#248

Herbert Hoover's Brush with Bolshevism

by

Bertrand M. Patenaude

Bertrand M. Patenaude was a Research Scholar at the Kennan Institute in 1990-1991 and a National Fellow at the Hoover Institution for War, Peace, and Revolution during 1989-1990. He received his Ph.D. in history from Stanford University in 1987, where he is presently teaching. This paper was written during his residency at the Kennan Institute.

Edited by Peggy McInerny

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies is a division of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Through its program of fellowships, meetings, and publications, the Institute encourages scholarship on Russia and the Soviet Union, embracing a broad range of fields in the social sciences and the humanities. The Kennan Institute is supported by contributions from foundations, corporations, individuals, and the United States Government.

Kennan Institute Occasional Papers

The Kennan Institute makes Occasional Papers available to all those interested in Russian and Soviet Studies. Occasional Papers are submitted by Kennan Institute scholars and visiting speakers, particularly those who wish to receive timely feedback on their work. Copies of Occasional Papers and a list of papers currently available can be obtained free of charge by contacting:

Occasional Papers
Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies
370 L'Enfant Promenade, SW, Suite 704
Washington, D.C. 20024-2518
(202) 287-3400

This Occasional Paper has been produced with support provided by the U.S. Department of State under the Soviet and East European Research and Training Act of 1983 (Title VIII). We are most grateful to this sponsor.

HERBERT HOOVER'S BRUSH WITH BOLSHEVISM

by

Bertrand M. Patenaude

HERBERT HOOVER'S BRUSH WITH BOLSHEVISM

Seventy years ago today one of the greatest rescue operations in history was underway inside Bolshevik Russia. As millions of Soviet citizens faced the twin threat of starvation and epidemic disease, a group of 250 young American men were engaged in a race against the clock to provide food and medicine on a massive scale across the vast Russian heartland. The American relief effort, largely forgotten today, saved millions of lives and was generally recognized at the time as the most extraordinary humanitarian enterprise ever undertaken.[1]

The Great Famine of 1921 descended upon Soviet Russia after seven years of war, revolution, and civil war had left the Soviet economy in ruins. A severe drought in the summer of 1920 resulted in a crop failure, and by the summer of 1921 it was clear that the lives of some twenty-five million people, most of them situated in the Volga valley and in the southern Ukraine, were in danger. The government of Vladimir Lenin, under enormous popular pressure, had been forced several months earlier to abandon its militant economic policies and introduce limited market freedoms, but these reforms could not prevent the impending catastrophe. In the end, according to credible sources, at least five million Soviet citizens died of starvation and hunger-related disease during the year 1921-22.

The number of victims would have been much higher had it not been for the decisive intervention of the United States, specifically of the American Relief Administration (ARA), a private relief organization under the direction of Herbert Hoover, the hugely successful mining engineer and businessman-turned-statesman. Hoover had achieved worldwide fame as the organizer and administrator of large-scale humanitarian relief operations, first in German-occupied Belgium during the Great War, and then in the post-war period as economic director of the Allied Supreme Economic Council and, subsequently, as director general of the ARA, which was until 1920 an official U.S. government agency. In the first half of 1919 the ARA was conducting relief operations in twenty-two countries across Europe and in the Near East.

At the time of the Soviet famine the United States had no official relations with Lenin's government, but as Hoover was Secretary of Commerce in the Harding Administration and exerted a major influence over the conduct of U.S. policy in Europe, the ARA mission had from the start a quasi-official character.

Hoover's original intention in August 1921 was to feed only about two to three million Russian children, but this plan was revised almost immediately as the American relief workers made their way to the towns and villages in the Volga region and filled their reports with descriptions of the piles of tangled corpses; of the thousands of refugees, ragged and typhus-ridden, fleeing westward in search of food; of the cries of the children, many with bellies swollen from eating grass, leaves, and bark; of the many living skeletons, beyond salvation and waiting to die. "A perfect hell" was the phrase used by more than one American to describe this landscape of horror and suffering. One of the first telegraphic communications out of Russia to the ARA's London headquarters declared simply: "We have come to the right place."[2]

In Washington Hoover began to put the pieces in place for a dramatic expansion of the mission. This came about on December 22, 1921, when the U.S. Congress passed a bill authorizing an appropriation of $20 million for the purchase of corn and seed grain from American farmers for Russian relief. To this total was added other government money and private donations (as well as the expenditure of about $12 million from the Soviet government's gold reserve), and in the end the two-year ARA mission was backed by over $60 million, a sizeable sum of money in those days. Of this total, about $5 million was raised by several American relief organizations affiliated in Russia with the ARA, notably the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers) and the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. In all, some 400 Americans served in Soviet Russia, employing a staff of over 120,000 local Soviet citizens.

The decisive phase came in March and April of 1922, when, against the considerable odds posed by the Russian winter, the ARA negotiated hundreds of railroad cars of corn and seed grain from the Soviet ports over collapsing railway lines and into the towns and villages just in time for the spring planting. The arrival of the American corn was the

occasion for extraordinary scenes of appreciation by peasants for their American benefactors. The back of the famine was broken and for several months Corn was King in Russia. The height of ARA activity was reached in August 1922, when American kitchens were feeding white bread, beans, corn grits, and cocoa to about 10 1/2 million Soviet citizens a day.

It is impossible to estimate how many lives were saved by the ARA's Russian mission, both as a result of its feeding and of its considerable medical relief program, which acted to check epidemics of cholera and typhus. Beyond saving lives, the ARA played an important role in the reconstruction of the Soviet economy, most crucially in the revival of the railroads, which might have shut down entirely had not American corn kept them running through the winter of 1921-22. These economic contributions were acknowledged at the time by the highest Bolshevik authorities and are documented in thousands of letters of appreciation to the ARA from Soviet citizens and officials from across the country.

Looking back upon this episode, George Kennan has speculated that the ARA "may well, for all anyone can tell, have saved the Soviet regime itself from utter failure and collapse."[3] There is a good deal of irony in this, for Herbert Hoover was America's most famous anti-Bolshevik.

Hoover earned his anti-Bolshevik credentials in conducting his post-war relief operations, when he openly used American food to combat the spread of bolshevism and maintain order and stability in Europe. For Hoover, bolshevism was a kind of disease brought on by an empty stomach, and for this he had a cure. In 1918 and 1919 when he spoke of the goals of food relief, in the same breath as he confirmed its humanitarian basis he quite plainly spoke of a political component: "to stem the tide of Bolshevism."[4] In the mid-1920s he wrote that "at no time were we of any other mind than that the European relief in 1919 was the greatest battle ever made against Bolshevism."[5]

Hoover's use of food to combat bolshevism has diminished his reputation as a humanitarian. This is not the place to review the substantial literature on this subject, but a few basic points will serve to illuminate the Russian episode. The first is that Hoover's notion of bolshevism as a

disease whose spread could be stopped with food was hardly unusual; indeed, it was shared by Woodrow Wilson and the rest of the Big Four, as well as by most of the key players in the American foreign policy establishment at the time. (Thirty years later, the fundamental assumption behind the Marshall Plan was, in the words of historian Thomas Bailey writing in 1950, that "an economically prosperous Europe . . . would reject the creeping paralysis of communism."[6])

Secondly, as Hoover biographer David Burner correctly points out, on the spectrum of anti-bolshevism in 1919, Hoover's position fell near the center.[7] He quite calmly analyzed the problem and proposed a solution. The shrill anti-Communism at home and abroad associated with his name after the Second World War is a different matter, and it is a mistake to project it back onto this period.

Furthermore, in assessing Hoover's motives it is not helpful to insist upon a dichotomy of humanitarianism vs. anti-bolshevism. To Hoover (just as to Wilson) bolshevism was synonymous with anarchy, the handmaiden of hunger. It was a symptom of people in distress; therefore, fighting bolshevism *was* humanitarian.

Hoover's critics are on firmer ground when they point to his economic nationalism, chiefly his efforts to unload in post-war Europe America's huge agricultural surplusses, for which he, as U.S. Food Administrator in 1917 urging increased production, had been largely responsible. Indeed, the $20 million Congressional Appropriation for Russian relief was used to purchase surplus corn from American farmers at a time when the U.S. economy was still trying to climb out of a mild post-war depression. But, at least in the case of Russian relief, it cannot not be suggested that Hoover tried to obscure considerations of American economic interests. "The food supplies that we wish to take to Russia are all in surplus in the United States, and are without a market in any quarter of the globe. . . ," he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the December 1921 hearings on Russian relief. "We are today feeding milk to our hogs; burning corn under our boilers."[8] So much the better if a humanitarian operation abroad made good economic sense at home.

Hoover's post-war activities were not limited to sterilizing Europe from bolshevik infection. He paid close attention to the fortunes of the White armies in the Russian Civil War, feeding behind their lines and, to a limited extent, even supplying food to their ranks. He was also at the center of diplomatic initiatives to establish Allied feeding operations inside Soviet Russia during the Civil War. These efforts, too complex to be recounted here in any detail, were based on the unrealistic premise that the Soviet government would agree to a truce in order that the Allies might establish independent, "non-partisan" food relief in Russia. The Bolsheviks, no fools and not inclined to commit political suicide, insisted that international diplomatic recognition precede any negotiations, and the proposals came to nothing.

However, by 1921, having won the Civil War but now faced with a famine of catastrophic proportions, the Soviet government could no longer hold out. With Lenin's approval, Maxim Gorky published an appeal on July 23 "To All Honest Citizens" to send bread and medicine. Hoover responded with an offer of assistance and negotiations in Riga, Latvia, led to the signing on August 20 of the so-called Riga Agreement between the ARA and the Soviet government, represented by Maxim Litvinov, Deputy People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs. The essential terms of this unofficial treaty granted the ARA control over its operations inside Russia. In return it pledged to conduct non-partisan famine relief and not to mix in Soviet politics.

The opening weeks of the mission were very tense. The Bolsheviks, deeply humiliated at having to be rescued by the foreign bourgeoisie, were also extremely suspicious of the ARA's true intentions. This was symbolized during the Riga negotiations by Litvinov's signature line, which he repeated in a half-pleading, half-scolding tone: "Gentlemen, food is a weapon." The Kremlin leadership feared that the ARA was a Trojan Horse: an article in the Petrograd Party newspaper warned by its title of "The Greek Hoover and His Gifts."[9] An edgy Lenin urged vigilance, warning that Hoover was an "insolent liar."[10] It did not help matters that on the eve of the mission a series of articles appeared in the journal *World's Work* written by the former ARA chief in Hungary, who boasted that Hoover and the ARA had been responsible for the downfall of the short-lived Communist regime of Bela Kun in April 1919.[11] Given all of this,

and with their economic program in full retreat, some of the Bolshevik leaders must have felt that the walls were closing in.

Further contributing to Soviet unease was the fact that the chief personnel of the ARA mission were active U.S. army officers; their leader was Colonel William N. Haskell, a West Point graduate with a distinguished war record who had run Hoover's relief operations in Armenia and Romania. Most of the relief workers were men in their twenties who had seen action in the war with the American Expeditionary Force. These men hired an enormous staff of local (mostly non-Communist) citizens to administer the relief. The Soviet authorities, accustomed by now to having all organized activities under their direct control, established a hierarchy of watchdog commissars (mostly members of the secret police, the Cheka), extending from Moscow down to the remote villages, to keep an eye on these activities. Relations between the ARA men and their Cheka minders were seldom cordial and often turbulent.

Even some of Hoover's radical critics at home accused him of intending to use the ARA's operations inside Russia to undermine the Soviet government. In a way they were correct; but they, like the Bolsheviks, misunderstood how Hoover intended to go about this. When he gave strict orders to his men not to meddle in politics, he meant it. He had no intention of channeling food to specific anti-Bolshevik political forces inside the country or of extorting political compromises from the Kremlin. Rather Hoover's idea was that if the people of Soviet Russia were rescued from starvation and properly fed they would build up the strength to cast off their Bolshevik oppressors, who were, he confidently and wrongly assumed, universally detested and holding power solely by force of arms. This rationale was, incidentally, supported by most of Russia's leading political emigrés, including Alexander Kerensky.

In short, Hoover's plan was to accomplish political ends in Russia not *under the guise of* humanitarian relief, but rather *by means of* it. In September 1921 he assured Herbert Croly, editor of *The New Republic*, whose editorials questioned Hoover's motives, that bolshevism was a "Russian fever that must burn itself out in Russia. . . ."[12] So why not speed the patient's recovery with humanitarian assistance?

After several weeks of ARA operations, as American kitchens began to open up across the country, from Petrograd to the edge of Siberia, the Kremlin leaders began to realize that Hoover's men were indeed going to try to deliver on their promises, that they were sticking strictly to their business. Once the worst suspicions were eased, Lenin and his colleagues were free to consider Hoover and the ARA as an opportunity.

As the economic situation in the country continued to slide, Lenin and the reform-minded among the Soviet leaders were increasingly eager, even desperate, to break out of their economic isolation and establish trade relations with the West. The limited market reforms known as the New Economic Policy (NEP), introduced early in 1921, had marked a retreat from the radical policies of centralized state control over trade and industry that had evolved over the course of the previous four years. The reforms left the central government with control over the major industries and a monopoly on foreign trade. But the retreat threatened to turn into a rout as private trade sprouted up everywhere. The Bolshevik Party found its ranks full of confusion, demoralization, and panic, as members wondered aloud what had become of Marxist ideology and where the retreat would end.

Lenin's speeches and writings during these months were extraordinarily bold, even with all of their evident contradictions and inconsistencies. In brutally blunt terms that scandalized many of his closest colleagues, he told his fellow Bolsheviks that they had to learn how to trade. He zigged and zagged, preaching the need for market reforms, while attempting to appease the numerous and influential unbending Communists, whom the Americans labelled "Die-Hards." (It is easy to understand why Mikhail Gorbachev often invoked the Lenin of this period in introducing his *perestroika* reforms after 1985.)

Lenin also had in mind another audience, foreign governments and capitalists, whom he wished to convince of the seriousness of NEP in order to attract trade and business concessions to Soviet Russia. The general direction of Lenin's reforms was already clear before the ARA arrived in Russia, but it is possible that the activities of the Americans influenced his thinking. In any case, it changed his view of Hoover. In October 1921, when he was delivering his most daring pro-reform speeches,

Lenin wrote in a note to People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs Georgii Chicherin: "HOOVER is a real plus." And again several days later: "Agreements and concessions with the Americans are super-important to us: with Hoover we have something worthwhile."[13] Lenin's hope was to convert ARA relief into economic and trade ties with the United States.

Not coincidentally, this was a time when the Soviet fascination with American efficiency became something of an obsession. A particular manifestation of this was the heightened interest among influential Bolsheviks, notably Lenin, in the "scientific management" theories of the American industrial engineer, Frederick Winslow Taylor. The ARA did not plant the seed of the Soviet Taylorism movement or of the general interest in American efficiency, but the ARA's conspicuous presence and popularity inside the country seems to have catalyzed it. Many Soviets considered Hoover's organization a model of efficiency: this lean staff of American boys overcoming formidable obstacles (even the Russian winter!) to accomplish a mission that most had felt was impossible.

Much of the official Soviet enthusiasm for the ARA focussed on the fact that Hoover ran it like a business operation, using the strictest accounting procedures. The ARA men shunned relief workers "of the missionary type" and described themselves as "cold-blooded" and "business-minded." Above all, they took pride in their efficiency, which they considered to be a feature of their national character as Americans. (Here they contrasted themselves to the inefficient Russians, whom they assumed were racially passive and fatalistic.)

The ARA men were engineers very much in the mold of Hoover, who was regarded at home as a great humanitarian, but an unsentimental one. His genius was conducting what he and the men under him routinely called the "business of relief." Who else could have raised so much money and found a way to move the huge quantities of food and medicine from American ports to the Russian peasant hut, and done it so efficiently, with so little waste? Most Americans agreed with Walter Lippmann, when he wrote in June 1922 that "probably no other living man could have done nearly so much."[14]

In Russia in the early twenties there was what historian Richard Stites calls an American efficiency "craze."[15] It is understandable why the Bolsheviks would have been susceptible to it. They had taken power in a backward country in the name of the proletariat, justifying this act as the spark that would ignite revolution in Europe. By 1921 it was clear to most of the leaders that the revolution that would save them was in fact not imminent and that their regime, the self-styled dictatorship of the proletariat, was isolated inside peasant Russia. Revolutionary enthusiasm was fading (and had anyway made a mess of things) and Lenin and his colleagues were groping for a way out. Their gaze fell upon the efficiency of the ARA and, prone as they were to utopian quick-fix solutions, Lenin and his fellow Bolsheviks sought a way to tap the American method of work and use it to launch an assault on Russian backwardness.

Documented evidence of the Bolshevik obsession with ARA efficiency could fill a thick volume. One published example was attributed to the top Cheka official assigned to the ARA, who was credited with these lines in a May 13, 1922, *Izvestiia* article:

> The high grade of efficiency displayed by the A.R.A. in its operations, which is too bulging and conspicuous to admit of any doubt, has become a powerful energizer and vitalizer of our official and labor machinery, stirring up the creative and executive energies of our Soviet officials, employees, and class-conscious workingmen, infecting them with new push and a faster rate of work.

This passage employed a motif that runs throughout the official and unofficial Soviet writings on the ARA: the notion of American efficiency as a welcome contagion that could cure Russians of their inertia and inefficiency. Soviet officials talked of doing things "in the American style" (*po-amerikanski*) and of becoming "Americanized," or "infected with American rhythm." As the ARA legend grew, citizens and commissars, especially in the provincial towns and villages, were eager to have a first-hand look at one of these efficient Yankees, yesterday's blood-thirsty imperialists.

Understandably, there was a good deal of curiosity about the man who was the moving force behind all of this. And for a brief moment in the autumn of 1922, it appears that some of the Kremlin leaders, with

Lenin leading the way, hoped to attract Hoover to Moscow. The person that set the wheels in motion was Colonel Haskell, who, apparently without Hoover's prior knowledge, suggested to Lenin during a private meeting in November 1922 that it would be in the Soviet government's best interest to invite Hoover to Moscow to advise it on economic matters. By this time, Haskell had become, somewhat to Hoover's embarrassment, a rather outspoken proponent of the idea that the United States government should hook up with Soviet Russia, at least to the extent of establishing trade relations, if not granting formal diplomatic recognition. Haskell's view—shared, incidentally, by the other leading members of the ARA mission—was that some form of U.S. recognition would have the positive effect of promoting the cause of the moderate Bolsheviks over the Die-Hards.

At about the time of Haskell's meeting with Lenin, another ARA official had a private conversation in the Kremlin with the Bolshevik Karl Radek, an influential spokesman on foreign affairs and a leading official of the Communist International. Without mentioning Hoover by name, Radek floated the idea of the Soviet government inviting a Western "economic advisor" to Moscow and offered the example of W. Morgan Shuster as a precedent.[16] Shuster was the American economic expert whose services the Persian government had enlisted in 1911 to bring order to its chaotic finances. So well had Shuster performed his role that the Tsarist government, eager to have Persia remain economically feeble, marched its armies on Teheran, forcing the dismissal of the American. It is unlikely that anyone in Moscow genuinely believed that Hoover would offer to serve as a Shuster to the Soviet government. Nonetheless, to succeed in attracting the American Secretary of Commerce to Moscow might open up all kinds of trade avenues.

It is unclear if Lenin and those of his colleagues who were present sincerely mistook Haskell's words (in whatever was their Russian translated form) for an official hint or if what they did next was attributable to, as Hoover later characterized it, "Soviet deviousness."[17] According to Lenin's calendar, on November 21 the ailing leader (within one month he would be debilitated by a stroke) sent to all members of the Politburo as well as to Chicherin a "strictly secret letter about Haskell's suggestion" and called for a vote to be taken approving its contents.[18]

On November 24, as his train was about to pull out of the Moscow station for Riga, Haskell was handed a copy of a "personal and confidential" letter (in English), dated November 23, from Chicherin to Hoover. In the letter, Chicherin reported to Hoover that he had lately been made to understand that

> . . . you are ready to come to Russia and to devote yourself under certain conditions to the work of Russia's economic reconstruction. . . .
>
> Mr. Lenin, finding this idea of great interest welcomes it and asks me to thank you in advance for your assistance.
>
> Mr. Lenin asks me also to repeat to you what he said personally to Colonel Haskell, namely, that the aid and assistance of such a prominent organizer and leader of the industrial life of a country based on economic principles different from ours would be of exceptional importance and especially desirous and agreeable to us.
>
> In accordance with the wish of Colonel Haskell this remains strictly confidential until you decide otherwise.

Haskell seems to have reacted to this document with alarm and a feeling of betrayal, and he may have spent a sleepless night composing his response. When his train reached the Soviet border on the following day, he sent an ARA courier back to Moscow with a letter adressed to "Mr. Lenin." Haskell explained that he thought he had made it clear when he raised the prospect of inviting Hoover to Moscow that "the idea was entirely original with me and that I was not authorized by Mr. Hoover to speak for him." Should Chicherin's letter be made public, he wrote, it might greatly embarrass Hoover. He requested a written statement acknowledging the accuracy of his interpretation, which he received within days at the Savoy Hotel in London in the form of an elliptical telegram from Chicherin.

When this and his other abortive efforts to assist the Bolsheviks were behind him, Haskell, who in his ARA work had frequent occasion to become exasperated with the intrigues of Soviet diplomacy, wrote to an ARA colleague that the Soviet leaders could "thank their own stupidity" for their continued isolation.[19]

It would be misleading to portray this episode as some kind of missed opportunity that, with a different outcome, might have changed the

course of U.S.-Soviet relations. Far from it. As Haskell wrote in his letter of November 24, "Of course Mr. Lenin you must know from my conversation with you . . . that I made it most clear that even the thought of coming to Russia has never entered Mr. Hoover's mind." While Hoover the chairman of the ARA was directing Russian relief, Hoover the Secretary of Commerce stood firmly by the non-recognition position of the Harding administration. He never changed his mind as to the "utter foolishness" of Soviet Russia's economic system. Nor did he believe that the New Economic Policy had transformed the essence of that system. What he read in the detailed economic reports of his ARA men confirmed him in his belief that there were no trade or investment opportunities in Russia.

It was in May 1922, with the ARA mission in full swing, that Hoover made his widely quoted statement that "Russia is an economic vacuum." To those (Lippmann among them) who disagreed with Hoover's position and argued that the U.S. should grant trade credits and loans to the Soviet government in order to encourage the reform-minded Bolsheviks and ensure further moderation, he countered that such action would serve only to reward their past transgressions and legitimize their revolution. He resisted pressures to have the ARA undertake the tasks of economic reconstruction in Russia; in fact he intended to close down operations completely in the summer of 1922, when the worst of the famine was over, but, anticipating adverse public opinion, opted instead for a major reduction of the ARA's activities. The Bolsheviks hold on power proved to be more tenacious than Hoover had imagined, but he still believed they were doomed to failure and he had no desire to prolong their rule.

Hoover spelled out his position in a passage in his little book of social philosophy published at the end of 1922, *American Individualism*, in which he wrote:

> If we throttle the fundamental impulses of man our production will decay. The world in this hour is witnessing the most overshadowing tragedy of ten centuries in the heart-breaking life-and-death struggle with starvation by a nation with a hundred and fifty millions of people. In Russia under the new tyranny a group, in pursuit of social theories, have [sic] destroyed the primary self-interest impulse of the individual to production.[20]

Hoover essentially stuck to this position through his presidency (when he refused to grant diplomatic recognition to the U.S.S.R.), indeed, until his death. This did not endear him to Lenin's successors, who villainized him in official publications, in which they portrayed his ARA mission to Soviet Russia as one big espionage and sabotage outfit, sent in to accomplish by other means what the Allied military intervention had failed to do.

But that was later. In 1923, as the ARA mission came to an end, the Soviet leaders had nothing but warm words of praise for Hoover and his ARA. Beneath the official tributes there is detectable the Bolsheviks' frustration at their failure to have made something more of American famine relief. At the ARA final banquet on June 16, there were numerous long toasts in the traditional Russian manner. These were the occasion for expressions of gratitude for America's benevolent intervention. Nearly all of the Soviet speakers had respectful words to say about the ARA's method of operation. One of the most outspoken in praising Hoover and the American efficiency was Radek, who also confessed his admiration for Hoover's *American Individualism*. According to a paraphrase of his speech, written by one of the Americans present, Radek (a Polish Jew who never felt at home among the Russians), "after viewing the results accomplished by Mr. Hoover and his subordinates," confessed that

> Mr. Hoover's individualism is a model which every Russian desires to achieve. On the streets of Moscow, one sees two kinds of Russians: the first type which slouches along in a dull stupid manner, dressed in dirty boots and wearing usually an oriental cap. The other type are men who walk smartly and energetically through the streets going straight about their business. This second type is now generally called "the American type" and we look to these new "American" Russians for the future of Russia.[21]

According to one American, Radek, in praising the book, claimed that the American and Soviet systems were actually not that far apart; that, after all, "Communism was really nothing more than collective individualism." This bit of verbal gymnastics elicited from the foreign correspondents present a number of skeptical questions concerning this "transgression of Marxism," to which Radek seems to have had no satisfactory answers.[22]

The ARA departed Soviet Russia, and the "Americanization" drive came to an end. When Haskell returned to the U.S., he wrote in his final report to Hoover: "Communism is dead and abandoned and Russia is on the road to recovery."[23] It was a view shared by many foreign visitors to Russia in the early 1920s, despite the occasional brave talk from within the ranks of the Party about resuming the advance toward socialism. The implication in Haskell's report was that the ARA had played a decisive role in the death of Communism. This was unconvincing to Hoover as long as there were Bolsheviks in the Kremlin.

The following year, shortly after Lenin's death, one of those Bolsheviks was heard to call for a leadership in Russia that would combine "Russian revolutionary sweep" and "American efficiency," which he characterized as "that indomitable force which neither knows nor recognizes obstacles; which continues at a task once started until it is finished, even if it is a minor task; and without which serious constructive work is inconceivable." These were the words of Joseph Stalin.[24] In 1929, at very same time that the Great Crash dealt a severe blow to Hoover's brand of American individualism, Stalin put an end to the ambiguity of NEP with his self-proclaimed Great Turn—introducing the forced collectivization of agriculture and accelerated industrialization under the Five Year Plan. This triumph of Russian revolutionary sweep thoroughly transformed the Soviet economic system, completely eradicating private trade and private property. It would make subsequent attempts at transition to a market economy immensely more difficult than Lenin's NEP.

NOTES

1. See H. H. Fisher, *The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923: The Operations of the American Relief Administration* (New York, 1927).

2. See the records of the American Relief Administration, Russian Unit, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford, CA [hereafter cited as: ARA Russia].

3. George F. Kennan, *The Nuclear Delusion: Soviet-American Relations in the Atomic Age* (New York and Toronto, 1982), p. 22.

4. Benjamin M. Weissman, *Herbert Hoover and Famine Relief to Soviet Russia*, 1921-1923 (Stanford, 1974), pp. 29-30.

5. Hoover to George Barr Baker, November 16, 1925, ARA Russia, box 281, folder 6.

6. Thomas A. Bailey, *America Faces Russia: Russian-American Relations from Early Times to Our Day* (Ithaca, 1950), p. 337.

7. David Burner, *Herbert Hoover: A Public Life* (New York, 1979), p. 119 and passim.

8. *Russian Relief: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 67th Congress, 2nd Session on H.R. 9459 and H.R. 9548 for the Relief of the Distressed People of Russia.* December 13 and 14, 1921 (Washington, 1921), p. 39.

9. *Krasnaia gazeta*, August 11, 1921.

10. Lenin to V. Molotov, August 11, 1921, in V. I. Lenin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (5th ed., Moscow, 1959-1965), vol. 53, p. 110.

11. T. T. C. Gregory, "Stemming the Red Tide," *World's Work* (April, May, June 1921).

12. Hoover to Croly, September 5, 1921, Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, West Branch, IA, Commerce Papers, box 30, folder: "American Relief Administration, Russia, Miscellaneous 1921."

13. Lenin, op. cit., vol. 53, pp. 274, 299. See Weissman, op. cit., p. 123.

14. Walter Lippmann, "The Charge That Hoover Has Sabotaged Russian Relief," *The World* (New York), May 14, 1922.

15. Richard Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (New York and Oxford, 1989), chapter 7, pp. 145-164.

16. Frank Golder to Christian A. Herter, December 2, 1922, Frank A. Golder Papers, Hoover Institution Archives, box 42.

17. See Hoover's undated note in ARA Russia, box 289, folder: "Tchicherin." This file contains most of the documentation of this episode cited in this account.

18. Lenin, op. cit., vol. 45, p. 458.

19. Haskell to Cyril J. C. Quinn, January 13, 1923, ARA Russia, box 85, folder 2.

20. Herbert Hoover, *American Individualism* (Garden City, NY, 1922), pp. 35-36.

21. See the addendum to C. J. C. Quinn to H. H. Fisher, June 23, 1923, ARA Russia, box 18, folder 1.

22. E. G. Burland, "Russian American Contacts," p. 9, Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, ARA Personnel files: "Burland, E. G."

23. Haskell to Hoover, August 27, 1923, ARA Russia, box 276, folder 5.

24. Cited in Robert C. Tucker, *Stalin as Revolutionary, 1879-1929: A Study in History and Personality* (New York, 1973), p. 318.