

60

TODAY'S WORLD

Books of Current World Affairs

No. 3

THE "SICK MAN OF EUROPE"

By Professor Lew Shankowsky



INTRODUCTION

By John F. Stewart

551
SH LEAGUE FOR EUROPEAN FREEDOM

g Street, Edinburgh

Telephone 87789

PRICE 6D.

Introduction

By JOHN F. STEWART

THIS little booklet requires very little introduction from anyone. It is of the most absorbing interest in itself, and presents a point of view which I must confess is new to me and will be, I think, to most people. None the less it is, I am sure, unquestionably sound.

Introducing Professor Shankowsky, I should say that he is a distinguished Ukrainian Professor of History. Like so many of his compatriots, he had to flee from the Russians, but has now found refuge and congenial employment in the United States. Like his compatriots, he looks forward to the day when the invading Russians are driven out of his country and he can return to his own teaching there.

I have long been an advocate for the dissolution of the Russian Empire, and for the independence of the States which comprise it, and whose peoples are no more Russian than I am. I belong to a nation which had to fight for hundreds of years to retain its own independence—a small nation as numbers go. And I therefore sympathise naturally with any country struggling to throw off an alien yoke. So it is a matter of principle with me.

But it is also a matter which concerns every civilised people and humanity at large. There is only one inveterate enemy of humanity in this world—Moscow. With the control it has of the illimitable resources of the non-Russian peoples it can and will dominate the globe; without them it cannot. Surely it is the commonest of commonsense to take steps to see that these resources are taken from any kind of Russia—whether Tsarist, Socialist, Democratic, Bolshevik, Kerenskyist, or any other. But it has to be recognised that the peoples of the West have not yet grasped this and, ignorantly, have swallowed another kind of propaganda—that Holy Mother Russia, One and Indivisible, must be preserved intact. But Professor Shankowsky shows us that, by the disintegration of the USSR or Russian Empire ethnic Russia might become, as a homogenous State, as peaceful and politically harmless as Turkey has become. Such a consummation would, at anyrate, make Moscow's power for evil very slender indeed, as these States would surround her and, understanding her as the West never will, would

see that she was indeed rendered harmless. At the same time I am sure that, if Moscow minds its own business, not one of those States will wish to interfere in Russian domestic affairs.

Whether for Russia's good or not, it is not only for the good of the rest of the world that Russian claws should be clipped, but that, for the mere survival of religion and all that Christian civilisation has meant to this distracted world, Russia as a World Power should cease to exist. It is no use shutting our eyes to this: it has to be faced, and the experience of Korea, by which Russia has created bitter hostility between America and Asia and introduced the mighty power of China to aid her in the world conquest, should put an end to the advice of our Government to be careful of what criticism we make so as "not to aggravate Russia"! This pusillanimous policy has brought nothing but disaster and is Moscow's own game.

While we are so careful about Russia's feelings, Moscow is, by all means in its power, doing its best to inflame all the peoples in the USSR against the West. By radio, the press, and huge posters on the trains and everywhere they can be seen, the peoples in the Soviet Union are told "The Anglo-Americans are your enemies: Down with them." Schools have been established all over the USSR which children and young people are compelled to attend and where they are taught atheism and hatred of the West.

In Parliament Mr. Churchill has again reiterated his claim that our only hope of survival is the possession by America of the atom bomb. That means that, when it is thought advisable, the atom bomb will be dropped in Russia. This shows that even Mr. Churchill has lamentably not yet gained any understanding of Russia. To be effective in our defence these bombs would have to be dropped on the great industrial centres making war equipment. This is practically useless; no factories are concentrated in any one area—they are scattered throughout Siberia. Further, few Russians would be killed, as the factories are worked by the wretched deportees from Eastern Europe and the non-Russian States of Asia, with, perhaps, Russian supervisors and technicians. But Mr. Churchill's atom bombs would massacre millions of men and women slaves of Moscow, men and women of our own kind. Even more than that, which Mr. Churchill seems not to know, all the non-Russian nations are looking to the West for freedom and are ready to help the West against Russian attacks. Let the West bomb their cities, as Lord Vansittart recommends, and no better confirmation could be given to Moscow's slogan "The Anglo-Americans are your enemies." Proffered co-operation would be changed to bitter hatred and no opposition would be given to any Russian attack on Western Europe.

There is again talk of trying to come to some "arrangement" with Russia. No arrangement is possible. It seems to be almost universally accepted that Russia will attack the West sooner or later, and the only question is—When? Mr. Churchill thinks it will not be for two years, but he knows no more about this than anyone else. He is often wrong. On 18th October, in a letter to him, I said "Mr. Bevin has just said that 'Russia will be more careful in future.' Why should she? Stalin has attained his object as he did when he forced on the West the humiliating and costly Berlin air-lift. In Korea he has embroiled Asia with America, showed the former the gigantic effort needed by the West to overcome a handful of Koreans, and how easy it would be for the 500 millions of Chinese to sweep the Whites into the sea, and has provided them with the slogan "Drive the Whites out of Asia." Mr. Churchill did not agree with any of this, and has again been proved wrong. The unfortunate thing is that all Western statesmen and politicians look on Russia as an honourable and civilised nation which means, like them, to honour its agreements. They have been given lesson after lesson in the last ten years of the futility of this but have not taken it to heart, and they have let their own countries and peoples down. If they did come to some "arrangement," it would still mean that we and our children and our children's children will still live in constant terror, and we have no right to expose them to this. The plain duty of all civilised mankind is to see that Russia is made powerless for all time. It is useless coming to "arrangements"; it is even useless trying to buy safety by spending £3,000 million pounds on defence. Russia will just go on spending more, as she can do when her economy is based, as it is, on slave labour. The only hope for the world is that the non-Russian nations in the USSR should succeed in their fight for independence and freedom and that the Russians should be confined within their own clearly-defined frontiers like the rest of the nations now imprisoned in the USSR.

But if we support that I am told "that means war with Russia." Well, we are at war with Russia. "Oh, but we must do everything to localise the war." Is it possible to utter greater nonsense? How are we going to do that unless we can confine the Russians within their own ring fence? The ring fence, the occupied nations, is ready. In permitting it to be destroyed we are engineering our own destruction.

And so, read what Professor Shankowsky has to say.

And think for yourself, as I do. Place no faith in any politician of any Party, as I place none: politicians are more concerned with scoring off their opponents than with guiding public opinion and telling it the truth.

The "Sick Man of Europe"

By LEW SHANKOWSKY

IT is hard to realize that the modern dynamic Turkey is the same power which throughout the past century was commonly referred to as the "Sick Man of Europe." Up to the beginning of World War I the Turkish Empire was considered "the horror of the world" because it was able to solve its national problems only by massacres such as in Bulgaria or Armenia. It could not justly rule the many heterogeneous peoples belonging to its Empire, which included Libya, Egypt, Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Kurdistan, and the Balkan provinces Bulgaria, Macedonia, Serbia, Albania, etc. But within less than one hundred years the Turkish Empire was deprived of all the territories it had obtained since the time of Mohammed II and Solymán II the Magnificent, and many independent and semi-dependent States arose in its place in the Balkan peninsula, in Asia Minor and Northern Africa. The records show that most of these newly-formed States have made greater cultural, economic and social progress as free nations than they had been able to make under Turkish rule.

However, modern Turkey, entering the post-war period as a homogeneous state, soon became a strong national state which is an important political factor in the present world. Nobody speaks any longer of Turkey as the "Sick Man of Europe." It must by now have become plain to all of us that this Turkish revival was due, not only to the genius of Kemal Pasha Ataturk, but, above all, to the fact that Turkey became a homogeneous State by giving political freedom to the oppressed and subjugated peoples though even against her will.

It is, I think, no exaggeration to say that many people in Great Britain, as well as in the United States, are not able to conceive this profound truth, that the Soviet Union has at the present time reached this dramatic climax that the Turkish Empire had reached in the past century. The "Sick Man of Europe" of to-day rules over many heterogeneous peoples belonging to its empire, against their will. Its empire includes Karelia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belorussia, Ukraine, Moldavia, Cossackia, Northern Caucasia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Siberia, Idel-Ural. It

solves its national problems by *genocide* as in Ukraine and in the Baltic States, etc., and though race-murder is an old Muscovite speciality, often practised by the Tsars, we can say that the Russian Communists have developed it to a "scientific method" for ruling over the non-Russian peoples. Look at Soviet statistics and you will find the best demonstration of this fact. For example, in 1897 Ukrainians comprised 23% of the whole of Russia, 1926 21.2%, and 1939 16.5% of the whole of the Soviet Union.

Two of the chief reasons why it is so difficult for some Western observers of Eastern Europe to accept the view that the Soviet Union is the "Sick Man of Europe" of to-day is the myth of the "one indivisible," and neglect and indifference of the average European and American to Eastern European problems, but it has, however, taken a firm hold of the minds of many Europeans and Americans. They can hardly believe that the Russian Empire in the form of the Soviet Union is not a unity but a diversity of subjugated and oppressed peoples strongly opposed to it. It is, therefore, for them equally difficult to appreciate that this "one indivisible Russia" is not only the "Sick Man of Europe" of to-day, but a very "prison of peoples" of our days.

In this place I think it necessary to say that this "prison of peoples" was not built up all at once. For some hundred years every successive Tsar fostered the gradual and steady expansion of Russian imperialism. To-day it is no longer a secret that this Russian imperialism has never made any contribution to European or world peace. On the contrary, it has always been a destructive force in the European family of nations.

What does Russia want? In the records of Russian imperialism is to be found the answer to that question. Ever since Iwan III of Moscow (1462-1505) took the title of Tsar and built up the theory of the Third Rome by marrying Sophia Paleologue, a member of the last ruling family of Byzantium (the second Rome), his theory has dominated Russian thought. It encouraged the Russian people and their rulers to push their military conquests east to the Pacific Ocean, west to the Baltic Sea, and south to the Black Sea. In actual fact it dominates Russian thought to-day, and drives the Russian people on to military conquest and mastery of the entire world.

The first victim on the road of Russian imperialism to the south was *Ukraine*. As soon as Moscow secured her hold upon Ukraine she changed her name to Russia (the name "Rus" belonged to Ukraine). And when Ukraine was seized the conquest of the Caucasus quickly followed. From then on the gates of the Near East were open to Russia and her dream of conquest ceased to be

fantastic. From then she began that long duel with Great Britain for control of the Dardanelles. But Russian imperialism of the Tsars is not only responsible for the destruction of Ukraine. It is also responsible for the partition of Poland (1772-1795), for the invasion of Georgia (1801), for the incorporation of Finland (1809), and for the subjugation of Northern Caucasus after fourteen years war (1864). In Asia it subjugated Siberia and Turkestan, the country of an ancient culture. In this Russian growth the characteristic is that the expansion took place constantly and in every possible direction. The area of the Russian State was:

In the XIVth century	-	216,000 square miles.
„ XVIth „	-	3,375,000 square miles.
„ XVIIth „	-	6,356,000 square miles.
„ XVIIIth „	-	6,964,000 square miles.
„ XIXth „	-	8,644,000 square miles.
„ XXth „	-	9,620,000 square miles.
„ XXth „	-	10,070,000 square miles (1945).

People addicted to statistics have worked out that for the last 500 years the Russian State has expanded at the rate of 49 square miles a day. (Cp. Ryszard Wraga: *Soviet Militarism*, in June 1949 issue of the Eastern Quarterly, London.)

However, at the end of World War I, internally the Russian Empire of the Tsars was forced by its subjugated peoples to disintegrate into its component national sovereign states. Democratic, free, national States of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Belorussia, Poland, Ukraine, the South-Eastern Union of the Cossack lands, the Union of the Caucasian Mountaineers, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, all declared themselves sovereign States with complete independence from Moscovite Russia, while other countries like Siberia, Bashkiria, Tartaria, etc., claimed their autonomy within the Federative Russia. Thus in 1917 the celebrated Russian unity, under close scrutiny, resolved itself into surprising diversity.

Early, very early, the Bolshevik Russian Federation entered the broad road of Russian imperialism. In 1917 the Soviet Government recognised the independence of Ukraine which had a socialist-democratic government, but, at the same time, the Red army marched in, and after three years of incessant armed struggle for freedom, Ukraine was transformed into a Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. In 1920 the Soviet Government recognised the independence of Georgia, a small country in the Caucasus which also had a socialist-democratic government. In 1921 the Red army marched in and Georgia was duly transformed into an affiliated Soviet Republic.

From this pogrom of democracies in Eastern Europe only Finland, the Baltic States and Poland survived, because they had recognition and the support of the Western Powers. Had the others had this recognition and support of the Western Powers they would have survived too and there would have been no World War II.

Between the two World Wars the Soviet Government concluded Treaties of Non-Aggression and Neutrality with the Western neighbours of the Soviet Union—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland. The secret agreement concluded with Nazi Germany in 1939 entitled Soviet Russia cynically to break every one of these Treaties and to occupy Western Ukraine, the Baltic States, Bessarabia and Northern Bukowina, etc. With acquiescence of Nazi Germany, Soviet troops invaded Finland on November 30, 1939. Ten years later, in 1949, among the satellites of the Soviet Union were the following formerly independent nations: Poland, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, and a great part of Germany and Austria, not to mention Sin-Kiang, Mongolia, China, Manchuria and Korea, which are under control of Soviet imperialism, as well as other areas of Soviet expansion in all directions.

I do not wish to overstress the parallel between Tsarist Russian policy during the past five hundred years and the policy which the Soviet government has followed and may follow in the years to come, but I believe it would be highly unrealistic to assume that because the Soviet Government recognised in 1917 (by the Declaration of December 19, 1917) the right of self-determination to subjugated nations, or because the famous 17th article of Stalin's Constitution grants to each member of the Soviet Union the right to secede from the Union, it would not to-day follow the historical Russian objectives. On the contrary, it is a fact that Red Russian imperialism is the direct successor of the White Russian imperialism of the Tsars, and the only difference is that the Red imperialism is more unscrupulous in its amorality.

Think of these points. The Soviet Empire with its "mystic (Byzantine) Stalin worship" is the most highly artificial mosaic State in the world. It is composed of many subjugated races striving for freedom and independence. Upon objective experience it may be said that any attempt at the subjugation of nationally conscious peoples by force, conquest or denationalization, has dismally failed in Europe. It is only necessary to mention that ancient Rome and Byzantium, the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Nazi Germany did not survive, mainly because they tried to retain their supremacy by the oppression of many heterogeneous peoples forced to belong to their empires. The history of these conglomerate empires of the past provides one of the best illustrations of the inevitable course

of historic events that is bound to take place in the future in the Soviet conglomerate empire of Central Eastern Europe.

The problems arising from these developments are of critical importance. Unless the Western democracies rid themselves of the myths that becloud the understanding of the situation in the Soviet Union, and unless they conceive that the "Sick Man of Europe" now in the form of the Soviet Empire must be healed in the way of the Turkish Empire at the end of World War I, they cannot hope to gain active support in Eastern and Central Europe and Western Asia. Without gaining the support of the oppressed and subjugated nations, the Western democracies have no chance of checking Soviet Russian imperialism in, like Nazi Germany, its grandiose scheme of world domination. Having this in view, the Western democracies must oppose the Communist ideals with flaming ideals of self-determination and the liberation of nations revolting from the Russian yoke. The sooner it is done the better are the chances for the future of mankind. *Caveant consules!*