

RESTRICTED

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNISM

463

19 October 1951

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION--Colonel Thomas G. Ennis, Member of the Faculty, ICAF.....	1
SPEAKER--Colonel Walter R. Godard, Member of CRIB Faculty, ICAF..	1
GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	15

Publication No. 152-40

INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

Washington, D. C.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

465

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNISM

19 October 1951

COLONEL ENNIS: Gentlemen, our lecture this morning is going to be on the "History and Development of Communism," and our speaker is Colonel W. R. (Rusty) Godard of the Civilian Reserve Instruction Branch. Colonel Godard is a student of communism and has done a great deal of research on it. He also has had some practical experience by going to Communist meetings to find out what makes them tick and how they run. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I now give you Colonel Rusty Godard of CRIB.

COLONEL GODARD: Today, our thinking of communism is inextricably tied in with Russia, and rightly so. Communism and Russia are more or less synonymous. We cannot think of one without the other creeping into our minds. Even in international relations, where we are dealing with the Soviet Government, the aims of the Communist Party, through the government, cloud and confuse the issue.

But, modern communism did not have its birth in Russia. For the background of communism we must look outside of Russia--in industrialized western Europe of the early nineteenth century.

By 1848--two German political and economic philosophers, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, had evolved an economic-political theory of revolution and government which was based on industrial conditions as they were 100 years ago.

At that time the worst evils of an uncontrolled laissez-faire capitalism were being practiced. The worst evil, from a humanitarian point of view, was that labor was considered to be a commodity--something to be purchased, used up, and discarded. These were the conditions of labor during the birth of the Age of Industry.

Marx reasoned that under such conditions, industry, as it expanded, would split into two classes, the Capitalists (the exploiters) and the proletariat (the workers). Over a period of time, he reasoned, the Capitalist class would become smaller and richer as the wealth of any industrial nation became concentrated in the hands of a few. At the same time, the workers would become poorer and more oppressed.

The basic difference between the two could never be reconciled peacefully. Eventually, the workers would rise in desperation and seize all the means of production and distribution so that everyone could participate in the profits and benefits of mass distribution.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

450

Marx's slogan was, "Workers of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains."

The initial aim of world revolution by the proletariat having been accomplished, the Marxian world state was to be run as a dictatorship of the proletariat. By this Marx meant "government of the people, for the people, but not by the people." All class distinction was to be swept away, leaving a classless society in which all men were absolutely equal.

Eventually, he predicted, the machinery of government would become unnecessary and would wither away, leaving a society wherein each would contribute according to his ability and receive according to his need.

That little phrase has probably done more harm to the world at large than any other single phrase propounded by modern political scientists that I know of. He made that statement, but I don't believe Marx, even in his wildest imagination, ever dreamed that this philosophy that he was expounding was going to come to birth anywhere except in Germany. He felt the German intellect and mind was ripe for this approach. Certainly he never thought of a nonindustrial state in connection with this philosophy. He did not expect this thing to come to birth in a country which at that time we called Russia, and yet that is exactly where it came to birth as an agrarian, semitotalitarian system.

Now I think we might well pose the question: What was the catalyst? What caused this birth in a country that should not have had it? You must come out of Germany and take a look at Russian history.

From the time the Varangians went into Constantinople and ruled, as the Rurik dynasty was founded, and we come down through the various czars, we find one common concept in the Russian people, the communal concept. The peasants were tied to the soil by law, and before the law, they were tied to it by circumstances. They lived in the most hopeless poverty. If you transferred ownership of the land, you automatically transferred all the people that lived on that land, you sold all the occupants. This was slavery in its vilest form. A man couldn't move without permission of the boyar. You have excellent control when you operate that way.

But because of that system, the village life in these little clusters of villages was always run as a community enterprise. These people would get together and elect a head man, an elder. This man would run the village on a communal basis, assuring every man would at least get his bit of bread.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

467

However, the village was not run for the benefit of the people. It was run for the benefit of the landlords, the boyar class, and that boyar class probably can be charged with the major responsibility for the autocracy that developed in Russia. There were some attempts to get rid of this system. Certain of the czars tried reforms--Alexander I, for example--but always this boyar class was able to stop any reform action. They were able to control the system so that the people found their position gradually deteriorating.

Then we had, before the Napoleonic wars, a group known as the military gentry. This is the actual transition. They began to take the place of the boyar class. Ivan I, Vasily I, Ivan III, and Ivan IV all had a hand in that. They wanted to destroy the power of the boyars, who had been able to overrun the country, and take the military gentry, men serving them in the field, and give them the lands they had taken away from these boyars.

So now a new class arose. This very class and its sons were the foundation of the 1917 Revolution. Incidentally, under the social caste system of Russia at that time, whatever you were, your son automatically became. If you were a trashman, your son became a trashman. During the Napoleonic Wars, these people got out of Russia for the first time; they went all over Europe. They saw the advantages enjoyed by other people in Europe, particularly in western Europe, and they soon became full of discontent.

Then, too, as has always happened, the effect is that these successful men--I have seen it in this country very many times--developed an intellectual curiosity. We have seen their likeness in this country--you know whom I am talking about--whose fathers created a fortune--Vanderbilt Field is a good example and there are others--but that same kind of condition seems to be inherent in the second generation. Maybe it is an inferiority complex, I don't know, but it seems that it is greater with that type of background.

Those men, many of them Army officers, came back with the intention to do something for the people of Russia. They formed revolutionary groups. Wherever they were discovered, they were exterminated. One of them was founded, operated, and controlled by Colonel Paul Pestel. They had an actual list of the things they wanted to do; they were important enough to read to you:

1. Overthrow the autocracy.
2. Murder the Czar and his family--which, of course, was an old Russian custom by that time.
3. Free the peasants.
4. Abolish all class distinction.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

468

5. Establish a central government complete with spies and censorship to prevent counterrevolution.

6. Divide half the land equally among everyone, leaving the other half free for private enterprise.

Mark you, gentlemen, that was in 1817 not 1917, a century before the Revolution and almost half a century before Marx promulgated these ideas.

In December 1822 they decided the time had come to take some action. They attempted a coup d'etat which was a complete failure, mainly because of traitors and spies in that organization. But the Decembrist uprising, as it became known, was the first definite open attempt to break the autocracy of the czars.

You will find if you read any of the modern Russian writings, it has become greatly magnified. The period which followed was one of rigid brutality, greed, suppression of thought--again nothing new in reform--close supervision of the most minute affairs of the people. Each wave of liberalism that swept over Europe merely resulted in the chains being forged a little tighter around the Russian people. Then came their defeat.

I am coming down rather rapidly now. Following Russia's defeat in the Crimean War in 1853-1855, the threat of revolution became so apparent that the new Czar, Alexander II, seeing the danger forced the military gentry to accept the abolition of serfdom, and in 1861 the law was passed that abolished serfdom, but it was passed in such a way that for all practical purposes there was still serfdom. A man had to buy land if he wanted land. It was divided in such a way that he might have an acre on this side of the village and another acre on the other side of the village. The tax system was such that he couldn't pay taxes and stay alive. So that land began to come back to the military gentry.

From here on, however, we find more and more of these little revolutions crackling out as more and more people begin to be educated abroad. All sorts of ideas, from anarchy and nihilism to constitutional monarchy, were put forth and in every case brutally suppressed. It came to the point where the swords of the Cossack cavalry were the only means of stopping the social eruption.

Here we get the first political party on a Marxist basis organized in 1883, called the Social Democratic Workers' Party. It was aimed at one thing--I think this is important--it did not aim at changing the system of rule in Russia; it aimed at changing the rule by the peasant. That party had that as its plain objective. It started at Leningrad. Within five years it had huge cells operating all the way down to Baku on the Caspian Sea. That was the forerunner of the modern Communist Party.

RESTRICTED

469

There was a very young man whose name was Lenin in that organization in those days. In 1903 Lenin took this Russian Social Democratic Party and forced a split within it. He had come to the conclusion--and I think history did support the theory--that the party was like some modern political party, it didn't know where it was going, wouldn't be happy until it got there, and when it got there, it wouldn't want to be there. Lenin forced a split in the Social Democratic Workers' Party and founded the first Bolsheviks. They favored an immediate revolutionary action. They also advocated a tight, centrally controlled party organization from the top all the way to the bottom. The other part of the Social Democratic Party, the Mensheviks, favored a loose, federated type of party organization. They thought they should wait and let this thing grow stronger of its own volition. You can see the fundamental difference. The Bolsheviks under Lenin became the major party. They became the main force.

We move along now to the Russo-Japanese War, and here, because of the resounding military defeat that these people had suffered, it became obvious that the people were again going to start one of their fire-cracker revolutions. In 1905 they had for the first time a revolution that covered every major segment of Russia. It was not organized. It operated in large places and in small places; in some cases on a strong basis and in some cases on a weak basis; but it took in all the people. Because of that fact, the Czar at that time decided to give the people a constitution. He created what they called the "Duma," a parliament. But even though the parliament was created, the Czar kept under himself absolute veto so that for all practical purposes there was a constitutional government operating on a majority basis which had no power whatever. It was still an autocracy.

Then we get down to 1914. Here if ever the czars of Russia, Czar Nicholas, particularly--of course, he showed how stupid he could be--if ever a man was presented with a golden opportunity to pull a people together and get them united, here it was. Always the old theory of "Unite the people against an outside problem and they forget the inside problem" works in a good many places, except with Russia.

There were a good many reasons for Russia's not entering the First World War. The Russian people were not in favor of going into war and did not support it. The government, too, did not have an industrial foundation capable of fighting even a semimodern war, as World War I was compared with World War II. They had no manpower to spare because the peasant class, which represented the great bulk of the people, was on the farms. There was very little manufacturing. They were short of ammunition and food, and their soldiers were many times sent to the field--this is a matter of history--with no weapons of any kind. Many Russian units attacked enemy positions unarmed in order to try to get arms for their own use. That was not conducive, I submit, to good morale on the part of the soldier.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

470

On top of all this, the bulk of the manpower that they needed could not be spared from the farms. In spite of some brilliant leadership, the Russian armies were not only defeated, they were absolutely crushed, and in 1917 with the weight of complete defeat upon them, the tottering czarist government collapsed. The long agony of Russia exploded into world revolution.

This then was the backdrop of communism in Russia--a country with a corrupt government, starvation, famine, people who had never known any really representative government--although that can be qualified; they had never known a government as we know it--and the final shock--probably the worst blow--three major military defeats in 65 years.

I want to clear up one misconception that the Russians have always sold throughout the world--the Revolution was not started by the Bolsheviks under Mr. Lenin. It was not started by any group. It was a revolution of the people in the streets, the factory workers, the peasants, and the armed forces. When the Czar abdicated on 15 March 1917, for example, Lenin was not even there.

The Duma at that time formed a provisional government in which they attempted to set up a constitution--a bill of rights, if you will--with the bulk of their representation in this government from the center. It was not successful. On 5 May Kerensky was called in to form a new government. Alexander Kerensky, who, as you remember, was a member of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, never gained full support in spite of the allied attempt to keep him going. In November 1917 Lenin overthrew Kerensky and established the Soviet regime.

It is interesting to note that, while he was attempting to do this, the Bolshevik leaders were coming back from all over the world--Trotsky from Brooklyn; Lenin in a sealed car which the Germans provided for him to get him from Switzerland. I think the program of the Bolsheviks is worth listing for you. Actually it was put on paper. We know just what it was.

1. Immediate peace with Germany (of course they were incapable of fighting).
2. Transfer of all political power to the Soviets (the Soviets had already taken it).
3. Transfer all land to the peasants (the peasants were in the very pleasant job of seizing it).
4. Transfer all factories to the workers (workers were helping themselves).

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

471

5. Here is a good one--free all the non-Russian elements (the hundreds of oppressed minorities).

6. The greatest selling point--food for all.

With respect to the second point, "Transfer all political power to the Soviets," what is a Soviet? Soviet merely means "council." It was not part of the Communist philosophy; it was part of the Russian language. Under the czars the ministers of the czar were often called Soviet. As far back as 1905, many of the villages were ruled by village Soviets. The Bolsheviks realized that there lay the power and the political control of Russia. They infiltrated--the same pattern they use today--the little Soviets, got one or two people in control and from that were able to get control of the whole system. As they got more and more control, they began to form into little autonomous groups, and from those groups we find the first four joined together in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which dwarfs all the rest.

There were 4 when they finally came into political cohesion; today there are 16. The largest one I have mentioned, the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, is as large as all the rest combined. They finally gained what they had been hoping for. Having gained political power, the Bolsheviks found that their troubles were just beginning. Instead of gaining their immediate objective, which was peace, they fought in the next five years--and I am going to read to you--England, France, America, Poland, Germany, Japan, the counterrevolutionaries, the peasants, and, last but certainly not least, each other.

The trouble with the peasants was that they found out that the great promises that the land would be given to them were not going to be fulfilled. You remember the slogan in 1917 was "Peace, Bread, and Land." That struck a most responsive chord in the heart of the peasant. He had been seeking it for 12 years. But collectivization, as he knew it, transferred his semiserfdom from a czarist regime to a Communist Soviet regime. In most cases the peasants absolutely refused to go along; in many cases they refused to sow the seed. The Red Army was used hundreds of times to put down rebellions, particularly in the Ukraine where the food comes from. The food shortage almost wrecked the Soviet regime.

By 1920--this, I think, is an interesting point, mainly overlooked--that the so-called government under Lenin controlled only a piece of territory around Moscow which was about the same size as Russia had been in 1300 or maybe half as big again as the state of New Jersey. That is all they controlled three years after the Revolution. We forget the fact that these people grew into power by virtue of conditions, not by their own smartness. They were smart, certainly, but two things came as a surprise to the Communist Party. The first was that they were able to stay in power at all; and more surprising yet, when they were able to stay in power, the whole world didn't spring into the uprising; the rest of the world didn't want to get involved in carrying out Marx's program.

7

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

472

From 1918 to 1921, Lenin tried desperately to make Marxian communism work in Russia, but he couldn't. By 1921 Russian production was lower than it had been in 1914. The obvious error lay, not with Lenin, but with Marx. In his calculations Marx had overlooked one fundamental factor that motivates the human animal, that is the human desire for profit. Consequently--and they don't boast about this I can assure you--the communism of Russia was modified by the N.E.P. (New Economic Program) which was set forth by Lenin and which allowed the re-creation of private enterprise, admitting the necessity of the profit motive. There are instances of one of the Russian ministry saying to an American businessman, "Oh, yes, you will find communism in Russia, but you won't find it exclusive of the profit motive." They admit frankly that it had to be considered.

However, we must remember too that the government did retain, as in the past, a very tight and rigid control over political power, foreign trade, and information media. The principles of communism went even further back with Lenin's announcement of his desire, not only his desire, but his eagerness to do business with the outside world on a capitalist basis. They had to have foreign exchange. We are apt to overlook that.

In 1924 this situation began to change. Lenin died, and one of the greatest undercover political struggles of all time began to take place right before our very eyes. Two men, one who would have gone one way and another man who would have gone another way, began to struggle for one-sixth of the land area of the world. Trotsky--the leader of the Red Army--he was really a Menshevik not a Bolshevik--was for world communism; the party's hope was world revolution as quickly as possible. Stalin, of course, was just the opposite. He was absolutely ruthless. He was quiet. He was the furthest thing removed from being volatile. I won't call him placid, but he was very near. But he did advocate socialism in one country.

Here you get the first deviation from communism--socialism in one country; cooperation, wherever expedient for Russia, with other nations. We don't need details of what happened; Stalin won. Trotsky was ridiculed and run out of the country; and, finally, murdered by a member of the secret police in Mexico City.

The time between 1924 and 1927 was a period of great upheaval, particularly 1927. As Lenin had scrapped Marxian communism under his creation of a new economic policy, so Joe now, in the guise of interpreting Lenin, scrapped Leninism. The single greatest change was the return to what I call "nationalism" as opposed to "internationalism," but the final aim was a great deal more simple.

The whole aim was to make the Soviet Union the magnetic center of world communism, a show piece, if you will, of communism. To accomplish

RESTRICTED

473

this, the Russians had to go into a very intense industrialization of the nation. They adopted what has now become a well-known pattern, to us the Five-Year Plans of Stalin, and I think we must give this rascal credit for some of the things he did. He was faced with a major decision. He could grant his people the promised rise in their standard of living, or he could further depress the already miserable standard in order to build Russia into a strong modern power. That he not only chose the latter, but also was able to carry it through is an indication of the character of the man. His methods, although not new, are worthy of examination.

With a ruthless and unswerving determination, he rid himself of absolutely all opposition. Not only were the czarists and capitalists eliminated, but eventually even the intellectual leaders of the Revolution, those who had lived abroad, who were intellectual in outlook, were done away with. Anybody whose memory reached back beyond 1927, who had ever expressed an idea contrary to Stalin--that is an overstatement but it is fundamental--was liquidated. The concentration was on youth--get rid of the old Bolsheviks. The battle cry was sacrifice. This was a war in peacetime, a war by the people against the rich-but-stubborn earth on which they lived, war against national weakness, war to prepare for war.

I am fully convinced that Lenin felt it was only a question of time when this war would come about. Stalin was very fond at that time--he doesn't do it any more--of quoting from volume 14, page 167 of Lenin. I am sure it has been quoted to you. "It is inconceivable that capitalism and communism can live side by side with each other. Sooner or later one or the other must conquer. Until that time comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable." They realized full well that this was going to come to a showdown.

They mobilized, for that reason, the entire nation--the factories, the mines, the farms; the workers were figuratively put into uniform. There were industrial campaigns, storm troops, shock brigades, battles. There was a complete disregard for life and economy in that sense. Those who were not willing to cooperate in the part of Russia where most of this was going on wound up by cooperating in Siberia--under guard.

I suppose that you might look for a moral in this; certainly we ought to. There is a certain amount of morality in most of this. I mean not in a real sense, not in the usually accepted, world sense. I might say this action of Stalin's from a moral point of view was a highly questionable element. When they succeeded in defeating the German Army in my opinion and as a matter of record, that is how and why Russia was absorbed by communism.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

474

I pointed out, or tried to point out, that we have a difference in communism as originally propounded and originally thought of and that we have distinguished by the term Marxian communism. You have a right to say to me, "Okay, what is Russian communism? How have Marxist principles been applied to the Soviet Union?" For the answer we might well take a look at the constitution. That constitution prepared in 1936 is the basic means of dominance under which the Russians operated. It covers every phase of political, social, economic, and industrial life within the USSR. It established the state as Socialistic rather than Communistic. That is to say, the land, the resources, and the means of production are state owned, and the state theoretically is owned by the people. The constitution warns--and these are words from it--a very literal translation--"He who does not work, neither shall he eat," and adds the principle of Socialism, "From each according to his ability; to each according to his need."

Tacked on to the constitution was a Bill of Rights--the right of free speech; the right to work; the right to annual vacations; the right to education; equal rights for women in all fields; human rights regardless of race or creed; freedom of worship or nonworship; freedom of speech, press, assembly, and demonstration; freedom from unlicensed search. I am not going to discuss them, but a couple of them are worth listing:

The right to work.--You have not only the right to work, but they make you work whether you want to or not; it is compulsory.

The right to annual vacations.--Since the promulgation of this right, a state of emergency has existed, so, at the behest of the party, which is tantamount to government decree, annual vacations have been voluntarily given up.

The right to an education.--Here, then, is something worth-while. Under the czars, 75 to 80 percent of the people were illiterate. At the present time it is estimated that 15 percent are illiterate, and among the youth illiteracy is almost unknown. Advanced education at state discretion is offered in every technical field, usually at state expense, but not always. There is no liberal education as we know it--the emphasis is on skills. But all study must include a thorough indoctrination in Russian interpretation of Marxism.

Equal rights for women in all fields.--Women are definitely granted equal rights in all fields, a factor which greatly increases Soviet use of the entire population.

Equal rights regardless of race or creed.--Here is one thing we could emulate. There is no distinction in Russia because of race or creed.

RESTRICTED

475

Freedom of worship.--To a certain extent you can believe anything you want to, but the party, as distinguished from the state, is atheistic, and beliefs--other than party beliefs--are discouraged and tend to retard a person's well-being.

The other freedoms--speech, press, assembly, demonstration, freedom from unlicensed search--are completely mythological in nature because of the peculiar relationship between the state and the party. You could oppose the Soviet operation if you wanted to, but I don't think you would last very long if you did.

I would like to make a point about the constitution. It is not the supreme law of the USSR. It can be changed by supplementary legislation. It can be overruled by decree by high government agencies. In general, it can be considered as little more than a broad statement of aims. It is not a government by law; it is a government by decree.

When another speaker was talking to you the other morning he gave you a description of the whole political setup of the USSR and the interrelationship of the party and the government. I want to take a certain segment, the upper segment of the charts that he used and build it in detail for you because I think you will find it informative.

The chart is not too easy to read. (The chart was not reproduced.) I made a slide and it was even worse so I came back to this old chart which I have used in Civilian Reserve Instruction. There are about 110 million voters in the Soviet Union; every person over 18 years of age votes regardless of sex, race, or creed--except the politically impure. They are eliminated in advance so that is no problem. These 110 million voters go to the polls at certain specified times and vote for a certain candidate. Everyone votes for one candidate who is approved by the local Communist Party. If you don't like the candidate, you can scratch out his name, but there isn't too much future in scratching out names on these ballots.

When that delegate is elected, he meets with other delegates who have been elected from other units and they elect a delegate to a higher body. This may happen from one to five times, depending on the administrative unit, and finally we reach the Supreme Soviet, the highest parliamentary group in the USSR--the second block up on the left-hand side--where you find one representative for approximately every 300,000 people.

This highest parliamentary group, as such, is divided two ways. First, there is the Council of Nationalities whose delegates are elected on a racial basis from the various union republics, autonomous republics and subgroups. It consists of 25 deputies from each of the 16 union republics; 11 from each of the 19 autonomous republics; 5 from each of 10 autonomous regions; 1 from each of 10 national areas. Second, there is the Council of the Union representing one man for

RESTRICTED

476

every 300,000 people--or none for that matter--elected at large and elections are supposed to be held every four years. The Supreme Soviet meets twice a year for several days. They did not meet at all throughout the war--from 1941 to 1947. When they do meet, they appoint Ministers, the Supreme Court, and the Attorney General. They then elect a 42-member presidium, which assumes all the power of this Supreme Soviet and sits in constant session. I might also mention that in any of this operation, the power moving upward also goes laterally. We haven't time to go into that but it is a control by which the party can stick its fingers into the pie from the top, under the pie plate, or can do whatever it wants to do. There is a president, 16 vice-presidents, a secretary, and 24 members. The power of this presidium is great indeed. It includes:

1. Convening and dissolving the Supreme Soviet (if the Supreme Soviet cannot agree on an issue, the presidium may dissolve it).
2. Calling new elections.
3. Appointing and replacing the high command of the armed forces.
4. Ratifying and denouncing treaties.
5. Declaring war.
6. Interpreting the law, including the constitution.

The Supreme Soviet appoints a group called the Council of Ministers. Here is the real government of the USSR. It is generally equivalent to the British Cabinet, an over-all, top-level executive and administrative body. Some indication of its great powers may be gained by mentioning a few of its primary functions:

1. Economic planning (they are the promulgators and administrators of the various Five-Year Plans).
2. Maintaining public order (this group controls and directs the Secret Police; is the agency of purge and reform; the definer of treason).
3. The control, the organization, and administration of the armed forces (this is the military high command).
4. Formulating foreign policy.

You see there has been complete delegation of authority of the Supreme Soviet upward. In short, the Council of Ministers governs every single phase of Soviet activity not specifically listed as part of their job. They can cover anything else that isn't listed for

RESTRICTED

477

somebody else. The chairman of the council, who would be roughly equivalent to the British Prime Minister, exercises over-all supervision of this group and nothing goes on without his approval.

Now look at the Communist Party. An outstanding political difference between the United States and the Soviet Union is the existence of only one political party in the latter. Only one party, the Communist, is authorized by law. Let us look into the party structure and see how it works.

Contrary to widely held opinion, not everyone in the Soviet Union is a Communist. In fact it's about as hard to get into the Communist Party as it is to get into a good club, but that's as far as the comparison can go. The party is highly exclusive. You have to go up through the channels, work your way up. Why? For the very simple reason that they have a better living--in other words, better food. If he is an ordinary working member, he is given wages. He may get certain decorations if he is in the right party. It chooses only leaders for membership.

In the early thirties, the party numbered about 2 million; by 1940 it had increased to 3.5 million; and was steadily expanded during World War II. After the war they brought in a lot of younger military men so that today it numbers almost 6 million--out of 110 million voters.

These people operate much the same way as the voters operated in electing delegates to the Supreme Soviet. The party members elect what they call the All-Union Party Congress, a body of 1,000 delegates, which is supposed to meet at least every three years. In practice they have met very infrequently and at the last meeting they unanimously approved all measures of the party leaders, past, present and future. That is a darn good system--shades of Boss Hague.

Unanimity, incidentally, is considered an absolute must in this operation. You may remember the 1936 meeting of the party. Several of the old Bolshevik leaders were foolish enough, and faithful enough to the original ideas of the Revolution, to get up and say, "Here, you are departing from the original ideas of the Revolution." Probably all of you remember the great party purges of 1936-1937. It was during this period that the last of the old Bolshevik revolutionaries were eliminated, and the complete unanimity of the party secured.

This Party Congress elected a 140-man body to carry on between sessions--the All-Union Central Committee. You see in theory this committee performs the work of the congress between sessions, but the committee meets infrequently and control is actually exercised by these three agencies which are appointed by this Central Committee:

RESTRICTED

478

1. The Political Bureau, or Politburo, is a 14-man group, certainly the most important 14 men in the Soviet Union, men whose power and influence are felt throughout the world. These men are the actual custodians of Supreme Party authority; they formulate both foreign and domestic policy for the party.

2. The Organization Bureau, or Orgburo, is a 9-man body which supervises the organization and the officials of the party. Their duties include direction of the huge party propaganda machine, party supervision of the secret police, and control of membership.

3. The Secretariat, headed by the Secretary-General, is the executive body of the party, the body that carries out party policy.

I have shown you very quickly the breakdown of the committees. Anywhere up here (indicating) you can blackball. The blackball system comes downward; it is also a beautiful system.

What is the relationship between government and party? On the one hand, we see the government of the Soviet Union and on the other the Communist Party organization, the only party authorized by law. What is the relation of one to the other?

Of the voting population of 110 million, about 6 percent are party members. By the time we get up to the Supreme Soviet, keeping in mind that there are several intermediate steps not shown on this chart, the party membership has increased to 81 percent--over a three-fourths majority. The 15-man presidium is, of course, all Communist. No one can get on unless he is. The 9-man Executive Board of the Council of Ministers is also all Communist and the Chairman or Prime Minister is, as might be expected, a Communist.

Where is the link that makes possible this high-level party domination? It lies in just one man, the 67-year-old son of a poverty-stricken Georgian cobbler--Comrad Josef Stalin. Stalin is a member of the Politburo. He personally selects the other members of the body. He is the first member of the Orgburo. The first five members of the Orgburo form the Secretariat, of which Stalin is the first secretary. Thus, he has complete control of the party, of the policy-making Politburo, the administrative Orgburo, and the executive secretariat.

Going back to the government, we see that he is a member of the presidium. The presidium chairman, a man named Shvernik, is a subordinate member of the Politburo. Stalin is also a member of the Council of Ministers. As first minister, he is chairman, or Prime Minister. Moreover, every member of the Executive Board of the Council of Ministers must be a member of the Politburo. Stalin today is the Soviet Union. His power is unchallenged and uncontested--more absolute than any czar before him. Thank you.

RESTRICTED

479

QUESTION: You have pointed out all the way through here that the Russian people seem never to have had at any time in their history a form of democratic government. Is that true or not true?

COLONEL GODARD: No, strangely enough, they have had in their history democracy in reverse. If you go back to the foundation of the Kievan state, they developed a popular assembly called the Vieche. That Vieche was called together by the ruling prince for emergency action when state decisions had to be made. The Vieche represented the boyars, or traders, and certain people of noble birth.

Most of the Russian towns--they were hardly towns but let us call them towns--were built on a river just as were our frontier towns, always with a view to transportation. They had, I think, an extremely interesting way of settling disputes. The grand prince would call the Vieche into session and say, "I propose to do this and such." The vote had to be unanimous. They would have the ayes and nays. If it was not unanimous, they would go out on the bridge over the river, have a fist fight and knock each other into the river. Whichever side came out ahead represented the unanimous vote.

When the Vieche began to lose power, the Zemsky Sobor took its place on a semiparliamentary basis. They again called various people together to discuss any proposal that would affect the entire population. They were allowed to advise the ruling prince but he did not have to take their advice. With the coming of the czars, autocracy grew in Russia, and as it did, the Russian Orthodox Church was gradually weakened until Czar Peter the Great decided to do away with the patriarch altogether. Gradually they built up an absolute autocracy. However, Russia knew a form of democracy as long ago as a thousand years. Granted, it wasn't what we call a democracy today.

QUESTION: Will you elaborate a little bit on whether the Russian people's religion went very deep into the roots. How in a few short years could they completely smother that?

COLONEL GODARD: I will have to get on into history again to cover that. When the Greek Orthodox Church was accepted by the Russian people, there was a patriarch appointed who reported to Constantinople. As the Kievan state declined and the Muskovites came into control in Russia, the foundation and center of Russian operation was in Moscow. The czars realized full well as long as the patriarchs were appointed by Constantinople they had a problem on their hands. The first Rome--they called Moscow the third Rome--had a great part in starting the idea of bringing the patriarch into Moscow and settling him there. Then the patriarch got so much power--as I have already mentioned--that the czars began to get very, very scared of him.

Mazour's book "Russia, Past and Present" discusses in fairly good detail the rise and fall of the Russian state. It also goes into a

RESTRICTED

480

little of what we have described here. I would also recommend Walsh's "Readings in Russian History." Those are the most easily read of history books.

To get back to our patriarch, until Ivan IV, the patriarch was the spiritual ruler of Russia and the czar was the temporal ruler. They were on a par. But Ivan the Terrible started a revolt against that. When Peter the Great came into power, he saw that the power of the church was getting too concentrated from his point of view. He dismissed the patriarch and there was no patriarch in office in Russia for 21 years. During that time, even with the breaking down of the power of the church, and getting rid of the priests, the fundamental, deep religion of the Russian never broke down. Today they have this fanatical religion called communism if you will let me use the word religion in a very broad sense. They are convinced that they are the saviours of mankind through this philosophy they call communism.

QUESTION: Looking at your outline it seems that nearly every time there was a war there was a revolution or near one. I seem to recall that even in this last war there was a small movement for revolution. Would you comment as to what would be the prospects of real conflict in case of another war?

COLONEL GODARD: Russian history shows from the very first that every time the government gets engaged in problems outside its borders and takes away the power and authority, in the sense of the troops, Cossacks, whatever it might be, the people who have been held down immediately try to rise. That is custom. You will find that wherever the people were dissatisfied. I hate to take away the possibility of their rising again, but we have never had, even in the most ruthless rule of Ivan, such complete ruthlessness as exists today in Russia. Even Ivan had some redeeming qualities. You can't have a revolution of one person. You can't talk to the guy next to you; he may be a member of the secret police. Children will denounce their fathers. The fanaticism of communism constantly overrides everything you and I consider as loyalty of the family. That is your danger. I believe that if they get involved in war there is a great possibility of an uprising in the Ukraine, but I also believe that it will be put down as fast as the Decembrist movement was in 1821.

QUESTION: From the standpoint of continuity, what do you believe is the weakest link?

COLONEL GODARD: The weakest link of any dictatorship is the desire for expansion. I don't see how it can continue to expand, and any system of dictatorship must either expand or retrogress. It can't stand still. I believe the further it expands, the weaker it will get.

RESTRICTED

481

Take the defense of Russia--here I am getting into strategy--but it seems to me the fundamental problem facing Russia today is defending that area. The Russians must maintain a tremendous number of ground troops to defend that area. Multiply that by trying to defend the satellites. If they continue their expansion, the growth of Russia is its greatest weakness. It will grow so big, it will topple. Maybe that is wishful thinking. I don't know.

QUESTION: I have two rather unrelated questions. You can pick out either one and answer it. But, first, I understand that what is now known as Russia was under the domination of the Mongol Empire from 200 to 400 years. I wonder if you might comment on the effect of that conquest on the present Russian state of the Russians' thinking?

The second one is I noticed on the chart that Mr. Stalin appears to be in a strategic position in the Russian hierarchy. Would you mind speculating on what may happen when he dies?

COLONEL GODARD: Actually what I believe will happen here, to speculate in the realm of the most wonderful theory in the world, three men will form a triumvirate in my opinion; Malenkov, Molotov, and Beria. Malenkov is the secretary of the Communist Party and incidentally is the only Ph.D. in the politburo. Whether good or bad, he has a job very similar to the job Jim Farley had in the Democratic Party and he has one attribute that Farley had. He can name the guys at the grass roots. He knows the fellow down in the first precinct. Therefore, you see he can control the party at the lowest level. Molotov, Joe's secretary for about 38 years, knows everything going on at the top level. Now we have potential control at the top. Then we have Beria who is chief of the secret police, some 12 divisions; also head of the Russian Atomic Energy Commission.

Those three men, because of the very nature of their jobs, are fundamentally the men who could be the future rulers of Russia. Now you can speculate as to what would happen, I would say, based on the fact that Beria ran the 1937 purge and was looked at by some of the Russians who ran the previous ones as too cruel. As the leader of the secret police he should be first to hear when Stalin dies. It seems to me that if he wants the job he has the inside track. Harry Schwartz of Syracuse University feels that these three men will rule as a triumvirate, because fundamentally they are the three strongest characters. I'll bet on Beria.

Now as to your first question, the Mongols came in under Genghis Khan and ruled for some 300 years. If you read Russian history, they came up to Kiev before the formation of the Kievan state, raided across the border, but when they got in they were a very moderate group of rulers, from a control point of view. They allowed the princes of the various municipalities to continue but these princes paid tribute to the Khan.

RESTRICTED

482

It is interesting to see how products change. The most important products that they could contribute to Genghis Khan and his group were wax, honey, and furs--those three things. They would take that archaic tribute and ship it down the river.

The Mongols did not like to rule as such and appointed the local prince who collected taxes. Mazour, in "Russia, Past and Present," says there is not the slightest doubt that the brutality present in the Russian make-up today stems back in large measure to the brutality that came in with those early raiders. The whole philosophy, I believe, permeated the Russian people to the extent which we have come to know today, that the end justifies the means.

QUESTION: The point I was wondering about was whether or not the Mongol influence had not encouraged setting up a complete autocracy?

COLONEL GODARD: Very definitely.

QUESTION: That helped support and encourage it.

COLONEL GODARD: The whole system of the Khan government was an autocracy. This group of people was like our frontiersmen who got away from their areas and headed out to the wide-open spaces. They were really tough people. Incidentally, that is where your word Cossack comes from. There was no such ethnic group. They were tough. The leader could be challenged by anybody at any time to mortal combat. Whoever won was the boss man.

QUESTION: We have always heard that the Ukrainians were most apt to be dissenters and would rise up if they were given an occasion. Could you comment on that?

COLONEL GODARD: At the time Martin Luther first got going in Europe, first of all we had the protest of Martin Luther nailed onto the door of the church. There began to grow up in Germany a whole nonconformist Protestant group. You had the Lutheran; then you had the Reformed Church; you had the Brethern; you had the Mennonites. There was a whole host of them. A lot of those people were persecuted. When the Protestants got some power, they did what they had protested against, they persecuted the poor people who disagreed with their Protestant views. Some of those people, roughly from 60,000 to 110,000, finally migrated out of Germany in 1780-1785--somewhere around there; that figure might be wrong--and went into what is known as the Ukraine. They were very fine, upright, essentially good citizens as Germans always are. They went there and lived and became a German principality of themselves, living under the czars. But because of the fact that they produced food for Russia, they were left alone by the czars. When World War II started, one of the first things the Russians did was to move them almost lock, stock, and barrel into Siberia. Later

RESTRICTED

483

it was estimated that 3 million people had moved from the Ukraine into slave labor camps. They have not come back. That has destroyed a lot of the potential of revolution, but if there is any place where an uprising would take place, it certainly would be in the Ukraine, definitely.

QUESTION: Keeping in mind that Russia is a Socialist government, not Communist, and that it is stated that Russia considers itself to be the center of world socialism and that communism and capitalism cannot exist side by side, eventually we will have world revolution and world socialism, where do the leaders of Russia consider the present other Socialistic states to fit into the scheme of things, such as England?

COLONEL GODARD: I stand convicted by my own eloquence. I was using Socialism in the broadest sense. When I used the term Socialist, I meant Socialist in the sense of the government owning everything. That is not the same form of socialism as exists in England. Russia is neither Socialist nor Communist; it is a totalitarian police state, of the worst kind. Socialism per se does not exist in Russia and you can't compare a thing that is operated by force and a system in which you have no say whatever with a system that is permitted by law. If 51 percent of the British people tomorrow decide they want socialism, there is nothing we can do about it. Neither could we if our constitution means what we say it means. For example, if Norman Thomas should run for the presidency and he got 51 percent of the vote, we would have to accept it. In my opinion we have been absorbing a lot of socialism for the past 20 years and haven't even realized it.

COLONEL ENNIS: Rusty, I see our time is running out. I would like to thank you very much for a most interesting lecture.

COLONEL GODARD: It was a pleasure, as always.

(5 May 1952--250)S/ijk

RESTRICTED