

*The World Significance of the
Russian Revolution*

By

GEORGE PITT-RIVERS

(Author of "Conscience and Fanaticism")

With Preface by

Dr. OSCAR LEVY,

(Author of "The Revival of Aristocracy," etc.)

Oxford :

BASIL BLACKWELL,

mdcccxx.

The hours should be instructed by the ages, and the ages explained by the hours.—EMERSON.

The surest way to prevent Seditions is to take away the Matter of them. For if there be Fuel prepared, it is hard to tell, whence the Spark shall come, that shall set it on Fire.—
BACON.

Every time I have heard rebel and foaming devils speak, I have found them bitter and shallow liars.

Ye understand how to roar and obscure with ashes! Ye are the best braggarts and the most gifted in the art of making dregs boil.—NIETZSCHE.

Against whom do ye sport yourselves? against whom make ye a wide mouth, and draw out the tongue? are ye not children of transgression, a seed of falsehood, enflaming yourselves with idols under every green tree?—ISALAH, LVII. 4.

THE WORLD SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

—:O:—

PREFATORY LETTER.

By Dr. OSCAR LEVY.

DEAR MR. PITT-RIVERS,—

When you first handed me your MS. on *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*, you expressed a doubt about the propriety of its title. After a perusal of your work, I can assure you, with the best of consciences, that your misgivings were entirely without foundation. No better title than *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution* could have been chosen, for no event in any age will finally have more significance for our world than this one. We are still too near to see clearly this Revolution, this portentous event, which was certainly one of the most intimate, and therefore least obvious, aims of the world-conflagration, hidden as it was at first by the fire and the smoke of national enthusiasms and patriotic antagonisms. It was certainly very plucky of you to try and throw some light upon an event which necessarily must still be enveloped in mist and mystery, and I was even somewhat anxious, lest your audacity in treating such a dangerous subject would end in failure, or what is nearly the same, in ephemeral success. No age is so voracious of its printed offspring as ours. There was thus some reason to fear lest you had offered to this modern Kronos only another mouthful of his accustomed nourishment for his immediate consumption.

I was, I am glad to report, agreeably surprised,—surprised, though not by the many new facts which you give, and which must surprise all those who take an interest in

current events—facts, I believe, which you have carefully and personally collected and selected, not only from books, but from the lips and letters of Russian eye-witnesses and sufferers, from foes as well as from friends of the great Revolution. What I appreciate more than this new light thrown on a dark subject, more than the conclusion drawn by you from this wealth of facts, is the psychological insight which you display in detecting the reasons why a movement so extraordinarily bestial and so violently crazy as the Revolution was able to succeed and finally to overcome its adversaries. For we are confronted with two questions which need answering and which, in my opinion, you have answered in your pamphlet. These questions are: (1) How has the Soviet Government, admittedly the Government of an insignificant minority, succeeded not only in maintaining but in strengthening its position in Russia after two and a half years of power? And (2) Why has the Soviet Government, in spite of its outward bestiality and brutal tyranny succeeded in gaining the sympathies of an increasing number of people in this country? You give the answer: Bolshevism was opposed by Democracy only, and a Democracy which was too cowardly to draw the last consequences of its own creed, which, of course, is ultimately nothing else but Bolshevism. The Bolshevist simply did what his father, Mr. Democrat, said he would do if he could but never dared to do—hence the latter's vacillation and hypocrisy and failure, hence the former's energy, sincerity and success. "No movement" you rightly say on p. 14 about the "White Opposition"—"representing a heterogeneous jumble of contradictory elements can ever defeat another movement, which at any rate knows its own mind and allows of no compromise."

What, then, is this wonderful "own mind" of the Bolshevists? You rightly recognize that there is an ideology behind it and you clearly diagnose it as an ancient ideology. There is nothing new under the Sun, it is even nothing new that this Sun rises in the East.

The Sun has a habit of rising there, his rays, thousands of years ago, used to select for a first visit the deserts and mountains of Palestine, where lonely Prophets caught this radiance and whence eager apostles brought it to pagan and less "enlightened" countries. It was by them that the light was carried to Europe, where, it is true, it was received at first somewhat unwillingly and distrustfully. After a couple of centuries this resistance was overcome, and moreover, what yonder was called the Reign of God and the Millennium of Brotherhood, became with us in Europe the "Reign of Liberty," the "Reign of Reason," the "Reign of Equality," and finally the "Reign of the Proletariat." We all remember from History these passionate followers of St. Peter and St. Paul—though more of the latter than the former—who, in Apostolic succession saw the coming "Dawn," and preached the Holy Faith. There is a direct line from Savonarola to Luther, and from Luther to Robespierre, and from Robespierre to Lenin . . . Lenin, the Lenin of to-day, may have been partially converted by that experience of men and affairs which has converted many an enthusiast and, alas! has frequently made a cynic or a rogue of him: one certain thing that may be gathered from his writings is this, that he was *before* the Revolution a dreamer and a visionary, and one quite worthy of his spiritual ancestors, of whom I have only named some, while omitting many other important names. It is quite certain that he started his revolutionary career as a true and convinced Apostle of "Light and Faith," which he preached as the orthodox disciple of his spiritual father, who inspired the "Newest" testament "Das Capital!" In M. Landau Aldanov's book, *Lénine*,¹ there is to be found an account of a young student who visited the Smolny Institute in order to witness the first public appearance of Lenin after the Bolshevik *coup d'état*. Neither Trotsky nor the others made much impression upon the young man, but Lenin

¹ *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine*, Paris, 1919, p. 70.

received with rapturous applause completely turned his head. "One could not say that it was a political harangue. It was the cry from the soul of a man who had waited thirty years for that moment." "I thought," the witness adds, "that I was listening to the voice of Girolamo Savonarola!!" . . . Poor Savonarola—he, a man no doubt of finer grain than his Russian progeny, was heard complaining one day, that he had to fight for his Heaven with the weapons of Hell.

"To Hell with such a Heaven!" That is the answer that you, would give to the outpourings of these enthusiasts and fanatics. You could give that answer honestly, indignantly, even passionately. For you have lost faith in Democracy and yours has become another aim, another valuation, another vision for the future of Mankind. One day, it is quite certain, this vision of yours will overcome its inspired opponent, whose representative now sits, though none too safely, upon his bloodstained throne. "A definite, positive movement," to quote your own words, "alone can defeat another definite movement!" But how could the undefined and undefinable Democrats, the Democrats of Statistics and Economics, the frequenters of Lecture Rooms and Debating Societies, the professors of "progress and evolution," ever even dare to oppose a movement that realised so gloriously what they themselves had always professed to believe, to hope, and to cherish! How could they ever venture to attack with their paper-dart arguments the heavy armour plate of pure conscience and inspired belief? How could this democratic powder ever allow itself to collide with the Bolshevist fire? For Bolshevism is a religion and a faith. How could these half-converted believers ever dream to vanquish the "Truthful" and the "Faithful" of their own creed, these holy crusaders, who had gathered round the Red Standard of the Prophet Karl Marx, and who fought under the daring guidance of these experienced officers of all latter-day revolutions—the Jews?

I am touching here on a subject which, to judge from

your own pamphlet, is perhaps more interesting to you than any other. In this you are right. There is no race in the world more enigmatic, more fatal, and therefore more interesting than the Jews. Every writer who, like yourself, is oppressed by the aspect of the present and embarrassed by his anxiety for the future *must* try to elucidate the Jewish question and its bearing upon our Age. For the question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things, and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this Race may be. For the Jews, as you are aware, are a sensitive Community, and thus very suspicious of any Gentile who tries to approach them with a critical mind. They are always inclined—and that on account of their terrible experiences—to denounce anyone who is not with them as against them, as tainted with “mediæval” prejudice, as an intolerant Antagonist of their Faith and of their Race.

Nor could or would I deny that there is some evidence, some *prima facie* evidence of this antagonistic attitude in your pamphlet. You point out, and with fine indignation, the great danger that springs from the prevalence of Jews in finance and industry, and from the preponderance of Jews in rebellion and revolution. You reveal, and with great fervour, the connection between the Collectivism of the immensely rich international Finance—the Democracy of cash values, as you call it—and the international Collectivism of Karl Marx and Trotsky—the Democracy of and by decoy-cries. . . . And all this evil and misery, the economic as well as the political, you trace back to one source, to one “*fons et origo malorum*”—the Jews.

Now other Jews may vilify and crucify you for these outspoken views of yours; I myself shall abstain from joining the chorus of condemnation! I shall try to understand your opinions and your feelings, and having once understood them—as I think I have—I can defend you from the unjust attacks of my often too impetuous Race.

But first of all, I have to say this : There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews. Take the Great War that appears to have come to an end, ask yourself what were its causes and its reasons : you will find them in nationalism. You will at once answer that nationalism has nothing to do with the Jews, who, as you have just proved to us, are the inventors of the international idea. But no less than Bolshevik Ecstasy and Financial Tyranny can National Bigotry (if I may call it so) be finally followed back to a Jewish source—are not they the inventors of the Chosen People Myth, and is not this obsession part and parcel of the political credo of every modern nation, however small and insignificant it may be ? And then think of the history of nationalism. It started in our time as a reaction against Napoleon ; Napoleon was the antagonist of the French Revolution ; the French Revolution was the consequence of the German Reformation ; the German Reformation was based upon a crude Christianity ; this kind of Christianity was invented, preached and propagated by the Jews : *therefore* the Jews have made this war ! . . . Please do not think this a joke : it only seems a joke, and behind it there lurks a gigantic truth, and it is this, that all latter-day ideas and movements have originally sprung from a Jewish source, for the simple reason, that the Semitic idea has finally conquered and entirely subdued this *only apparently irreligious* universe of ours.

It has conquered it through Christianity, which of course, as Disraeli pointed out long ago, is nothing but " Judaism for the people." The Ideal of Democracy contained in this appeal of the Jews to the people was their successful battle cry, their most wonderful propaganda work, their "*Dieu le veult*," that finally forced the world to follow them. With it they have inspired—or, if you will, infected—Lollards and Hussites, Protestants and Puritans, Socialists and Bolsheviks alike. Now Democracy, as we all know, declares—or pretends to proclaim—everybody free and equal : it was therefore bound to

destroy the bond, feudal or patriarchal, between lord and serf, master and servant, and it replaced it, had to replace it, by another bond (a bond it had to invent for the occasion) that of wages and salaries. Democracy, as we all know, abolished slavery—that natural slavery in which the master took an interest in his slaves, because they were part and parcel of his most valuable property; but it re-introduced it in the form of Wage Tyranny, by means of which the “freed” serf could be freely exploited and even squashed out like a lemon without any harm being done to the Master’s interests. Thus ended this glorious liberty principle of the Reformation and the Revolution: the finest theory that has ever been invented for the most miserable of all practices, that have ever defiled this world. No doubt the Jews are responsible for this, as they are responsible for everything, because they are the spiritual fathers of *Democracy and therefore of plutocracy*. But now let me ask you this one question: “Have they perchance introduced these theories into this country? Were Cromwell and his Ironsides Jews? Was the Puritan Revolution inspired by an English Trotsky? Was Charles I. beheaded at the bidding of a Jewish commissary of the people? . . . Why, there were no Jews in this country before Cromwell. The Roundheads of the Great Rebellion, it is true, chanted and rechanted the Hebrew psalms, but their poetry alone and not the poets themselves had up to this time been admitted to England. The Christians did the wonderful thing all by themselves, just to prove to the world, what good Jews they could be if “the Spirit moved them!” And when Jews were once admitted, they and the Christians alike became the victims as well as the exploiters of this Puritanism, this democracy, this idealism, this plutocracy. The Scotch and American financier succeeded as well as his brother of the original Puritan faith. The Christian usurer took his pound of flesh with the same gusto as did his colleague of the Jewish persuasion. And as to the factory system, that destroyed and destroys the soul and

body of men as well as the bounty and beauty of the land; it has been and is carried on by blonde and flat-nosed Jews—at least in this country—as successfully as by their dark and sharp-featured brethren on the Continent of Europe.

All this “tu-quoque” argument is, of course, no excuse whatever for the Jews. There is no doubt that the Jews regularly go one better or worse than the Gentile in whatever they do, there is no further doubt that their influence to-day justifies a very careful scrutiny, and cannot possibly be viewed without serious alarm. The great question, however, is whether the Jews are conscious or unconscious malefactors. I myself am firmly convinced that they are unconscious ones, but please do not think that I wish to exonerate them on that account. . . . A conscious evildoer has my respect, for he knows at least what is good, an unconscious one—well: he needs the charity of Christ—a charity which is not mine—to be forgiven for not knowing what he is doing. But there is in my firm conviction not the slightest doubt that these revolutionary Jews do not know what they are doing; that they are more unconscious sinners than voluntary evildoers. I am glad to see that this is not an original observation of mine, but that you yourself have a very strong foreboding about the Jews being the victims of their own theories and principles. . . . On p. 39 of your pamphlet you write: “It may be that the Jews have always been instrumental in bringing about the events that they most heartily disapprove of; that maybe is the curse of the Wandering Jew.” If I had not the honour, as well as the pleasure, of knowing you personally, if I were not strongly aware of your passionate desire for light and your intense loathing of unfairness, this sentence, and this sentence alone, which tells the truth, will absolve you in my eyes from the odious charge of being a vulgar anti-Semite.

No, you are not a vulgar, you are a very enlightened, critic of our Race. For there is an anti-semitism, I hope and trust, which does the Jews more

justice than any blind philo-semitism, than does that merely sentimental "Let-them-all-come Liberalism," which in itself is nothing but the Semitic Ideology over again. And thus you can be just to the Jews, without being "romantic" about them. You have noticed with alarm that the Jewish elements provide the driving forces for both communism and capitalism, for the material as well as the spiritual ruin of this world. But then you have at the same time the profound suspicion that the reason of all this extraordinary behaviour may be the intense Idealism of the Jew. In this you are perfectly right. The Jew, if caught by an idea, never thinks any more in water-tight compartments, as do the Teuton and Anglo-Saxon peoples, whose right cerebral hemisphere never seems to know what its left twin brother is doing: he, the Jew, like the Russian, at once begins to practise what he preaches, he draws the logical conclusion from his tenets, he invariably acts upon his accepted principles. It is from this quality, no doubt, that springs his mysterious force—that force, which you no doubt condemn, but which you had to admire even in the Bolsheviks. And we must admire it, whether we are Jews or whether we are Christians, for have not these modern Jews remained true to type, is there no parallel for them in history, do they not go to the bitter end even in our day, do they not take the Cross upon their shoulders, as once did their great Brother in Race? Their brother in Race as well as in Revolution, He, against whom the accusation, as found in the Gospel of St. Luke xxiii. 5, ran, "He stirreth up the people teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place." . . . Who stirred up the people during the late war in Germany? Who pretended to have again the truth, *that* truth about which Pontius Pilate once shrugged his shoulders? Who pleaded for honesty and cleanliness in Politics, *that* honesty which brings a smile to the lips of any experienced Pro-consul of to-day? Writers, who were mostly Jews: Fried, Fernau, Latzko, Richard Grelling—the author of "J'Accuse." Who was killed, and allowed himself to be killed for these

very ideas and principles? Men and women of the Jewish Race: Haase, Levine, Luxemburg, Landauer, Kurt Eisner, the Prime Minister of Bavaria. . . . From Moses to Marx, from Isajah to Eisner, in practice and in theory, in idealism and in materialism, in philosophy and in politics, they are to-day what they have always been: passionately devoted to their aims and to their purposes, and ready, nay, eager, to shed their last drop of blood for the realisation of their visions.

"But these visions are all wrong," you will reply. . . . "Look where they have led the world to. Think, that they have now had a fair trial of 3,000 years standing. How much longer are you going to recommend them to us and to inflict them upon us? And how do you propose to get us out of the morass into which you have launched us, if you do not change the path upon which you have led the world so disastrously astray?"

To this question I have only one answer to give, and it is this: "You are right." This reproach of yours, which—I feel it for certain—is at the bottom of your anti-Semitism, is only too well justified, and upon this common ground I am quite willing to shake hands with you and defend you against any accusation of promoting Race Hatred: If you are anti-Semite, I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite too, and a much more fervent one than even you are. . . . We have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3,000, 2,000, nay, a 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an ever wider anarchy. I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, and with a sorrow, whose depth and pain an ancient Psalmist, and only he, could moan into this burning universe of ours. . . . We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we, who have even boasted of having given it "the" Saviour, we are to-day nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners. . . . We who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven, we have finally

succeeded in landing you into a new Hell. . . . There has been no progress, least of all moral progress. . . . And it is just our Morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and—what is worse—which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours. . . . I look at this world, and I shudder at its ghastliness: I shudder all the more, as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness. . . .

But its authors themselves, unconscious in this as in all they are doing, know nothing yet of this startling revelation. While Europe is aflame, while its victims scream, while its dogs howl in the conflagration, and while its very smoke descends in darker and even darker shades upon our Continent, the Jews, or at least a part of them, and by no means the most unworthy one, endeavour to escape from the burning building, and wish to retire from Europe into Asia, from the sombre scene of our disaster into the sunny corner of their Palestine. Their eyes are closed to the miseries, their ears are deaf to the moanings, their heart is hardened to the anarchy of Europe: they only feel their own sorrows, they only bewail their own fate, they only sigh under their own burdens. . . . They know nothing of their duty to Europe, which looks around in vain for help and guidance, they know nothing even of their own great ancestors, to whose heart the appeal of pity was never made in vain: they have become too poor in love, too sick at heart, too tired of battle, and lo! these sons of those who were once the bravest of soldiers are now trying to retire from the trenches to the rear, are now eager to exchange the grim music of the whistling shells with that of the cow-bells and vintage songs in the happy plain of Saron. . . .

And yet we are not all Financiers, we are not all Bolsheviks, we have not all become Zionists. . . . And yet there is hope, great hope, that this same Race which has provided the Evil will likewise succeed in supplying its antidote, its remedy—the Good. It has always been so in the past—was not that fatal Liberalism, which has

finally led to Bolshevism—in the very midst of that dark nineteenth century, most strenuously opposed by two enlightened Jews—by Friedrich Stahl, the founder of the Conservative Party in Germany, and by Benjamin Disraeli, the leader of the Tory Party in England? And if these two eminent men had no suspicion yet that their own race and its holy message were at the bottom of that unfortunate upheaval, with which their age was confronted: how eager, how determined, how passionate will be the opposition of the Disraelis of the future, once they have clearly recognised that they are really fighting the tenets of their own people, and that it was their “Good,” their “Love,” their “Ideal,” that had launched the world into this Hell of Evil and Hatred. A new “Good,” as new Love, a true Love, an intelligent Love, a Love that calms and heals and sweetens will then spring up amongst the Great in Israel and overcome that sickly Love, that insipid Love, that romantic Love, which has hitherto poisoned all the Strength and all the Nobility of this world. For Hatred is never overcome by Hatred: it is only overcome by Love, and it wants a new and a gigantic Love, to subdue that old and devilish Hatred of to-day. That is our task for the future—a task which will, I am sure, not be shirked by Israel, by that same Israel which has never shirked a task—whether it was for good, or whether it was for evil. . . .

Yes, there is hope, my friend, for we are still here, our last word is not yet spoken, our last deed is not yet done, our last revolution is not yet made. This last Revolution, the Revolution that will crown our revolutionary work, will be the revolution against the revolutionaries. It is bound to come, and it is perhaps upon us now. The great day of reckoning is near. It will pass a judgment upon our ancient faith, and it will lay the foundation to a new religion. And when that great day has broken, when the values of death and decay are put into the melting-pot to be changed into those of power and beauty, then you, my dear Pitt-Rivers, the descendant of an old and distinguished

Gentile family, may be assured to find by your side, and as your faithful ally, at least one member of that Jewish Race, which has fought with such fatal success upon all the spiritual battlefields of Europe.

Yours against the Revolution and for Life ever
flourishing,

OSCAR LEVY.

ROYAL SOCIETIES CLUB,
ST. JAMES' STREET,
LONDON, S.W.
July, 1920.

THE WORLD SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

<i>Section.</i>	<i>Page.</i>
	PREFACE BY DR. OSCAR LEVY I to XIII
I.	THE POLICY OF UNCONCERN - - - 1
II.	WHAT IS THE REAL ISSUE? - - - 3
III.	THE STRUGGLE IN RUSSIA - - - 4
IV.	THE NEW INDUSTRIALISM, AND THE DAWN OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT - 5
V.	THE PERSONNEL OF "BOLSHEVISM" AND "ANTI-BOLSHEVISM" - - - 8
VI.	THE COLLAPSE OF THE "WHITES" - - 10
VII.	LACK OF PRINCIPLES AND POLICY THE CAUSE OF DEFEAT - - - - - 14
VIII.	WHAT IS BOLSHEVISM? - - - 17
	"BOLSHEVISM" AS A PARTICULAR - - 18
IX.	THE JEW AS TRADER AND AS REVOLUTIONARY 19
X.	THE "IDEALOGY" APOLOGETICS AND POLICY OF BOLSHEVISM - - - - - 21
XI.	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COMMUNISM - - 24
	WOMAN AND THE FAMILY - - - - 24
XII.	THE MEANS TO THE END - - - - 28
	THE RED TERROR - - - - - 30
XIII.	THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERROR - - - - - 31
	SADISM AS MOTIVE - - - - - 31
XIV.	RELIGION - - - - - 35
XV.	THE DISILLUSIONMENT - - - - 37
XVI.	THE JEW FACTOR - - - - - 39
XVII.	OUR "POLICY" - - - - - 41

THE WORLD SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION.

I. THE POLICY OF UNCONCERN.

The last phase of the—by no means unforeseen—collapse of the White anti-Bolshevist forces which may be said to have begun with the failure of Yudenitch to take Petrograd in October, 1919, and ended with the capture of Kolchak in the East, the retreat of Denikin in the South, the new threat to Poland and Central Europe in the West and to Persia and India in the East, had, at least, one signal merit; it at last brought us face to face with the reality of the situation—a situation which compels a total re-examination of our attitude and policy towards it, and which makes the once fashionable attitude of complacent indifference, not only ludicrous, but impossible.

It is easy to hear of an outbreak of cholera in some far distant land with becoming composure, and even, in the fullness of one's heart, to send two shillings to the fund for supplying Christian Hottentots with medical and spiritual comforts. In the same spirit of magnanimity it has been easy to watch from afar the conflagration in Russia, and, under the blissful delusion that it is no concern of ours, to mumble with decorous complacency, "Russia must work out her own salvation without interference from outside," or "Hands off Russia, business as usual." It is true that not very long ago Western Europe, engrossed as she was with a little quarrel of her own (purely about a matter of abstract principle—as to whether the world

should, or should not, be made safe for Democracy) was yet able to take so strong and "disinterested" an interest in Russia that she vowed that never, under any circumstances, would she leave Russia to her fate. Did we not all with the fervour of Sir Galahads re-echo the noble words of President Wilson? "The whole heart of the people of the United States is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves for ever from an autocratic government and to become the master of their own life."¹ Could words exceed the sonorous fatuity, the profound and cynical ineptitude, of such a message at such a time?

And now the much belauded "glorious Revolution" has freed them so satisfactorily from the autocratic Government of the Tzar only to place them under the heel of a far more autocratic government of Alien Internationalists and Jews, who, *unlike* the Tzar's Government, massacre by the hundred thousand, employ gangs of Chinese torturers and executioners to kill people who have never been tried for any offence, who proscribe Religion by torturing priests, who "free" workmen from "wage-slavery" in order to subject them to a far more besotting slavery without wages or a sufficiency of food, and who deliberately starve to death all who do not join them unquestioningly in their criminal folly. And yet—in this country there are still simpletons who in their innocence think that this régime of forced labour and organized rape, which they are told is the longed for "dictatorship of the proletariat," has given any class, except the clique of Alien adventurers, Revolutionaries and criminals, more freedom!

¹ Vide President Wilson's telegram to the American Consul at Moscow, dated March 11th, 1918.

It was from this very rabble of petty extortioners and psycho-pathic anarchists that the monarchical government protected the peasants, who, war-weary and easily inflamed, were allowed by their instigators and exploiters the initial freedom necessary to do away with all the Russian elements capable of ruling, in order that they (the revolutionary Jews) might take the vacant place and exercise despotic sway.

Is this how men become "masters of their own lives?"

There is something exquisitely humorous in the "Hands off Russia" cry in the face of Lenin's declaration of war against the civilized world. We may, it is true, profess to have no further concern in the affairs of Russia, but Lenin and his international Jewish satellites have no intention of replying in the same lofty spirit "Hands off Western Europe." On the contrary they announced with exultant effrontery their intention of making predatory onslaughts upon Poland, Persia and India. Whether or not our "whole heart is with the Russian people" we shall be forced before long to contribute more than pious phrases towards a solution of the problem; neither can that solution be found in panic-stricken attempts to placate an implacable foe by supplying him with the weapons he needs to continue his war against us.

II. WHAT IS THE REAL ISSUE?

Whatever our previous opinions or lack of opinions about the obscure situation in Russia, we are compelled now to discover exactly *what* is at stake. What are the principles involved and what, in consequence, is our policy to be? It is notoriously hard to find a clear-cut issue in the world of thought and endeavour: there are too many people interested in confusing the issue. It

is easy to prate of "the issue between Reaction and Progress." Such verbiage means nothing; every shallow tub-thumper calls his hackneyed catch-words "progressive," and seeks to make the flesh of his *bêtes noires* creep by calling them "reactionary!" "They are nothing," said Disraeli, "but words to mystify the millions. They mean nothing, they are nothing; they are phrases, not facts."

III. THE STRUGGLE IN RUSSIA.

The bewildering play and inter-play of forces which has finally enthroned Lenin in the seat of power may well confuse the casual eye. How is it that Lenin, the neurotic son of a public official and the brother of an assassin, with a small executive consisting chiefly of alien or of Jew internationals,¹ is able to exercise despotic sway over a population (before the revolution) of 148 millions, of which at least 87% are peasants bitterly opposed to communism, and of the remainder consisting of industrial proletariat (less than 3% of the population) *intelligentsia*, and the parasitic Commissar and public executioner class, the latter class only (at most 2% of the whole) does not loath the régime?

The answer to the riddle can only be understood if we clearly distinguish between the attractiveness of the propaganda, decoy-cries and prospects of unbridled licence which hypnotised the masses on the initial "breaking-up" stage, and the bitter realization which came after their dupes had allowed their new masters to

¹ There were practically speaking no Jews in North or Central Russia, since they had always been excluded from all parts of Russia except Russian Poland.

establish themselves in power. It is also necessary to distinguish the exotic ruling element from the exploited masses they use, and to trace its rise to power.

The Revolutionary outbreak in Russia in the year 1905 was the direct result of a revolutionary struggle of which the active participants on both sides were confined to an exceedingly small section of the total population, it was in fact a struggle between two sections of the educated classes. The latter consisted of a few million aristocrats, professional men, officials, merchants, journalists, agitators, and land-owners—a mere fraction in a population containing 145 millions of peasants. And within this fraction, the elements of discord on both sides of the struggle were a still more tiny fraction of the nation.

IV. THE NEW INDUSTRIALISM, AND THE DAWN OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT.

Industrialism is a new factor in Russian life, an importation from Western Europe that had its origin about the end of the nineteenth century ; and with the industrial invasion of Russia came the mammonised ideals and values of Commercialism with all their potentialities for strife. In the words of Mr. Stephen Graham : " Intelligentsia, bourgeoisie, and proletariat are all products of the same family ; they are *westernised* Russians ; books, commerce, industry, the three boasted instruments of our civilization have not civilized Russians, they have *de-civilized* them. But, as yet, Russians of this character form only a tiny fragment of the nation."

Between the forties and the sixties, and fostered by

the same new forces (i.e., mammonism and industrialism) there set in a revolutionary movement which went by the name of Nihilism, of which Tchernishefski, the novelist, was the leader, and Dobrolinboff, a writer, Micaïloff, a professor, Bakunin, Prince Kropotkin, Sophia Perovskaia, a pupil of Dobrolinboff, who like Kropotkin belonged to the higher nobility of Russia, and a host of other neuro-pathic "intellectuals," and Anarchists, such as Herten and Ogareff, who published their propaganda from London, were henchmen.

By 1862 the movement had spread with marvellous rapidity among the morbid and neurotic elements of the literary and student classes, who were as concerned in their anarchical principles to prove their contempt of all control by growing their hair long, neglecting their persons and by an utter chaos and lack of any order in their sexual and matrimonial relations, as they were to promote bloodshed and revolution among the working populations of the towns. In spite of the extensive propaganda campaign in the towns and villages, in spite of the growing inefficiency of an effete bureaucracy tending always to assimilate the ideas and values of Western "Liberalism-cum-Commercialism," they met with little or no response from the agricultural masses, who indeed have small liking for either anarchy or communism—least of all when they have tasted either!

All this, of course, is well known history, but the complete collapse of the Nihilist movement after the assassination of Alexander II. in 1881, when for a brief spell a better and stronger administrative awoke from the former reign of lethargy and incompetence, serves to illustrate the facts so often ignored, which have an equal

bearing upon the Revolutionary movement of 1905 and upon the situation to day.

- (1) The Revolutionary movement in Russia is a foreign exotic growth, flourishing and subsisting not only upon the ideas of Western Socialism and Liberalism, but indispensably upon the factory systems introduced into an agricultural community by foreign capitalists. It should be remembered that the Russian Liberal party first made overtures to the Revolutionaries in order to form an alliance with them in 1878.
- (2) That the movement found its native recruits *not* among the peasantry, and only to a relatively small extent among the newly manufactured proletariat, but predominantly among the more or less decadent anarchistic specimens of the upper classes, and among the young peasants, taken away from their rural occupations on the land, who received University Education from the Liberal Government of Alexander II., a book education divorced from moral teaching, which is *least* conducive to employment when completed. A system similar to the one of giving Indian "baboo" English University Education and no opening afterwards, and little chance of turning it to any better use in their own country than in editing revolutionary and seditious papers.
- (3) That the firmness, or it might even be tyranny, of the governments was directed against the alien anarchist and the Jew, and that when these classes were excluded the peasantry were contented and happy for the reason that it was the Jew, who, in a country ill-equipped with a native middle-class when he *did* penetrate into the rural communities, became the banker, usurer, shop-keeper and middleman, and ground the faces of the poor.

- (4) That it was not the tyranny of the Russian governments, nor the supposed discontent of the masses which caused them to fall, but their weakness, growing incompetence and the sinister machinations of Jews and international doctrinaires, which finally culminated in their collapse under the appalling strain of the War. In other words, it fell, not because it was autocratic, an autocracy at least implies an autocrat with a will and a purpose, but because it had long *ceased* to be autocratic, and was merely weak, incompetent, and lacking in policy, will and purpose.

V. THE PERSONNEL OF "BOLSHEVISM" AND "ANTI-BOLSHEVISM."

We now approach the question : What are the opposing forces in the struggle ? To suppose that the barbarous terms " Bolshevism " and " anti-Bolshevism " do any more than supply two very misleading labels which explain nothing, is to show a signal lack of power to appreciate the situation and to probe beneath the surface scum of verbal obscurantism. Before the long foreseen, utter, and inevitable collapse of the White Anti-Bolshevik Armies, the Red Army representing Bolshevism, and the White Army under Kolchak, Denikin, and Yudenitch, were composed, for the most part, entirely of the same material, that is to say the *Russian* element in both armies was identical. The rank and file on both sides were Russians of the same class, with the same sympathies, and the same interests. They were ignorant and illiterate Russian peasants, whose only clear and all-compelling motive was to get enough food and clothing to keep them from death by starvation and cold. The very

same men were fighting alternately first on one side, then on the other. When Kolchak or Denikin advanced, their recruits were drawn almost entirely from Red prisoners; and whole divisions and corps went over to them when they got the chance. When the Whites retreated or had their communications threatened by traitors and Bolshevik emissaries in their rear, these same troops passed over again to the Reds.

So much for the rank and file, Red or White, it was all the same. Even the officers on both sides were to a great extent officers of the old Tzarist Armies. The Soviet Government learned (better than the other side) that to fight you must have an efficient army, and an efficient army needs trained officers and an iron discipline. Gradually the Red Armies became more efficient.

The methods by which they had secured the services of the old officer class, or rather the proportion that had survived massacre and execution, was simple but effective. Their wives and womenfolk are held hostages, at the first sign of infidelity, the extraordinary commission consigns these women to torture and death. The Communist Party—so-called "Convinced Communists"—is splendidly organized, in fact the only party in the country which is organized. Although an infinitesimal fraction of the population,¹ they have spies everywhere. The commissaries, mainly Jews, have perfected an organization by which the "convinced" communists are secretly distributed amongst the staffs and rank and file of the Army, and throughout the Soviet governmental and administrative machinery, on a plan analagous to secret masonic organizations. Every officer and every

¹ Only 600,000 people.

official is carefully watched. As long as they serve their Soviet masters the "employee's" condition is good, in fact in many ways his position is better than on the White side, for besides sufficient food and comfort for his family, officers are given absolute power over the soldiery; flogging and shooting are the only punishments. They realize, too, the hopeless and heart-breaking conditions under which their former brother-officers on the White side tried to lead an army under impossible conditions. The Whites, of course, were far too "democratic" to be either disciplined or efficient. Far too much a pot-pourri of incompatible and irreconcilable elements vainly trying to find a compromise, united only by a common hostility to another régime which does at any rate know what it wants, to be either thorough or purposeful.

VI. THE COLLAPSE OF THE "WHITES."

How can an army in the field fight an enemy, "when their division commander is arrested within an hour of the time fixed for their offensive, and his chief of staff has to be shot for being a Bolshevik intelligence officer? How can an offensive be carried out when a general who has given written assurances of his loyalty, and has undertaken certain important co-operation, makes an attack on the forces of his commander-in-chief instead?"¹ How can a commander-in-chief expect to maintain discipline when he fails to suppress the open sale to civilians of military stores at his own headquarters by his own officers? Yet all these incidents took place in Yudenitch's Army before it collapsed.

¹ From the letter of a British official who chooses to remain anonymous.

Is it any argument in favour of the Bolshevik régime that their White opponents are corrupt and incompetent, owing, in part, to the conditions forced upon them by the Allies (who throughout have encouraged *only a negative and vacillating policy*, viz.: anti-monarchical and anti-Bolshevik), and in part to the presence and influence of alien intriguers on the White side? Yet General Gough and many other superficial thinkers in England appear to imagine it is.

Is it surprising that discipline cannot be maintained in an army composed of warring elements, where the few loyal officers are exposed to the *sabotage* and conspiracy of alien intriguers and traitors? A system of *sabotage* which began with the first organization of the Volunteer Army in Siberia where a few loyal officers rallied round the Czecho-Slovaks. The same Czecho-Slovaks who eventually stabbed Kolchak in the back and secured his defeat; finally surrendering him to the Bolsheviks for execution. Is it surprising that Kolchak found it next to impossible to administer occupied territory when his political counsellors could unite on no policy beyond a willingness to defer *all* questions of policy and principle to the decision of a Constituent Assembly which is to be convoked after the destruction of the Soviet administration, and decline to accept even the temporary makeshift which might bind them to a definite principle?

Above all is it surprising that the White administration could have no policy, and the White Army could have no discipline, when one remembers the history of its growth. The part in it for instance, played by one, Savinkoff, who after a little difference with his next-of-kin the Bolsheviks and his failure to find employment with Denikin, joined

his fellows of the Social Revolutionary Party—in Ufa—to form a Directorate, consisting exclusively of Social Revolutionaries or Mensheviks,¹ whose first steps were to institute soldiers' committees, commissaries, election of officers by their men, etc. All the methods in fact, which a year before had transformed 7½ million Russian troops into one band of deserters and mauraders.

Admiral Kolchak, it is true, temporarily scotched the plan to destroy his Army from behind his back, by arresting the directorate. They were, however, subsequently released, and dispersed, vowing vengeance on Kolchak, some of them, at any rate one of their number, Tchernoff, returning to Moscow and his friends the Bolsheviks.

Their activities were next directed against the "Russian Political Conference" in Paris, in the beginning of 1919. Here again Savinkoff took a prominent part with the other "heaven-sent" protagonists of the Kerensky revolution—the first, the glorious and thoroughly "democratic" revolution.

Mde. Breshko Brehkovskaya boomed the movement in America, and Dr. Soskiss, Kerensky's Secretary became its high priest in London. The first object, of course, was to secure the downfall of the "wicked" counter-revolutionary Kolchak. A strenuous propaganda campaign was started to discredit him by labelling him "reactionary" and "autocratic," which, of course, are the stock social-revolutionary synonyms for efficiency when applied to their enemies. Kolchak was on no account to be helped unless he took the "democratic"

¹ Tchernoff, Argounoff, Avksentieff, Zenzinoff.

oath of allegiance, i.e., he was to re-adopt the Social-Revolutionary experiments which successfully ruined the Russian Army in 1917. Unless these conditions were enforced Allied help must immediately be withdrawn. Meanwhile another branch of the same gang sprang up in Siberia. Unfortunately their efforts were now more fruitful. "Counter-Revolutionary" (i.e., experienced and capable) officers were replaced by "democratic" geniuses of the 1917 type. After much struggle, the principle of commissaries, committees and elected officers, was enforced, and the retreat which began in October and November, 1919, the loss of Omsk—the beginning of the end—was the immediate and inevitable sequel. The story of the Yudenitch failure is very similar, for the same hand was at work there; plotting in the rear of the Army and controlling supplies.

Their names, of course, with one or two exceptions, convey little to the English public, and some of them may shelter under the protective laws of this hospitable country. In any case the names of the members of the Social-Revolutionary party which devoted their especial attention to the Baltic are well-known. With the proximate success of General Yudenitch, Petrograd—the city of the dead, and the "Northern Commune's days were numbered." To prevent this at all cost was the work of our "friends" of the Revolutionary left. They hampered the Government and the Ministries, and they controlled large finances.

The sudden collapse of Yudenitch before the very gates of Petrograd, testifies to the thoroughness of their work.

The equally sudden decision to withdraw all British Troops from Archangel owing to the pressure of their friends and their *dupes* in England drew the curtain on the drama and its logical *finale*.

There are still people, especially in England, who ask in mild surprise how it is that the Whites everywhere collapsed so completely and effectually; when the forces at work within the White movement are examined in the light of the afore-mentioned circumstances it need occasion very little surprise. The reflection however that the Allied Governments did so much to assist the machinations of those whose avowed object was to work "for the advent of a Social-Revolutionary government and to maintain the Bolsheviks in power until preparations of the Social-Revolutionary party were completed, and, at all costs, to prevent the march on Petrograd," this reflection may indeed be a mortifying one to those who had little idea of what was going on behind the scenes.

VII. LACK OF PRINCIPLES AND POLICY THE CAUSE OF DEFEAT.

The White Armies were defeated, because they were inefficient, they were inefficient because political traitors were allowed to conspire to ensure their *inefficiency*. The administration of the occupied White territories also ensured the collapse of the movement for the same reasons. The Whites could unite on no policy because they *had* no common policy, because all their efforts were nullified by intrigue, conspiracy and "sabotage," and finally *because no movement representing a heterogeneous jumble of contradictory and incompatible elements*

can ever defeat another movement which at any rate knows its own mind and allows of no compromise.

A definite *positive* movement alone can defeat another definite movement. Even the Russian peasants understand this better than the Allied statesmen and the politicians. When Denikin was making his rapid advance on Moscow the enthusiasm of the peasants of the liberated territories was unbounded. They marched out in procession to greet their deliverers, bearing at their head their Holy Eikons and the portrait of the Tzar. Imagine their perplexed chagrin when the astute political officers in Denikin's retinue told them to bury their baubles, carefully explaining that their "little quarrel with the Bolshies" had nothing to do with the Tzar, in fact they really agreed with them about the Tzar; they had not yet had time to make up their minds as to *exactly* what it was they *did* want to substitute for the Bolshevik Show. Anyhow they would see when they got to Moscow, and everyone must trust them because they were thoroughly "democratic." No one could dispute that, because they said so themselves. Are you surprised that the peasants went away sadly shaking their heads and saying, "We thought you had come to save us from the Bolsheviks, if you don't want Bolsheviks obviously you must have a Tzar, but now we see you are only another brand of Bolshevik after all?"

The so-called "policy" of the "Whites" and "anti-Bolsheviks" was very characteristically set forth in a series of articles by Mr. Paul Dukes in the *Times*, in October and November, 1919.¹

Mr. Dukes explained very clearly and explicitly that

¹ See especially concluding article of Nov. 12th.

the Whites were "anti"-Tzarist and "anti"-Bolshevist. The Russian people he thought "may not have learned what they want," he, at any rate, would "*attach no importance to the oft-expressed wish of the peasantry to have a Tzar back.*" It is not, of course, to be expected that anyone who has no more definite ideas than that he is "thoroughly democratic" would attach any importance to any positive aspirations! The peasantry, he says, have certainly learned that they do *not* want "Bolshevism," so this is the "positive policy" which, he claims, all Russian parties except extreme monarchists and Bolsheviks wish for instead: they are contained in the following seven "original aims" of the "Centre Party."

- (1) Complete transference of the land to the peasantry. (This was one of the first cries the Bolsheviks thought of.)
- (2) Separation of Church and State. (The Bolsheviks likewise did this long ago.)
- (3) Acceptance of the main principles of Bolshevist development of education. (Even an "anti"-party might have thought of something more original!)
- (4) Acceptance of the main principles of Bolshevist marriage law. (An equally candid confession!)
- (5) Restoration to workmen of effective measure of control in factories. (Same comment as No. 1.)
- (6) Reform of laws of justice on a *popular* basis. (Obviously much easier than to promise efficiency and equity, and it needs no definition!)
- (7) Convocation at earliest moment of a national assembly. (A grand excuse for having no policy or principles of their own!)

VIII. WHAT IS BOLSHEVISM ?

We have seen that outwardly there was little difference between the Red Armies, and the White Armies, the material on both sides consisted mainly of Russian peasants whose only real concern was peace and food. They got none of the former and little enough of the latter. On both sides there was also a considerable foreign element. In the Red Army were Chinese, Letts and dago mercenaries of every description. In the White Armies were Czecho-Slovaks, and alien ex-prisoners of war. The Red Armies have a sprinkling of German military experts on their staffs, and the Whites had a sprinkling of Allied officers. Why then are these Armies, so nearly alike in personnel, nationality and interests, fighting each other ?

The answer is supplied when an examination reveals what Bolshevism really is.

Like all other terms denoting a definite historical movement associated with an " ideology " more or less particular to it, the term Bolshevism has been used to express, not only the bare fact of its existence, but in addition all the odium, and also, let it not be forgotten, the rapturous approval, of its partisans and opponents. But mere abuse and mere effusive praise does not help to explain, in the least, what a thing is—its characteristics, properties, origin, relations and consequences.

However inadequately, an attempt will here be made to analyse it as scientifically and briefly as possible. In dealing with it in the broadest possible way it will be found necessary to deal with it under two aspects—common to all scientific classification—the generic and the specific. That is to say we must now recognise that " Bolshevism "

is not simply a sporadic growth which suddenly makes its appearance as the result of one nation's economic and military collapse, but that it is a movement with a very long history and which in its development bears the closest association to, and the identical symptoms of, movement in other countries and at other periods of the world's history. Our account must therefore involve two sets of ideas: one deals with the particular, the other with the type; the former with its symptoms, i.e., what it is ostensibly—its apologetics, its "ideology," its growth; its locality, historical antecedents, and particular and immediate causes and effects. And the latter with its diagnosis; it treats it psychologically and comparatively; with its motives, its affective (i.e., emotional) power, and the *general* causes of its condition: these being peculiar to no country and no time.

"BOLSHEVISM" AS A PARTICULAR.

Everyone by now knows that the origin of the term "Bolshevik" was merely the accidental fact that at the Brussels-London Conference of the Left Social Democratic Party in 1903, the extreme left wing had a majority (Bolshinstvo). As a party they now officially style themselves "The Communist Party (of the Bolsheviks.)"

The origin and growth of the Revolutionary movement in Russia has already been briefly sketched out, and attention has been called to the fact that it had its rise in Russia with the introduction of industrialism in the nineteenth century, and the importation, from the highly commercialised countries of Western Europe, of the Socialistic and Communistic doctrines which a highly mammonised industrial system inevitably breeds—as

surely as a foul body breeds lice. We had also to insist on the essentially different type of civilisation presented by an almost exclusively agricultural country like Russia, and, as a consequence, the patriarchal nature of its government, and the comparative absence of middle classes, bourgeoisie and proletariat (industrial operatives); all these imported classes forming an insignificant fraction of the total population. It can now be understood why the patriarchal government of the Tzars took care to exclude and vigorously control Jews, who, as a class, are normally found in greatest numbers among the bankers, middlemen, profiteers and usurers.

IX.—THE JEW AS TRADER AND REVOLUTIONARY.

Generations of persecution and repression developed in the ghettos a race whose powers of adaptation under such treatment must necessarily have preserved many of the meanest (the most adaptable) as well as a few of the noblest elements (the most resistant to a mean environment) amongst them. Constantly plundered and robbed of their goods, they have learned to handle the power that lies in bonds and exchangeable tokens of wealth. When deprived of the concrete goods of this world they have set store by the abstract or the ideal. The Jewish race has produced great financiers and merchants, but also great scientists, great philosophers and great prophets. When a Jew believes in an ideal he will give himself up to it more whole-heartedly, perhaps, than any Gentile. When he rebels against the inhospitable country of his birth, he rebels passionately with a slow, persistent fire, and waits for his revenge; but when he can identify himself and his power with the country which sheltered

him, he becomes one of those rare powers of consolidation which was brought to so fine a pitch in the person of Benjamin Disraeli.

It would be futile to suggest that all Bolsheviks are Jews, or that it is *merely* a Jew movement. I am only trying to show why, as a matter of *fact*, Revolutionaries are so largely Jews in Russia. The full significance of the part played by the Jews in Bolshevism must be postponed for a while ; meanwhile it is sufficient to point out that :

- (1) Russia had particular attractions for the " usurer " instinct of the Jews as a class, because of the greater thriftlessness and helplessness of the illiterate peasantry, and the absence of middle-class rivals.
- (2) The not unnatural resentment of Jews in Russia at their repression, and exclusion from so profitable and favourable a field for their particular type of genius. Their suppression resulted in the formation of the most formidable of the revolutionary parties in modern Russia the so-called " Jewish Bund."
- (3) The equally natural solicitude of a paternal government, its primary *duty*, to save its masses from exploitation at the hands of a foreign element in its midst. The " pogroms " which even now continue, in spite of the protection of a Jew bureaucracy, being sufficient proof of the Russian peasant's hatred of the Jew—deplorable in their effects and in themselves though pogroms are.

At this point it may not be out of place to make a very brief digression by pointing out that it was in England, the home of the Jew, that the Tzar's Government was always systematically vilified, and for years made out as the blackest home of tyranny and oppression in the

world. Although there were English writers like Mr. Stephen Graham who, years ago, went out to Russia to live there because he considered it the freest country in Europe. It was, of course, the least commercialised, while England, one of the most commercialised countries—and the greatest lovers and entertainers of Jews—in the world, in consequence, sees no merit in a *simple agricultural existence*. Neither is it surprising in view of her cult of unlimited industrialism, and its consequences—an ever-expanding industrial and urban population—free commercial exploitation by all and sundry middlemen, usurers, Jews; and the translations of all values into money-values, by which alone can be realized that ideal of personal equality, dead-levelness and compulsory mediocrity in which she glories under the name of Liberalism and Democracy. Can England with her tradition of 300 years of Jew-loving free-mammonism, democratic-shopkeeping, Puritanism, and obsessional urban-industrial expansion, in any case understand a healthier ideal of rural simplicity and paternal government, which, in spite of the obvious short-comings of his successor, was the ideal of Alexander III?

X. THE "IDEOLOGY" APOLOGETICS AND POLICY OF BOLSHEVISM.

We all know that the central idea of the Bolshevik "ideology" is internationalism and communism. Agricultural Russia was selected as the scene of an experiment in economic and social theory which had its birth-place in industrial Germany. The psychology of the Russian would favour the attempt, for unlike the Teuton and the

Saxon, the Slav attempts to realize his ideas in action. But these international forces did not emerge till after the overthrow of the first Revolution. It is important that we should clearly realize the three-cornered nature of the struggle. The first Revolution saw the bourgeois-socialists and the commercial interests overthrowing the war-weakened and disorganized government of officials and native aristocracy which stood in the way of the full commercialization and capitalization of the whole country. It must not be thought that at this stage the internationalists and communists took no part. They had long been maturing their plans and they were content to keep out of sight to start with ; at the same time aiding by every means in their power the initial phase of the first Revolution, which must inevitably precede the introduction of their own régime. The commercialists and bourgeois-socialists of the Kerensky régime were used as an *indispensable weapon* for the attainment of their ends. Lenin, as a Marxian socialist, had, for a great number of years, realized that Russia must first be *commercialized* before she could be destroyed, as all states must be destroyed in the interests of "internationalism." As far back as 1894, in spite of other differences, he agreed with the constitutional social-democrat (Cadet) Struve, on the "necessity, the inevitability, and the progressive function of Russian capitalism." It was only through the industrialization of Russia that she could be made ripe for his communistic schemes, or rather it was through the partial and incomplete industrialization of the country that she could be made vulnerable at all.

As Lenin represents the very small but energetic group of theoretical international-communists, and who is further

distinguished by being one of the few who is actually a Russian (by birth, though not in sentiment), and also one of the ablest of them, it will be as well to relate his origin.

According to his biographer and great admirer, Zinoviev, (the Bolshevik Minister, a Jew, whose former name was Apfelbaum), Lenin, whose real name is Vladimer Iliitch Oulianov, was born in 1870 at Simbirsk, and was the son of a councillor of state, belonging to a family of hereditary nobility. His brother was executed for the attempted assassination of Alexander III. in 1887. Vladimer Lenin's whole life was spent in exile, organizing revolutionary schemes.

He has always had a perfectly clear and consistent idea as to the means to be adopted to attain his ends, and the end itself. The end was, of course, the dictatorship of Lenin, and a subservient executive, over the masses from whom all possible rival leaders had been removed. Trotsky, his right-hand man and chief lieutenant (also a Jew) has said of him, "To him the rule of social democracy means martial law, the rule of Lenin over social democracy. He has taken upon himself the rôle of the incorruptible Robespierre." The idea is, of course, the very essence of communism, which necessarily implies a dead level equality of the masses without individual possessions, or ambitions, in complete subjection to the will of a despot. In primitive communities this can, of course, be realized. It was this ideal which was never distant from the mind of Karl Marx. In his "Capital" (p. 351) he thus describes the primitive organization of Indian village communities. "Side by side with the masses thus occupied with one and the same work, we

find the "chief inhabitant," who is judge, police and tax-gatherer in one; the book-keeper who keeps the accounts of the village, the Bramin, water-overseer and other officials exercising authority."

XI. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COMMUNISM.

Communism is, psychologically, economically and morally, a return to the primitive and barbarous. Socialistic and communist writers, consequently, when they write and show that communism in any form is workable because it *has* worked, are bound to revert for their instances to an immature and primitive civilization, just as Marx does. What they advocate is therefore regression—in truth they become "extreme reactionaries." This return to the primitive and crude inevitably affects every department of life. It affects most vitally the "family"—the keystone of civilization.

WOMAN AND THE FAMILY.

Anthropologists are now generally agreed that man's original state was one of comparative sexual promiscuity. The earliest attempts at organization brought about the Mother Age or Matriarchy. The uncertainty of paternity resulting from sexual promiscuity naturally thrust the mother, the only known parent, into the position of prominence. Group marriage, where the men of one tribe or clan make common use of the women of another (probably the original form of exogamy) is merely a socially limited form of promiscuity. It is still based upon a form of matriarchy in which the women must be to some extent communized and the offspring become the children of the

tribe. It represents the period antecedent to, but incompatible with, the family system, upon which all true culture and civilization rests. From the organization of society on the family basis, sprang *the ideas and customs of property and inheritance*. Hence was developed the father's care for his progeny, and his sense of responsibility for their future welfare, even after his decease. The development of these sentiments caused enormous strides to be made in the progress and welfare of the race; it lengthened men's visions, and induced them to subordinate present pleasure to future racial welfare.

All communists in their mad desire for a return to the primitive (clearly to be distinguished from a desire for simplification, which might indeed be a great step forward) sooner or later have to direct their attacks against the family system, which they seek to undermine. Every attempt at communism that has ever taken place, has, logically enough, sought to establish a communisation of women. The idea of community of wives appears in Plato's Republic, and Dante makes a brief reference in the "Inferno" to a friar, Dolcino, who, in 1305, led a company of some 3,000 men and women into the mountains of Lombardy. They lived by depredation for two years and practised community of property and wives. Their leader eventually died at the stake in Novara in 1307.

Perhaps the best known practical attempt at Communism was that made by the Perfectionists of Oneida in America in 1847. Here again, community of women was practised and taught, as an indispensable feature of communism. Appeal was made to the Bible, which teaches that in the Kingdom of Heaven, the institution of marriage, which assigns the exclusive possession of one woman

to one man, does not exist. They affirmed in words almost identical with those used by the Bolsheviks to-day —(though the latter refrain from quoting the Bible) that “there is no intrinsic difference between property in persons and property in things; and that the same spirit which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money, would abolish, if circumstances allowed full scope to it, exclusiveness in regard to women and children. St. Paul expressly places property in women and property in goods in the same category. . . . amativeness and acquisitiveness are only different channels of one stream.”¹

This last observation is indeed true; and it is as absurd and unnatural to deny or to pervert the normal and beneficent expression of the one as of the other. The endeavour should be to direct both in the general interests of society. The total suppression or fanatical interference with either has always led to the most serious consequences.

It may be remarked that one of the greatest differences between these early attempts to communize women and property and the attempts made by the Bolsheviks consists in the fact that the former communists have usually been content to communize their own property and their own women. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, while professing the same principles, have systematically appealed to the cupidity, acquisitiveness and lust of those with little or nothing to lose, by holding out to them the prospects of enrichment, at the expense of those to be dispossessed, and of acquiring their women. In the words of the decree of the Soviet of Kronsdat posted in Saratoff in East Russia and in Ekaterinberg in the beginning of 1919, “Social

¹ See J. H. Noyes' *History of American Socialisms*, p. 624, 625.

inequalities and legitimate marriages having been a condition in the past which served as an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie, thanks to which all the best species of all the beautiful have been the property of the bourgeoisie, the proper continuation of the human race has been prevented. All women according to this decree are exempted from private ownership, and are proclaimed to be the property of the whole nation." What, therefore, was merely voluntary promiscuity in the earlier communisms became rape in Bolshevik Russia. "Bolshevism" is in fact an extreme form of regression—of lapsing back to the primitive and undeveloped. It is the Rousseauesque *retour à l'état de nature*.

To realize his communistic ideals one thing Lenin saw to be absolutely necessary, the existing State and all rival classes capable of leading and governing, and with them democracy itself must be completely annihilated. And in order to attain this end all means must be adopted to undermine the existing State, *all* revolutionary movements encouraged, and economic depression, commercial exploitation and everything tending to produce discontent, unrest and misery, must naturally be fostered. On this subject Lenin is perfectly candid, and equally clear about the means to be adopted. The first stage is simply one of breaking up. The working classes must be incited to break up the State, and to clear away all its native leaders who stand in the way of foreign and international exploiters. Without leaders and men of integrity and superior ability, the masses are helpless and fall an easy prey to the organized invaders. Thus Lenin writes on p. 39 of his "State and Revolution," "The working class must break up, shatter the available machinery

of the State," and on p. 84, he reminds us that "it is constantly forgotten that the destruction of the State involves also the destruction of democracy." But according to Lenin, the value of democracy is instrumental. Its catch-words are good propaganda, and *it constitutes a necessary phase by hastening the wrecking process*, just as Capitalism has to be encouraged and hastened in order to destroy "Feudalism." He writes, "The immense significance of the struggle of the proletariat for *equality*, and the power of *attraction* of such a battle-cry are obvious, if we rightly interpret it as meaning the *annihilation of classes*" (p. 102)—with the exception, of course, of the Internationalists and some of their Jew friends! The attainment of a dead-level of equality by the simple method of exterminating all classes with the capacity to lead and direct, endows the confederation of secret conspirators with absolute power, when the time comes, to exert a despotism without fear of rivalry or interference.

XII. THE MEANS TO THE END.

It is clear, then, and indisputable that whatever incongruous and opportunist elements may have attached themselves to the Bolshevik cause, and whatever wholly distinct forces may have utilized the Bolsheviks for entirely different purposes of their own, there yet exists at the very core of the movement a small band of determined and fanatical theorists who genuinely believe in Communism, and who, logically enough, see that such a régime could only be established, or even attempted by (1) themselves assuming absolute power; (2) by a *world-international* revolution; (3) by equalization of all national

classes by amputation, as the only means to the consolidation of their own *super*-national power.

Once the ultimate objective and desideratum of the communist-internationalists is grasped, their policy and propaganda is easy to understand. That desideratum, is, in a phrase, absolute power for themselves and absolute equality and subservience for everyone else.

The first phase and objective is the smashing up and wrecking of all existing institutions and States. For this purpose *all* revolutionary, anarchial and disintegrative forces must be stimulated and encouraged.

The culmination of the first phase is brought to a close by the Reign of Terror, which is an essential instrument, and indispensable, in their policy for removing all rivals to their bid for absolute power.

Lenin had planned the Terror years before he assumed power, and his writings are full of the function of the *bellum omnium contra omnes*. Thus he wrote, "Down with the sentimental dream of peace at any price; let us raise the Standard of civil war. We Marxists have always been and continue partisans of revolutionary war against all counter-revolutionary peoples."

In this first phase of wrecking and destruction all those who have nothing at all to lose, all criminals, anarchists and homicidal maniacs will naturally rally to the call with the prospect of satisfying their lusts for licence, power, plunder, and rape. The first phase is ochlocracy. But behind the blind delirium of mob destruction works the secret organization directing it against all its enemies in order to annihilate them completely. It was Danton who said "in times of revolution authority remains with the greatest scoundrels."

THE RED TERROR.

The silly argument of Bolshevik apologists that the Red Terror was either : (1) the consequence of " Counter-revolutionary " movements, or (2) the excesses of a " nation of slaves," brought by long years of oppression to a pitch of exasperation that found a vent in crimes and horrors, is easily proved a base invention, for the reasons that : (1) the Terror was planned, written about and advocated, by the Bolsheviks before they came into power. (2) The tortures and massacres are arranged and executed by the " Chezvyckaikas " (extraordinary commissions for fighting counter revolution) who employ for this purpose not the ordinary peasant, but criminals, murderers and low-class Chinese mercenaries ; and the peasants themselves, after the virtual extermination of that small proportion of the population which contained the " other classes," have always been the chief victims.

As apologists have so often, and still do, attempt to defend their Bolshevik or Jacobin heroes by accusing the mass of the people of the loathsome crimes which the Bolshevik leaders themselves planned, it is of interest to note the close parallels existing between the terroristic régimes of the Bolsheviks, and of the Jacobins of France in 1793. In the latter country, as Mrs. Webster remarks in her able history of the French Revolution, anarchy and terror were deliberately planned and brought about as the result of a policy long previously decided upon. " The members of the Triumvirate that headed the Mountain were agreed in regarding a period of anarchy as necessary to the realization of their vision, and were therefore content to work together in order to destroy

existing conditions. For this purpose it was necessary to enlist the aid of the mob—that portion of the people, mainly women, who, having nothing to lose by general confusion, were ready in return for adequate remuneration to stamp and shout for each party in turn. Applauders and murderers are to be had at all prices.”

A good example of the transparent absurdity of this stock argument of English white-washers of Bolshevism is provided in Lieut-Col. Malone's recent booklet, *The Russian Republic*. In order to try and show that the Red Government was obliged to make, and justified in making somewhat wholesale exemplary executions, because of the Allies' organised attempts to assassinate Lenin, which provoked “popular indignation,” resulting in rioting and massacre, he refers to a declaration published in the Parisian Press in August, 1919, by Savinkoff, “in which he claims the credit for having organised the murder of Lenin.” In view of what has already been related about the activities of Savinkoff (see § VI. p. 12), who has so admirably served the Bolshevik cause, there is a humorous irony in claiming him as working for the forces of “monarchical reaction and counter-revolution.”

XIII. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TERROR. SADISM AS MOTIVE.

While it does little good to dwell on the horrors and bestialities that have been committed wholesale in Red Russia, all mention of their psychological significance cannot altogether be omitted, as they serve to give meaning to what would otherwise seem to lack explanation. It has long been known to the medical profession and to

psychiatrists that the lust to murder and inflict acute suffering is often an all-dominating motive in the conduct of a very large number of pathological individuals. That is to say that murdering, torturing and raping have been indulged in and systematically organised to a very great extent in both the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution. Among the conscious or unconscious motives in the scoundrels who perpetrate these crimes there exists in many of them the satisfaction afforded by indulging their perverted and diabolical tastes.¹

Such an individual was Jean Baptiste Carrier, a wholesale executioner in the French Revolution, and the willing tool of Marat, whom this little misshapen, hideous dwarf resembled in many ways.

Carrier enrolled companies of criminals, negroes and mulattos, one of which was called "The Company of Marat," just as Trotsky & Co. formed Terrorist Troops and Chinese gangs in Russia, and just as the troops of "Lenin Boys," under a homicidal Jew maniac called Szamuely, were formed during the Communistic Terror in Hungary. These companies were used by Carrier to butcher men, women and children, chiefly of the peasant

¹ Many authorities hold that this instinct to inflict or to suffer pain lies hidden in *every man's* subconsciousness, but only finds expression in normal and healthy individuals in harmless and useful "sublimated" forms, as in artistic work, poetry, games, sports, etc. The perverted and pathological manifestations of the instinct are more likely to appear in those individuals or races whose normal outlets for free expression have suffered unduly from a long course of "repression." For these, religion or alcohol, by supplying the mechanism of "sublimation," may act as compensation, and preserve the sanity of many, who, when both are withheld and the "Reign of Reason" is proclaimed, must fall a prey to madness.

class, as Prudhomme describes, during the terror at Nantes. It was Carrier who invented the famous "*noyades*" or wholesale drownings, which also took place at Nantes; when, according to the estimate of one of Carrier's own committee, 9,000 people, priests, peasants, and women with babies were herded into barges, which were taken out and sunk in the Loire. Carrier's own declaration of the intense joy he experienced in seeing his victims suffer are recorded at his eventual trial after the downfall of Robespierre. "I have never laughed so much," he declared, "as when I saw the grimaces those priests made as they died." These incidents may help us to understand the psychology and the motives of at any rate some of these men.¹

Robespierre and Marat, like their ardent admirers, Lenin and Trotsky, at the present day, were animated by the same noble vision, not to relieve present distress and injustice by legislation, but only to annihilate all existing conditions, and "to exterminate all classes of the community except 'the people' over whom they hoped to rule supreme."

Is it without significance that Trotsky (alias Leiba Douvitz Bronstein, the son of a well-to-do merchant) is an epileptic? Or is it without historical precedent that, as Kuprin, the well-known Russian writer, describes him, "this bilious and dyspeptic chemist, anarchist, spy and plotter, whose speeches are full of such phrases as 'roast on a slow fire,' 'strangle,' 'inundate with blood,' 'cut off

¹ The pathology of the Terrorists of the French Revolution deserves a closer study than that usually devoted to it. I am indebted to a friend for calling my attention to Barras's cynical claim to relationship with the notorious Marquis de Sade. Count Paul de Barras, general-in-chief of the Revolutionary army, debauchee and enthusiast of the Terror "avows himself with a sly smile somewhere in his memoirs the cousin of the Marquis de Sade." (See Louis Madelin's 'French Revolution,' p. 489.)

their heads,' should be seized by a blind fate and placed in the seat of power, instead of ending his days as a 'sadist' in a ward for violent lunatics? "

The importance of 'sadism' as a revolutionary motive is widely recognised by psychologists. There is much evidence in the writings of revolutionaries and syndicalists that it exists as a motive in the unconscious, at times becoming wholly conscious and very plainly articulate; as, for instance, in the writings of those worshippers of "violence for the sake of violence" (e.g., M. Georges Sorel's *Refléxion sur la Violence*). In their vision of the "New Birth of Society," it is the blood of the Caesarian section they hope to practise on the expiring mother society, not the fate of the offspring which is their chief concern.

Medical men and psychologists may be referred to Dr. Iwan Bloch's very instructive contribution to the psychology of the Russian Revolution contained in Chapter XXI. of his book on the *Sexual Life of Our Time*. The part played by sadism as a revolutionary motive is revealed in the authentic journal of an "algolagnistic revolutionist" herein published.

Now that the terrorist period appears to have burned itself out to a very great extent in Russia, it is well that we should realise that it was an essential and deliberately designed phase of the Bolshevik plan, and that, as it was manifested with the same maniacal ferocity, wholesale butchery and bestiality, in Hungary, so would it be an inevitable prelude to any successful attempt to establish the same régime in any other European country. Mob licence and destruction would be encouraged and tolerated only as a means to preparing the way for the new dictators and for placing them in power.

XIV. RELIGION.

Religion is regarded by the Bolshevists as "opium for the people" and a "tool of capitalist domination." The Russian Church is naturally regarded with special enmity by Bolshevism, as it is the embodiment and symbol of national life. Every effort has consequently been made in the last two years to extinguish it altogether, by persecution, and executions of priests. These very persecutions have, as has so often happened before, been the very means that have brought about a religious revival. In 1917-18 a remarkable National Assembly of the Orthodox Church sat in Moscow, reorganised the Church on an autonomous basis, and restored the Patriarchate. In the person of the heroic figure of the new Patriarch Archbishop Tykone—the embodiment of the *national* cause, the degrading cult of an international oligarchy endeavouring to set up material interest as the *only* Social bond, has met with a formidable opponent. The Red authorities are becoming increasingly uneasy at the growth of friendly relations between the "classes" under the influence of religion. In an interesting account by the one-time Professor of Law in the University of Moscow, which reached this country from Central Russia last January, an incident is described which occurred last year :

"One day the commissaries of Moscow 'nationalised' the auditorium of the Church of St. Barbara, where religious addresses were being given to the people. The 'orthodox' working men, who had founded the auditorium demanded the restitution of their property, insisting that they had a right to it as members of the proletariat. They were met with a formal refusal, the motives of which are

interesting. 'This auditorium,' they were told, 'has become a place for pacific meetings and for friendly intercourse between the bourgeois and the proletariat'; and from the revolutionary point of view nothing could be more inadmissible."

It is perhaps fair to point out that the religious movement, revived by the revitalised Russian Church, is a menace to Bolshevism, *not* merely because it calls itself Christian, but because it is *national, spiritual, vigorous and integrating*, and is incompatible with an anti-national, international, economic materialism. On the other hand, there was nothing which aided Bolshevism more thoroughly or effectively than the type of invertebrate Christianity (Tolstoyism), which a Russian author, writing from Ecateninodar, refers to in the following excerpt: "Bolshevism," he says, "was fostered during the first six or nine months of the Revolution by the absurd *idealism of the intelligentsia who quoted the text, "Do not overcome evil by evil!"*" This was the genuine spirit of the teaching of that quaint enthusiast, Leo Tolstoy, whose doctrine of non-resistance to evil suited the Bolsheviks so admirably, and which served to reconcile the teaching of the Great Nazarene so conveniently with the teaching of that other Hebrew Prophet, Karl Marx: a circumstance which no doubt greatly contributed to the popularity of that hybrid creed among the intelligentsia of Russia and Western Europe, before the war.

We can, at any rate, understand the very natural outburst of an educated Russian workman, witnessed and reported by an Englishman¹ who escaped last year. "How

¹ Mr. John Pollock.

"I hate your intelligentsia," said the former to a lady. "Why?" she asked. "Because," was the answer, "because of their meekness. Why are they so Christian? Why cannot they hate? They make me sick with their fraternity. A student came to us the other day and preached that we are all brothers and must live in peace. How can a man of sense say that he—or that we—must be brothers with all this murderous *canaille*?"

XV. THE DISILLUSIONMENT.

The truth is that all over Russia the peasants and the workmen are now realising, too late, that by their apathy and ignorance, they had allowed the growing disaffection of a greedy and rapacious bourgeoisie (commercialists) to undermine a benevolent but weakly paternal and disorganised government. And so, after the inevitable fall of their hopelessly inefficient bourgeois-socialist successors—the Kerensky idealists—the way was prepared for the present despots; who have turned their quondam dupes, whom in their own jargon, they had named "wage slaves," into real slaves, working under conditions of forced labour at the bayonet point, without the wages necessary to buy sufficient food.

They now know, to their cost, what "communism" is and they want none of it. They know that "communism" which, as propaganda, is always designed to appeal to the acquisitive and covetous instincts (therefore egoistic and anti-communistic) of those who think they have least to lose and most to gain, but which as actual fact, has deprived them of everything that ever gave a zest to life for the privilege of being the bondsmen of Jews and international revolutionaries.

And among no class is this disillusionment more bitter than among the peasants who form 85 per cent. of the total population. They very naturally keenly resented the Bolshevik agrarian decrees by which they tried to take the land back from the peasants in order "to nationalise" it and turn it into communal property.

So the Bolsheviks countered their resistance by organizing committees of "poorest peasants," which included the waster and criminal dregs of the villages. And these were given power over their more industrious and thrifty neighbours.

Lenin himself, of course, knew well enough that the period of disillusionment, which would inevitably follow the initial breaking up period, must be reckoned for. He wrote a tract in 1905 (N. Lénine, *Deux Tactiques de la Démocratie Socialiste dans la Révolution Démocratique*. Published at Geneva), in which he wrote: "The time will come when the struggle against the Autocratic Government will be over. When that time comes it will be ridiculous to talk of the voluntary unity of the proletariat and the peasants, or of a 'democratic' dictatorship, etc. When that comes we shall have to think about a socialistic dictatorship of the proletariat." Which latter—the dictatorship of the proletariat—means we see "of Lenin" *tout seul* and his alien friends. In spite of his prognostication Lenin was only accurate with reference to his own motives and intentions, for the peasants and the great majority of the workmen are heartily in accord in loathing the commissaries of the People appointed by the self-styled "Government of Workmen and Peasants."

XVI. THE JEW FACTOR.

It is not unnaturally claimed by Western Jews that Russian Jewry, as a whole, is most bitterly opposed to Bolshevism. Now although there is a great measure of truth in this claim, since the prominent Bolsheviks, who are preponderantly Jewish, do not belong to the orthodox Jewish Church, it is yet possible, without laying oneself open to the charge of anti-semitism, to point to the obvious fact that Jewry, *as a whole*, has, consciously or unconsciously, worked for and promoted an international, economic, material despotism, which, with Puritanism as an ally, has tended in an ever-increasing degree to crush national and spiritual values out of existence and substitute the ugly and deadening machinery of finance and factory. It is also a fact that Jewry, as a whole, strove every nerve to secure and heartily approved of the overthrow of the Russian monarchy, which they regarded as their most formidable obstacle in the path of their ambitions and business pursuits. All this may be admitted, as well as the plea that, individually or collectively, most Jews may heartily detest the Bolshevik régime, yet it is still true that the whole weight of Jewry was in the revolutionary scales against the Tzar's government. It is true their apostate brethren, who are now riding in the seat of power, may have exceeded their orders; that is disconcerting, but it does not alter the fact. It may be that the Jews, often the victims of their own idealism, have always been instrumental in bringing about the events they most heartily disapprove of; that maybe is the curse of the Wandering Jew.

Certainly it is from the Jews themselves that we learn

most about the Jews. It is possible that only a Jew can understand a Jew. Nay, more, it may be that only a Jew, can save us from the Jews, a Jew who is great enough, strong enough—for greater racial purity is a source of strength in the rare and the great—and inspired enough to overcome in himself the life-destructive vices of his own race. It was a Jew who said, "Wars are the Jews' harvest." But no harvests so rich as civil wars. A Jew reminds us that the French Revolution brought civil emancipation for the Jews in Western Europe. Was it a Jew who inspired Rousseau with the eighteenth century idea of the sameness of man according to nature? Dr. Kallen, a Zionist author, writes: "Suffering for a 1,000 years from the assertion of their difference from the rest of mankind, they accepted eagerly the escape from suffering which the eighteenth century assertion of the sameness of all men opened to them. . . . They threw themselves with passion into the republican emancipating movements of their fellow-subjects of other stocks." It was a Jew, Ricardo, who gave us the nineteenth century ideal of the sameness of man according to machinery. And without the Ricardian gospel of international capitalism, we could not have had the international gospel of Karl Marx. Moses Hess and Disraeli remind us of the particularly conspicuous part played by Jews in the Polish and Hungarian Rebellions, and in the republican uprising in Germany of '48. Even more conspicuous were they in the new internationalism logically deducible from the philosophy of Socialism. This we were taught by the Jew Marx and the Jew Ferdinand Lasalle, and they but developed the doctrine of the Jew David Ricardo.

It was Weininger, a Jew—and also a Jew hater—who explained why so many Jews are naturally communists. Communism is not only an International creed, but it implies the abnegation of real property, especially property in land, and Jews, being international, have never acquired a taste for real property; they prefer money. Money is an instrument of power, though eventually, of course, communists claim that they will do away with money—when their power is sufficiently established to enable them to command goods, and exercise despotic sway without it! Thus the same motives prompt the Jew Communist and his apparent enemy, the financial Jew. When owners of real property in times of economic depression feel the pinch of straightened circumstances, it is the Jewish usurers who become most affluent and who, out of the goodness of their hearts, come to their assistance—at a price.

XVII. OUR "POLICY."

The complete failure of the Allied politicians even to grasp the meaning of the International-Communist-Futurist-Sadistic movement, vaguely called Bolshevism, has resulted in a complete absence of policy in dealing with the situation. By attempting to fight against a movement they failed either to understand or guess the nature of, they directly fostered the very conditions upon which it thrived.

Two conditions are necessary in fighting any movement. It is first of all essential to know exactly *what* is being fought, and secondly, a perfectly definite and positive principle must be opposed to it. This positive principle has never been used to oppose it, see § VII. p. 15-17. No mere "anti" movement has ever triumphed. The struggle

in Russia has been a three-cornered one. The initial phase saw the overthrow of the forces of national solidarity by the combined forces of Social-Revolutionary-bourgeois-commercialism (the middle) and the revolutionary-international-communistic-Jewish (the extreme) group.

Power quickly passed from the middle to the extreme. The middle, the Kerensky party, was the party of compromise, indecision, vacillation, greedy opportunism, inept utopianism and hopeless incompetence. The middle was aided by the extreme in the initial stage for the latter's own purpose, and cast aside as soon as it had served its purpose. In the same way the extreme was also aided by Germany, who hoped thereby to score against the Allies.

From the time of the overthrow of the middle by the Bolsheviks, the armed struggle has been between these two, that is to say, between the first revolution and the second revolution. Now at last the middle, the party of invertebrate incompatibles, has finally been submerged, in spite of the vacillating and bewildered assistance that the middle has received from England and the Allies.

From the very first we characteristically backed the "wrong horse," and the sooner we recognise that fact the better. Had we backed Korniloff in April, 1917, against the forces of anarchy and disruption, even if that assistance had been purely "moral" assistance, it might already have been too late; on the other hand, it might have turned the scales and preserved Russia for herself and *also for us, her Allies*. Instead we chose to throw the weight of our support, moral, financial, and eventually in armed forces, on the side of the feeblest traitor who ever ruined his country. And why should this revolutionary solicitor of the German firm of "Kunst and Alberst"

(whose members were interned as German Agents by the Russian Government at the beginning of the war), why should this incompetent intriguer have received our support? Was it only because he lent his hand to the overthrow of monarchy—monarchy, which Englishmen appear to regard as a crime in any country except their own? And yet it is only a monarchy restored, purified, and constitutionally established, which can restore to Russia her national life and soul, and which alone can protect her, and indirectly us too, from the exploitation, both of International anarchists, and revengeful Germany.

The time is now past when Russia can be assisted by armed forces from outside in regaining control of her own national life. The regeneration must come from inside. It will be well for us if it does not come in the person of another Napoleon burning with a bitter sense of wrong against the Allies who deserted Russia in the hour of her downfall. What do the Russian people, caught in the meshes of an alien and international conspiracy, think now of those "fine" words of the Allied spokesman in the beginning of 1918: "The whole heart of our people is with the people of Russia in the attempt to free themselves and to become the master of their own life." And again, when at the Peace Conference, the same spokesman, speaking of his own people, said: "They came as crusaders, not merely to win a war, but to win a cause; . . . and I, like them, must be a crusader for these things, whatever it costs, and whatever it may be necessary to do, in honour, to accomplish the object for which they fought."—(President Wilson at Paris, Jan. 25th, 1919.) If he has won a cause, it is Lenin's cause, whose contempt and derision he has earned in winning it!

Now the time has come when Russia, left to her own resources, must regenerate herself from within, if she would free herself from the crazy paranoiacs and parasites who are sucking her life's blood. We can only try to understand her troubles and help her, where we can, in regaining her national life. Though we have helped her little enough, she may yet have helped us, by teaching us to look to our own health, and to take early precautions against the disease through which she is passing. Thus we may learn to distinguish between the empty catch-words and decoy-cries and the motives and *ills* that cause them to become the powerful agents of destruction. There is no smoke without fire. Let us pay heed to the *cries*, not to the crazy remedies wrung from distracted brains.

The pages of history are blackened with the records of the misery and suffering men have created for themselves, of countless human holocausts as horrible and senseless as those of Dahomey, whose tortured victims have been destroyed—self-immolated, for the most part—on the altars raised to vain words and meaningless symbols. And still their crazy priests and fanatical votaries, mad with frenzy and drunk with blood, shriek for ever more victims, never content until the whole world is infected with their madness and rocks helpless in an orgy of self-destruction.

NOTE.

The author has, as the subject requires, attempted to deal with it openly, fearlessly, and without ambiguity or veiled allusions. Vague allegations against unnamed individuals (where the names were relevant) have been avoided, but, on the other hand, the anonymity of information has had to be respected where this, for obvious reasons, has been necessary.

The author will, however, be very glad to receive comments and criticism (addressed to him c/o The PUBLISHER), or to answer questions, where he can do so without betraying confidences, on the subject of this pamphlet.

WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

June, 1920.

Mr. Blackwell has published from time to time a series of pamphlets, written by experts on a wide range of subjects, from which the following List is a selection.

RELATIVITY — AN INTRODUCTORY SKETCH BASED ON EINSTEIN'S ORIGINAL WRITINGS.

By H. L. BROSE, M.A., 1s. 6d. Net. (*Fourth Impression*).

¶“ May well serve as a starting off point for interested readers.”—*Discovery*.

THE REVIVAL OF CRITICISM.

By J. S. PHILLIMORE (Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow). 1s. 6d. Net.

¶“ Pleads wisely and wittily for the true canons of textual criticism.”—*The Spectator*.

OXFORD AFTER THE WAR AND A LIBERAL EDUCATION.

By J. A. STEWART (White's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford). 1s. 6d. Net.

¶“ Strikes at the very heart of what is evil in our Educational tests of to-day.”—*The Times Educational Supplement*.

A WORLD'S ASSIZE.

By PAUL HOOKHAM. 1s. 6d. Net.

¶“ A brilliant, deeply interesting, and occasionally provocative essay.”—*The Oxford Chronicle*.

RECONSTRUCTORS AND RECONSTRUCTION.

By W. H. V. READE. 1s. Net.

¶“ Many of the glib fallacies of the day are crisply and effectively exposed.”—*The Globe*.