is temporarily prostrate it is the duty of the community of nations to uphold the principle of inviolability of the status quo. There are friends of the League of Nations in Washington who are saying emphatically how different the situation would be if the league were at hand, with American participation, as an instrument to adjust international troubles in the Orient."

Of course, China lay prostrate when the capitulations were forced upon her, but she must respect the dead Czarism when the Soviet Government of Russia, the only Russian Government in existence, and the only government therefore that has any right to represent Russia in China, publicly denounces the Czarist concessions and renounces any desire to profit by the past military weakness of China. The morality that the Western powers appear to oppose to the alleged principle of "Might makes Right", is that it is right to despoil a prostrate colony or an incipient proletarian state, but wrong to withdraw from an effete tyranny capitulations imposed by force by that tyranny. For "diplomatic observers" to object to China's using the "Might makes Right" principle on Western nations is a rather sad joke.

And let us not forget the Boxer indemnity itself. By the treaty of September 7, 1901, the Chinese Government, after foreign troops had put down the Boxer uprising, and after Chinese mandarins had been legally sentenced to commit suicide in the presence of foreign troops, in the streets of Peking, the indemnity to be paid to the United States, France, Germany, England, and Russia, which had been fixed at 450,000,000 taels, was divided into thirty successive annual instalments, of which each of the powers mentioned was to receive an equal share. This humiliation Czarist Russia permitted China to bear, but Soviet Russia has declared its unwillingness to accept this money. We may note, in passing, that the United States Government had (in 1908) already taken similar action, and thus taken an important step toward gaining the friendship of the Chinese people. But how do the diplomatic informants of the *Times* greet the new Russian proposal to treat China as an aggregation of human beings? Let us quote:

"China's decision is closely connected, in the opinion of informed Washington observers, with the renewed and energetic activities of the Bolshevik delegates in China, who with fresh vigor are evidently carrying out the program announced as long ago as April, soon after the Kolchak collapse brought Bolshevik power into contact with the very frontiers of China. At that time a note, which may soon assume historic importance, was addressed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs at Peking, to the Chinese people and to the Governors of East and West China, by Janson, Bolshevik plenipotentiary of Foreign Affairs in the Far East. Informing the Chinese people of the approach of the Red Army, Janson, as envoy of Lenin, called upon the Chinese people to join hands with the Russian proletarian forces to throw off the "hated yoke" which foreign capital and "imperialistic government" had imposed on the Chinese people in order to exploit them." The Soviet Government, on its side, proposed to pay for the affiliation of the Chinese, the price of repudiation of all the treaties, including the agreement covering the Chinese Eastern Railway, which had been concluded between Russia and China."



In other words, when a proletarian government rights an ancient wrong, it is "paying a price for the affiliation of the Chinese," while the honorable Czarist Government was no doubt unwilling to "bribe" the Chinese people in this way. It makes a great difference "whose dog is bit," and it will be a long time before American newspapers apply to proletarian governments the yardstick with which other institutions are measured. We are surprised the *New York Times* should not go so far as to permit its informants to tell it that the United States Government, when it remitted the payments on the Boxer indemnity in 1908, was "bribing" the Chinese people, or "paying a price" for some concession. It would be no more ridiculous than the misrepresentation of which the *Times* is guilty with regard to Soviet Russia's attitude toward China.

\* \* \*

VICENTE BLASCO IBANEZ is a Spanish writer known in his own country and much better known in the United States. When he turned from the production of novels of Spanish peasant-life, such as *Barraca*, *La Catedral*, *La Bodega*, and other works dealing with things he knew, to the creation of *Los Cuatro Ginetes del Apocalipsis*, and other even less literary labors in the service of French and English propaganda in Spain and in Spanish-America, his reputation perforce rose in France, England, and America, while it somewhat declined in Spain. We have not read the illustrious journalist's remarks on the Mexican Revolution of 1920, but an article from his pen in the *New York Times* of September 26, entitled "Bolshevism as a Tyranny," has come to our notice. Mr. Ibanez in this article says he has certain friends, and they are represented by him in the course of his remarks—chiefly quotations from these friends—as having misinformed and lied to him to a rather unfortunate degree. These friends seem, some of them, to be former Russian revolutionists who turned their backs on the Revolution as soon as it became a reality, and Mr. Ibanez expresses some surprise that these men should now be "persecuted" in Soviet Russia. Some of these gentlemen live in Paris because there is freedom of thought in that city! One of them, doubtless practicing the "new freedom" of thought, told Mr. Ibanez, who quotes his remarks as if approving them, that "Lenin is a Czar without the crown and without the scrupulous sense of responsibility of the old emperors." So Mr. Ibanez also is willing to have the *New York Times* pay him for aiding in the rehabilitation of Czarism! And they used to tell us Mr. Ibanez had begun as some sort of a radical in Spain.

With some understanding of the recent course of European history, Mr. Ibanez writes a few paragraphs, of which we quote three, on the Second Internationale:

As the reader knows, there now exist two "Internationals", the Third, which met in Moscow and is composed of adherents of Bolshevism, and the Second, which met recently at Geneva, and is composed of

what people think of as the "Common Sense Socialists", but whom Lenin refers to as the Opportunists.

The Second International always does everything "in theory". That is why it is inferior, as an organization, to the International of Moscow. In 1914 the Second International expressed itself as opposed to the war "in theory". It does not want a Soviet world, but it will do nothing to prevent such a catastrophe from taking place.

The Second International is an assemblage of celebrated nonentities, men who are famous the world over, but have no power anywhere.

It would be far from us to deny the accidental hit Mr. Ibanez makes when he alludes to persons whose principles are at variance with their practices as nonentities, but we consider it unfortunate, from his standpoint, that he should at once continue with a quotation from one of his nonentities in support of his hope that Soviet Russia may be going to the "demnition bow-wows."

Mr. Vandervelde, the illustrious Belgian Socialist, uttered some undeniable truths in his speech to the congress.

Said he: "Russian Bolshevism is not the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the dictatorship of a small group of individuals resting on bayonets and machine guns. The work of the Soviets will be simply that of preparing for the restoration of the Czars."

\* \* \*

CZAR NICHOLAS II OF RUSSIA was considered in the editorial columns of American newspapers during his lifetime as a tyrant, the head of an undemocratic and cruelly autocratic government. But now that all the newspaper editors have been told that they must fight "Bolshevism" to the last drop of that fluid which in other men would be called blood, the former exaggerations of the personal wickedness of the Czar are beginning to be replaced by a kindly respect for his "gentlemanly" qualities, and no doubt the newspapers will soon have placed him on a pedestal fully as high as that to which they elevated William II of Germany on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his accession. We are informed by persons who read the newspapers carefully that the details of the execution of the Czar by a certain Soviet commissar—who, by the way, was later executed by the Soviet Government for this alleged and unauthorized act—are again being paraded before the public, of course with many indications of the truly noble nature of the poor maltreated sovereign. If any of our readers have seen these accounts, and if the details should have represented the act as one of unparalleled cruelty, they should not forget that the whole business is the report of a Commission instituted by Kolchak to study the manner of the taking-off of Kolchak's illustrious rival (for there can be little doubt that there would have been many questions requiring heated discussion between the Little Father and the Supreme Ruler, had both remained alive and in control of a sufficient number of "subjects" for mutual mobilization)—and perhaps Kolchak commissions, like Kolchak propaganda organs in America, have not always told the truth.

## Chicherin's Note to Baron Avezzana

October 4, 1920.

*The following letter has been sent by the Russian Soviet Representative in the United States to the Italian Ambassador in the United States:*

His Excellency, Baron Camillo Romano Avezzana,  
Washington, D. C.

Excellency:

I am instructed by the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of my Government to transmit to you his despatch in reply to the note of the Secretary of State, Bainbridge Colby, addressed to you under date of August 10, 1920. The despatch of the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, George Chicherin, follows:

"Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby's note to the Italian Ambassador contains an attack upon Soviet Russia's policy and her political system. Soviet Russia cannot leave unheeded these false and malicious accusations of a character quite unusual in diplomacy, and desires to bring them before the bar of public opinion.

"The American Government bases its objections to the policy of the British and Italian Governments on the principle of the territorial integrity of the former Russian Empire and would enter into friendly relations and intercourse only with such a Russian Government as would not be a Soviet Government. The only exceptions made by Mr. Colby from the principle of the territorial inviolability of the former Russian Empire are Poland, Finland, and Armenia. The demand for independence of those nations is considered by him as legal, inasmuch as they were annexed to Russia by force, wherefore their secession does not infringe Russia's territorial sovereignty. Mr. Colby imagines that the other oppressed nationalities of Czarist Russia were not annexed by force, and that the aspirations of the Georgian, Azerbaijan, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and Ukrainian peoples for independence in the form of either secession or state sovereignty and federation with Russia are illegal. The discrimination on the part of the American Government in favor of some of these nationalities as against the others is unintelligible, being probably due to lack of information concerning national conditions in Eastern Europe. The condition precedent for Mr. Colby's friendship towards Russia is that her government should not be a Soviet Government. As a matter of fact any other government at present would be a bourgeois or capitalist government, which in view of the present economic unity of the world, would mean a government identified with the interests of the world's dominating financial groups. The most powerful among the latter, as a consequence of the world war, are the North American financial groups. The condition upon which Mr. Colby would extend American friendship to Russia is therefore that her regime should be such as to permit of the domination of the American financial groups in Russia. Mr.

Colby displays in his note a strong friendly feeling towards the Russian Government of 1917, i. e. towards that Russian Government which coerced Russia's working masses to bleed on the side of the allied and associated powers in the world war which was fought for the interests of financial capital; of that Russian Government which under the cloak of a pretended democratic regime supported the domination of the bourgeoisie in Russia, i. e. of the capitalist system and in the last resort the domination of the world's leading financial interests over Russia. As far back as 1905, when the weakness of Czarist Russia and her dependence on the western financial interests for the first time became clear, Maximilian Harden wrote that Russia was in fact a colonial land which must be governed in a business-like manner by commercial agents and clerks of business firms. This idea, so cynically avowed by Harden, in reality underlay all those plans which were elaborated by the Entente during the period of the intervention against Russia's Soviet system, and likewise explains the hostility towards Soviet Russia of the interests Mr. Colby speaks for. At the same time it must be noted that Mr. Colby, in his desire to maintain the integrity of the Czarist territory, not merely dissents from Britain's policy, but is actually engaged in a struggle against her policy. Obviously the groups he represents perceive that other, viz., British, interests have established themselves in the new states separated from Russia, and Mr. Colby sees no other way of combating those interests than to abolish the independence of these states. Quite different from this policy of maintaining the integrity of the Czarist territory with the object of establishing on this territory the domination of foreign financial interests, and quite different, on the other hand, from the more successful policy of establishing the domination of those interests in the new bourgeois border states, quite different from both, is Soviet Russia's policy,—the policy of complete abolition of the exploitation of the workers by the former owners of the means of production, which is the basis of the Soviet system. The Soviet Government unwaveringly upholds the right of national self-determination of the working people of every nationality, including the right of secession and of forming separate states. This is the cornerstone on which it wishes to establish friendly relations with the new border states. This system, represented by the Soviet Government, under which the working masses govern themselves and determine their own fate, is the only present day challenge to the domination of the exploiting interests of the leading groups of world's capital, foremost of all the American groups; this is why Mr. Colby displays such an implacable hostility to the Soviet regime and hurls his false charges at it, which are the exact opposite of actual facts. Mr. Colby asserts that the Soviet system is based, not upon the rep-



resentation of the popular masses, but upon brutal force, notwithstanding the fact that this system is at present the only one under which the working masses are free from exploitation by the privileged few and from the domination of the exploiting financial capital, a domination really based on brutal force. The latter dominates in all countries where the parliamentary regime is in force, and yet this regime is held by Mr. Colby to be the only one deserving recognition. The substance of the parliamentary regime is that the working masses being in an unorganized condition are under the absolute domination of strongly organized political parties which are completely subservient to the leading financial groups. This organization has its ramifications throughout the country, which are connected with innumerable local interests; it subjugates the minds of the masses through a subservient press, through inspired literature, through the pulpit, etc. Under the so-called democracy the semblance of freedom of the press, of freedom of assemblage, and of association, and of free speech is in reality a *mise en scene* of the domination of the leading financial groups acting through a venal press, venal politicians, tribunals, writers, clergymen, etc. The Soviet system alone is a permanent organization of the working masses under which the real sovereignty and the executive power in every locality are vested in the local Soviet, this permanent organization of the working masses on the spot. The structure of the Soviet regime invests the working masses with such power and draws them to such an extent into the workaday functions of government that the mere suggestion of the central power being able, under the Soviet system, to rule against the will of the masses, is sheer absurdity. It is the masses themselves, who, in the fight for liberty, amidst a sanguinary civil war which threatens all their conquests, have come to realize the necessity of a firm centralized revolutionary power for crushing the last resistance of the exploiting classes at home and for carrying on the unprecedented struggle against the capitalist governments of the whole world, which stand united against the Revolution whenever the working masses attain power in a particular country. At the time when all the capitalist governments of the world are united against the workers' and peasants' rule in Russia in an attempt to crush her resistance by the force of arms, by the hunger blockade, by fostering perennial conspiracies of the exploiting classes against the working masses in power,—at this time the working masses have become fully conscious of the fact that only a relentless proletarian dictatorship can defend their revolutionary conquests against the attacks of capital and of all its agents from within and without. The Communist Party, which directs this implacable struggle against the exploiters of the whole world, rules in Soviet Russia for the only reason that the masses themselves consider its rule as the only effective means of successful warfare against the deadly danger threatening them from world capital.

“But the Communist Party arouses Mr. Colby's ire also for another reason, viz., because the Communist Party is at the head of the revolutionary movement of the working masses in all countries, and also in the United States. Its world-wide struggle is rooted in the actual conditions of all countries, but Mr. Colby attempts to account for it by alleged propaganda of Russian Soviet agents. It is not for the first time that we witness attempts on the part of American financial groups to discredit Soviet Russia by calumnies. We have not forgotten the publication by the United States Public Information Division of the absurd Sisson documents charging the Bolsheviks with being German agents. The forgery was so crude that the least examination was sufficient to disclose that fraud. Owing to the subserviency of the press to the financial interests, which is almost complete in the parliamentary countries, calumny against Soviet Russia is one of the principal means of combating the movement of the working masses in every country including the United States. Mr. Colby, too, in his note to the Italian Ambassador, has resorted to coarse slander against Soviet Russia. We most emphatically protest against his false allegation that the Soviet Government violates its promises and concludes agreements with a mental reservation to transgress them. Not a single fact can be quoted in support of this calumny. Even the Brest-Litovsk Treaty which was imposed upon Russia by violence was faithfully observed by the Soviet Government. Whenever it was accused of violating its diplomatic obligations, a frame-up by enemies of the Russian Soviet Government was shown to be at the bottom of the charges. If the Russian Government binds itself to abstain from spreading Communist literature, all its representatives abroad are enjoined scrupulously to observe this pledge. The Soviet Government clearly understands that the revolutionary movement of the working masses in every country is their own affair. It holds to the principle that Communism cannot be imposed by force but that the fight for Communism in every country must be carried on by its working masses themselves. Seeing that in America and in many other countries the workers have not conquered the powers of government and are not even convinced of the necessity of their conquest, the Russian Soviet Government deems it necessary to establish and faithfully to maintain peaceable and friendly relations with the existing governments of those countries. That the elementary economic needs of the peoples of Russia and of other countries demand normal relations and an exchange of goods between them, is quite clear to the Russian Government, and the first condition of such relations is mutual good faith and non-intervention on both parts. Mr. Colby is profoundly mistaken when he thinks that normal relations between Russia and the United States of America are possible only if capitalism prevails in Russia. On the contrary we deem it necessary in the interests of both nations and despite the differences of their political and social

structure, to establish proper, peaceful and friendly relations between them. The Russian Soviet Government is convinced that not only the working masses, but likewise the farsighted business men of the United States of America will repudiate the policy which is expressed in Mr. Colby's note and is harmful to American interests, and that in the near future normal relations will be established between Russia and the United States.

(Signed) CHICHERIN."

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Very respectfully,

(Signed) L. C. A. K. MARTENS,

*Representative in the United States of the  
Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic.*

### POLISH-LITHUANIAN RELATIONS

By A. D.

The relations between Poland and Lithuania were never too friendly, but at the present moment these two countries are actually, if not formally, in a state of war. In the first days of September the Polish legioners crossed the Curzon line, ostensibly for strategic reasons, and occupied the county seat Seyny (of the Suwalki province), situated within the boundaries of ethnographic Lithuania. By order of the Kovno government the Lithuanian troops then took the offensive, recaptured Seyny and forced the Poles to retreat to Suwalki. And but for the fact that Grodno is defended by the Russian Red Army, the Lithuanians would now be battling the Poles in the Grodno region.

To show why the Polish-Lithuanian relations have become so strained we will have to recall briefly the events which preceded the Russian offensive.

In the course of 1919 the Poles occupied almost a third of ethnographic Lithuania. They seized not only the whole province of Vilna, but also most of the Suwalki province and the southeastern part of the Kovno province. The Polish authorities and the Polish legioners acted in the most flagrant manner. Requisition followed requisition, extreme measures of compulsion were used to force the Lithuanian youth to join the Polish army, all the Lithuanian newspapers were suspended. Socialists and even moderate nationalists were thrown into the jails. Everyone who could be suspected of the slightest connection with Lithuanian culture was thrown out of the University of Vilna.

To provide itself with "spokesmen" in the name of the Lithuanian people, the Warsaw government used all means to promote and to support Lithuanian *Petturism*. It dug up a few mercenary Lithuanian nationalists, appointed as their chief the well-known adventurer Augsztolaytis, and began to publish in Vilna a Lithuanian newspaper, *United Lithuania*, which voiced the views of the Polish Government. This newspaper advocated the union of Lithuania with Poland, which

would thus form the strongest part of the anti-Bolshevist cordon. In this respect the Polish occupational authorities of Lithuania followed in the footsteps of the German occupational authorities, who closed all Lithuanian newspapers and began to publish their own organ *Dabrtis (The Present)* to propagate their views. But the Lithuanian *Petturists* had no influence. Their newspaper was generally boycotted.

The Lithuanian nationalist government at Kovno was not in a position to fight the Polish occupants and confined itself to protests. Moreover, this government could not even wage an ideologic struggle against the Poles, since it pursued an aggressive policy against the working class and the small peasants in that part of Lithuania which was under its rule. It submitted in political affairs to the direction of the British mission.

The role of liberator of Lithuanian territory from the yoke of the Polish landlords fell to the Red Army. This is a fact of great significance. But in driving the troops of the Polish landlords out of Lithuania the Red Army did not intend to conquer Lithuania for Russia. According to the peace treaty which was concluded between Soviet Russia and Lithuania, the whole province of Vilna (except the Disna and Vileyka counties), and part of the Grodno county were given to Lithuania. Soviet Russia concluded peace with a government which can by no means be called a workmen's and peasants' government. But the establishment of such a government is the task of the toiling masses of Lithuania. The Soviet Government does not interfere in the internal affairs of the neighboring countries.

The fact that the Red Army liberated almost a half of the Lithuanian territory from the oppression of the Polish nobles naturally aroused great sympathy to the Bolsheviks among the masses of the Lithuanian people. Of late the Communist movement in Lithuania has grown stronger. As a result, the Communists and their sympathizers are attacked with more ferocity than ever by the government circles and the reactionary Lithuanian press. The British diplomats, and of late the French diplomats also, are doing their utmost to bring about an understanding between the Lithuanian reactionaries and their Polish brethren. As Millerand himself admitted recently, France has recommended to the Poles to be moderate and to refrain from invading Lithuanian territory, because an open war between Lithuania and Poland would indirectly aid the Red Army. If the report of the Paris correspondent of the *New York Sun* is authentic, several French diplomats recently expressed themselves emphatically in favor of immediate peace between Poland and Lithuania, for such a peace would strengthen the anti-Bolshevist coalition and, consequently, weaken Russia.

That is why the Allied imperialists are opposed to a war between Lithuania and Poland. They are well aware that this would make a very considerable gap in the "cordon sanitaire." It is possible that their efforts will be temporarily success-



ful. Poland may agree to some insignificant concessions to the Lithuanian nationalists.

But this will not at all solve the nationalist conflict in the southern part of the Suwalki province and in the provinces of Grodno and Vilna. The Lithuanian nationalists are getting ready to act as the masters of this region, just as the Polish nationalists acted as its masters before they were forced out by the Red Army. The Polish nobles who left Lithuania and White Russia, and took refuge in Warsaw, have organized there a so-called "Vilna-Grodno conference" and have sworn to restore the power of the Polish nobility along the Nieman and Vilya. A secret patriotic military organization of "Nieman sharpshooters" is active on Lithuanian territory. Only a really popular Lithuanian government, which would bring about the union of Lithuanian, White Russian, and Jewish masses, only a Soviet government could wage an effective struggle against the Polish counter-revolutionists. But as long as Lithuania is ruled by the present nationalist government there will

be no end to the intrigues of the Polish nobility, the nationalist problem will not be solved, nor will there be a solution of the social question. And at the same time the foreign and internal policies of Lithuania will be dictated by the British and French missions.

The popular masses of Lithuania, as is becoming ever more obvious, are in favor of a "Russian orientation." The congress of the trade unions (the largest organization in Lithuania) has given unequivocal expression to the opinion that the economic and political interests of Lithuania demand the closest possible union with Soviet Russia. The eyes of the Lithuanian masses are directed toward Moscow, not toward Paris or Warsaw. The Allied imperialists are striving to enslave Lithuania economically and politically. Russia alone has nothing to gain from the enslavement of Lithuania. Only in union with the Russian revolution will the Lithuanian toiling masses be able to secure the final defeat of their sworn enemies, the Polish landlords.

## The Condition of Working Women in Soviet Russia

**T**HE transition from the monarchical to the republican form of government, bourgeois democracy, has brought political equality to the women of Germany and German Austria. It has, however, inasmuch as it did not touch the system of individual housekeeping, prevented women from progressing from formal equality on paper to real equality in life. In Russia, the Revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, has not only freed women from political injustice, it has at the same time (and therein it decidedly throws into the shade the much vaunted progress in the capitalistic states) cleared the way for actual liberation of women from exploitation and oppression of every kind.

In the resolution of the All-Russian Women's Congress of November, 1918, it is pointed out that with the passing of the power into the hands of the Soviets there becomes possible not only the full political and civil liberation of women, but also the complete abolition of her sex and family slavery, and that the thing to strive for now is the concrete realization of these conditions. As a result of the November Revolution, as a result of the coming into power of the Soviets, the complete social liberation of working women, by way of the abolition of the old forms of family and of household economy, becomes not only possible, but appears also as one of the necessary conditions for the development of Socialism. The resolution continues as follows:

The first All-Russian conference of working women declares that working women have no special problems that differ from the general problems of the proletariat, for their liberation depends upon the same conditions as that of the proletariat as a whole, that is to say, the proletarian revolution

and the triumph of Communism. At the moment of the socialist revolution which is now in course of development, which demands the putting forth of every proletarian effort for the development and defence of the Revolution as well as for the cause of constructive Socialism, all working men or women must become soldiers of the Revolution, ready to offer all their forces for the triumph of the proletariat and Communism; thus appears as the fundamental problem of working-women the active cooperation in every possible form of the revolutionary struggle, at the front as well as behind the lines, by way of propaganda and agitation as well as by immediate armed struggle. Likewise, the conference states that the old forms of family and of domestic management weigh as a heavy yoke on the woman worker, and prevent her from becoming a fighter in the cause of the Revolution and Communism; and that these forms can be abolished by means of the creation of new forms of domestic economy. The belief is also expressed that the working woman, in taking the most active part in all expressions of the new order, must also devote her particular attention to the creating of new forms of feeding, social distribution, and public bringing-up of the young, by the help of which also the old form of family slavery will be destroyed.

So long as the care of feeding her people rests with woman, so long as it is her office to buy and prepare the necessary food for her family, and to keep the house clean and in order, she cannot attain professional equality with man; nor can she find time and strength to take part in public life to the same extent as man, and develop herself further mentally. To deliver woman from the duties of individual housekeeping means, there-

fore, to afford her the possibility of freeing herself from ignorance and narrow-mindedness, of becoming man's fellow-worker and fellow-combatant, instead of being his inferior and creature. The first step toward unburdening woman of domestic duties is the establishment of community kitchens in which the cooking for a considerable number of people is done by trained hands. In Russia, during the dictatorship of the proletariat, the number of community kitchens has steadily been increased. That has also been the case among us, although not to the same extent. But in Russia—and therein lies the merit and the power of attraction of this institution in the eyes of women workers—the character of the community kitchens has at the same time changed. They are no longer, as before the Revolution and as with us today, more or less charitable institutions whose beggar's soups the workers must gulp down without a protest on pain of being cast out, but they are real democratic establishments that are managed and controlled by the men and women workers themselves. Particularly highly developed is the system of community kitchens of Petrograd. There a complete transition to communal feeding was made in July, 1919; that is to say, nearly the whole population receives its food from the general municipal caldron. In July, 1919, there were already in Moscow 679 eating houses and their number has since increased considerably.

So long as the task of caring for and bringing up children falls on the family, so long is woman not only seriously hindered in her freedom of movement, but it is also impossible for her to free herself from economic dependence on man. For the sake of providing for her children she is forced to enter marriage, which in many cases robs her of her economic independence; for the sake of providing for her children she is compelled to tolerate an unhappy marriage, submit to torment and humiliation of every kind. The liberation of woman from the predominance of man will therefore be possible only when it is no longer the duty of the individual partners, but of society, to feed, clothe, and educate children. In Russia they are on the way toward this new order. As early as May, 1919, a decree appeared which established gratuitous feeding of children up to the age of sixteen. In Moscow and Petrograd, as in all industrial centers, the cost of the maintenance of children has since been borne by the state. Of how much nerve-shattering care, how much trouble and labor are women thereby relieved! The number of creches, kindergartens, children's asylums, and recreation homes has been increased enormously during the dictatorship of the proletariat. And these institutions are no longer, as in capitalistic society, charitable institutions to which mothers must reluctantly and only out of need entrust their little ones; they have become establishments which exist not only for, but also through the workers. Managed by specialists, physicians, and educators, they are under the control of the proletarian parents. In the homes and

schools the children are provided with clothes and shoes. Instruction is free of charge from the kindergarten to the academy. Noteworthy, and particularly important, for the position of woman is also the fact that illegitimate children enjoy the same rights as the legitimate.

If a prisoner who has never known freedom is to find his way into the open, it is not enough to unbolt the door of his prison, he must also be taught to open the door himself. Through having been bound to the house for thousands of years woman has become accustomed to a narrow sphere of action. The desire to be active in public life, to take part in men's battles, to cooperate in the building up of the new order, and, through the perfection of the above-mentioned arrangements, to realize the conditions necessary for their own complete deliverance, must first be awakened in the great majority of women. In Russia, with her numerous backward peasantry, this is a particularly difficult problem. One of the most important means of solving it lies in the "propaganda of action." An effort is made to attract women workers of the cities and peasant women directly to work that is carried on by the Soviets or to any other work. "Delegates of women workers and peasant women," says Comrade Kollontay, "are divided into groups that work in some one of the Soviet districts. They cooperate in the creation, investigation, and control of creches, homes, kindergartens, and elementary schools, in the control and inspection of kitchens and dining-halls, in the elimination of abuses and disorder in the latter, in the supervision of the proper distribution of clothes and shoes in the schools, in the collection of information and in assisting the work of inspectors, and in the strict enforcement of the regulations for woman and child labor."

To be sure there is in Russia, for the present, only a small advance guard of women who are consciously and actively cooperating in building up the new social order. But, as we have seen, the provisions for freeing the great mass of women from domestic confinement and slavery have been made in Russia. What the future development of these things will be depends not only on the Russian working woman, but also on the workers of other countries. If Russia finally arrives at peace with her external enemies, and that depends essentially on the revolutionary determination of the non-Russian workers, if she can devote to internal constructive work the forces which she is at present consuming in war, then these beginnings in behalf of the liberation of woman, for which we can even now envy Soviet Russia, will have a truly wonderful development.—From *Die Rote Fahne*, Vienna, August 15, 1920.

#### MARRIAGE LAWS

The pamphlet containing these may be somewhat delayed, but the new edition of the Labor Laws will probably be ready by October 20.



## Easter in Moscow

By DR. BOHUMIR SMERAL

Moscow, Wednesday, April 14.

WINTER lasts a long time in Moscow, but in the middle of April, it suddenly transformed itself into summer. A week ago, I still trembled from the cold in my room. Today my overcoat seems too heavy. And Easter is behind us. Life here is so strenuous and the impressions received so strong that we were hardly conscious that we were in the midst of the holiday season. Even the leader "The Paskha of the Proletariat" appearing in *Pravda*, failed to bring the fact to our consciousness. We were surprised when on the third of April the streets of the city were full of branches and pussy-willows. I look at the calendar—Holy Saturday.

With these first pussy-willows, official Easter was inducted. It is the "Soviet Easter", in reality, however, celebrated by no one. Officially, the western European calendar has been inducted. But that part of the population, which is subject to religious feeling and to the old orthodox traditions, notwithstanding state decrees is, in matters of the Church, guided by the old calendar, and will celebrate a second—its own Easter—twelve days later. No holidays here for the Communists! Only work, work, work. Among the indifferentists, religious feeling has not been entirely weeded out. Already, the very first Sunday of my stay in Moscow, I did not fail to notice how full the churches were. Moscow has a greater number of churches than any other city in the world. Forty times forty, as they say here. The gilded or blue domes supported on their low steeples give each street an individual character. In every church which I entered there were services and attendance. Through the streets, accompanied by the tinkling of small bells and singing, and with flags flying, religious processions pass. In former days, it was of course unthinkable for even one man not to uncover. Today a large number of passers-by greet it with indifference, but a good half of them remove their hats, and I have seen a Red Guard, who was doing guard duty in the middle of the street through which the procession was passing, remove his cap and cross himself in the orthodox manner. I almost have the impression that there is a large number of people here whom the crucial time is driving to mysticism and to God. The Workmen's Government should, in a sense, imitate these religious functions, organize meetings in beautiful halls and among beautiful surroundings with music and song, with a short talk, not about the daily cares and battles, but dealing with inspiring thoughts of the High Ideal, and with music and song ending the program. The proletariat in power has the means for it, and taking into consideration the psychology of the people here, I believe it would have a good effect.

The unofficial but the real Holy Saturday occurred a week later. By that time, spring had truly made its entry into Moscow. We have

warmth and thaw. The waves of the river have just borne the last ice away, the water rose two meters in four days. Children are swarming in the streets. They play in the same way as our own children at home, in that they jump on one leg kicking a pebble from one square to another in a traced pavement, or they play foot-ball with a large leather ball (where did they get it here?). One new game I have seen here which has been born of the spirit of the times. Just as at home our boys play "soldiers", so here they play "revolution". In one of the side streets about twenty boys, between six and eight years of age, stand in a semi-circle around a lamp-post, with pockets full of stones and with yells begin bombarding the lamp-post. Bang! Bang! the stones fly against the metal post, and the greater the noise the throwing of the stone makes, the greater the glee. Two fishermen have betaken themselves to the Moscow quay and are trying to catch fish with a long pole. I fail to see that they have got anything, however. At another spot near the river lies a wet fishing net. In the park sits an eighteen-year old lover with a still younger maid. Hand in hand, tenderly gazing into each other's eyes, their words flowing with the soft breath of love. I pass by and overhear that they too address each other "tovarishch". A group of people sit on the steps of the Church of Christ the Savior, awaiting the beginning of the services. Here too, I hear the word "tovarishch". Were I to describe the clothing of the people in the Moscow streets on week days, I would say that I did not see clothes strikingly beautiful nor extremely poor. On this day, people are generally better dressed—more holiday-like than usually. It is therefore not true that they have worn out their last.

In the evening and at night I walked with Sirola and Olbracht through the city. We wished to witness the night service in one of the cathedrals. In the churches within the Kremlin there will be no services. In the afternoon a rumor was spread among the indifferentists that the members of the Soviet Administration would participate in the services of the Uspensky Coronation Cathedral. Obviously this was not true, yet it is characteristic that there were people who believed it. At midnight we went to the Church of Christ the Savior. The church adheres not only to the old calendar, but also to the old time (hours). Therein lies, perhaps, a tacit rebellion of the clergy against the Soviets. The midnight service does not begin until three in the morning. We could not wait so long. At two o'clock in the morning, we were tired and went to bed. In some of the smaller churches services had already begun. Attendance was not as large anywhere as I had anticipated, considering the full churches of the Sunday previous.

Easter Sunday is one of the most important holidays in the orthodox church. Through the

entire city of Moscow the bells toll. In the impressive clanging of the chimes, the small bells of the passing processions are discernible, with their higher and quick tones—just as at home on the day of Corpus Christi. At the Savoy, we get pure white bread and a side portion of good Siberian cheese; at noon, besides soup, a portion of tasty goulash with good potatoes; in the evening two meat balls, potatoes, and butter. How reverently do all the people here take up pure white bread! And to the spell of the holidays which to them brings also the recollection of their young and peaceful days, even the extreme communists succumb. We spent the morning together with Olbracht and Vajtauer at Miligina's. To a good revolutionist, religious holidays are obviously "Bourgeois Prejudices", but today, it is evident that she gladly succumbs to the spell of the day, which, even for her, is not an ordinary day. Sunshine streams in through the windows, the table is at least half-covered with a clean cloth. At other times, we take turns in bringing in from the kitchen water for tea, where it boils all day long in a copper kettle. Today it bubbles in a large polished samovar standing on the table. Four more comrades come in, two men and two women. We do not know each other, do not ask each other's name, we naturally belong together: "All Communists are good." In the afternoon Sirola and I strolled through the remotest corners of the city.

The house in which I live, in the meantime, received additional inhabitants. One day, there appeared at breakfast, for the first time, a patriarchal-looking man, of an aristocratic countenance—a beard like that seen in pictures of St. Peter. He wore an old shabby plush coat—Chertkov, well-known as a friend and disciple of Tolstoy, formerly a publisher in London, now propagandist of his ideas in Bolshevik Russia. Now and then we read on street corners notices of his meetings of protest against violence and against war, and with a prophet's indignation, he proclaims it a crime, even if carried on by the Bolsheviks. On the door of the room next to mine, there is a new visiting-card. "Jean Mayerhoffer, Chef de la Mission Autrichienne pour la Russie". Oh, Viennese, then! Then I am accosted by a young man who says he knows my name: he was, last year, a member of a Mission of the Russian Red Cross in Prague, and was given three days by the government to leave the country. From Germany a new comrade was added to the delegation, which is negotiating for collective immigration of German workers into Russia. He speaks pessimistically about internal conditions in Germany, is in despair over the split in the labor movement, over the sectarian spirit, which with its heated quarrels weakens even the Communist wing. Says he has no faith in the development of German affairs, and that he would rather not go back at all. Several of the old inhabitants moved out. Sirola departs today for Petrograd on a special train for the delegates of the trade congress. When he took leave of me in the dining room, a "tovarishch", who before

the war had been an official at the Consulate in Prague, said to me: "He is an important personage here. In Finland, the government would give many thousands for his head." It is peculiar how quickly people get acquainted with each other here. When alone in the dwelling which we had mutually occupied, I miss Sirola, and I feel that he will miss me too. We worked well together and in observation supplemented each other. Last night before retiring, in my last conversation with Sirola, he was explaining to me his interesting ideas about the necessity of having a knowledge of military science for the purpose of revolution, and how he, during the Revolution, came to know the meaning of the religious movement; and further how hard it is for him to think that Finnish revolutionary Socialism has no real scientific expert for military navigation, so important for that country. At home, no one could imagine with what seriousness the Finnish comrade thinks of these problems. He reads Tirpitz' memoirs and speculates how things could be made to become a reality when transferred from the experience of a German militarist into the arsenal of the fighters for the liberation of the proletariat. He especially became discursive on the subject—that those who stand at the head, are not, in fact should not be specialists, but should be able to govern the specialists (Trotsky); and that the one who stands before a great achievement, should beware of wanting to do everything himself (a leader of a revolution can only work with success when he surrounds himself with efficient, reliable co-workers). I recollect now also that the Finnish comrade Usenius, on his way from Reval to Moscow for revolutionary reasons, read Ludendorff's memoirs. Now I am beginning to grasp why Engels, when he graduated from the 1848 Revolution, in which he participated during the armed uprising of Willich, profoundly submerged himself in military science. Until now I did not realize this connection with the principle of his life, and saw in it merely a whim incidental to his inclination to sportsmanship.

After Sirola's departure, I go to report to the commander of the house that one room is at his disposal. Comrade Commander is in bad humor. He grumbles that the Department Soviet sends him so many bourgeois strangers. "I put three in one room and they have plenty of space. You are a comrade, and you are working and cannot be disturbed by another occupant: you will, therefore, for the time being, remain alone in both rooms." For the first time in my life then, I live alone, bourgeois-like—have two rooms, one for sleeping, and one for visitors and work.

Now that the season of congresses and holidays is over, I feel it a necessity to lay out a definite constructive plan for my work and for my observ-



ations for further stay in Russia. Although personally I prefer to conduct myself unobtrusively I must needs act quickly, definitely, clearly. I cannot stay away from home indefinitely and I am obliged to use the short time to the greatest possible advantage. I went to the building of the Internationale, where I said to Berzinov and Radkov as the representatives of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, in substance, this: "I have been here fourteen days. During the Congresses all official persons were so occupied that I could make no demands upon them. Also, I used this time to look around for myself and to accustom my ear to the language, so that I should be able to understand at least the most essential and that I might become somewhat acquainted with the city and its people. Now I have to have a strict plan for my activity. Either I shall carry on here merely elementary political talks, leaving deeper penetration to Olbracht and Vajtauer, and return to Bohemia—or I shall remain longer. In the event of my prolonged stay, I shall have to be afforded an opportunity of free entry everywhere, so that, if time permits and if I should find it expedient, I can look into every department of the state administration and economic life, and that I may be able to investigate everything personally and form an independent judgment. This, after my prolonged stay, the workers would expect of me, and I shall have to answer for it. I am putting this question to you for decision, because in the event of your deciding that it is advisable that I should not be limited to political questions only, but that I should stay on, then you would be in duty-bound to make things accessible to me, and I, who am generally unobtrusive and retiring, shall be in a position to ask energetically and squarely all the support you can give me for facilitating my work." (The Comrades were of the opinion that even in the event of my longer stay in Russia, it would be impossible for me to investigate everything, yet they requested that I stay in Russia at least a month. I shall, of course, have admittance everywhere. And they ordered for me by telephone a special legitimation card signed by Comrade Lenin, and we agreed that the next few days I was to devote to the study of Moscow wholesale merchant in the street of Denezhnyi ill at present, has recovered, that I am to accompany him, Radkov, and Berzinov to Petrograd to a conference with Zinoviev, on which occasion I shall have an opportunity of becoming acquainted also with the organization and social administration of Northern Russia.

Today for the first time I inspected the house in which the Third Internationale has its offices. It is a large house of a one-time millionaire Moscow wholesale merchant in the street of Denezhnyi Pereulok. The house is furnished in bad taste with overdone luxuriousness. The largest of its salons, overfilled with rare treasures, is not used by the Internationale, and is closed so that nothing can be damaged. This entire palace served for the exclusive use of one family consisting of four

members. While visiting this bourgeois Croesus, the German Ambassador Mirbach was killed by bombs hurled by Social-Revolutionists. Until the present day in the same corner stands the same chair from which Mirbach fled when the bombs were hurled at him. Berzin, the Chief Secretary of the Third Internationale was, in the first phases of the Soviet Republic, its ambassador to Switzerland. I am of the opinion that he is tired, overworked, and that he has incipient tuberculosis. He admits nervousness and smokes a great deal. He will last at his work possibly a few weeks, but then he will have to go to a sanitarium. I made new and interesting acquaintances at the Internationale! A French comrade, the writer Guilbeaux, the Servian comrade Mikic, an English correspondent of the *Daily Herald*, and a young Italian journalist, Kappa. Guilbeaux tells me of Sadoul who is organizing the work in Kharkov. Mikic too is active in the Ukraine. Joy is mirrored in his eyes, when he tells me what spirit rules the Yugoslav movement and how bravely stands Comrade Lapcevic. Comrade Kappa is better acquainted with Olbracht and is very much interested in Prague. His wife is a Czech, Zatkov's daughter. He is separated from his wife's family by an abyss of world's creed, but humanly it seems to me, he entertains for them tender affection and devotion.

### *Soviet Russia Pamphlets*

An important rearrangement of this valuable series is about to be made. Orders should not be placed before October 20, as the series will not be ready before then.

1. **LABOR LAWS OF SOVIET RUSSIA.** Third Edition. Will contain all the matter included in the first and second editions, together with a supplement on "The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia," by S. Kaplun, of the Commissariat of Labor. About 80 pages, price 25 cents.
2. **MARRIAGE LAWS OF SOVIET RUSSIA;** also **Laws on Domestic Relations.** New translation from recently received Russian original; an improvement on the version printed in **SOVIET RUSSIA.** Almost 60 pages, price 15 cents. To be ready about October 20.
3. **TWO YEARS OF SOVIET RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY,** by *George Chicherin.* A full account of all the diplomatic negotiations between Soviet Russia and foreign powers, from November 7, 1917, to November 7, 1919; 36 pages, price 10 cents.

All bound in heavy paper covers.

*Special Rates in Quantities*

Address:

**"SOVIET RUSSIA"**

110 W. 40th St. Room 304 New York, N. Y.

Original from  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

## Wireless and Other News

### APPEAL OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN UNION OF WORKERS IN THE BUILDING TRADES

Moscow, September 15, 1920 (via Stockholm).—To all Unions of Building Trades. Although our government of workers and peasants readily puts at our disposal all means of communication, and in spite of its incessant appeals to our comrades and brothers in capitalistic Europe to enter into constant and organized relations, we have up to now, thanks to the ruling classes of the West, been deprived of the possibility of communicating with the unions abroad. On account of this lack of information, it is uncertain whether our delegates will be in a position to attend the next international congress of the unions of the building trades workers. We shall be informed about that congress only by the bourgeois press, from which, moreover, we will receive only garbled reports which may come late.

We are sending to the International Union of the Building Trades Workers and to the kindred unions an urgent request to send us detailed information on all matters that interest us, and to keep up live communication with us through the medium of the Communist parties which will readily undertake the task of coming to our aid.

With brotherly greetings.

*Central Committee of the All-Russian Union of Workers in the Building Trades,*

BURAGOL, *President,*  
BOGDANOV, *Secretary.*

### THE RUSSIAN MANCHESTER

Moscow, September 17, 1920.—*Pravda* publishes the following report about the conditions in the district of Ivanovo-Voznessensk:

In this Manchester of Russia the power belongs to the workers, who have instituted complete order and maintain an exemplary cleanliness. All branches of the public service are functioning with the greatest exactness. The political activity of the people in the entire district is energetically encouraged. Industry has reawakened to a new life. Everybody, beginning with the ordinary workman and ending with an engineer, is consciously working in the interest of the Soviet Republic. In the center of the district, as well as in the villages, one finds the same zeal as in the first days of the Revolution. On the Volga, a busy traffic of steamers and barges, carrying corn, timber, cotton, chemical products, etc., is developing. All workers compete in the work of production for the proletarian state (as well as for themselves), and not for the privileged classes. Meetings are being held regularly for the discussion of internal and foreign political affairs. This state of affairs is the more noteworthy since the majority of the best revolutionists are at the front.

### SHLYAPNIKOV SECRETLY SENT TO NORWAY

CHRISTIANIA, September 17, 1920 (*Rosta*, Vienna).—From Bodo, Norway, the following is being reported to *Rosta*: The head of the Russian Trade Union Delegation, Shlyapnikov, who had been arrested in Stockholm and brought to an unknown place which the police refuse to disclose, was, according to *Nordlanets Social Demokrat*, brought over under police guard from Stockholm to Norway. He arrived in the company of a Swedish detective on Sunday in Narvik, whence a Norwegian detective brought him on to Vardo. The Swedish as well as the Norwegian Government has done everything to keep the voyage a secret.

### OIL DRIVEN LOCOMOTIVES

*The following information is taken from a statement made in a London periodical by W. McLaine upon his return from Russia.*

Last week's London papers made a tremendous fuss about a new oil driven locomotive that had drawn a train from London to Birmingham.

In the Volga region in Russia, now that the British have been cleared out of Baku and oil is available, oil driven locomotives are performing daily service. The steamer *Belynsky* that took us down the Volga was oil driven, and I spent a profitable half-hour looking round her engine room, where everything was in apple-pie order.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY TROTSKY

CHRISTIANIA, September 3 (*Rosta*, Vienna).—Moscow, September 2. Trotsky issued the following announcement, at the time of the defeat of the troops landed by Wrangel on the coast of Kuban: The railroad workers of Kuban suffered a great deal, in order to bring about the defeat of the new Wrangel offensive. The self-control, the exemplary conduct and rapid movement of the Red troops, made it possible to move them from 700 to 900 versts in twenty-four hours. Railroad workers! Remember that you have a great responsibility and that it is you that are next in importance to the Red Army in the fight for freedom and labor.

LEON TROTSKY.

ALEXANDROVSK, September 1, 1920.

### REORGANIZATION OF INDUSTRY

Moscow, September 13, 1920 (*Rosta*, Vienna).—The Petrograd *Pravda* communicates that the well-known rubber-boot factory *Treugolnik*, which occupies a space of sixty hectares, is in operation again. The operation aims first of all at satisfying the needs of the army and navy. In some sections of the factory, the production exceeds that of 1916, which was a record year.



### WORKERS' RING ROUND POLES

BERLIN, September 9.—The *Rote Fahne* accuses the German Government of allowing shiploads of munitions to pass through the Kiel Canal with the full knowledge that they are meant for Poland. The *Rote Fahne* is evidently right, for this morning the Greek steamer *Iolanthe*, carrying airplanes and munitions, passed through the canal unhindered.

The Swedish steamer *Cavalla* was stopped by the workmen at one of the locks, and the Danish steamer *Dorxit*, coming from France with 10,000 tons of munitions for Poland, was held up by workmen near Kiel and Brunsbuettel.

To organize more efficient control over every lock, the Control Commission of Berlin Workers has circulated a manifesto, insisting that the greatest vigilance over the railways and canals is necessary in order to maintain German neutrality in the Russo-Polish war, and pointing out that the government, contrary to its promises, is not genuinely trying to stop war material from reaching Poland.

The Exchange reports that a British steamer is also held up.

### GERMAN WORKERS DOING THEIR DUTY

RATIBOR, August 14 (*Wolff*).—The workers of the Ratibor Main Works held up early today a French troop-train and, according to the *Oberschlesischer Anzeiger*, insisted, with success, that the train be switched off onto a side track where it remains guarded by the workers.

MANNHEIM, August 12 (T. U.).—A street demonstration in favor of Soviet Russia, which had been called for by the Spartacus League, took place yesterday afternoon. Many thousands attended, among them a surprisingly large crowd from Ludwigshafen and environs. Street-car traffic was interrupted for a considerable length of time by the procession in which several bands of music marched also. No clashes are known to have occurred.

### DANISH COUNCILLOR OF STATE ON SOVIET RUSSIA

STOCKHOLM, August 19.—A few days ago there arrived in Copenhagen about fifty Danes, some of whom had been prisoners of the Red Army in North Russia. Among those returning from Soviet Russia there was the Danish Councillor of State, Kofoed, who had worked in the services of the Russian Ministry of Agriculture during the Revolution, and has been a resident of Russia for about forty years altogether. *Nationaltidende* has had an interview with the Councillor concerning conditions in Russia, and his statements on Bolshevism are noteworthy, particularly in view of the fact that he is an opponent of the Bolshevik ideas. On the matter of provisioning, the Councillor of State says: "I assume that they now have overcome the worst difficulties. Hunger is not past, and things still look bad for those who are not particularly healthy, but the people in general are

beginning to adapt themselves to the existing conditions."

The Councillor particularly emphasizes the care of children, as follows: "I have had occasion to visit a number of the public children's colonies, both at Moscow and Petrograd. Everywhere I received the most favorable impressions; the children look happy and healthy, and the teachers took their tasks seriously and with understanding. Instruction in general has not yet been completely regulated, but the plan at least is good."

The interviewer asked: "Is it possible to place children in the schools chosen by their parents?" "Yes, the parents are at liberty to send the children where they will really learn. The Bolsheviks, furthermore, devote much care to arts and sciences; the great art collections remain intact. Society looks after the professors and the scholars, who get big rations and are not obliged to resort to additional work to eke out their income." Finally, the Councillor definitely denounced the contemptuous attitude of the bourgeois press on the subject "mob in power". He had met a number of the leading men of the government and had found them to be men of clear vision who are open to negotiations even with those who do not share their ideas. In one respect the present government is far superior to the earlier governments: "It maintains justice within its own ranks."

### FOR THE RECOGNITION OF THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT

PRAGUE, September 3, 1920 (Report from *Rosta*, Vienna).—Dr. Benesch, Minister of Czechoslovakia, delivered an oration on the question of the alliance of his country with Jugo-Slavia and Rumania, and on its politics with regard to the Entente, in which he made the following statements: Our attitude to take every means possible to resume commercial relations with Russia as soon as possible, marks one of the policies of Czechoslovakia's peace and neutrality activities. The Russo-Polish War hindered this." During the debate, Dr. Heller, the German senator, declared that he agreed with the speaker. He said that this should be done as soon as possible, since Italy and England have entered into friendly relations with Russia. The speaker declared, however, that the Russian Government should be recognized, and that this should be done independently of the Entente.

### RIGA PEACE PROPOSALS

The following interview sent by the special correspondent in Riga of the London *Daily Herald*, appeared in that newspaper on September 15, 1920:

RIGA, September 13.—The Russian-Ukrainian Peace Delegation has arrived, Yoffe and Abolinsky representing Russia, and Manuilsky the Ukraine. Kirov, the Russian representative in Georgia, is on his way. Among the advisory experts are Polivanov, the former Czarist War Minister, and Novitsky, a Czarist general.

I interviewed Yoffe, who said that he would urge that the conference be open to the press, and that the British Labor representatives (Adamson and Purcell) should take part in the deliberations if they wish. He stated that the Russians expected immediately the Polish counter-proposals, though they would consent to discuss on the basis of the Russian proposals, which are still pending.

The most important issue was the guarantees that Poland would give of a lasting peace. This point involved practically all the Russian proposals, but most of all disarmament.

Territorial considerations are not, he said, a fetish with the Soviet Government, but it could not handle the principle of self-determination. The new nationalities of Lithuania, Lettland, White Russia, Ukraine, and so forth, were established facts. The new nationality issue in East Galicia, however, would be a matter for discussion. Thus far Western Europe had considered the principle of self-determination as it applied to the diminishment of Russia only. It must also be applied outside Russia, as in the case of Eastern Galicia, whose status the inhabitants should decide.

A Moscow wireless message states that the Polish delegation is expected tomorrow.

### A JEWISH RABBI OF A LITHUANIAN TOWN ON THE BOLSHEVIKI

[The following is part of a letter which was received by Mr. S. Minkin, of 196 Canal Street, New York, from his father, David Minkin, who is the Rabbi of Dubnes, province of Kovno. The letter was published in full in the Jewish "Forward" of September 1.]

July 19, 1920.

I will briefly relate to you the miracles which

the Creator has shown toward us, be He ever as merciful. On July 3 we heard that the Poles were retreating and that they were looting Breshlov. You can imagine how we felt. Monday, 10 A. M. People were walking around, awaiting the fate that might befall us. Suddenly a report came that the Poles were retreating toward Wanighishok. This was a great miracle. Had they marched through Dubnes and halted there for one moment we would have been lost. In Zakistcheny they set fire to seventy houses and did not allow the fires to be put out.

Suddenly a Gentile came riding up and reported that the Reds had already reached Plusse (eight versts from our town). An hour later Red scouts arrived. Then our dread left us, for we had heard that wherever they came they did no harm.

A little later the Reds came riding in thousands, like a flood. They stopped in the streets and in the houses. I can describe to you how kindly and gently they acted toward us. All night long we cooked for them, but we rejoiced. They thanked us for everything. In some houses they paid very well.

The whole world should take lessons from Trotsky. What a wonderful teacher he is (the Lithuanians, however, need no lessons, as I will explain below) to have taught millions of soldiers to be so honest and fine! They did not trouble anybody. Even the children played with them, addressing them as "Comrades" . . .

### THE NEXT ISSUE

## SOVIET RUSSIA

Will Contain, Among Other Features, the Following:

1. AN INTERVIEW WITH VICTOR KOPP, by Julio Alvarez Del Vayo. An interesting statement by the Soviet Representative in Berlin.
2. THE BRITISH CONSPIRACY IN RUSSIA. A striking account of the plot hatched in 1918 by British and other foreign representatives in Russia, to overthrow the Soviet Government.
3. The fourth instalment of "MOSCOW IN 1920", by Dr. Alfons Goldschmidt.
4. PEACE TREATY BETWEEN SOVIET RUSSIA AND LATVIA.
5. REGULAR WEEKLY MILITARY REVIEW, by Lt-Col. B. Roustam Bek.

Ten Cents at all News Stands

Subscription Price: \$5.00 per year; \$2.50 per half year; \$1.00 for ten weeks. (Make all checks payable to L. C. A. K. Martens.)

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED BY

SOVIET RUSSIA

110 West 40th Street

(Room 304)

New York City