

The Captive Nations Resolution and Other US Relics of the Cold War
W George Krasnow

Remarks by Dr. W. George Krasnow at a panel discussion of the 92nd anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution and the 20th anniversary of the Fall of the Berlin Wall.
[1]



President Reagan holds up a proclamation designating Captive Nations Week after signing it in a Rose Garden ceremony.

First, I salute the sponsor of our panel, the Conflict Solutions International. It is a team of independent pro bono lawyers whose mission is to prevent new threats to peace and security in the world. Strategically located in Washington DC, the CSI relies on volunteers throughout the world. Striving to ameliorate current conflicts, they serve as fact-finders, monitors and mediators.

As president of the Russia & America Goodwill Associates (RAGA), an informal organization of Americans favoring better relations with Russia, I cannot think of a better forum. The goals of RAGA are the same as those of the CSI. Luckily, since the Fall of the Wall, Russia and the United States do not have unsolvable conflicts. Whatever conflicts they now have are not of the kind that existed during the Cold War, when the world's very survival was at stake.

But the job of securing a peaceful world is not yet done. Both Russia and the United States have failed to fully benefit from the absence of the Cold War. Both countries failed to lay aside the old mistrust and suspicion to improve upon the present situation which can be described as a Cool Peace. As an US citizen and former Soviet defector, I feel it my duty to point out some of the relics of the Cold War and the mentality behind them. Like deadwood, these relics serve no useful purpose. They only obstruct our vision, overshadow mutual goodwill and feed potential conflicts.

A prime example is the failure to disband NATO after the retreat of Soviet forces from the Warsaw Pact countries. After all, NATO as a military alliance had been specifically created to deal with the threat of Soviet aggression. The bombardment of Yugoslavia and NATO expansion into former Soviet bloc countries and Soviet republics followed. These unwise steps were bound to reinforce Russia's mistrust of the West.

The recognition of Kosovo is another unwise decision. Had we listened to Russian objections, most likely we would not be facing the problematic independence of South Ossetia and Abkhazia today. But there is no point in arguing for the reversal of history.

What we can and must do now is stop the current US tendency to advance its misperceived national interests at Russia's expense. The line should be drawn to stop NATO expansion to Georgia and Ukraine. The expansion there is likely to precipitate a civil war in both Georgia and Ukraine, into which Russia will inevitably be drawn. As the August 2008 war in South Ossetia showed, the passions among different peoples there are as great as our ignorance about them.

In addition to the unwise political steps taken by US government in the wake of the Fall of the Wall, US legislation is full of Cold War relics. One such relic is the Jackson-Vanik amendment designed in 1974 to pressure the USSR to allow free emigration of Jews. Now when citizens of Israel and Russia enjoy visa-free travel, this amendment is a needless irritant in the US-Russia relations.

Let me now focus on an even more ancient relic of the Cold War. This year is the 50th anniversary of the so called Captive Nations resolution that was signed into law (*Public Law 86-90*) by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1959. Here is its crucial part:

“Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Viet-Nam, and others; ... The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as “Captive Nations Week” and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”

A number of questions arise in respect to this document. First, what are those countries named as White Ruthenia, Idel-Ural, and Cossackia? I suspect that the first one refers to Belorussia. However, having become independent, it named itself Belarus, not the Latinized White Ruthenia. Second, Idel-Ural refers to a huge area in the middle of Russia occupied by six different republics, the descendants of ethnic groups which until 16th century were dominated by the Tatar-speaking Khanate of Kazan and then became part of Russia. As far as I know, none of them made a serious bid for independence. Cossackia is a fictional country which cannot be found even in Wikipedia. It did not exist before the

Bolshevik revolution and is unlikely to ever come into being, even though there is a cultural revival of Cossack traditions in many parts of Russia.

Apparently, these fictional “captive nations” were introduced into the congressional resolution as wishful thinking about dismembering Russia. The authors’ imagination was certainly freer than the ambitions of their clients. One might suspect that the exotic names made their way into US Congress from the writings of Alfred Rosenberg, Hitler’s minister for “Eastern Regions,” since one of the chief goals of The Third Reich was the dismemberment of Russia.

While naming the hypothetical aspirants for independence from “the imperialist Communist Russia” may seem innocuous exercise in “what if,” it is not astute politics. It is indeed a harmful relic of the past, with all the foibles and prejudices of the Cold War. But this was THEN, when it was easy to plead ignorance because the USSR surrounded itself with the Iron Curtain.

Alas, even NOW the resolution is still in force. Since 1959 every US President has been issuing proclamation as required. This happened even after the end of “Russian Communist Empire.” It’s true, the list of captive nations has changed. President George W. Bush replaced the White Ruthenia with Belarus, excluded China, added Sudan, Syria and Zimbabwe, for good measure.

Last July President Obama again proclaimed the Captive Nations Week “to reaffirm our commitment to all those seeking dignity, freedom and justice.” However, acknowledging that “The Cold War is now consigned to the history books,” he wisely did not list any “rogue” states. This was a significant symbolic step away from the Cold War mentality underlying this document.

Don’t get me wrong. I do rejoice that so many “captive nations” are captive no more. But I rejoice even more that my native Russia is not captive anymore. That’s what the Resolution 86-90 failed to do: it did not spell out, loud and clear, that all peoples in the USSR, including ethnic Russians, were the captives of the Bolshevik revolution. The Russians were the first victims of Communism. It is noteworthy that in the USSR they never called it a “Russian” revolution. Soviet propagandists always used its official name, the Great October Socialist Revolution. And the official coat of arms of the USSR showed the hammer and sickle transposed over the whole globe.

The authors of the Resolution apparently never read the works of Marx, Lenin or Stalin where it was always stressed that the revolution was driven by “proletarian internationalism.” Nor did they read the Pravda newspaper’s masthead which had proclaimed, even into the dying days of 1991, “Proletarians of the world unite!” And so did all newspapers in the USSR, including those in Latvia, Georgia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Birobidjan.

Indeed, the majority of Bolshevik leaders were not ethnic Russians, but Jewish, Latvian, Georgian, Polish and other minorities. During the Russian civil war, the Red Army

consisted mostly of minorities. The fiercest troops that Lenin used to guard the Kremlin and suppress anti-Bolshevik uprisings were two Latvian divisions. To be sure, a great many Russian workers, impoverished peasants, and disaffected soldiers were also duped into the revolution, but they were still a tiny minority of the Russian people. Among prominent Soviet leaders Stalin was a Georgian, Trotsky a Jew, Dzerzhinsky a Pole, Beria a Georgian, Mikoyan an Armenian, Khrushchev and Brezhnev were Ukrainian rather than Russian.

My point is not to shift the blame for Communism from ethnic Russians to other peoples. Rather, I wish to demonstrate that there were reasons why so many people, even those who lived in the Free World, were captive of Communist ideology, either in its Marxist-Leninist form or disguised as Marxism. No nation was immune to the poison of Marxism. Until about 1968 it was fashionable to be a Marxist, and anti-American, in many European countries allied with the USA. In France, it was difficult to get tenure at a university without Marxist credentials. The killing fields of Khmer Rouge were run by the Cambodian expatriates who learned their murderous ideology from Marxist tutors in Paris. Twenty years later, in 1988, when *glasnost* exposed Communism for what it was, the syndicated columnist George Will quipped in *The Washington Post* that there were more Marxists at Harvard than in the entire Soviet Union.

Since Communist ideology was not even mentioned, the resolution was bound to skew US foreign policy to be more anti-Russian than anti-Communist. Still on the books, this resolution offends the memory of countless ethnic Russians, like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn or Andrei Sakharov, whose contribution to the fall of Communism was of paramount importance. Moreover, it questions territorial integrity of the Russian Federation.

Recently I went to the Cato Institute to see a new documentary film “The Soviet Story.” The blurb promised “a story that has never been fully told — until now. Many of the crimes committed by the Soviet regime, stretching back over 70 years, have remained hidden or their recounting has been taboo.” This documentary proved more truthful than the Captive Nations resolution. While the brutality of Soviet occupation of Latvia was in full display, the main thrust was not anti-Russian, but, as in the title, anti-Soviet. Introducing the film, the Latvian Ambassador acknowledged that ethnic Russians had suffered under Communism no less than the occupied nations. The film makers made it clear that their purpose was to enlighten about the crimes of Communism all countries, especially, the West.

What a coincidence! On the same day *The Washington Post* ran an Op-Ed article by Paul Hollander who fled from Hungary during the uprising in 1956 and now is an associate at Harvard. Listen what he says about the need of enlightenment in the United States: “There is little public awareness of the large-scale atrocities, killings and human rights violations that occurred in communist states, especially compared with awareness of the Holocaust and Nazism (which led to far fewer deaths). The number of documentaries, feature films or television programs about communist societies is minuscule compared with those on Nazi Germany and/or the Holocaust.” [2]

Indeed, I don't remember a single good Hollywood film carrying a truthful exposure of Soviet totalitarianism. Hollander's article itself is extremely rare. And so was his book *Political Pilgrims* where he described how the luminaries of the West from George Bernard Shaw to Jean-Paul Sartre to Susan Sontag glorified Soviet totalitarianism. [3]

Alas, the false and misleading accounts of the USSR did not come only from the Left. They also came from the political Right. Some on the Right paraded anti-Communism, but were animated by something else. Well, this year I mark a couple of personal anniversaries. One is the 30th anniversary since I had a debate with Harvard Professor of Russian History Richard Pipes on the question of whether US foreign policy was not dictated more by anti-Russian animus rather than a deeper understanding of Soviet system. The debate took place on the pages of *The Russian Review* and later re-printed in the British *Encounter* magazine. [4]

Since Professor Pipes was about to be appointed to the National Security Council under President Reagan, I decided to review his political writings. I had a high regard for President Reagan as one of very few American politicians who paid close attention to Soviet dissidents. I was concerned that he gets the best scholarly advice. Having read Pipes' political writing, I was disappointed. The only thing with which I agreed was that Soviet leaders' professions of love for peaceful co-existence should not be taken at face value.

The real difference was: Why Soviet leaders cannot be trusted? Pipes's answer was that "the elite currently ruling the Soviet Union is for all practical purposes directly descended from peasantry" who are allegedly famous for their "unusually low business ethics." Being a product of the Stalin era, these "peasants" were heirs to "the persistent tradition of Russian expansion" inherited from the czars. "These various elements of historical experience blend to create a very special kind of mentality, which stresses slyness, self-interest, reliance on force, skill in exploiting others, and, by inference, contempt for those unable to fend for themselves," concluded Pipes.

Pipes argued that Marxism-Leninism, with its notions of world revolution and class warfare, exerted only a "minor influence" on Soviet leaders; so minor that Soviet leaders' world view "is better studied from Russian proverbs than from the collected works of the 'coryphaei of Marxism-Leninism.'"

Nowhere in the works of Pipes can one find an analysis of "The Communist Manifesto," the mantra for all Soviet people, certainly Politburo members. "The Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things," says the *Manifesto*. Since "The Communist Revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations," the mantra went on, "its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas." As to "eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc.," Communism "abolishes all religion and all morality" inherited from the past. This *Manifesto* clearly gives its adherents license to lie, murder, obfuscate, and deceive as long as their actions advance the cause of Communist world revolution.

In his reply, Professor Pipes accused me of blaming “all the suffering [Russia] has experienced and inflicted since 1917 on a scape goat, a German writer, long dead.” He thus refused to credit Marx with creating a most powerful intellectual movement which had dominated the world throughout the 20th century and resulted in one-party dictatorship, brain washing, the GULAG and mass murder on an unprecedented scale. It still holds sway in China, North Korea and Cuba among other countries. With the current global crisis there is no telling if Marxism will not be reborn elsewhere--even in the United States--because Marx’s critique of capitalism cannot be easily dismissed.

It was not Marx’s critique of capitalism that caused the greatest calamity of the 20th century. It was the violent world revolution he preached was needed to replace capitalism with what now proved to be an utterly utopian vision of universal socialism. Don’t blame just Russian Bolsheviks for trying to implement this utopia. The French philosopher and former socialist Jean-Francois Revel called the appeal of Marxist ideas in France and everywhere else *The Totalitarian Temptation*, as his 1976 book was titled. [5] One recent reviewer warned: “Make no mistake: the USSR may be gone, but the totalitarian temptation is still very much with us.” By dismissing Marx as “a German writer, long dead,” Pipes showed just how little even the best Sovietologists understood the phenomenon of the USSR, an utopia which could not have existed that long without adding and abetting from its fellow travelers in the West.

Generously funded by American tax-payers, American Sovietologists failed to predict and even anticipate the fall of Communism. When Solzhenitsyn was kicked out from the USSR in 1974 and declared that his books and he would return to a free Russia, he was ridiculed by Sovietological establishment as a dreamer. Not only did he predict the fall of the USSR, but, in his *Letter to Soviet Leaders*, which he had mailed to all the Politburo members in 1973, he suggested the least painful, gradual, evolutionary, and realistic way out from the dead-end of Communism.

He implored them to reject Marxist-Leninist ideology in favor of a more pragmatic approach. He pleaded they abandon the unattainable goal of world communism as it depletes the country’s resources, impoverishes its population and threatens world peace. He asked to limit their task to defending the country’s territorial integrity and national interest, a task with which all normal non-ideological governments are charged. “Give that ideology to the Chinese,” he advised. All that was needed was a gradual return of the traditional values of Russian culture and patriotism.

But what about the captive nations? Wasn’t Solzhenitsyn calling for a return to great power chauvinism? Not at all. He suggested that Moscow allow the “border area republics” to hold a referendum on whether they wanted to secede or be part of Russia.

The Politburo addressees kept silent. Circulated in Soviet *samizdat*, the letter was published in English. Alas, in the West too Solzhenitsyn only earned scorn and snide remarks that he was reactionary. After the defeat in Vietnam, the prevailing mood in the USA, at least, in its intellectual establishment was defeatist. The best and the brightest of America were more concerned with placating Soviet leaders. It seems that the only place

where Solzhenitsyn's advice was heard was the People's Republic of China whose leaders have suspended Marxist-Leninism in favor of pragmatism, at least, in the country's economic life. [6]

For the Russians, the fall of the Berlin is a double celebration. For them, the entire Iron Curtain surrounding the USSR also fell. Most importantly, it was the end of Russia's isolation from its own past. For a tyranny to be truly totalitarian, the tyrants seek to have a complete control not just over their domain's geography, but also its history. Only with the advent of glasnost, did the Russians begin to penetrate the wall of isolation from their own past, both pre- and post-revolutionary. Only then did they realize the scale of destruction, distortion, and amnesia caused by the revolution. The fall of the Berlin wall made Soviet leaders powerless to maintain the internal wall of censorship and restrictions that had separated Russia from its own past for the long seventy years.

To give you an example, let me ask a simple question: Who was the last Russian czar? Well, I see that the audience is about evenly split between those who are modestly silent and those who named Nicholas II. Just one dissenting voice named Michael II. And he was right. True, Michael was never crowned. But he was as important to Russian history as any czar. He is important even now. But don't blame yourself for ignorance. I doubt whether even 5 people out of 100 Russians would recall his name. Only gradually is Russia awakening from amnesia of the past.

What happened was that Soviet propaganda made everyone think that Czar Nicholas's abdication was the end of monarchy. It was not. Nicholas abdicated in favor of his younger brother Michael. The following day, in the midst of workers unrest and soldiers mutiny, Michael deferred a possible ascension to the throne until Russian people decided on the form of government. He mandated the Provisional government to conduct the general election to the Constituent assembly. His courageous and prudent decision stopped the February revolution and averted the threat of civil war.

The general elections were held nine months later. These were the freest elections in Russia's history. The ballot was universal, equal, secret and direct. Women voted too, several years before they did in the United States and other Western countries. The Bolsheviks suffered a resounding defeat, garnering about a quarter of the vote. However, since on November 7, 1917, they had already seized power, on January 17, 1918, they forcibly dispersed the first session of the Constituent Assembly. Thus, they precipitated a civil war which caused more deaths and devastation in Russia than WWI. On June 12, 1918 Michael, the uncrowned czar, was slain in my native Perm, five weeks before Nicholas, his family, and loyal servants were massacred in Yekaterinburg.

That is how Russia became the first captive nation, captured as it were, by a small, but well armed and ruthless band of Bolsheviks. Their power indeed came not through ballot but the barrel of their guns. They were also well armed with Marxist-Leninism, the "ideology of proletarian internationalism," which was to replace all religion—Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and Buddhism--and all morality inherited from the past. Of a distinct Western origin, this ideology required the population to spare no effort in

spreading the Communist world revolution. Thus the first totalitarian state of the 20th century was forced upon Russia.

Let me illustrate the pernicious effect of Russia's internal wall on the history of the USSR. Was there any event of Soviet history reminiscent of the mutiny on the battle ship "Potemkin"? Well, thanks to Sergei Eisenstein's film everybody knows what I am talking about. Soviet propaganda made it sure we do. But very few people, here and in Russia, know that on November 8, 1975, in the midst of celebration of the 58th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, Soviet frigate "Storozhevoy" (meaning Vigilant!) moored in the bay of Riga, the capital of Latvia, made a dash for freedom.

Some crew managed to escape from the mutinous ship. Alerted by them, Soviet Navy ships caught the frigate in international waters of the Baltic Sea. Leonid Brezhnev's order was to destroy it. When Navy men refused to shoot at their own, Soviet Air Force jets were ordered to drop the bombs near the ship. The mutineers had to give up. Surrounded by Soviet Navy, the frigate was taken back to the bay of Riga. The leader of the mutiny was no other than its political officer, Valery Sablin. Charged with high treason, he was executed in August 1976.

As I was writing at the time a book about Soviet defectors, I described the Storozhevoy incident as a collective attempt to break through the Iron Curtain. [7] Only after the fall of the wall did I learn that their goal was not to escape, but to reach Leningrad where they intended to make a central TV station broadcast their condemnation of the corrupt Brezhnev regime and announce a program of reforms similar to what Gorbachev proposed 12 years later.

US intelligence knew of the incident, but chose not to report it to the media. I would not be surprised if there was a political decision "not to rock the boat of the delicate US-USSR relations." The mutiny started, by the way, after the crew had watched Eisenstein's famous movie. Most of the mutineers, including captain of 3rd rank Valery Sablin, were ethnic Russians. The Russians did not learn of his incident until the fall of the Wall. The Westerners did know about it, but chose to remain silent.

The one who did not remain silent got it all wrong. It was Tom Clancy who based his best-selling 1984 novel, *The Hunt for Red October*, on this incident. However, Clancy made a Lithuanian, captain Marko Ramius, not a Russian, the hero of the story. To set up his defection to the USA, the Lithuanian rebel kills a certain Ivan Putin, political officer, to make sure that nobody interferes with the defection. Putin is obviously ethnic Russian. Of course, a novelist has the right to poetic license. But one may easily suspect that Clancy was under influence of the same Russophobic slant that inspired the authors of the Captive Nations resolutions, that is, the Russians can serve only as jailors of small freedom-loving nations.

The wall of Russia's separation from its past greatly contributed to ignorance about Communism among foreigners and Russians alike. However, the foreigners were free to study Russia's past; the Russians were not. Therefore, the greater responsibility fell on

us, the free people of the free world. As long as Soviet watchdogs controlled the archives and the borders, our sources were limited, but we were free to analyze, discuss and publish them. Soviet historians were not. Surely, there were conscientious foreigners whose research helped Russians overcome the amnesia. Robert and Susan Massie were the first to present a truthful and sympathetic account of Nicholas II and his wife Aleksandra at a time when Soviet historians could not even raise such a taboo topic.[8] Later, Suzanne Massie wrote one of the finest accounts of Russian history and culture in her book, *Land of the Firebird: The Beauty of Old Russia*.[9]

Likewise, the best account of Michael II belongs to a British couple, Donald and Rosemary Crawford. It's true that they did their research in 1992-1997 when access to Russian sources became relatively free. But it did not even occur to Russian historians to study such "exotic" subject. Besides, the Crawfords had access to many sources outside of Russia as they were willing and able to spend money on travel and translation of the Russian sources. All of the above was simply out of reach for Russian historians.

Those are just two of many examples of how Western scholarship helped overcome the wall of Russia's fateful separation from its past. Unfortunately, the negative examples abound. It's not the place here to discuss them. Suffice to say, that scholarly advice behind the Captive nations resolution was biased and misleading. The same goes for Clancy's book *The Hunt for Red October* which was followed by a Hollywood movie of the same name. Of course, Clancy is not an historian. But why should one make a Lithuanian the hero of his story when in real life it was a Russian? Was it to make the American public think that the only bad thing about Communism was that the Russians ran it? I am afraid he sent his hunters for Red October on a wrong scent. Hollander is right that Western intellectual establishment did little to counter Communist totalitarianism, and the little it did, was often wrong-headed.

This pervasive ignorance about Russia's past was bound to have a deleterious effect on the Russian reforms under Gorbachev and Yeltsin. These reformers were either ignorant or disdainful of the Russian tradition of reforms from Alexander II through Petr Stolypin and Michael II. The court system created under Alexander II was certainly more democratic than it is now. Whereas Stolypin strengthened Russian agriculture to create middle class; the free-market reformers ruined the already inefficient Soviet agriculture, creating nothing instead. Michael's definition of people's sovereignty was not even considered for the current Russian constitution. The reformers also ignored Solzhenitsyn's suggestion that the priority should be on saving lives, not experimenting with a new Western economic theory. As a result, these reforms did not hark back to the vertical continuity of Russian history. They consisted of strictly horizontal, geographic and mechanical borrowings across the fallen Berlin wall. They were one-dimensional. As such, they were bound to fall flat on their face.

Like under the Bolsheviks, Russia again fell under the spell of a Western fashion. In 1917 to 1921 it was the Marxist model of total nationalization and socialist planned economy. In 1991-1998 it was the neo-liberal unfettered capitalism under the aegis of "Washington consensus." The US was not an innocent bystander. Under US tutelage, these reformers

marched Russia from the extreme of Marxism to the extreme of Friedmanism, while letting the oligarchs to loot the country. The fraudulent privatization in a country where the only entrepreneurs were crooks or political cronies was bound to produce an economic monster. It also wiped out all the achievements of social justice and economic equality that were bought at the enormous cost during Soviet dictatorship. Russia was back to square one, back to social and economic disparity that existed under the czars, a disparity that precipitated the Bolshevik revolution.

The cost of the reforms was enormous too. My colleague at this panel estimates it at 6 million lost lives. The suffering Russians experienced in the 1990s is comparable only to a major war. Like old Bolsheviks, the reform Bolsheviks ruled by decrees. The oligarchic system they created is a parody of the American model they tried to emulate. When President Putin tried to rein in the unruly oligarchs, we accused him of authoritarianism. Ironically, woken up by a global economic crisis, we now seem to have second thoughts about the wisdom of unfettered capitalism even in this country where the tradition of free enterprise is deep-rooted. Now President Obama is trying to rein in our financial tycoons, so far with little success. The conditions are ripe for Marx's comeback. Hopefully, only as a critic of capitalism, not prophet of revolution and socialist utopia.[10]

As the Conflict Solutions International seeks to ameliorate the existing conflicts and prevent the future ones, the importance of hearing from both sides is obvious. I have been on both sides and I believe the opposing views can be made agreeable. The examples of Russian history I cited clearly demonstrate that history matters. That's why the Captive Nations resolution, not being based on historical facts, should be scrapped as an anachronism and kept in the archives as a monument to ignorance about Communism. The only excuse I can think of for President Eisenhower signing it into a law was the Russophobic prejudice of his advisers.

There were, no doubt, many good things that President Eisenhower did. One was establishing a student exchange with the USSR. Today is just about the fiftieth anniversary since I saw the first Americans live. It was on the floor of Moscow University dormitory assigned to History Department where I was enrolled. In spite of being constantly watched, I managed to befriend some of them, in particular, Jeremy Azrael and his wife Gabriella. Indirectly, I am here thanks to the exchange President Eisenhower established. Indirectly, because neither Jeremy nor Gabriella encouraged or assisted in my defection. In fact, they had no idea of my plans at all. But, once I got political asylum in Sweden, I let Jeremy know that I was free. Soon he invited me to the University of Chicago so that I could share my insights with his students and learn English. The rest is history.

Sadly, Jeremy, whose last appointment was at RAND, prematurely died last March. I have always admired him for his sensitivity about what was happening behind the Iron Curtain and for his sympathy for its captives. So I dedicate my talk today to the memory of Jeremy Azrael, a perceptive and fair-minded American Sovietologist and a dear friend of mine. I wish he were here to take part in our debate.

Dr. W. George Krasnow (aka Vladislav Krasnov) is president of [Russia & America Goodwill Associates](#). Former professor of Russian Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies and author of "Russia Beyond Communism: A Chronicle of National Rebirth," he is an intercultural communications consultant residing in Washington, D.C.

ENDNOTES:

1. The panel was arranged by the Conflict Solutions International of Washington DC (CSIORG.org) on November 7, 2009 at The Letelier Theater. The other panelists were Paul Goble, Philip de Leon; David Satter, and Dmitry Vetrov, Counselor at the Embassy of Russia.
2. Paul Hollander, "Murderous Idealism," *The Washington Post*, November 2, 2009
3. Hollander, Paul, *Political Pilgrims: Western Intellectuals in Search of the Good Society*, 4th edn.
4. Wladislaw G. Krasnow, "Richard Pipes's Foreign Strategy: Anti-Soviet or Anti-Russian?" and Response by Richard Pipes, *The Russian Review*, Vol.38, No.2, April 1979, pp. 180-197. Reprinted as "Anti-Soviet or Anti-Russian" in *Encounter*, April 1980, pp. 67-75.
5. Jean-Francois Revel, *The Totalitarian Temptation*, 1976
6. The PRC constitution makes it clear, however, that it is still a one-party system, and that the party is "guided by Marxism-Leninism" as it builds socialism.
7. Vladislav Krasnov, *Soviet Defectors: The KGB Wanted List*, Hoover Institution Press: 1985, pp. 137-138.
8. Robert K. Massie, *Nicholas and Alexandra*. Atheneum, New York 1967 (written in cooperation with his wife Suzanne)
9. Suzann Massie, *Land of the Firebird: The Beauty of Old Russia*. Simon & Schuster 1980.
10. As one site reports, Marx's works are selling in record numbers across Germany; publishers cannot reissue his works especially (*Das Kapital*) fast enough to keep up with the demand, as German universities have made him a prime topic of study in an attempt to understand the crisis affecting capitalist economies.

Posted by W George Krasnow on December 13, 2009 5:27 PM