

## Two Sides of the Shield

### HUNGARY.

The traveller who enters communist Hungary with the idea of identifying Bolshevism with anarchy, is destined to a crescendo of disappointment. There is in Europe today no city more monotonously orderly than Budapest.

The essential difference between Russia and Hungary lies in the fact that the Hungarian workers were from the first united. There are no Mensheviks and no Social Revolutionaries in Hungary. The result is that there has been no attempt at sabotage by the intellectuals. Never was an overturn accomplished with less terror than this of the Hungarian government. All the world now knows how the revolution was accomplished. Instead of disorder and riots and bloodshed, wonderful to state, the result was a sudden extinction of the old jingo passion and a welling forth of a new passion for brotherhood. Bela Kun states, "We don't care about boundaries. All our hopes are in the masses and the possibility of brotherhood. The boundaries of our republic will be coterminous with the boundaries of the proletariat."

Naturally, not everything is perfect in this new state. Practically banking business has stopped, except for the drawing of small checks, up to 2000 Kr., for personal use, or checks for the payment of wages. International business and trading in foreign exchange are past. An unpleasant feature to the capitalists, is the law governing the coming Soviet election. In these elections only working people can vote; no capitalist will be allowed to cast a ballot. The daily papers have been turned into Gazettes which devote interminable columns to the edicts and legislation of the new government.

H. N. Brailsford says in "The New Republic," "Communism as I have seen it in Hungary, is a principle of constructive order. Two able men, one of them an historian of European repute, the other a statesman of equal note, both in the old days opponents of Socialism, said to me: 'The era of capitalism is over in Eastern Europe: It can never be restored.' If freedom is eclipsed for a moment, the destruction of the capitalist system makes for the first time in a modern state the only condition under which real freedom is conceivable. Hungary builds upon ruins, but the authors of the destruction were the makers of the war. To chaos and despair a living idea has brought the stimulus of a creative hope."

### FINLAND.

Secretary Lansing has issued a statement in Paris that "In view of the fact that the people of Finland have established a representative government, the Government of the United States of America declares that it recognizes the government so constituted as the de facto government of an independent Finland."

The Government so recognized invited the German armies into Finland, and later invited a German in as king. As for atrocities, 90,000 workers were arrested by the White Guard government. Of these, between 15,000 and 20,000 were shot in cold blood. In five months not less than 13,000 human beings, and probably more than 18,000 were starved to death. A writer in a recent number of "The New Statesman" estimates that the White Terror in Finland "destroyed some 30,000 lives, as compared with the 1000 destroyed during the Red Terror." Among the latter are included many deaths for which the brief Red Government was not responsible.

Here is a government erected by German bayonets, and stained with the most terrible massacres in all history, recognized by the United States and the Allies as a "representative government"—a government that is admittedly one of the bloodiest governments in history. Yet it was a French statesman who some months ago said with reference to Russia that the French Government would not

[George V. Lomonsoff, lately director of the Railway Department of the Russian Soviet Bureau in the United States, has just left for Russia to undertake the task of reorganizing the railway system under the Soviet Government. In Russian politics he was a Social Revolutionary and, as such, opposed the Bolsheviks, but for some considerable time, has been one of their most vigorous supporters.—Editorial Note.]

At the end of March, 1918, at the time when I had not as yet broken with the so-called Embassy of Bakmeteff and when nothing was known of England's active interference in Russian affairs, a well-known Russian General, Dobrjansky, called on me at Washington with his aide-de-camp, Captain Martini, one of my former students. The had just arrived from London in company with an English Lord, whose name I cannot recall, and in a few days they were to sail for Vladivostok. After a lengthy foreword, they explained to me that the Allies had decided, as a counter-balance to the Soviet Government, to create in Siberia a third Provisional Government with Admiral Kolchak at its head, and they offered me the post of Minister of Ways of Communication in that Government.

At that time innumerable more or less fantastic schemes and plots to aid the Russian counter-revolutionists were already the order of the day in certain circles, and I did not pay particular attention to this proposition. Declining the offer, I told the gentlemen that their scheme was impossible, and that an attempt to realize it would lead to nothing but greater chaos. To this Captain Martini replied hotly that the British Government had decided to support by all means and methods the Government which they were to create, even to sending an army of a million men. Therefore, the success of the enterprise was fully guaranteed. In proof of this, Egypt and India were brought to my attention as examples. I refused the offer a second time, but Captain Martini did not surrender and insisted that I should meet the English Lord somewhere on neutral territory. I refused the third time and finally; and owing to the multitude of events that followed, I had forgotten the incident entirely.

Later, when Kolchak appeared on the political stage as the "selected" leader of the "All-Russian Committee of Restoration of Russia," and now that desperate attempts are being made to make him appear the standard-bearer of democracy and the chosen leader of the Russian people, I recall that incident, and I place it before you as an illustration of the way in which "All-Russian Governments"

"contract with crime."

General Mannerheim, the present usurper of Finland, has arranged satisfactorily with the Allies and in consequence, an invading force of 50,000 has been organized and naval skirmishes are beginning between the Red navy and the Entente warships in the Finnish Gulf. According to the New York Globe, "The presence of the Entente warships off the Finnish and Estonian coasts is by no means to be regarded as provocative or ornamental. It should be realized that the Finnish coast would lie hopelessly exposed to the Bolshevik navy but for the protective presence of the foreign warships."

What is back of all this is, that capitalistic governments are determined to recognize only capitalistic governments, no matter what crimes they may be guilty of. Even the stigma of alliance with the late "enemy" will not bar them from the general family of capitalistic nations. Russia has committed the unpardonable crime of freeing the workers and peasants, and that act is infamous in comparison with the wanton and brutal murder of 30,000 workmen.

Russia and Hungary are outcasts among the nations; but the United States recognizes the "representative" government of Finland.

## Kolchak's Rule in Siberia

and "chosen leaders" of the Russian people originate.

I know Kolchak personally. He is an outspoken monarchist, deeply convinced that the Russian people can be ruled only with an iron fist, and without sentimental or "democratic" scruples. He is a very able man, and relentless, which makes him much more dangerous.

The American press today is swamped with propaganda depicting Kolchak as the very incarnation of democratic ideals. Apparently without any sense of humor, the press dispatches state that the Allied Governments are prepared to recognize Admiral Kolchak as the all-Russian authority because the present Government of Russia is not a sufficiently democratic institution to warrant recognition. Once more the press dispatches count upon the ability of the public to forget facts. Some persons, however, will remember that when the so-called Russian Government first was organized with Kolchak as a part of it, it contained members belonging to some moderate Socialist groups. Although these groups were bitterly opposed to the Bolsheviks they did not suit Admiral Kolchak's notions of democracy. Kolchak brutally arrested members of his own so-called Government, among them Ayksentiev and Zenzinov.

Kolchak's rule in Siberia has been marked by appalling brutality and organized terror, beside which the most exaggerated stories about the Red Terror in Russia dwindle into significance. To prove this one need not rely upon statements from Bolshevik sources. Sufficient evidence has appeared in publications pronouncedly hostile to the Russian Soviet Government.

The March issue of the Red Cross Magazine printed a horrible story of a train of death containing hundreds of prisoners taken by the Kolchak forces who were dragged from one end of Siberia to the other end until they succumbed from hunger, cold and disease.

A most interesting contribution to the characterization of the present rule in Siberia may be found in the June issue of Hearst's Magazine. It is written by an American Army Intelligence officer. He frankly admits that 95 per cent. of the people in Siberia are Bolsheviks, and that the counter-revolutionists are able to keep them down only by methods of extreme brutality. He speaks of cases where Kolchak's Cossacks flogged people into unconsciousness with iron rods. He gives instances of indiscriminate executions of people who dared to voice their protest against the regime of Admiral Kolchak.

Recently some self-styled representatives of Russian Co-operatives in the United States came out for the recognition of Kolchak. But the chairman of the American Committee of Russian Co-operatives, who is opposed to the Bolsheviks and therefore can not be regarded as biased in this matter, states that in coming out for Kolchak the representatives of Siberian co-operatives in no way represented the opinions of the Siberian co-operatives, and that the Siberian co-operative movement, if it were not for the terrorism practised by the Kolchak Government, would certainly be the first to oppose his recognition. Yet the fact remains that the Allied Governments, according to reliable dispatches, are on the verge of offering Kolchak recognition.

The reasons given for the Allied opposition to the recognition of the Soviet Government have been, (1) that the Soviet Government is not a democratic form of government, (2) that it maintains itself by terroristic methods, and, (3) that it has not the support of the Russian people. It is evident that the so-called Kolchak Government is indisputably and in the highest degree guilty on all these three counts. Somehow, however, it does not seem to disturb the conscience of those who contemplate his recognition.

The ways of diplomacy are inscrutable indeed.