

The
**UKRAINIAN
REVIEW**



1 9 6 6

C O N T E N T S

<i>Vera Rich</i> : ELIZABETH, THE WISE-KING'S DAUGHTER	2
<i>Karl Siehs, Ph.D.</i> : A GREAT EUROPEAN MIND: IVAN YAKOVYCH FRANKO. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his death	3
<i>Evhen Malaniuk</i> : IVAN FRANKO AS A MANIFESTATION OF THE INTELLECT	16
<i>Ivan Franko</i> : EASTER DAY. Translated by Vera Rich	22
<i>Ivan Franko</i> : THE IDYLL. Translated by Vera Rich	24
<i>Terrence J. Barragy</i> : ROMANOV'S OR PSEUDO-ROMANOV'S?	27
<i>Evhen Malaniuk</i> : TO THE PROBLEM OF BOLSHEVISM (3, Conclusion)	40
<i>D. Donzow</i> : WHY WAS PETLURA MURDERED?	55
— ARRESTS OF UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS	62
<i>A. W. B.</i> : PROMINENT WESTERN INTELLECTUALS PROTEST AGAINST PERSECUTION OF SVITLYCHNY AND DZIUBA	63
— FROM THE INTERNATIONAL P.E.N. CONGRESS	65
— OPEN LETTER TO THE BOARD AND MEMBERS OF THE DANISH WRITERS' UNION	66
IVAN DZIUBA ON HRYHORY SKOVORODA	67
<i>A. W. Bedriy</i> : THE COLD WAR EDUCATIONAL GAP	71
<i>Dr. Theodore Mackiw</i> : WASHINGTON—PEKING—MOSCOW	74
<i>A. W. B.</i> : PROBLEMS OF ACQUISITION OF MATERIALS ON UKRAINE IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES	75
THE AMERICAN CHAMPION OF RUSSIA'S INDIVISIBILITY: GEORGE F. KENNAN. By W. Luzhansky	79
UKRAINIAN CHRONICLE	80

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The management of *The Ukrainian Review* wishes to express its gratitude to Mr. Harry Weston, member of Coventry City Council, who has donated the sum of £22.0 to the Press Fund of our magazine.

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Vol. XIII No. 3

Autumn 1966

A Quarterly Magazine

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Professor Dr. Vasyl Oreletsky
Chairman of the Board

Mrs. Slava Stetzko, M.A.
Editor

Volodymyr Bohdaniuk, B.Litt.
Executive Editor

Professor Lew Shankowsky (USA)
Associate Editor

Anatol Bedriy, M. A. (USA)
Associate Editor

Michael Sosnowsky, M.A. (Canada)
Associate Editor

Published by
The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd.,
49, Linden Gardens, London, W.2.

Vera RICH

Elizabeth, the wise-king's daughter...

Elizabeth, the wise-king's daughter,
Walked by the green and purple water,
Pale on the shores of Birsay Bay
While the Islands glimmered in silver light,
Like dreams that sail on the rim of sight,
And the moon was a misted king by night,
And the autumn sun was a queen by day.

Elizabeth, the wise-king's daughter,
Gazed at the gleam of light on water,
And dreamed the gold of her father's home;
The sea lapped quiet amid the creeks,
She dreamed the splendour of Norway's peaks,
And her lord's swift navy, set forth to seek
The seven-fold kingdom to grace his own.

Elizabeth, the wise-king's daughter,
(Wedded with song beside Dnipro's water)
Waited, pale as October, waning-skied,
While her lord slept quiet in an English grave,
(The seven feet that his namesake gave)
While, traceless vanishing as a wave,
A daughter's life, with her father, died.

N. B. Elizabeth, daughter of Yaroslav the Wise, Grand Prince of Kiev, was the wife of King Harald Hardrada of Norway (1045-1066). She was left behind in Orkney — then a Norwegian dependency — together with her two daughters, Ingigerd and Maria, when Harald sailed on his full-scale invasion of England in September, 1066. At the same hour as Harald was killed in the battle of Stamfordbridge near York on September 25, 1066, his daughter Maria died "and men say they had but one life between them." (*Orkneyinga-Saga*, ch. 34). See also "Ellisif Jarizleifsdottir in the Northern Sources", *The Ukrainian Review*, No. 4, 1963.

Karl SIEHS, Ph.D.

A Great European Mind

Ivan Yakovych Franko

(Born 15 (27) August 1856 at Nahuyevychi. Died 28 May 1916 at Lviv)

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his death.

Labour and song are mighty twin forces
To which to the end all my service I'll give;
A broken skull in the tomb, in time's courses,
For generations to come, I shall live.
(Pisnya i pratsya, 14 July 1883)

... Son of a nation
Once prisoned in deep vaults, now rising high,
My watchword: toil, conflict and liberation.
Peasant, no epilogue but prologue I.

(Dekadent)

"Prologue, not epilogue"... Who does not think here of Rytsky and the neo-classicists? The parallel is by no means a superficial one, for as they were born into the renaissance mood after the first world war, so Franko found himself placed in the atmosphere of a nascent Galicia, a mighty prologue, a spokesman for the whole of Ukraine.

Yet Franko's personality cannot be adequately explained by the mood of the times alone. Although we do not intend, any more than Beletsky (Ivan Franko. *Stikhotvoreniya i poemy*, Biblioteka Poeta, M. 1960, p. 5), to compare Franko with Goethe or the geniuses of the European renaissance, "the range of his activity is nevertheless unusual. Though the European literatures of the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century abound in great writers, there is hardly one among them who at one and the same time was poet, belletrist, dramatist, literary critic, historian of literature, folklorist, economist, philosopher, political journalist, translator of ancient and modern foreign writers, bibliographer and textual critic..." (ibid.).

The clue to this extraordinary versatility is to be found not only in the fact that Franko — as Baratynsky said of Goethe — literally "responded to everything with his heart", but also in a truly super-human capacity for work. Percival Cundy (Ivan Franko, *Select*

Poems, N.Y., 1948, p. 8) relates an incident which, as he rightly says, suffices to characterize the whole. A young man, then a first year student at the University of Lviv, records his first meeting with Franko in 1889. "When I called on Franko for the first time at his home, he was sitting at the table writing. Standing at the threshold, I greeted him with the words 'Good day!' and stepped forward a little way into the room. However he did not return my greeting, merely glanced at me absent-mindedly and went on with his writing. I remained standing a while and waited for him to reply. But he did not do so and continued his writing without a break until he finished, folded his papers and looked up. He then immediately asked me what I wished and very willingly gave me the information I desired. It was clear that the most important thing for him was work, literary work, to which he devoted all his time and all his strength, without regard to circumstances or environment. Later, visiting Franko frequently at his home, I found him many a time busy with his literary work with children playing and crying around him, in the midst of the disorder caused by the household activity going on all around him. It was manifest that he was a man of strong nerves."

Nothing and nobody could keep him from his work, neither prison nor vacations, neither the most depressing circumstances nor his paralysing illness. In this respect, too, he fully deserved the epithet attached to his name, "kamenyar" — the stonebreaker (derived from his poem "The Pioneers").

Ever since his early childhood Franko had displayed this indefatigable industry. And the theme of his childhood in the parental home frequently recurs in his work. The well in front of his father's house from which the boy drew water to lug it to the smithy. Water and fire hardened the steel which his father's skill turned into useful tools. "At the back of my memories there is burning still that small but mighty fire of my father's forge, and it seems to me that even as a child I stored enough of it in my soul for life's long journey." (Mykhailo Voznyak, *Veleten' dumky i pratsi*, 1958, p. 26.)

He had need of this fiery force and steeliness throughout his hard life, not only to produce about 1000 articles, translate from 60 different authors, write more than 100 short stories, 9 novels, and publish a considerable amount of poetry, but above all in the fight for his ideals, an all-out and rigorous fight, conducted over a field as extensive as his activity as writer and critic.

*

The year in which Franko was born was a memorable one. It saw the conclusion of the Crimean War by the Treaty of Paris, the prohibition of privateering by international maritime law, the establishment of the Boer Free State in far-away Africa. In the

world of letters there appeared Wilhelm Raabe with his "Chronik der Sperlingsgasse" and A. de Tocqueville with "L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution." Franko's lifetime fell into a period when the working classes demanded their rights with ever greater insistence. Socialist thought, spreading throughout the world, found a fitting expression in the birth of the British Labour Party and its rise to political power in 1906. This was at a time when Franko had already abandoned his former radical views. The moderation of his social standpoint is clearly discernible in his "Boa Constrictor", a sociological novel whose first version of 1878 differs considerably from the last version of 1907. And in 1916, when his troubled life came to an end, there appeared — almost symbolical of him — the first genuine anti-war novel, "Le Feu", by Henri Barbusse.

It was a time — as E. Malaniuk in his clear-sighted analysis stated it (*Knyha Sposterezhen'*, Toronto, 1962, p. 120) — when cosmopolitanism in politics, naturalism in the arts, and atheism in religion were the predominant features. Malaniuk goes on to say: "What feats of clairvoyance, even of prophecy, Franko's intellect has produced!" To illustrate his point, Malaniuk then quotes two passages from Franko's writings. The first, dating from 1898, reads: "Oh, the cruelty of our time! There is distrust and hatred everywhere, and antagonisms have reached such a pitch that it will not be long before we have a formal religion (in fact, we have it already) based on the dogmas of enmity and the class struggle." The second quotation is from Franko's essay entitled "What is Progress?", written in 1903:

"...The infinite power of the [Marxist] state would lie like a terrible and crushing burden upon every citizen. Personal freedom and individual thought would have to disappear... Education would turn into a mind-killing drill. Men would grow up and live in such utter dependence and under such thorough-going surveillance by the authorities that the methods of even the most absolutist police states would seem mild by comparison.

But who is to be at the helm in this type of state? About this the Social Democrats are not very explicit. But, whoever they are, those at the top would have tremendous power over the lives and fate of millions of people, such as even the most despotic of governments have never exercised."

These are the words of a man who, like the famous Russian philosopher Berdyaev, had studied Marx and admired Chernyshevsky. Berdyaev, however, was only after the bitter experiences of the year 1905 to reach the point at which Franko had arrived seven years earlier. While Shevchenko had been a crier in the wilderness and fate did not grant him to see even the slightest result of his labour, Franko was destined to witness how under the influence of his thought the stirring buds of social solidarity and national consciousness burst into full bloom.

*

Who would have predicted this for the little boy from Nahuyevychi? His mother, it is true, came from the small gentry but knew no other than the social level of the Ukrainian peasantry in Galicia, one of the most forsaken regions of the Austro-Hungarian multinational empire, of whose Habsburg doctrine *divide at impera* the Polish gentry took full advantage. Only eight years had passed since the abolition of serfdom in Galicia when Ivan was born a free peasant's son. He was the eldest of the Frankos' four children; there were two other sons and a daughter who died in childhood. The impression of the yoke of serfdom was still so fresh that in 1887 Franko wrote his famous poem "Pans'ki Zharty" (The Lord's Jests) as a memorial to his father, who had died at Easter 1865. At that time, still a small schoolboy, he was moved to write his poem "Velykden" (Easter) in memory of his father. In Franko's time his home district was still so poor that Nahuyevychi had no school and the boy had to attend the elementary school at Yasenytsia Silna, where he lived with his uncle Pavlo Kulchytsky. At the age of eight, by which time he had already acquired a considerable knowledge of Ukrainian, Polish, German and Church Slavonic, he was sent to the German-speaking school of the Basilian Fathers at Drohobych. His stepfather Hryn Havrylyk, whom he held in high esteem all his life, enabled him to continue his education, and in 1868 he entered the Gymnasium (Grammar school) in Drohobych. He was an excellent scholar and — according to the custom in those days of seating the pupils in the order of their progress — was never in less than third place, but mostly in the first.

Franko was twelve when he entered the Gymnasium. During his time in the lower Gymnasium (the first four years of the eight-year course) he displayed, apart from his outstanding performance as a scholar, no particular ambitions. But this was to change radically when he was in the upper Gymnasium. Here he began to read omnivorously everything he could lay his hands on: Goethe, Heine, Schiller, Klopstock, Mickiewicz, Eugène Sue, Dickens and Shakespeare. In this fertile period he also made his first acquaintance with Ukrainian literature from beyond the border. Shevchenko, to whom one of his teachers — Ivan Verkh ratsky — had introduced him, soon became his favourite author beside Kotlyarevsky, Marko Vovchok, Kulish and Panas Myrny. He owed much to another of his teachers, the Pole Julian Turczynski, who belonged to the "Ukrainian school." The name of the young Franko began to get known outside Drohobych and, as Antin Chaykivsky relates, one had heard in Sambir, a town about 20 miles north of Drohobych, of his brilliant work at school. In the fifth class he wrote a versified history of Rome up to the time of Tullus Hostilius. A year later, in the 6th class, he handed in a verse tragedy in Polish, a fragment of a tragedy in German verse, and for his teacher of Ukrainian, Okhrymovych,

he wrote a story of Ukrainian country life. Under the direction of M. Vahylevych, the student dramatic society performed a historical drama of his, written in hexameters, a precursor of his later prize-winning novel "Zakhar Berkut."

Several important events further mark this period of early development: Franko saw himself in print for the first time; the death of his mother leaves him bereaved of both parents; a journey through parts of Galicia provides him with new material for his collection of folklore and enables him to become intimately acquainted with the local intelligentsia and the common people, the contact with whom was to prove of great importance later in his life.

In 1875, having finished his studies at the Gymnasium, he passed the entrance examination for Lviv University with flying colours. When in the autumn of that year he departed for Lviv he carried in his luggage his collection of more than 800 folk-songs, as well as a number of his own translations, including "Antigone" and "Electra" of Sophocles, two cantos of the "Odyssey", large portions of the Bible (especially the Book of Job), the first chapters of Karl Gutzkow's "Uriel Acosta" and parts of the "Nibelungenlied." He had widened his knowledge of literature and, apart from knowing the whole of the "Kobzar" by heart, he had become familiar with the works of Pushkin, Lermontov, Aleksey Tolstoy, Khomyakov, Turgenev, Lev Tolstoy, Pomyalovsky and Emile Zola. An affair of the heart, however, made him unhappy. His ardent but unrequited love for Olha Roshkevychivna, daughter of the parish priest of Lolyn, inspired many of the lyrics in his "Withered Leaves" (Ziviyale Lystya):

If you hear in the night at your window there seems
Something weeping and mournfully sighing,
Do not awake in alarm, do not stir from your dreams,
Do not run, dear, to see who is crying.

It is not an orphan that, motherless, roams,
No starveling, dear, troubles your sleeping,
It is my yearning, despairing that moans,
It is my love that is weeping.

Neither Franko's own nature nor the turbulent events into which he found himself plunged on his arrival in Lviv allowed his personal emotions to get the upper hand. In the political squabbles of the time one of the disputed questions was the use of Ukrainian as a literary language. (Cf. George Y. Shevelov: *Die Ukrainische Schriftsprache* (Ukrainian as a written language), 1798-1865. Wiesbaden, 1961, p. 61 seq.) Corresponding to the warring factions of their elders, the Lviv students were also split into two hostile groups: The Academic Circle (Akademichnyy Kruzhok), supported by the Muscophiles, and the society known by the bizarre name of The Friendly Moneylender (Druzhnyy Lykhvar), maintained by the Nationalists. Franko joined

the Academic Circle, not because of its Muscophile tendencies, but for purely material and practical considerations. It was not for the sake of free theatre and concert tickets, etc., furnished to the student members, that Franko took this step. What really attracted him were the facilities offered by the Circle's assembly rooms, a reading room well supplied with periodicals, and the magazine "Druh" (The Friend) which it had been publishing since 1874 and in whose pages Franko first appeared in print. Proof of Franko's far-sightedness came when he succeeded in persuading a number of Nationalists to join the Academic Circle and with the help of their votes at a general meeting in 1875 gained control of the society's organ "Druh."

This successful manipulation, which brought the editorship of the Muscophile "Druh" under the influence of the Nationalists, coincided with a growing acceptance of the ideas of Michael Drahomaniv. Franko's first contacts with Drahomaniv eventually led to a close and lasting friendship between the two men.

One of the leading scholars of the time in Dniro-Ukraine, Drahomaniv, then in exile in Switzerland, paid close attention also to events in the Galician West Ukraine. The gist of his ideas was:

- 1) The young generation should not be hostile to Western ideas and should not blindly follow the prejudices of the older generation.
- 2) In order to bring the Galician Ukraine into touch with European culture the local vernacular must be developed into a literary language. In this connection, the ideas of the Muscophiles must be kept at a distance. It must be appreciated that a Ukrainian literature already existed.
- 3) The masses must be dragged out of their state of ignorance, so that they can be better protected from exploitation.

An extended argument with the editors of "Druh" earned him Franko's wholehearted admiration, and the influence of his thought can clearly be traced in Franko's work. From the romanticism of his earlier writing Franko now turned to realism, a trend which becomes more marked from about 1877 onwards with his masterly poem "The Hired Hand" (Naymyt) and the "Boryslav" sketches.

The third of Drahomanov's demands had in Franko the most eager champion. The sincerity of Franko's friendship with Drahomaniv was soon put to a severe test when in August 1877 Franko, Pavlyk and practically the whole of the editorial staff of "Druh" were arrested because of their connection with Drahomaniv and their alleged advocacy of "international socialism."

"...I was treated like a common criminal, thrown together with 14 to 18 malefactors and vagabonds in one cell..." Coming out of prison after many months, Franko faced still greater moral trials when he discovered that society treated him as an outcast. He stood

at the parting of the ways. He could either rejoin society as a "repentant sinner", or he could voluntarily take his place in the ranks of the "outlaws." He chose the latter course, and Franko the radical became Franko the revolutionary. Yet his socialism was of a special kind. He himself tells us: "...I had courage enough... to strive for a true humanitarian socialism... for personal as well as national liberty, and not for any party dogmatism..."

And that so tender heart you bear, life gave you
To bring man succour in his hour of grief,
To speak a word of warmth to ease woe's craving.

(From: "The Poet's Task" in the *Semper Tiro* cycle)

In this period appeared his famous "Kamenyari" (The Pioneers), the novel "Boa Constrictor", his translations of Byron's "Cain", Zola's "L'Assommoir", and selections from Goethe, Heine, Hood, Moore, Shelley and Lermontov. It was also at that time that he made contact and eventually worked together with the Polish socialists, in whose periodical "Praca" (Labour) he published much of his work. In 1880, however, he was arrested and imprisoned for the second time.

*

Perhaps the best introduction to the following years of tribulation in Franko's life is his story "Na Dni" (At the Bottom), which he wrote in a miserable hotel room and sent with his last money to Lviv. It begins with his release from prison and his return, under police escort, to Nahuyevychi. "This trip from police station to police station, through Stanyslaviv, Stryy and Drohobych, was one of the hardest experiences of my life", wrote Franko.

The spirit of rebellion and courage, bitter disillusionment, the nobility and magnanimity of the poet's soul — all these find expression in his poetry of that time: "Vichnyy Revolyutsioner" (The Eternal Revolutionary), "Vesnyanky" (Spring Songs), "Ukraina", "Vidsuralysya Lyudy Mene" (Forsaken), "Ne Lyudy nashi Vorohy" (Not Men are our Enemies). Never before had Franko spoken so strongly in his poetry. He was now becoming for the younger generation the idolized prophet and leader. In the nineties the majority of students went so far as to rank Franko above Shevchenko. This is probably explained in part by the fact that Shevchenko's "Kobzar", though mutilated by the Polish censor, was permitted reading, while Franko's "Z Vershyn i Nyzyn" (From Heights and Depths) had the added attraction of a prohibited book.

The two prison sentences cruelly dashed Franko's hopes of becoming a university teacher. There was no chance of his obtaining an appointment and he had therefore to try and make a living by journalism.

In 1881 began his collaboration with "Svit" (The World), but, not being able to earn enough to support himself in Lviv, he was forced to

return to Nahuyevychi. He also wrote for the magazine "Zorya" (Dawn), published by Drahomaniv's partisans in Kiev, but this, too, did not bring him in much, and he had to do farm work. In spite of these depressing circumstances, he completed his translation of "Faust" and wrote the novel "Zakhar Berkut", with which he won a prize. There followed further years of disappointment and privation. It came to a break with both parties. He then went to Kiev to seek support for a new literary periodical. Although this was done on Drahomaniv's suggestion, Franko failed to raise the necessary funds and nothing came of the project. He returned to Lviv and, compelled by financial need, rejoined the staff of a paper from which he had earlier dissociated himself, an action which almost cost him his friendship with Drahomaniv.

Franko's marriage to Olha Khorunzhynska fell into this period. According to Volyansky, the union was on the whole a happy one.

Considering the difficulties Franko had to contend with, it is not surprising that for his literary work those years were not very fruitful ones. In his collected works we find only four poems dating from the time between 1884 and 1886. Reading his correspondence with Drahomaniv during those days, one can well understand why his poetic output at that time was so meagre. In the end things came to a head in the autumn of 1886 when, after a lot of friction, Franko finally resigned from the staff of "Zorya" and joined the editorial board of the Polish "Kurjer Lwowski", a position he held until 1897.

Yet it cannot be said that Franko "broke his Ukrainian pen", although the majority of his articles during that time were written in Polish.

In 1889 his poem "Smert' Kaïna" (The Death of Cain) was published, one of the profoundest of his speculative and symbolic creations. It attempts nothing less than to fathom the meaning of human existence: Reason and emotion were to combine in harmonious union, so that the lost paradise might be regained within each individual soul. The work appeared shortly after his revised translation of Byron's "Cain" and demonstrates the strong influence the English poet exercised over Franko.

That same year, 1889, Franko was imprisoned for the third time, on this occasion in connection with the elections to Parliament. This new bitter experience, which he shared with Pavlyk, the Polish Radical Wyslouk, and a number of students from Kiev, who had come to Galicia on a 'tour of friendship', moved him to write his "Prison Sonnets." For the rest, all we have of that time are some short prose sketches.

There was, happily, a brighter finale to this distressing period in Franko's life: In 1892 he went to Vienna University, where he won the degree of doctor of philosophy in 1894.

*

In the last decade of the 19th century a strong Ukrainian renaissance in Galicia came about at long last. Franko and Pavlyk brought out the review "Narod" (The People) and soon succeeded in attracting a good number of contributors, among them Drahomaniv, who by that time had moved to Sofia. In 1892, the group which had gathered around "Narod" organised a political party of their own, the "Radical Party of Ruthenian Ukrainians." This was the first political party, in the European sense, to come into being in Galicia. From then on Franko was feverishly engaged in political activity. The new Radical Party championed tax and economic reforms, freedom of speech and of the press, and its membership grew consistently despite vigorous attacks from both Muscophiles and Nationalists.

Notwithstanding his activity in the political field, Franko kept up his literary production. In 1890 he published a collection of stories, drawn from the life of the people, under the title "V Poti Chola" (By the Sweat of the Brow). They give a realistic view of the most varied types: exploited peasants, unfortunate artists, Jews, thieves, prisoners, gypsies, and many more, all drawn with deep sympathy and gentle humour.

In the same year began the publication of a long series of books for children, with "Lys Mykyta" (Micky the Fox) as the first, followed, in 1891 by a verse adaptation of Cervantes's "Don Quixote" and, in 1893, a collection of fables "Koly zviri hovoryly" (When the Animals Talked).

In 1893 there appeared the second, enlarged and improved edition of "From Heights and Depths." This contained many happy surprises, especially with regard to form, in which he is seen to have found the link with the literary traditions of Western Europe. The same year Franko published the best of his dramas, "Ukradene Shchastya" (Stolen Happiness), which only by some mistake obtained the second instead of the first prize in a drama competition. Other plays followed, among which the comedy "Uchytel" (The Teacher) is perhaps the most successful.

At the same time Franko continued to pursue his studies in Vienna from 1892 to 1894 and presented as his doctoral thesis a monograph on Ivan Vyshensky. This subject he was to treat again in a great poem, first published in 1900 in Lviv and issued in book form in 1911. In the meantime, the chair of Ukrainian Language and Literature at the University of Lviv became vacant and Franko hastened to take the necessary steps to qualify for nomination. On 18 February 1895 he gave his inaugural lecture on Taras Shevchenko's "Naymychka", which was a great success and led to his election to the chair by the college of professors. However, another bitter disappointment awaited Franko. The Polish authorities refused to approve the appointment of a man who had three times been in prison.

In 1894 Franko began to publish the fortnightly "Zhyttya i Slovo" (Life and Word), devoted to literature, history and folklore, the first local periodical conceived on European lines. In it appeared, besides a great many articles, two of Franko's short stories, "Osnovy suspil'nosti" (The Bases of Society) and "Dlya domashnoho ohnyshcha" (For Hearth and Home).

The appearance in 1896 of the volume "Zivviale lystya" (Withered Leaves), containing his finest love lyrics — an absolute novelty in the Ukrainian literature of Galicia — was justly acclaimed. Only a few voices were raised in adverse criticism, among them that of the poet Vasyl Shchurat, who reproached Franko with decadence. To him Franko replied in the following lines:

Because my song has pain and sorrow in it —
Only since life has burdened us with this;
Brother, there is a further note within it:
Hope and free will, feelings of joy and bliss.

(From "The Decadent")

*

Shchurat's attack was only the prelude to another stormy period in Franko's life, in which two affairs were to have particularly strong and wide repercussions. The reason for the first scandal was the appearance in the Vienna weekly "Die Zeit" (Time) of an article by Franko on the Polish poet Mickiewicz and his poem "Konrad Wallenrod." The article was entitled "A Poet of Deceit" and laid special emphasis on this line from the poem: "The captive's only weapon is deceit." Any illusions Franko had cherished as to the possibility of Poles and Ukrainians becoming reconciled and working together, an aim for which he had striven in the ten years of his close collaboration with the Poles, were now dispelled — burst like shimmering soap-bubbles. Wild indignation among all classes of the Polish population broke like a storm over Franko's head.

At the worst possible moment Franko committed another still greater sin, which made things even more difficult for him than they had been some years back when, after his break with all the Galician-Ukrainian parties, he had to return from Kiev to Galicia deprived of all his hopes. In 1897 his "Galician Sketches" appeared in a Polish translation, prefaced by an introductory piece called "Nieco o sobie samym" (Something about Myself). This foreword, originally written in 1895 and previously held back from publication, contained the fateful personal confession of the thoroughly honest author. In it Franko wrote: "First of all let me confess that which many a patriot will consider a mortal sin: I do not love the Ruthenians... I confess an even greater sin: I do not even love our Rus' to such an extent as our self-labelled patriots do, or pretend to. What is there about it to love?... I am too great an enemy of empty phrases... I so ardently love the universal ideals of justice, fraternity and freedom as to be

only too conscious of how few examples there are in our history of real social spirit, real self-sacrifice and real love for Rus'... Yet... no honest labour on behalf of such a people will ever be in vain."

The volume of poems "Miy izmaragd" (My Emerald) reflects a good deal of this bitterness and of Franko's honest and true love:

"And, brother, you love Rus',
But I do not love her,
You are a patriot,
And I am but a cur.

You love Rus', and for that
Honour and praise be yours,
But Rus' to me's a wound
Where heart's blood ever pours.

And, brother, you love Rus'
As you love bread and bacon,
While I can only bark
In hope that she awaken.

For, brother, you love Rus'
Like home, beasts, cows — no less;
I love her not, from love
Too deep to be expressed.

(IV)

And what great hardship came to wrong you?
That men called down this tumult on you:
"He does not love Rus', not a trace!"
Spurn it! I, son, know well the babble
Of all this patriotic rabble,
The value of each loving phrase.

(II)

One might well have assumed that the rising storm would rob the tree, now in full flower and promising a rich harvest, of its fruit. Fortunately the incident did not leave destruction in its wake, thanks to Franko's earlier work and to subsequent statements of his which defined more clearly the essence of true patriotism as he conceived it. He was able to continue his victorious advance, now devoting all his strength to literature and science, and to attain fulfilment — the crown of a poet's life.

With Franko's assistance, a new periodical was founded in 1898, the monthly "Literaturno-Naukovyy Vistnyk" (Literary and Scientific Herald), whose appearance was a landmark in the history of Ukrainian culture. Although there were many changes on the editorial board and the magazine's headquarters were moved in 1907 from Lviv to Kiev, Franko always remained chief editor as well as main contributor.

In 1899, a publishing concern which was to become well-known, the Ukrainian-Ruthenian Publishing Company, began its activities. From that time, practically all of Franko's work appeared either in the "Vistnyk" or was published by the Company.

It is not surprising that Franko withdrew more and more from political activity and devoted himself almost exclusively to scientific and literary work. He was, nevertheless, named in June 1898 the Radical Party candidate in the provincial elections. However, he was

defeated, due to machinations behind the scenes, one more reason for Franko's final withdrawal from partisan politics. It was all to the good: Franko was by now looked upon and acknowledged by the community as a whole as its spiritual father and leader.

This development and the true state of affairs became clearly visible on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of his literary and public activity, which fell on September 30, 1898. The public celebration of this jubilee turned out to be one of the highlights in Franko's life.

"My thanks are also due to my opponents. During the twenty-five years of my activity fate has bestowed them on me in no unsparing measure. They have spurred me on, never allowing me to settle down in one spot. Fully realising the value of struggle as an aid to development, I am grateful to my opponents, and I sincerely esteem all those who have fought against me with honourable weapons..."

From that memorable year 1898 onwards, Franko's literary work is marked by a mood of tranquillity, the expression of a soul which has found peace.

If outwardly his life reached the highest point in 1898, Franko the writer and poet came to culmination in 1905. Even in this last period he occasionally strikes a minor note, as for instance in his volume of poems "Iz Dniv Zhurby" (From Days of Grief), published in 1910. But this is clearly a matter of passing shadows. The same volume contains his great poem "Ivan Vyshensky" which, like "The Death of Cain" and "Moses", is of the psychological and philosophical type that explores the inner relations of the human soul to certain problems of life, a theme exclusive to his masterpieces.

"Moses", which appeared in 1905, is almost an autobiography of Franko. Together with "Cain" and "Ivan Vyshensky", its closely related forerunners, it may confidently be placed alongside the greatest achievements in world literature. It shows the working of the mind of the spiritual leader in the difficult task of communicating his ideas to the people around him and his equally compelling desire to follow the chosen path to the very end. Cain, Vyshensky and Moses — each of them depends on human society for his mission. Sooner or later each of them comes to realise that he cannot find the peace he sought either in solitude or among the inert, unthinking crowd — and herein lies the tragedy with which their inner lives are confronted.

The despairing Moses withdrew from his people and even lost faith in Jehovah, whom he accuses of deluding him. He was not to know that only a short time after his death Joshua would be able to lead the people into the Promised Land.

During these years Franko's career reached another zenith. In 1908 he was elected an honorary member of "Prosvita", having previously received an honorary degree from the University of Kharkiv. There

was talk of making him a Fellow of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg. He was proposed for the chair of Slavonic Literature at the Ukrainian University to be established in Galicia. But at this stage fate struck a last disappointing blow, eight years before his death.

*

It was the onset of a progressive paralysis, and the doctors did not think he would live much more than a year. Yet he valiantly remained at his post for a full eight years in the midst of his family — one daughter and three sons. Materially, things had by then become easier for him, since a regular salary from the Shevchenko Society at last enabled the family to live in modest comfort.

It seemed as if he had no time to die. The fortitude which he had shown throughout his life remained with him to his death. When he lost the use of his hands, he dictated to his son Andriy. When the latter died in 1913, he asked his friends to come and take his dictation. When these failed him at times, he would himself with infinite pains put his verse and prose to paper in clumsy capital letters. He gave the impression that something was driving him onward, as though he were in a desperate hurry to finish a task begun. Having achieved more than one might think humanly possible, he at last released his hold on life, after an agonizing winter, in May 1916.

One last poem may here bear witness to the nobility of this great man:

THERE ARE TWO ROADS

There are two roads to virtue the years offer,
There are two crowns that life for us ensures:
One, burdensome, to trudge on feet that suffer,
With faith and prayer, the other, to endure.

Happy the man and happy is the nation
Fate leads from this to that with its sure guiding,
From field of toiling to the field of patience,
Silent to pass through flames and through deriding.

Yet if he walk, like traveller benighted,
Tears in the eyes, yet hope in heart, he'll prove
To come to see the dawn, free will and rightness.

Brothers, fate leads us by the hand to move
Forward with prayer, ill-destiny despitng,
We journey towards fortune, light and love.

(*The Years of Youth*, 1914)

(*Translations of poems by Vera Rich*)

Evhen MALANIUK

IVAN FRANKO AS A MANIFESTATION OF THE INTELLECT

Ivan Franko was born more than a hundred years ago into the family of a blacksmith — not a peasant, but a craftsman — on the edge of the village of Nahuyevychi in the Drohobych region — a man to whom fate had allotted greatness.

He became famous not only in Galicia, but in the whole of Ukraine, in the whole of Europe, as one of the select circle of those representing European culture before the entire world. Even if today this statement is still likely to be considered perhaps as Ukrainian national exaggeration, yet one day it will no doubt happen that the historian of European literature will no longer be able to pass by the name of this great son of our native country. For even the recently organised special exhibition in the New York Public Library on the occasion of Franko's anniversary, or the meeting in his honour held by the Polish Scientific Society in New York, are not isolated events, but represent a growing trend. These first signs of the inevitable recognition of the extent to which Franko is more and more penetrating the frontiers of national communities can therefore be evaluated as such.

I

Let us meet then the greatness of this man face to face. What a far-reaching and, in the final analysis, inconceivable subject! What in fact is his greatness? The penetrating mind and imaginative intuition of the literary critic, Mykola Zerov, has emphasized this characteristic of Franko in his historical study of Franko as a poet: "A greatness which is no longer doubted by anyone." And this was written at the end of the twenties.



IVAN FRANKO
(Reproduction from a portrait by the painter I. Trush)



IVAN FRANKO
(Photograph from 1875)

PICTURESQUE UKRAINE



ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH OF VYDUBYTSKY
MONASTERY NEAR KYIV (1088)



HOLY SAVIOUR'S TRANSFIGURATION CATHEDRAL
IN CHERNIHIV (11th Century)



THE CASTLE OF THE PRINCES OSTROZHSKY
IN OSTRIH, VOLYNIA (14th Century)

Thanks to the fatal accumulation of a whole series of insurmountable obstacles, Franko did not succeed at the end of his life in reaching full maturity either as a poet, as a great scholar, or as a great thinker; indeed, he did not even — and this surely was the worst — gain recognition from us, Ukrainians, as a great organiser and leader of our nation.

But this characteristic and — I may say — specific greatness of Franko paradoxically created a unique synthesis of all these outstanding achievements just listed, for he was at the same time a leading figure in public life and a political thinker, as well as a scholar, novelist, playwright and poet, and all this in such a high measure and in such a rounded completeness, as had been seen only in the men of the Italian Renaissance or in our Kievan Athens in the epoch of Mohyla and Mazepa (the 17th century patrons of arts and sciences, the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla and the Cossack Hetman Ivan Mazepa). It was relatively easy to become famous in the atmosphere which reigned even quite recently in Britain and to a certain degree it was still possible, up to the ruin of Europe in the Second World War, in countries such as France, Italy, Germany or in Scandinavia — all countries in which there existed a stable structure of society, with its instincts for hierarchy finely shaped by history, and this state of affairs still pertains to a large extent even today. To become great — even if only in the field of culture — was still possible where there was patronage, either noble patronage as in Poland, or a social one as with the Czechs. But how much more difficult it was to think of becoming famous in the historically and culturally deformed conditions and in the politically colonial circumstances, in which social life was lacking in vigour, as was especially true of some East European countries! It was extremely difficult there; it was difficult enough simply to preserve and save from destruction even a candidate for a great man.

If, then, Ivan Franko succeeded in becoming famous in just such a country (and, as time passes, the more famous he is likely to become), he was indebted only to himself and to no one else, but certainly not without paying a high price for his greatness! Let us just consider the story of his hard life with its daily sacrifices and superhuman efforts, his life filled with the struggle with his environment, with conditions and even with himself. His greatness was due only to his steel-hard will and the character of his extraordinary personality. For it is precisely the personality in him which made the greatest impression and will impress more and more. His greatness and its secret is precisely concentrated in his character and his untraditional, almost un-Ukrainian will.

But let us imagine that that miracle in the life story of Shevchenko which he himself described in "Ovidian Metamorphoses" had not occurred and he had remained all his life a serf of the

landowner Engelhardt. Let us further imagine that Lesya Ukrainka had not been born into a family of Volynian hereditary gentry, but under the thatched roof of a peasant hut!

In the case of Franko there was no such miracle. He possessed clear understanding inherited from his forefathers, diligence and in some measure also a certain realistic outlook on life. Yes, and then there was the fact that Franko was a subject of the Austro-Hungarian Empire — which after all was constitutional — even though he lived in its most distant, semi-colonial, culturally backward corner... Naturally, Franko's life story is not particularly extraordinary in comparison with similar biographies. The salt, so to speak, which is necessary for the development of the creative powers of every man is tragedy. Despite the large number of catastrophes which overshadowed the life of Franko, — and moreover with a fatal consistency, — despite that constant lack of opportunities to proceed at last to creative work, or more exactly, to devote himself to poetic creation, Franko was without doubt a born poet, although that "bitter poverty of a beggar", as his friend Mykhaylo Pavlyk describes it, was apportioned to Franko in such strong doses that they would normally have been more than enough to break a strong character, indeed even a person above the average.

The external framework of life, in which the days of his creative existence were enclosed, formed so to speak a life-long prison... Fate granted him, the brilliant pupil of a Jagić and school-fellow of an Alexander Brückner, not even such a natural and logical basis for existence as a chair at a university, and this misfortune pressed all too clearly in 1895 both on the life and on the general creative activity of Franko, as if one could minimise another misfortune. But all this was on the material plane and it sank powerless into the dust before the spirit of this man. Clearly more frightening, however, seemed another circumstance, which Franko himself described as follows:

I am ready to fight for the truth, —
But in fighting with myself
I do not persevere for long...

The young Yevshan, the first modern critic of Franko, noticed this problem and formulated it as "the terrible fatalism of the epoch", whose living symbol — influencing Franko's life — was Mykhailo Drahomanov, more a demonic warder than an angel.

II

Let me once again recall the times in which Franko was born and in which he was to be formed. It was a time in which positivist, rationalist, socialist and even anarchist doctrines ruled and were being received like a religious message of joy, as it were. Proudhon,

Marx, Bakunin were the most outstanding apostles of this trend and considered unshakeable deities. There was a belief in a kind of sociological Darwinism with a so-called peaceful evolution leading to a paradise on earth. There was a fanatical idolisation of so-called progress and the extension of a genuine and innate patriotism to an unnatural "class consciousness." As a consequence of all this, the symbol of this belief seemed to be, as someone in Pavlyk's circle once put it:

- 1) cosmopolitanism in politics,
- 2) naturalism in art,
- 3) atheism in religion (!).

For us all this sounds like a casual anecdote, and a very amusing one at that! But in the 1870's and 1880's this piece of grotesqueness was by no means just an anecdote even in Western Europe. And where do our Ukrainian territories fit into this, not to mention Eastern Europe, which was very exposed to the powerful influences of these dogmas in one way or another, and to the dozens of Chernyshevsky's and Mikhailovsky's who dominated the so-called great Russian literature of the time which was poisoning and killing off everything which had life in it? It was in such an atmosphere that the specifically Socialist reverence of the peasantry was born in Russia which tainted and deformed our love of nationhood, which was pure and idealistic and, in a sense, even holy. We saw and witnessed all this much later, when it drew a mist across the eyes of the Ukrainian Central Rada government and played such a fatal role in the violent pains of our state's foundation.

The ideological situation of that epoch was really formidable, and as unshakeable as the hardest rock. And it was this rock that the young Franko, perhaps not yet aware of it, had decided to shatter.

What could the son of a craftsman from Drohobych do against this rock?

The peasant Shevchenko, who in any case was of Cossack origin, attacked this rock with his powerful national instincts; he knew in spite of everyone and everything that "one's own rights and liberty and power dwell in one's own house." But Franko, for various reasons, was not graced with this national genius. So the craftsman's son from Drohobych went at this rock with the weapons he had brought with him into the world, the weapons he had hardened and perfected throughout his difficult life — the weapons of **reason**.

Shevchenko flew over this rock on the wings of genius. But Franko had to shatter this rock bit by irksome bit. And he worked at it, winter and summer, day and night, year after year, untiring, with systematic and directed labour, until through a hole in the rock he was finally able to show the light of historical reality, almost

suffocating in smoke and blood. But the tunnel had been dug, and bondage, intellectual bondage, was conquered and overcome by Franko's superhuman labour.

In the poetry of the whole world I know of no apologist and singer of reason and the intellect such as was the poet Ivan Franko:

Thou reason clear and sharp,
Rip off the chains of centuries!

This is the *leitmotiv*, the daily prayer of the poetry of Franko's youth. It is a prayer, for when he wrote it, this "materialist" through idealism and circumstance did not yet believe in reason, but in a "mighty reason not founded on belief." This miraculous power of reason was still hidden from the young Franko, and he was not yet aware that

Thy birth, O Christ, our God,
Bathed the world in reason's light;
Serving the stars on Earth,
A star Thou hast departed from us.

And it was this very divine power of reason which brought him from the stance of "no belief in the foundations" to the position of "with the foundation of belief." This belief flamed aloft like the great oratorio from Moses.

III

It is worthwhile to return again and again to Franko's reason, for in its full creative force it was the pure expression of our national intellect. It became a force which cannot be excluded from the history of our thought. However, the history of this thought has been so little illuminated that we are still far from any conjectures or conclusions about it — although this is essential from the historian's point of view.

Our modern national thought was fanned into flame by Pańko Kulish, smouldered gently, and finally went out again with Drahomanov. When in the eighties and nineties the chasm of provincialism refused to close and "national non-existence" blossomed forth, it was Franko who strengthened, deepened, and extended Kulish's intellectual prologue, and brought us a huge step forward along the often difficult and unpleasant path of national thought. And our experiences of the not too distant yet already historical past prove that we hardly possessed this thought to a sufficient degree, and will certainly not possess it to this degree in the foreseeable future.

Franko's intellectual victory was a miracle not only of clear-sightedness but of prophecy. Two extracts will be enough to show this.

The first comes from the year 1898, from the time when Offenbach's operettas were being played all over Europe and the whole continent

danced to the waltzes of Strauss, when the Tsar was receiving no ambassadors because he was recuperating on a fishing holiday, and the intellectual skies of Europe were dominated by two idols — progress and Karl Marx. Of Marxism Franko wrote:

“O cruel time! It is full of hate and mistrust. Antagonisms have increased in such a horrifying manner that we have not long to wait before we have (and in fact we have it already) a religion founded on the dogmas of hate and the class-struggle.”

The philosopher Berdyayev, now so famous, was himself once a Marxist, and all of ten years later after the bitter experiences of 1905 he repeated almost word for word the formulation of the craftsman's son from Drohobych.

Our second extract from Franko comes from his work of 1903, **What does Progress really mean?:**

“The all-powerful might of the (Marxist) state would put a terrible, oppressive burden on the life of every single citizen. Personal freedom and personal thought would disappear... Education would become a spirit-killing set of exercises. People would grow up and live in a state of such dependence and under such thorough state control that it is unthinkable even in the most absolutist of all police states at present.

“But who would be at the helm in this type of state? On this subject the Social Democrats do not express themselves very clearly, but at any rate these people would have tremendous power over the lives and fates of millions such as has not been known in the most despotic of states.”

Is this not the prophetic vision of a great man, a vision which has been made real down to the smallest detail? These conclusions, stemming from an intellect with such a scholarly training as Franko's, can be compared only with the irrational seer Dostoyevsky when he wrote **The Devils**.

As early as 1904 Franko was using expressions such as “total rule” (we would say “totalitarianism”), “Communist state”, “State Socialism”, “the triumph of the new bureaucracy over the material and spiritual life of society”, etc.

This, if we honour the truth, was written for our then freshly baptized Marxists. Perhaps a certain Petlura, who, together with his party, was thrown into the conflagration of the liberation struggle, had remembered these prophetic warnings and concise findings of the heroic intellect of Ivan Franko.

Ivan FRANKO

Translated by Vera RICH

Easter Day

(From "The Lord's Jests")

Come Easter Day. Dear God Almighty,
There had not been since we were born
Such Easter morning for us ever.
From daybreak, chatter, noise; excited,
The village like an anthill swarmed
And seethed with people. All together
Rushed to the church. And when the first
Time: "Christ is risen" sang they throbbing,
Then all, like children, wept, the sobbing
Shook the church in a mighty burst.
For, so it seemed, that we had languished
An age, had suffered long-drawn anguish
Till He had risen here with us.

Then, somehow, we all felt the birth
Within our souls of light and cherished
Peace, and, it seemed, that all were ready
To cry aloud to heaven and earth,
To shout and sing: "All evil's perished!"
The worst of enemies, effacing
Their feuds, kissed, joyfully embracing, —
And still the bells pealed far and wide!
And the young folk ran, hardly sober
With joy, and shouted on all sides:
"No lord, no serfdom, it's all over!
"We're free, we're free, all, all are free!"
And even the small children, seeing
Their elders, also cry out, seeming
Like quails that run the field about.

But when the praise of God was over,
Out to the churchyard we all poured,
Some several hundred; in accord
All knelt upon the earth, and raising
Their voice, the whole folk sang God's praises,
And sang that glorious hymn of yore:
"We praise Thee, God, forevermore!"
Like thunder, first, the sounds came throbbing,
The mighty words, a joyful ringing,
But at the end the holy singing,
Covered the sound of deep, deep sobbing.

It is in vain I try, my children,
To tell you, even in the least,
What happened on that glorious feast,
The things which mine own eyes beheld then.
The people seemed to have gone mad!
Like boys, old men danced round each other.
And by his horses, one old dad
Stands kissing them just like a brother,
And talks, and pats them quietly.
And there the girls stand, grouped together,
And each of them takes off her headdress
And makes a bow, and humbly spreads it
Before the ikons. Each man said
Loud to his neighbour, as a greeting
"Christ is risen! Serfdom has
Gone to hell." And, one grand-dad, weeping,
Older he is than all the rest,
On an old grave-hump, half-effaced,
As if he'd gather to his breast
And would the very sod embrace,
And cries with all his might: "Dad, dad!
We're free, O dad, d'you hear, we're free!
And you a hundred years were trying
To live out serfdom, fought against dying,
Waiting for freedom. Dad, d'you see?
We're free! Poor Dad! You couldn't manage
To live it out, but dawn has come!
And now no master in his palace
Can take my grandsons, unlike me.
O Dad, now call me, call me home,
Your son can die a man, and free!"

Ivan FRANKO

Translated by Vera RICH

The Idyll

It was in days of old. Two little children,
Clasping each other's hand, across flower-spangled
Meadows of the low slopes, by narrow pathways
Over the fields, on a hot summer day
Went from the village.

The boy was the elder,
With flax-white hair and large blue eyes, and holding
A willow-branch as hobby-horse. He carried,
Tucked in his shirt, a fine big chunk of bread,
And in his old felt hat he'd stuck a flower.
The little girl, though, led him by the hand
Though she was smaller. Her eyes, sharp as thorns,
Blazed like small coals, and darted, full of life,
Here, there and everywhere. Like a mouse's tail
Her little plait hung down behind, and in it
A strand of scarlet ribbon had been woven.
And in a little apron, folded double,
She had some roast potatoes, while some pods
Of ripe green peas were safely tucked away
Inside her bodice. The boy seemed unhappy,
And as he walked, he glanced round timidly.
But without pause, the small girl chattered on,
Giving new depths of courage to her comrade.

“You ought to be ashamed! He’s grown so big,
And yet he wants to cry! A boy, afraid!
What’s there to be afraid of? When I say
Something is so, it must be true. My granny
Is not like some who might tell fibs, you know!

Just look — d'you really think it's very far?
Just to that hump, and then Mount Dil's quite near,
And then we'll climb Dil, higher all the time,
Right to the very top! Enough! We'll rest —
Or maybe not, for what's the point of resting
When we have got so near?... We'll shout "Oooo-ooh!"
And straightway we'll run until we reach
The iron pillars that hold up the sky,
And then we'll hide behind a pillar, quiet,
O very quiet, and hide there till evening.
And don't you dare start whimpering to me,
And don't start crying! So you hear? Or I
Will give it you! And then, when evening comes,
And the bright sun comes homeward for the night
And knocks upon the gate, then quietly,
O very quiet, we'll steal in behind him.
And do you know what my dear granny said?
He has a daughter — and so beautiful
You can't believe it. And she works the gate
Each evening for her father, and each morning.
And she loves children, she loves them so much
You can't believe it. But the sun won't let
Children come in to her, for fear straightway
She'd run away with them. But we'll steal in
O very quietly, and then — we'll seize
Tight to her hands, and then the sun can't do
A thing to us. Only don't be afraid,
And don't you dare start crying. It's so near,
And we have all we need to last the way.
And then, of course, the Lady'll give us plenty
Of everything, we only have to ask her.
Say now, what would you ask for?"

The boy looked

At her, and put a finger to his lips
And said, "Well, p'waps I'll have a nicer horse?"
"Ha-ha-ha-ha!" The girl burst into laughter.
"Well, maybe, then I'll have a nice new hat?"
"Ask what you like, but me, I know, I know
What I shall ask for!"

"Tell me, what is it?"

"Aha, I shan't tell *you*!"

"Tell me, or else

I'll cwy!"

"Well, go ahead and cry! I'll go
On by myself, and leave you here alone!"
"Well, then, why won't you tell me?" "You know, you're
So silly. My dear granny told me that
The sun-maiden has apples made of gold,

And if she gives a golden apple to you,
Then you'll have health and wealth for all your days,
And beautiful, you'll be so beautiful.
These apples, though, are just for little girls!"
"I-wanna-napple!" The boy started crying.
"Silly, don't cry! Just don't forget to ask.
I'll see to it, and she will give you one.
And once we have the apples safe and sound,
Then we'll go home once more, and nevermore
Tell anyone. You won't tell?"

"No, not I!"

"Well just remember! If you do, she'll take
It back. So hide it safe where no one'll find it.
No, I know, you must give me yours as well
And I will hide them both together. You're
Too silly, she would take it back from you.
All right?"

"All right!" The boy said. Off they went.

Many a year since then has rolled away.
And far beyond their childish expectations
The road still stretches, long and burdensome,
To the sun's palaces. The grass, the ploughland,
The sun, the sky, all, all of it has changed
To the boy's eyes. Only she has not changed,
His little friend, his guide upon the way.
Her chattering so merry and so dear,
Her laughter and her hope beyond all quenching
They are a living stream that binds today,
Yesterday and tomorrow in the heart.
And since that time their purpose has not changed,
Only grown, branched forth and become more clear.

And thus along the many-peopled highway,
Among the crush, disputes and buffeting,
They go, deep-hidden in their breasts they have
The hearts of children as their dearest treasure.
The fool in puffed-up pride will pass them by,
And sneer. The grand "Excellency" will pass
Without a glance. But when a peasant meets them,
He gives to them fresh water, so that they
May slake their thirst, points out the path to them,
And gives them shelter from the storm and darkness.

Clasping each other's hand, then quietly
And happily, without a backward glance
Or fear, they go towards the golden sun.

Terrence J. BARRAGY

ROMANOVS OR PSEUDO-ROMANOVS?

I

American students have been mesmerized by the constant repetition of both College teachers and textbooks that "...both the Tzar [Nicholas II] and his brother abdicated, bringing the Romanov dynasty to an abrupt end."¹ Books omitting a reference to the Romanovs at the time of Nicholas II generally include a sweeping statement with their treatment of Michael Romanov, such as "From the election of Michael in 1613 to the Russian Revolution of 1917, the Romanovs held the throne",² or "Finally Michael Romanov became Tzar (1613-1645), thus founding the dynasty that ruled Russia until 1917."³ In short, it seems extremely difficult to discover a European or World History textbook in America which deviates sharply from the standard Romanov approach.⁴ Thus, American students have been led into the unquestioning belief that Russia was ruled from 1613 to 1917 by the Russian Romanov dynasty. This is understandable, since even most books written specifically on the Romanovs are confusing, unscholarly, and in many cases blatantly in error. I propose a careful examination of the Romanov question.

II

The Romanovs were descendants of the Kambila, who migrated from Prussia and Lithuania in 1280 and soon gained a prominent position in the Russian Empire. Andrew Kobyla, who is mentioned in the Muscovite Chronicles in 1347, is generally considered to be the founder of the Romanov dynasty. Kobyla served under the Grand Dukes Ivan Kalita and Simeon the Proud.

¹) S. B. Clought, *et al.*, *A History of The Western World* (Boston, 1964), p. 1113.

²) C. Brinton, J. B. Christopher, and R. L. Wolff, *Civilization In The West* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964), p. 206.

³) Joseph W. Swain, *The Harper History of Civilization* (New York, 1958), II, p. 71.

⁴) See also: Richard M. Brace, *The Making of the Modern World* (New York, 1955), p. 268, and Steward C. Easton, *The Heritage of the Past From The Earliest Times to 1715* (New York, 1959), p. 674.

Although not even the Ruriks were all legitimately descended in an unbroken line from Rurik, the founder of the dynasty, it was considered essential in 1613 that their successor be related to the original Rurik line. Michael Romanov, however, was elected Tzar in 1613 by the Zemsky Sobor for reasons chiefly of convenience rather than legitimacy. He was representative of the royal house of Rurik only through his grandmother, and therefore families more suitable than the Romanovs were certainly available. Specifically, the Dolgorukis, a family of direct descent from Rurik, were passed over because the Zemsky Sobor felt that Michael could be more easily controlled.

Fortunately for the dynasty, Romanov legitimacy, having started in this un auspicious manner, followed the principle of primogeniture through the reign of Peter the first; and the first Romanovs took brides from among their subjects. These two facts are important for my study, which has two primary aims: first, tracing the so-called royal Romanov blood, and secondly, examining the amount of non-Muscovite blood in the royal family. Michael Romanov, who was born the 12th of July, 1596, married a Muscovite commoner. She gave birth to a son, Alexis, who succeeded his father on the throne. Alexis also married a Muscovite girl, named Maria Miloslavsky. Maria gave birth to two male children: the first, Theodore, ruled as Tzar from 1676 to 1682, when he died childless; the second became Ivan V and ruled as co-Tzar from 1682-89, with the son of Alexis' second wife. Ivan V fathered three daughters, Catherine, Anne and Praskovie, before his death in 1696.

After tiring of Marie, Alexis married, in 1669, a low-born peasant girl named Natalie Naryshkin. She was the daughter of a Muscovite officer of dragoons and a foreign woman named Hamilton. As the Hamiltons were of Scottish descent, we have the first introduction of non-Slavic blood into the Romanov line, for Natalia gave birth to Peter I (Peter "the Great"). Peter ruled with his half-brother Ivan V until Ivan and his sister, Sophia, were driven out in 1689. Peter, who is undoubtedly the greatest figure of the Romanov dynasty, married twice. He first married Eudoxie Lopukhin in January of 1689. Although he deserted her after two months of marriage and eventually had her shut up in a convent in 1699, they had one son, named Alexis. Alexis, differing in many respects from his father — one being physical stamina — died of torture inflicted by Peter's henchmen in 1718. The practice of primogeniture was broken when the son of the murdered Alexis, Peter II, was not allowed to rule.

Peter the Great, who possessed a prodigious sexual appetite, soon formed an association with General Menshikov's mistress, Martha Skavrenska. Martha, later Catherine I, has a background somewhat surrounded in controversy, though almost all books agree that she was of Livonian origin. She bore Peter eleven children, at least five

of them before her marriage to Peter in 1712. Two daughters of great importance in Russian history, Anne and Elizabeth, were thus half Livonian — and were illegitimate.

Although both Scottish and Livonian blood were thus introduced relatively early into the Romanov family, the blood line eventually became overwhelmingly German. The first princess of the house of Romanov to marry a German prince was the niece of Peter the Great, Anne Ivanovna, who married Frederick, the Duke of Courland. She was destined to rule Russia from 1730 to 1740. Next, Peter had his niece Catherine married to Charles Leopold, the Duke of Mecklenburg. This marriage is very significant, as it resulted in the birth of grandson, Ivan VI, who was apparently the last of the Romanovs. Finally, Peter had his daughter, Anne, married to Charles Frederick, the Duke of Holstein-Gottorp. This marriage resulted in the birth of Peter III, whom I shall discuss later.

Shortly before his death in 1725, Peter passed a new rule of succession abolishing primogeniture and conferring upon the sovereign the power to nominate his own successor. This decree was to result in many difficulties for the Romanov line. Rather than place Alexis' son Peter II on the throne, according to primogeniture, the Russian Guards regiments insisted that Peter I's widow, Catherine, be his successor. Upon her death in 1727, Peter II, then twelve year old, was considered next in line. Unfortunately, he died of smallpox in 1730 before his coronation, and the Supreme Privy Council chose as his replacement Anne, the niece of Peter I who had married Frederick Duke of Courland. As Anne had no children at her death in 1740, she was succeeded by Ivan VI, the grandson of Catherine Duchess of Mecklenburg. Ivan ascended the throne in 1740 at the age of one month and three weeks and was deposed at the age of one year and three months in 1741 by Elizabeth, the second daughter of Peter I. As she had declared before her ascent to the throne that she would never marry, she provided for the succession by naming her nephew, Karl Peter Ulrich (Peter III) heir to the throne. Being the son of Anne, eldest daughter of Peter the Great and Catherine I, Peter was approximately one-fourth Livonian, half German, six percent Scottish and only nineteen percent Russian. His father was Charles Frederick, Duke of Holstein-Gottorp.

Peter III, being orphaned at an early age, was brought to Russia. After long and careful deliberation, Elizabeth chose Peter's cousin Sophia-Frederica-Augusta of Anhalt-Zerbst as his future bride. They were related through the house of Holstein-Gottorp. Upon her reception into the Greek Church, Sophia was renamed Catherine (Catherine II). With the marriage of Peter and Catherine in Kazan Cathedral, on August 25, 1745, we arrive at the principal point of dispute in the history of the Romanov family. Russian historians are almost evenly divided concerning the true father of Catherine's first

son, Paul, who was born in 1754. If Peter is the father, then Paul has Romanov blood from Peter's mother and Holstein-Gottorp blood from Peter's father. Thus, Paul and all later Romanovs possess Romanov blood, although in greatly diluted form toward the end of the dynasty. But, if Serge Saltykov is the father of Paul, as the second group contends, then the Romanov blood abruptly ends at this point. Paul would possess low Muscovite blood from his father, Saltykov, and only German blood (Anhalt-Zerbst and Holstein-Gottorp) from his mother.

There are at least three writers who firmly believe that Peter III is the father of Paul. In her book *Catherine The Great and the Expansion of Russia*, Gladys Scott Thomson states that Paul was probably the son of Peter for three reasons. First, Paul looked like Peter; secondly, the two possessed many of the same traits, and thirdly, Catherine actively disliked her son. Miss Thomson states that Paul is probably the son of Peter because Catherine actively disliked Paul, but she then, in at least two different places, explains that Catherine was afraid of Paul because of her instability on the throne, and that this factor served to divide them. In a third place, Miss Thomson states that Catherine saw in Paul the same faults she had seen in Peter. She also states that Paul and Nikita Panin were plotting to overthrow Catherine. She thus destroys one of her own arguments, forcing one to question her grasp of the problem.

In his introduction to *The Memoirs of Catherine The Great*, edited by Dominique Maroger, Dr. G. P. Gooch agrees with two of the points set forth by Gladys Thomson. Gooch states that Paul's legitimacy is strongly supported by his appearance. Paul, being an ugly snub-nosed man, was probably not the son of a "good-looking woman" (Catherine) and an exceptionally handsome man.⁵

Secondly, Gooch agrees in general with Miss Thomson when he states that Paul possessed the same mental instability as Peter. He then weakens his argument by stating that perhaps this is explained by his being quarantined by Catherine. He remarks that it is impossible to answer the question of Paul's legitimacy with confidence since both Catherine's husband and son profess uncertainty on the subject. He admits that Catherine provides circumstantial evidence in her diary that Serge Saltykov was the father of Paul, but he does not consider it definite proof.⁶ In taking this position Gooch differs sharply from the first editor of Catherine's *Memoirs*, Alexander Herzen, whom I shall discuss shortly.

⁵) Catherine II, *The Memoirs of Catherine The Great*, ed. Dominique Maroger, Trans. from Fr. by Moura Budberg (New York, N.D.), p. 13.

⁶) Catherine II, Maroger, p. 12. In his book *Catherine The Great and Other Studies*, G. P. Gooch presents an even weaker defense of Paul's legitimacy than in his preface to Catherine's *Memoirs*.

The most significant and also most recent exponent of Paul's legitimacy is E. M. Almedingen, who sets forth her views in *Catherine the Great: A Portrait*. Miss Almedingen bases her approach to the legitimacy of Paul on two reports. In February, 1746, the French Ambassador, d'Alion, reported to Paris that "on m'assure que le Grand'Duc n'a pas fait voir encore à la Grand Duchesse qu'il fut homme..."⁷ She firmly believes that Peter suffered from a physical defect and states that "The married life of their Imperial Highnesses was a mere fiction. They were husband and wife in name only."⁸ Mrs. Almedingen then describes "a story which had many versions", that Serge Saltykov persuaded the Grand-Duke to consent to an operation which ended successfully. She bases her approach to the problem on an account "told by a man who had heard it from Saltykov himself." Although this affair concerning a possible operation is mentioned in several works, its precise nature is never described and thus leaves the reader rather confused.

Almedingen's statement is somewhat vague; however, she seems to indicate that Saltykov was responsible for Catherine's first pregnancy, which ended in a miscarriage, as he was "forbidden to Court and ordered to live on his estates for a time."⁹ While she admits that the affair of Paul's legitimacy remains confused she bluntly states:

Of that son's [Paul's] paternity, however, there can be no doubt. Here, Catherine's liaison with Saltykov becomes irrelevant and all palace gossip must be brushed aside. Paul was Peter's son in body, soul and mind. The grotesque and puerile traits in the father's character were all inherited by the son.¹⁰

In my opinion her defense of Paul's legitimacy is weaker than those already described. Her presentation and interpretation of Catherine's *Memoirs* is weak and confused, and her work seems generally undependable. Although Miss Almedingen is convinced of the continued Romanov legitimacy through Paul, she states that Elizabeth was "the last Romanov living..."¹¹ although both Peter III and Ivan VI were alive during the period she refers to. She then turns about and falsely states that "Peter [III] was the only living member of the Romanov family at the time",¹² although both Elizabeth and Ivan VI were alive at this time. Thus, Ivan VI, in actual fact the last indisputable member of the Romanov dynasty, is not a Romanov and Peter III is either a Romanov or non-Romanov depending on which part of the book one consults.

7) E. M. Almedingen, *Catherine the Great: A Portrait* (London, 1963), p. 30.

8) Almedingen, p. 35.

9) Almedingen, p. 40.

10) Almedingen, p. 40.

11) Almedingen, p. 14.

12) Almedingen, p. 43.

In conclusion, while there exist some rather solid arguments supporting Paul's legitimacy, these arguments are best found in books other than that of Miss Almedingen.¹³

All works concerned with Paul's illegitimacy are based upon Alexander Herzen's edition of the *Memoirs Of The Empress Catherine II*. Catherine's *Memoirs* were banned in Russia by her son and grandsons and hence were first published by the revolutionary Herzen in London in 1859. In her *Memoirs* Catherine states that the Empress Elizabeth informed her that she should have children. The lady-in-waiting Madame Tchoglokov [Choglokovala] then informed Catherine that for the good of the State she should have sexual relations with either Sergius Soltikoff or Leon Narichkine.¹⁴ Herzen states quite definitely that "the father of the Emperor Paul is Sergius Soltikoff."¹⁵

In his introduction, he writes:

What renders the present publication [1859] of serious consequence to the imperial house of Russia is, that it proves not only that this house does not belong to the family of Romanoff, but that it does not even belong to that of Holstein Gottorp.¹⁶

Although Catherine's statement concerning Paul's legitimacy is greatly disputed by historians, there are two other significant statements in the *Memoirs* which seem to be almost universally accepted. Catherine recounts a conversation in which Madame Tchoglokov informed the Empress that although Catherine and Peter had been married since 1745, still they did not have marital relations.¹⁷ Thus, it is generally agreed that the two lived as brother and sister for at least the first seven years of their marriage. Secondly, although many historians dispute the fact that Paul was illegitimate, they accept the fact that Catherine gave birth to an illegitimate daughter, Anne, in December of 1757. In regard to this pregnancy, Peter stated before several people:

"God knows where my wife gets her pregnancies, I don't very well know whether this child is mine, and whether I ought to take the responsibility of it."¹⁸

Peter then refused to sign a statement saying he had not slept with his wife — but then, how many men would after thirteen years of marriage?

¹³) In addition to the works already cited, see E. A. Brayley Hodgett's *The Life of Catherine The Great of Russia* (New York, 1914).

¹⁴) Catherine II, *Memoirs Of The Empress Catherine II*, ed. Alexander Herzen (New York, 1859), p. 165.

¹⁵) Catherine II, Herzen, p. 14.

¹⁶) Catherine II, Herzen, p. 14.

¹⁷) Catherine II, Herzen, pp. 158-159.

¹⁸) Catherine II, Herzen, p. 255.

There are a number of scholars who have merely accepted Catherine's statement concerning Paul's illegitimacy and failed to do any further research on the subject. Such treatment is of little value. One example of this approach is a work entitled *The Romanovs* by William Gerhardt. The author states that "Peter III... almost certainly was not Paul's father",¹⁹ but then fails to examine the problem in any detail.

There are five sources dealing with the topic which are of significant value in any attempt to arrive at the truth. Gina Kaus in her book *Catherine: The Portrait of An Empress* states that:

All contemporary records, Catherine's own confessions, and his own admissions point to the fact that Peter was not the father of Paul...²⁰

She describes the situation as set forth by Catherine and adds that Peter never slept in Catherine's room again after Paul was born. This is apparently meant as supporting evidence that Peter did not consider himself the father of Paul. In support of her belief that Paul was illegitimate, she attempts to destroy the argument that they looked alike by stating that Paul was pretty until the age of ten, when he contracted a disease. More importantly, she gives several basic reasons for the fact that the actions of Peter and Paul were so strikingly similar and for the split between Catherine and Paul. She lists two reasons for the similarity between the two. First, Paul's early youth was repressed in the same way that Peter's had been. Secondly, she reveals that Paul was like Peter because he imitated Peter on purpose owing to his hatred of Catherine's morals. Sons are always the sternest judges of their mother's morals and Catherine's morals disgusted Paul. Concerning the split between Catherine and Paul, there had never been any pretense of a genuine and tender love between Catherine and her son, and secondly, Paul discovered at an early age how Peter III had met his death, and he witnessed the Orlovs at the Russian Court and his mother's passionate relationship with Gregory Orlov. In summary, Miss Kaus states: "Half wishing to resemble his idol, half wishing to annoy Catherine, half deliberately, half unconsciously, he [Paul] began to model himself on Peter, and in time became almost his double."²¹

Katharine Anthony in her book *Catherine The Great* states that "Paul... was not a Romanov but a Saltikov."²² She points out that Paul's ugly turned up nose was very similar to that possessed by Peter Saltykov, the brother of Serge.²³ In fact, a careful comparison

¹⁹ William Gerhardt, *The Romanovs* (New York, N.D.), p. 157.

²⁰ Gina Kaus, *Catherine: The Portrait Of An Empress* (New York, 1935), p. 301.

²¹ Gina Kaus, p. 303.

²² Katharine Anthony, *Catherine The Great* (New York, 1925), p. 121.

²³ Katharine Anthony, p. 122.

of the portraits of Serge Saltykov and Paul reveals close resemblance between the two.

There are in addition two books of great importance to any study of Paul's paternity, since they examine the problem in detail. Angelo Rappoport sets forth approximately ten points bearing on Paul's paternity. He points out that the problem of Paul's paternity is very vexed and can only be cleared up by mothers and midwives. Thus Catherine is the one best qualified to identify the father and she does so in her *Memoirs* — Serge Saltykov.

Her [Catherine's] words, however, have been discredited by historians, who believe that Catherine, who hated Paul because he really was the son of Peter, wrote these lines in order to disqualify him for the throne.²⁴

Rappoport points out that this makes little sense because with her statement she also disqualified her grandson Alexander, whom all are agreed she wished to see on the throne. In his second argument he quotes Bourrée de Corberon, *Un Diplomate Français* (Journal Intime, 1901), vol. I, p. 245, to show that "no one at the Court of St. Petersburg believed Paul to be the son of Peter, and Sergius Soltykov was always mentioned as the father of the heir apparent."²⁵ The author then quotes a contemporary, Count Fedor Golovkin, *La Cour de Paul I*, in regard to two rather curious incidents. When Paul was accused of conspiring against Catherine, Count Panin brutally told him that he was an illegitimate child.

You are the heir apparent only by the gracious will of your mother. You have hitherto been left in the belief that you are the son of Peter III, but it is now time that you should learn the truth. You are an illegitimate child, and the witnesses to this fact still exist.²⁶

Secondly, Golovkin relates that in 1796, the King of Poland, Stanislaus Poniatowski, informed him "that Paul, with tears in his eyes and kissing the king's hands, implored him to acknowledge himself as his father." Paul was visibly disappointed when Poniatowski denied it.²⁷ Rappoport says that in spite of Paul's filial love for his pretended father he never believed himself to be the son of Peter III of whom he often spoke as "a drunkard and an imbecile." His conduct was dictated by his hate for Catherine and Potemkin rather than his reverence for Peter III.²⁸ Equally important is

²⁴) Angelo Rappoport, *The Curse Of The Romanovs* (New York, 1907), p. 27. Rappoport must be used with caution since his views are obviously biased — as, indeed, are those of most writers on the topic.

²⁵) Rappoport, p. 28.

²⁶) Rappoport, p. 29.

²⁷) Rappoport, p. 29.

²⁸) Rappoport, p. 29.

Rappoport's presentation of the fact that Peter III "himself never considered the child as his own", and intended to exclude him from the dynasty. On her death bed, the Empress Elizabeth implored Peter III to cherish his son Paul because she was well aware of the fact that Peter III refused to recognize Paul as his own flesh and blood. Several days later, when Peter III ascended the throne, the name of Paul, as heir to the throne, was omitted from the form of the oath of allegiance taken by the subjects on the accession of Peter III.

The French Ambassador, M. de Breteuil, stated that "The Emperor has seen his son [Paul] only once since his accession. Should he get any male issue by his mistress, it is probable that he will marry the latter and appoint the boy as his successor."²⁹ Rappoport then recounts an event which may or may not be true. Peter III recalled Sergius Saltykov from Paris and treated him with marked kindness. The courtiers maintained that Peter was "searching for the father" of his son, and wished Saltykov to acknowledge himself as the real father of Paul.³⁰

Rappoport ends his discussion of the problem of Paul's paternity by apparently accurately describing the reason for the alienation between Catherine and Paul. Paul despised Catherine because for thirty-four years she denied him his lawful right to the Russian throne. Catherine hated and feared Paul because he represented a direct threat to her rule.

Probably the finest book to date in English on the life of Catherine II is the recently published *Catherine The Great* by Zoé Oldenbourg. Mme. Oldenbourg presents what appears to be the most rational and scholarly treatment of Paul's paternity presently available. She considers it absolutely certain that Empress Elizabeth instructed Madame Chogloкова to procure her an heir at all costs. The Empress held Peter III responsible for the sterility of the young couple. Catherine, having apparently lost her virginity to Saltykov a short time before this, was already pregnant by him. Peter III experienced his first *divertissement* during this same period through an arranged affair with a young widow, Madame Groot.

Mme. Oldenbourg's most important thesis is that while Peter was not impotent, he was "very probably sterile." She feels that this may have been caused by the many serious illnesses he suffered as a child. More importantly she points out that:

Peter had numerous mistresses, yet he has never been credited with being the father of natural children, while the woman who lived intimately with the Grand Duke for seven years [Elizabeth Vorontsov]... married after his death and at once produced a child.³¹

²⁹) Rappoport, p. 34.

³⁰) Rappoport, p. 34. Translated from the French.

³¹) Zoé Oldenbourg, *Catherine The Great* (New York, 1965), p. 155.

Although Peter succeeded in carrying on an affair with Madame Groot, she did not give birth to a child. Catherine, on the other hand, suffered a miscarriage in December, 1752, three or four months after her affair with Saltykov began. Following the miscarriage, Catherine was instructed by Madame Chogloкова to have an affair with either Serge Saltykov or Leon Naryshkin in order to provide an heir to the throne. This is the incident described by Catherine in her *Memoirs*. Three months later Catherine was again pregnant. It seems almost certain that the Empress knew of her niece's escapade from the beginning and knowingly encouraged it. Oldenbourg points out that the Empress was:

...quite intelligent enough to realize that her nephew, although the true grandson of Peter the Great, was in fact merely a symbolic heir. The succession could equally well be assured by a child who merely appeared to be legitimate...³²

Elizabeth was to have her wish denied a second time when on June 29, 1753, Catherine had a second miscarriage.

Not only Elizabeth, but also the Grand Duke, was aware of the affair. Peter informed his valet de chambre, Bressan, that "Sergei Saltykov and my wife are fooling Choglokov, making him an accessory to their desires and then mocking him."³³

Seven months after her second miscarriage, Catherine was again expecting, and this time the affair was crowned with success. On September 20, 1754, after nine years of marriage, Catherine gave birth to Paul, and the all important Romanov succession was assured. In conclusion, Oldenbourg strikes directly at the central problem.

The still open question of whether Paul was in fact the legitimate heir of the Romanov dynasty recurred time and time again. All the evidence suggests that he was not, and that he was known not to be, otherwise Catherine would surely not have dared to hint at it so broadly in her memoirs.³⁴

She then counters the argument that Paul possessed an undeniable resemblance to the Grand Duke Peter, physically as well as in character.

...Paul's face with its flat cheekbones, big slanting eyes, and small snub nose like a Pekinese is only very faintly reminiscent of the long, attenuated visage of his supposed father.³⁵

Anyone who has compared portraits of the two men must feel that Oldenbourg's statement "only very faintly reminiscent" is quite conservative. Thus, the argument for legitimacy based on similar physical appearance is of little value. Anyone doubting this should

³²) Oldenbourg, p. 158.

³³) Oldenbourg, p. 153.

³⁴) Oldenbourg, p. 170.

³⁵) Oldenbourg, pp. 170-171.

compare the available portraits of the two men. They fully support Oldenbourg's position.

We have already seen that the argument of similarity in character is equally weak. Oldenbourg states that:

The character resemblance, too, can just as well be explained by the similarity of the situations in which the two men found themselves, by Paul's desire to copy a father he idealized but never knew, and by the common ancestry of Peter and Catherine who were, after all, second cousins.³⁶

If Peter was the father of Paul, then a faint trace of Romanov blood continued down to Nicholas II, though the line is still not Russian but overwhelmingly German. If, on the other hand, Paul was fathered by Saltykov, which seems highly probable after a careful examination of the available evidence, then the line is non-Romanov and non-Russian.

I wish to conclude my treatment of the Romanov Dynasty by briefly tracing the heavy influx of German blood into the Romanov line during the period 1796-1918 when five of the last six Romanov rulers took German brides.

At the age of nineteen Paul married Wilhelmina, the daughter of the landgrave of Hesse. The grand duchess died in childbirth in April of 1776. Less than half a year later Paul married Sophie Dorothy, Princess of Württemberg. Frederick II of Prussia, an uncle of the princess, took a part in arranging the match, and it was a highly successful one resulting in four sons and six daughters. Two of the sons became Tzars and imitated their father by marrying German brides. When he was less than sixteen Alexander I married Elizabeth, formerly Princess Louise of Baden. Elizabeth gave birth to two daughters, both of whom died in infancy.

The Romanov line was perpetuated through a second son of Paul's, Nicholas I. In July of 1817 Nicholas married Princess Charlotte of Prussia, daughter of King Frederick William III and sister of the future King Frederick William IV. Charlotte had four sons and three daughters. Nicholas I was succeeded on the throne by his son Alexander II. Alexander's marriage in 1841 to Princess Wilhelmina Maria of Hesse-Darmstadt resulted in the birth of six sons and two daughters. One of the sons, Alexander III, who ruled Russia from 1881 to 1894, broke the German tradition by marrying, in 1866, Princess Sophia Frederica Dagmar of Denmark. She was the daughter of King Christian IX of Denmark and represents the only introduction of Danish blood into the Romanov line. This blood was passed on to her son, Nicholas II. Nicholas, who represents the end of the Romanov line married a German, Princess Alice of Hesse-Darmstadt. Although born in Germany, she was brought up in London by her grandmother,

³⁶) Oldenbourg, p. 171.

Queen Victoria. The Princess introduced hemophilia into the "Romanov" line. The disease apparently started with Queen Victoria and was passed on to Alexis, the only son of Nicholas II.

The so-called Romanov line came to an abrupt end on July 16, 1918, at Ekaterinburg, when Nicholas II and his entire family were murdered by the Bolsheviks.

Contrary to popular belief, the assassinated Tzar was not only non-Romanov but also non-Russian. If Serge Saltykov is the father of Paul, as seems probable, then Alexander III is approximately twelve percent Russian and eighty-eight percent German. Nicholas II was only six and one-fourth percent Russian. If Peter III is the father, Alexander III is one and one-fourth percent Russian, one and one-half percent Livonian, and about ninety-seven percent German. Nicholas II, in this case, had only five-eighths of one percent Russian blood. It might be mentioned that although Saltykov is considered to be completely Russian, it seems probable from his name that the family has Tartar blood in it.

We must now examine the reasons for the Romanov myth which has been widely spread in this country.

III

The Romanov myth was perpetrated by the ruling dynasty of Russia for basically three reasons. One, of no great importance, is that the Romanov name was preserved out of convenience. The easiest course was simply to continue with an already established name. Of much greater importance is the fact that the ruling family preserved the name Romanov for reasons of legitimacy. They kept the name because it was a great aid, in fact an indispensable aid, to a foreign dynasty in its rule of the Muscovite people and Empire. Russian history clearly reveals that the Muscovite people despised any form of foreign rule. When the King of Poland Sigismund III attempted, through negotiations, to become Tzar of Muscovy during the Time of Trouble he was violently rejected by the Muscovite people. During the reign of Peter the Great, the common people in Muscovy rejected his attempts at westernization and looked upon the Tzar as a "German" or an antichrist. It is common knowledge that the Russian people gladly accepted the rule of Elizabeth I because of their strong dislike of German influence during the reign of Anne (1730-40). Similarly, they later accepted the rule of Catherine II because of the German influence during Peter III's reign. Gogol (Hohol) voiced the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the Russian people when he summed up Germany as "nothing but a stinking belch of the coarsest tobaccos and the most disgusting beer." Zoé Oldenbourg points out that when Catherine the Great's brother Fritz died she took almost "no further interest in her family and

did her best to make people forget that she was a German."³⁷ There is much more evidence available on this subject but it would seem unnecessary to present it here.

Finally, and most importantly, the Romanov name was preserved for Panslavic reasons. A Russian Tzar is absolutely essential to the doctrine of Panslavism, for the Slavic peoples of the world cannot be united under the leadership of Moscow if Moscow is ruled by a German Tzar. Such a situation would reduce the doctrine of Panslavism to absurdity. The writings of such leading panslavists as M. P. Pogodin clearly reveal that they paid homage to the Tzar as their "Most August Father" and considered him to be their leader. In addition, Panslavism is in one respect anti-German. It would have been virtually impossible to oppose Germany under a German Tzar.

The Slavophiles who were partly the forerunners of the Panslavists were convinced that the Russians were the true divine people of modern times and that the twentieth century would be the century of Russian, or Slav leadership. They believed that in order to fulfil her providential mission, Russia must emphasize her own identity or Russian civilization. Russia could seemingly never fulfil this all-important mission if she was guided by a German dynasty. Finally, both Panslavs and Slavophiles placed heavy stress on the importance of Russian-Muscovite Orthodoxy. The Romanov dynasty possessed a close bond with Russian-Muscovite Orthodoxy as its establishment in 1613 was based upon the leadership of Patriarch Philaret, the father of Michael Romanov. A German Dynasty would have a much closer tie to Lutheranism than to Russian Orthodoxy.

American historians of Eastern Europe have made a mistake by blindly accepting Russian monarchist terminology. Under Tzarist rule historians in many cases were denied the right to publish historical truth. Under the present Soviet regime conditions are even more distressing. Americans must therefore accept Russian monarchist writings only with caution. As for the Romanov problem, Soviet historians have shown little interest in the problem, perhaps because Russian Panslavism has been replaced by Soviet Neo-Panslavism.

I propose that for the sake of historical accuracy the name "Romanov", after the time of Catherine II, be used only in quotation marks or, better, replaced by the term "Pseudo-Romanovs." And finally, whenever the Romanov line is discussed in American history books the strong foreign blood in the line should at least be mentioned.

³⁷) Oldenbourg, p. 369.

Evhen MALANIUK

(3)

To the Problem of Bolshevism

Let us look for a moment at the history of the Raskol in its relation to our own national culture. It is common knowledge that the Raskol and the movement which sprang from it were caused by the correction of the church books, undertaken on the initiative and by orders of the Patriarch of Moscow, Nikon. The grave errors which in the course of centuries had crept into the sacred books had long been obvious. The work of revision was at first assigned to a few Moscow churchmen but, owing to the ignorance and obscurantism prevailing in Moscow, their enterprise failed hopelessly. Nikon, who had previously been Archbishop of the newly annexed Novgorod and thus was used to a different climate in church life and culture, turned for help to the centre of that culture, to our Kiev. In 1649, the Kiev Academy sent a group of learned theologians (Epifaniy Slavynetsky, Arsen Satanovsky, Theodosiy Safanovych) to Moscow, who were to assist the "sister church" in its task. These were later joined by thirty scholars, translators and professors of the Greek language. They were shocked by what they found in the Moscow church books. Their criticism, although expressed in diplomatic terms, aroused a veritable storm of indignation and anger among the Moscow clergy, headed by the Bishop, who accused the revisers of "Latin heresy." It may be mentioned here that at an earlier stage the Greek scholar Arsen, who was the first to apply himself to the correction of the Moscow church books, had for that same "heresy" been banished to Solovetsky monastery and had only in 1656 been brought back by Nikon.

The rather belated attempt to adapt Moscow church life to the Ukrainian pattern did not achieve any positive results. After some time, it rather led to a terrible tragedy within the Moscow Church and finally to the complete subjection of the Church to the State. The official Church lost all influence and was reduced for ever to the role of just another government department in the civil administration of the Moscow State and, afterwards, of the Russian Empire. The attempt made during the Revolution of March 1917 to restore the Moscow Patriarchate, i.e. the autonomy of the Church, was quickly and radically suppressed by the Bolshevik regime and its traditionally Muscovite methods.

These facts show up once more the strong contrast and most essential difference between the Churches of Kiev and Moscow, both supposedly adhering to the same "Orthodox" faith.

In spite of all historical evidence, Bolsheviks as well as anti-Bolshevist Russians continue to cling to the phantom of the "unity of faith" between the Russian and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. The so-called Moscow Patriarchate, reconstituted under Bolshevik auspices after World War II, has made "the unity of the Orthodox faith" and its "militant mission" the basis of its church policy (designed, of course, to prop Soviet imperialism). Thus — to give only one example — it drove, with the help of Soviet security police, Ukrainian Catholicism in Galicia under ground.

But to return to Patriarch Nikon who was Patriarch of Moscow from 1652 to 1658. Like his predecessor of tragic fame, the Metropolitan Philip Kolychev, he was a remarkable man. In contrast to Philip who was a nobleman by birth, Nikon was of humble birth (like Pope Gregory VII). Hardened in his stormy youth, he showed an iron will and great, sometimes overwhelming ambition. It may well be that he tried to model himself on Gregory VII, for there were elements of papal caesarism in his church-reforming activity. It was he who declared that "the priest is above the tsar." He consented to becoming Patriarch only after the Tsar had long and humbly beseeched him and had gone on his knees before him (a humiliation for which Tsar Alexis apparently never forgave him). Before being enthroned, Nikon was able to persuade the Tsar to have the remains of the Metropolitan Philip murdered by Ivan the Terrible transported in state from Solovetskiy monastery to Moscow (1651). In short, the year 1652 was a Russian version of Canossa in the history of the Moscow Church. At a number of Councils, Nikon achieved the *de facto* autonomy of the Moscow Church and eventually even had his own archers, a military force not subordinate to the Tsar's authority. Nikon might very well have solved great historical and church problems if he had not stepped outside the ecclesiastical sphere and reached for political power, and if he had shown some understanding for the Raskol and its leaders.

It is an illustration of the chaotic conditions in Moscow at the time that the Patriarch and the Raskol movement should have become deadly enemies. The conflict was paradoxical, since both sides really pursued the same aim — i.e. spiritual emancipation and independence of Church from State — and had become divided only on purely superficial and unessential issues (the two-finger crossing, the double Hallelujah, etc.). In the course of centuries, these ceremonial customs had become a fossilized, sacrosanct church ritual, which took on the character of dogma and was defended with religious-nationalist fanaticism.

Nikon's radical measures in the matters of Church rite and his unrestrained lust for power eventually led to his ruin. In the meantime, the cunning Tsar Alexis bestowed on him the dubious gift of the title "Gosudar", or sovereign, which in name put him on a level with the Tsar. This caused a violent reaction not only from the

nationally oriented Church (the later Raskolniki), but also from national political circles, the Boyars, who saw in it an attempt to weaken the absolute power of the secular government. Tsar Alexis, who had for some time been aware of Nikon's real intentions, cleverly exploited these antagonisms. In the end, Patriarch Nikon was the loser in the unequal struggle, the Raskol crystallized into its final form, and the tsarist regime acquired its last polish in dealing with church affairs. From now on the tsarist system was able to formulate the principles of its church policy for centuries to come. In this connection Peter I, the son of Tsar Alexis, was to play a decisive role.

Peter's "reform" of the Moscow Church was, in the words of an expert on the subject, "outright blasphemy and mockery." "Peter succeeded in weakening the national forces of Orthodoxy and to deprive them of their sight" (G. P. Fedotov, "Novy Grad"). He "reconstructed" the official Church and added to it a new institution, the Holy Synod (Protestant in origin, but old-Muscovite in content). For the suppression of the Raskol Peter enlisted police and army forces; he imposed special taxes and even decreed special dress for the Raskolniki. During his reign, the watchwords of the Raskol were coined: "The Tsar is the servant of Antichrist" (Peter himself was simply called "Antichrist", or "Usurper", or "the Jew from the tribe of Dan", etc.); "the two-headed eagle is of demoniac ancestry, since only the devil has two heads"; the Synod was called "Jewish Sanhedrin", and the Senate — "Antichrist's Council."

The Pugachev rebellion of a later period (1773-1775) can in all probability be regarded as the armed rising of the Raskol against the "Antichrist's state", just as the earlier revolutionary activity of Razin was no mere coincidence. But it was already the swan-song of a movement, which had had its great chance at the time of its birth and growth around the middle of the 17th century, when Tsar and Patriarch were engaged in the struggle for supreme power. By virtue of its peculiarly Russian nationalist character, however, the Raskol itself was under the spell of "the nationalist conception of power." It is significant that both Razin and Pugachev were Don Cossacks by origin and officers of Cossack forces by profession.*

*) Note: The only study of the movements led by these men is by the Ukrainian historian M. Kostomarov (see his monograph on "The Revolt of Stenka Razin" and other writings). Western scholars have shown hardly any interest in the subject and seem to have accepted the official version of Russian historiographers, according to whom Razin and Pugachev were nothing more than agitators, unbridled and ignorant representatives of the mob. But, first of all, both Razin and Pugachev were officers, not "mob", and they commanded forces numbering tens of thousands. Their enthusiastic followers were the non-Russian Tartars, Mordvins, Kalmucks etc., as well as the population of the Cossack regions. Both men had their own political ideas and principles. These armed rebellions were only with great difficulty put down by the Moscow and Petersburg governments, who used every means from bribery, treason and "fifth columns" to terrorism, including the wholesale slaughter of populations and the burning down of towns and villages.

The Raskol proved unable to found its own anti-tsarist church, with its own teaching and its own hierarchy. It succumbed to the idea that the Tsar was the sole embodiment of national power. The Raskol as such ceased to exist; but the forces which produced it have kept alive.

Peculiarly transformed, the essential features of the Raskol appeared again in such groups as the Slavophiles and the Narodovoltzy (The Will of the People), as well as in the attacks on the life of tsars, in the Rasputin episode, and in the S.R.s (Socialist Revolutionary Party). It was to a large extent the elemental force of the Raskol which gave the first impetus to the early groping attempts of Bolshevism. And it was due to the passive attitude of the nation, which the repression of the Raskol had induced, that the "foreign" seed of Marxism found fertile and historically prepared soil. With a people deprived of its faith and of elementary human rights, condemned to slavery and divested even of the right to personal property, with the structure of society destroyed and reduced to an inorganic "collective" mass, Moscow Russia was indeed "the chosen one", as Khomyakov expressed it.

But chosen by whom and to what purpose?

V. TSARDOM

As the reader will by now have appreciated, the subject under discussion is so vast that it cannot be exhaustively treated even in a number of volumes, far less in one small book. The Polish scholar Jan Kucharzewski collected in the twenties and thirties an enormous amount of material, which he published in the seven volumes of his "From White to Red Tsarism." The author tends, however, to get lost in too many abstractions and theories. He never saw and experienced Russia and thus he is not really familiar with its mentality. For the sheer wealth of material brought together, the work is nevertheless most valuable.

The interest and reasonably well informed reader may justifiably point to serious omission in these pages. Circumstances did not permit to treat or go into detail about certain side issues or subordinate themes, such as Moscow's "German Suburb" in the 16th and 17th century, for instance. This was the district assigned to the merchants and diverse experts from Western Europe who had taken service with Moscow. Not a few of these settlers were adventurers and even criminals, a fact in which one can see certain analogies with the Moscow Comintern of the 1920's and 30's. Historical writing has not shed much light on the part played by the German Suburb, but there cannot be any doubt that it was an important one. Through these foreigners in her midst Moscow became acquainted with the technical achievements of Western civilization and — what is even more important — through them Moscow was able to advance her foreign policies and spread her political myths.

Our account has had to omit such important events in the history of Moscow as the appearance of the pseudo-Tsar Dmitry I in 1605-1606. (There was to be a second false Dmitry as well). Although external forces were quite obviously at work (i.e. Poland, the Vatican, Ukrainian magnates headed by Prince Constantine Ostrozhsky, and the Cossacks of Ukraine), the persistent appearance of Pretenders at that period must primarily be seen as a natural reaction of the Moscow-Russian people to the preceding terrorist regime of Ivan the Terrible. Even the Ukrainian Hetman, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, had another Pretender "in reserve" (Timoshka Akundinov) in case he might be needed. Seen in historical perspective, the championing of Pretenders appears to us now as the first and, to that extent, perhaps the only effort made by Russian society to free itself from its Mongolian past and to join the ranks of Western society and civilization.* For the lack of success the blame does not lie with the Pretender Dmitry I. To judge from the scant information available, he was a remarkable personality, an able statesman and ruler, who fully grasped the problems which confronted him in Moscow. The reasons for the collapse of this westernising attempt at the beginning of the 17th century are to be found in the carelessness of the outside instigators, in their inability to carry through an enterprise of historical importance at that vital time, in their ignorance about the psychology of the Russian people and its religious and national orthodoxy. A further factor responsible for the failure was the attitude of the Boyars at home. They even murdered Dmitry, who had become the idol of the Moscow populace.

On this, as on so many other occasions, the obstacle to change arose out of that obscure psycho-historical complex of Tsardom and Orthodoxy, which defies all attempts at rational analysis. It crystallized in Tartar times and has held the Russian soul in chains which can apparently never be shaken off.

The leaders of the revolutionary attempts that followed — the Don Cossacks Stenka Razin and Yemelyan Pugachev — were, as we have seen, by no means as primitive as official Russian history makes them out. (The most valuable contribution on the subject of these two men was made by M. Kostomarov, who also wrote about the

*) Note: That "tsardom" in its political aspects was of Mongolian origin — a modification, in fact, of the Tartar khanate — is beyond question. The distinct culture, which the Tartars bequeathed to Moscow, has been clearly outlined by G. Fedotov in his "Novy Grad": "The Tartar element penetrated the body of Moscow and took hold of its soul. This spiritual conquest occurred at a time when the political power of the Horde was on the wane. In the 15th century, thousands of baptised and unbaptised Tartars entered the service of the Moscow Princes, filling up the ranks of the service-gentry, i.e. the future nobility... It was not so much under the 200 years of the Tartar yoke, but *after* it, that Moscow lost its freedom."

Many public figures of the later Petersburg empire were of Tartar descent, e.g. Derzhavin, Aksakov, the extreme Westerniser Chaadayev, and others. Even Turgenev and L. Tolstoy had Tartar blood.

"Samozvantsy", the Pretenders.) Both Razin and Pugachev were men of character and experience, the latter having travelled abroad. Both built their strategy on the strong moral basis of the Raskol. It was in their tactics that they made mistakes. Razin, who had a vast army and whose command extended from the Caspian to the White Sea, was ingenuous enough to declare: "I do not wish to be Tsar." And, yet more naïve, he acted accordingly when the revolutionary struggle was at its peak. Pugachev drew a lesson from Razin's experience and from the start claimed to be Tsar Peter III (who had recently been murdered by the lover of his wife, Catherine II). However, he could not keep up the pretence for long. One of the reasons for this was that the "europeanised" administration of Catherine II functioned more efficiently than that under Tsar Alexis, when there were *de facto* two Orthodox Churches, when the preacher Avvakum made his passionate appeals and the tsarist regime was shaken in its foundations by the storms of the religious controversy.

Pugachev lost his moral influence when the people began to suspect that he was not Peter III, and the talents of General Suvorov helped to bring about his military defeat. By the use of terror and bribery (a reward of 10,000 roubles was on Pugachev's head), the rebellion was crushed. It was to be the last of the revolutionary attempts of this kind in the history of Russia. In the succeeding centuries the spiritually "for ever pacified" Russian nation could do no more than either "remain in silence", to use Pushkin's words, or to lend itself as a blind, soul-less tool to Petersburg and Soviet tsarism.

Another subject for which there is no room in these pages is the peculiar phenomenon of the Russian "Intelligentsia." As Russian-Bolshevist legend and influence spread in the West, this uniquely Russian concept has found its way into the vocabulary of European nations, although it is hard to see why Western social psychology should have burdened itself with an additional concept that never was an element of organic culture.

Let us here only briefly state that the Intelligentsia of the Petersburg empire must not be regarded as identical with what is commonly meant by the term "intellectuals", i.e. members of the learned professions. They did not belong to any distinct national or professional categories, but formed an enclave, an enlarged "German Suburb" as it were, within the society of the empire. They were people of diverse origin, background and education, who had gravitated from the various subject nations into the service of the government, which needed their cooperation as, for instance, primary school teachers, journalists, lawyers, doctors, writers and university professors. These people, who had been uprooted from their native soil, their society and their national culture, were entirely lacking in national consciousness; they were anational. Their official "Russian nationality" was a meaningless formality. This explains the renegade mentality, conscious or unconscious, which resulted in stunted minds

and creative impotence. While the lower orders of the Intelligentsia served in the capacity of administrators as tools for the imperial policy of Russification, the upper strata — consisting predominantly of scientists and writers, but also artists — were responsible for creating various myths and, particularly, for perpetuating and elaborating, not without success, the lost legend of the empire. The very existence of the Intelligentsia was taken as “visible” proof of the correctness of the doctrine of the indivisibility of the empire. The same school of thought prevails today among the majority of Russian emigrants, who propagate these ideas outside the borders of the USSR.

The fate of the “All-Russian Intelligentsia” under Bolshevism was a tragic one. After it had found its political expression in the Kerensky government and had played the role of midwife at the birth of Bolshevism, it was destroyed, even physically, by the same Bolshevism it had helped to bring into the world. There were various more or less logical reasons for this turn of events. For one, it is obvious that, with few exceptions, the members of the Intelligentsia, accustomed to the europeanised atmosphere of the Petersburg empire, were incapable of fulfilling any function in the mediaeval and national Muscovy that was reborn during 1917-1920.

Since the late 1920's, however, the Bolshevik regime can clearly be seen to aim at the creation of a new Intelligentsia, this time calling it “Sovietskaya”, which is to play the traditional role of supporting the imperial idea.

There is a considerable amount of literature on the Russian Intelligentsia, yet we would refer our readers to the concise, but weighty, contribution made on the subject by G. Fedotov in his “Novy Grad.”

*

No historical event of any significance should ever be regarded as a *deus ex machina*. Every occurrence is explained by historical development. The phenomenon of Bolshevism has more than proved this axiom: It exposed to the eyes of the world the inner workings of the Moscow state machine and clearly demonstrated the spirit of traditional tsarism. Let us now look at a few details. The fact that most of those who went abroad never returned to Russia is nothing new. When Tsar Boris Godunov (a Tartar, successor to Ivan the Terrible) sent eighteen youths to study in Western Europe, not one of them came back. “Once one has breathed the air of spiritual freedom one is not likely to return to prison”, comments G. Fedotov on the matter.

Neither the sovkhoz nor the kolkhoz is a result of Communism or Marxism, nor are they inventions of the Bolsheviks. Up to 1861, all landed properties in the Moscow and Petersburg empire were state farms, i.e. “sovkhozes”; and every village on ethnographically Russian territory always has been a “kolkhoz.” When Ukraine was conquered

by the force of arms, there, too, collective farms in the shape of "military colonies" were established by the dictatorial Arakcheyev, the minion of Alexander I. Bolshevism merely continued and intensified traditional policies in agriculture and followed in the steps of Peter I in its methods of "industrialisation."

Among the apostles of the Muscovite "obshchina" (communal ownership) were, besides the reactionary tsarist politicians, such radicals and progressives as Alexander Hertzen, Chernyshevsky (the "dishevelled seminarist", as Shevchenko called him), N. Mikhaylovsky — one of Lenin's mentors — and Karl Marx himself. Around the year 1880, the inventor of "scientific" socialism accepted and confirmed the Chernyshevsky-Mikhaylovsky theory, according to which the Russian communist obshchina provided the basis for direct transition to Marxist communist socialism, bypassing "the terribly long road" (Chernyshevsky) taken by "Roman-feudalistic, bourgeois-industrialised Europe" (Hertzen).

All these men, together with the declared reactionaries like Leontyev, Pobedonostsev and others, and even Leo Tolstoy (as philosopher), were unanimous in their hatred of the humanist civilisation of Europe.

There is nothing in the history of modern "Russia" that does not have its roots in the past. Neither the open aggressiveness of Moscow nor the carefully hidden inner causes of that aggressiveness are anything new. The whole history of "Russia", of that "military empire", is the history of incessant, rapacious, cynical imperialism.

In the reign of Ivan IV, at a time which did not appear to be particularly favourable for expansionist activity, the biggest and for the history of Moscow most characteristic conquests were made, both in the West and in the East: the Western republics of Novgorod and Pskov, and the Tartar khanates of Kazan and Astrakhan. Moreover, in that same period Siberia was conquered by the Cossacks of the so-called "fringe nations", i.e. elements generally incompatible with Moscow. A paradox? No, rather a clever move of the interior imperial policy of Moscow. It achieved thereby the diversion of potentially revolutionary forces, which spent themselves in raids on foreign countries. How often, from Tsars to Soviet, the "political wisdom" of Moscow had recourse to this traditional device! Was not the war with Japan a desperate — and for the Petersburg regime tragic — attempt to evade the 1905 revolution?

In the hope that we have been able in the preceding pages to sketch the rough outline of our topic, let us now leave methaphysics aside and proceed to an examination of the more technical political aspects of the subject. Let us pass from bygone centuries to a period much closer to us, with which contemporaries are familiar either from personal experience or from first-hand description by the older generation.

The names of two eminent statesmen of the last phase of the Petersburg empire, Witte and Stolypin, will not be unknown to our readers. The careers of these two, by now historical figures — at which we shall be looking more closely in a moment — are strikingly symbolic of the perennial problem, which might be called the political doctrine of every kind of "Russia."

Summarizing what has been said before, this political doctrine can be variously formulated: beginning with the "God in Heaven, Tsar on Earth" dictum of Old Muscovy, through the "Orthodoxy and Autocracy" of Nicholas I, to the "Workers of the World, Unite" slogan of the present. What is most essential and characteristic in this doctrine can be expressed in a few rational, though necessarily somewhat simplified, statements:

"Russia", no matter what her political form may be, can never tolerate within her dominion any kind of freedom, neither the freedom of the individual, nor that of the family, nor that of the race and, least of all, national freedom, not even that of the ruling nation (under Nicholas I the word "nation" was considered "revolutionary" and was prohibited). There can be no freedom for body or mind. Thus even the Church can be no more than a department of the Ministry of the Interior. "Russia" has at all times been based on the extinction of all individuality and hence, on the abolition among her people of private property, as this would provide a basis for personal freedom. "Russia" is therefore either the private domain of an autocrat or the "socialist" property of the formless, impersonal, soulless collective, i.e. ultimately it is part of a centralised state bureaucracy.

Owing to the numerous internal frontiers between nations, races and cultures, that have no spiritual connection of any kind with Russia, the government of the "Russian" empire — whether it is autocratic or "democratic" (and there even was once a democratic Russia) — has to maintain an extensive police apparatus with huge forces, dedicated to repressive action inside the country. (In the present USSR the police force is not much smaller than the standing army.) This state of affairs arises logically from the internal political situation, and no "Kerensky" could get away from the inner law of the "Russian" political structure. Outsiders may have failed to detect it in the reign of the Tsars, but the Bolsheviks have disclosed all the secrets of the basic political "law" to the whole world. The foundations on which the political structure of "Russia" rests can thus be seen as 1) total extinction of individuality, 2) prohibition of private property, and 3) systematic and all-pervading terror, modified and applied as circumstances require. And this, in essence, is "Russia's" political doctrine. Its logical consequences are obvious: military aggressiveness; the building up, by diplomacy, of "neutral zones" and moveable "iron curtains", behind which numerous agents in the shape of "communist parties", "fifth columns" and a host of "experts"

are in action. (The latter, who know the defence secrets of their respective countries, often are ostensibly engaged in harmless theoretical "Sanskrit studies" or in practical homosexuality.)

We have seen then that Russia, in its imperialist role, must perforce disseminate the political and cultural ideas of mediaeval Muscovy throughout the countries, peoples and cultures it has conquered ("re-united"). Since this cannot be done without force, "Russia" must always be a militaristic empire and pursue a course of aggression and, to use non-diplomatic language, of robbery and destruction.

Two renowned statesmen of the Petersburg empire had gained a deep insight into the civilization of Western Europe and noted with concern how that civilization steadily pervaded the western parts of the empire. Both had the courage to pursue policies which might well be called revolutionary. But, alas, unknown to themselves they played the roles of tragic heroes. They engaged in a fight against the historical *moira* (to use a classical term) of Russia itself and the outcome could be no other than that of every tragedy.

*

Sergei Witte (who on his dismissal was made a Count) was the son of Julius Witte, probably a German settler from the Baltic area or, more likely still, from the region of Odessa. His brilliant civil service career, which sounds almost like a fairy tale — from station-master at Fastov to Prime Minister of the Empire, began with a chance meeting with Tsar Alexander III. Shortly after the railway disaster near Birky in Ukraine, in which the imperial train was involved, Alexander happened to overhear from the window the conversation between the train commandant and some unknown official. The latter said in a raised voice: "The life of my Emperor is more important to me than your regulations. I cannot permit the train to travel at such a speed, because I know the profile of the track on my line." The Tsar had the official called to his carriage and asked him his name. It was Sergei Witte, master of a section on the South-Western Railway. Soon afterwards Witte was appointed Minister of Transport. His rise led in Witte to a peculiar Hamlet mentality: although a democrat of Western type and almost a republican by conviction, he was dazzled by the boundless opportunities with which the absolutist tsarist regime presented a man of his ability and energy and by the vast field of activity which seemed to stretch before him. Witte was also an excellent mathematician (Odessa University had held out to him an academic career) and his versatility and creative energy made him an outstanding personality. His monetary reform, which immensely strengthened the empire's economic position, and his brilliant negotiation of the Portsmouth peace treaty with Japan after what looked like a fatal defeat for Russia — these are examples of Witte's extraordinary

talents. He was past master in handling the empire's administration, which he wanted, if not to reform, at least to perfect, and he clearly did so with some success. The later course of his career, however, demonstrated how tragically utopian his plans were.

Witte was fully aware of the peculiar political structure of the empire and saw all the shortcomings in its administration, which to him, a progressive of the 19th century, appeared historically out-dated. He perceived clearly the frontiers of nationalities and cultures which cut across the geographical "unity" of the empire, a unity which could only be maintained by the secret police and large forces of constabulary and gendarmes. As a man of Western background with a mathematician's mind, Witte knew only too well that this "unity" was a function of unknown qualities and could not be relied on. He intended, cautiously and without taking anyone into his confidence, to bring about by evolutionary processes the transformation of the inorganic and internally incoherent "Russian" empire into a centralised-monarchistic, but organic federal state after the German pattern. To achieve his aim, he proposed to enlist — and herein lies the tragic paradox — the help of autocratic and omnipotent tsarism itself. (When Witte was asked one day how he envisaged the future "Russia", he promptly replied: "Like the United States of America." This was presumably during the conference at Portsmouth, N.H., when he came into personal contact with the USA.)

One can hardly assume that Witte was ignorant of the history of Russia or the nature of the Muscovite nation, or that he did not see the significance of certain typically Russian phenomena (he perceptively described, for instance, the established religion as "orthodox paganism"). But there can be no doubt that he was prevented by his German antecedents and European education, as well as by his positivist and rationalist mode of thinking, from comprehending the spirit of historical Muscovite tsarism that lay behind the façade of "emperors" and the German Romanov-Holstein-Gottorp dynasty. His knowledge of the past must have been based on the distorted version of traditional teaching, otherwise he would not have failed to see how over the centuries Moscow had developed the tsarist principle, how it had created an ideology and built a whole system around it. In short, when Witte embarked on his venture he was not aware of the tremendous difficulties ahead of him, nor did he realise that the first and most formidable obstacle barring his way would be the very institution — historical tsarism, his arch-enemy — which he, from his rationalist and European point of view, had naïvely regarded as an ally or at least the Archimedean lever for his reforms.

Witte wanted to overcome tsarism with the help of tsarism — this was the tragic paradox in his undertaking. Never a favourite with the last of the Tsars, Nicholas II (a belated romanticist of orthodox tsardom, who was already under the influence of Rasputin), Witte was called upon to govern only in moments of obvious crisis. ("Jack

of all trades" was his own ironic description of himself.) He saved the dynasty and the empire when he quenched the fires of the 1905 revolution by causing the Tsar to issue the Manifesto of 17th October 1905. It was a vague and anaemic document, promising a pseudo-constitution. (It is quite possible, and would be rather like him, that Witte himself genuinely believed in the sincerity of Nicholas II, whose disaster he had averted.)

After the introduction of the gold standard and the Treaty of Portsmouth, this was the third political battle Witte had won. Unfortunately he seemed to be one of those who win every battle but lose the war. The monetary reform and the Portsmouth treaty did not interfere with the essence of tsarism, they rather helped to strengthen it. But the October Manifesto, weak though it was, with which Witte had averted the immediate threat to the tsarist regime, was a different matter. When Witte in his simplicity tried to insist on the fulfilment of the promises made in the Manifesto, he, who was a statesman and devoted servant of the empire, was dismissed by the Tsar like a lackey whose services were no longer required.

Witte's idealistic plans, which he cherished and for which he was prepared to suffer — he often was snubbed by the flunkeys at court, who looked at him as an upstart, — were thus wrecked overnight. They had come into collision with the basic concept of "Russia", with the principle of the inviolate and indivisible historical tsarism which, with the help of "Orthodoxy", had over the centuries been built up into a dogma and become a taboo.

Witte, Count of the "All-Russian" empire, the giant among the nonentities of a degenerate court, whom tsarism had overthrown, died forgotten and dishonoured on the eve of another outbreak of the Revolution whose tide he had stemmed in 1905. As on previous occasions in the history of the Moscow State and of Russia, this revolution was once more to be a "pitiless and senseless rebellion" (to use Pushkin's phrase) — the rebellion of a people whom tsarism had turned into slaves and who, as we now know, fought their battles on tsarist terms.

*

The task which another protagonist in the last act of the Petersburg tragedy had set himself appeared far more modest and less revolutionary — at least at first sight.

Peter Stolypin came from a noble Russian family and was certainly one of the best representatives of the nation that ruled the empire. He owned an estate in Lithuania and was for some time Governor of that Western colony. He was thus in a good position to compare the conditions of the Lithuanian peasantry, who owned the land they worked, with those of the Moscow peasants, who had never even known the right to property. He came to the conclusion that if the peasantry of his mother country was to be a support for the monarchy

and the tottering empire it had to be put on a sound basis, and that the only way to achieve this was to introduce legislation which made the peasant the owner of the land he cultivated.*

Shortly after Witte's dismissal, Stolypin was appointed Minister of the Interior and subsequently Prime Minister. With great persistence and energy he worked on the land question and finally persuaded the Tsar, still alarmed by the 1905 revolution, to issue the edict which made it possible for a peasant to claim his holdings as personal property (9 Nov., 1906). This would have eventually transformed the peasant from his traditional status of "kolchoz-member" of his village community into a free farmer on his own land.

It would seem that Stolypin's plan was perfectly logical and natural and no more than a necessary modicum of reform, but subsequent events were to show that even his moderate aims were revolutionary and, alas, utopian.

In the autumn of 1911, while attending a gala performance at Kiev with the Tsar and the Court, Stolypin was assassinated. The murderer, Bogrov, was able to get into the well-guarded opera house because he was himself an assistant of the Secret Police who were responsible for the security of the building. At the same time he was supposed to have been a member of a revolutionary terrorist group. (If so, one might have expected that he would have assassinated the Tsar himself, the main target of terrorist activity...)

In the history of the Russian revolutionary movement collaboration between revolutionaries (or rather the terrorists among them) and the imperial secret police was not without precedent (Azev, Father Gapon, and others). It is now difficult to analyse the exact circumstances of Stolypin's murder, particularly since the authorities at the time dealt with the matter very rapidly and without leaving any documents or accounts. The circumstances of the Prime Minister's death were certainly strange and will no doubt remain for ever a secret.

There was no secret whatever about the attitude to Stolypin's agrarian reform of the revolutionary movement on the one hand (which contained the seed of the future Bolshevik government) and of the highest nobility close to the throne, on the other. The

*) What is generally known in the history of Russia as the Emancipation of the Serfs amounted to freeing the peasant from personal slavery and from unpaid labour on the estate of the landowner. The land, which had previously been the *de jure* property of the State and had been apportioned, together with the serfs, to various individuals in remuneration of their services, was now the property of the gentry. The peasant himself was not granted the right of ownership of his holding and was burdened with excessive redemption payments. The 1861 Act consequently created a huge agricultural proletariat. Foreseeing unfortunate effects, the more judicious had warned Alexander II of "these half-measures" of reform, as they called them. In the Russian colonies — Ukraine, Poland, the Baltic provinces, etc. — where Roman law of property prevailed for centuries, the agrarian situation developed on somewhat different lines.

revolutionaries saw in a strong land-owning peasantry ("kulaks") a danger for their plans, since a prosperous peasant class would not provide a motive force of revolution. But how is one to explain the opposition against the land reform, and the hatred for the man who launched it, on the part of those who were his equals in rank, wealth and cultural background? What caused the pronounced displeasure of the Tsar with a man whose antecedents were unimpeachable, whose loyalty to the monarchy and whose personal qualities — benevolent intention, sincerity, courage — were beyond question (in contrast to Witte's case)? What was the reason for the fact, reported by contemporaries, that Stolypin's death — allegedly by the hand of a revolutionary — made the Tsar and the top members of the court and of the bureaucracy heave "a sigh of relief"?

There is only one possible answer to these questions: As Witte before him, Stolypin and his land reform had come into serious conflict with the dogmatic basis of the concept of "Russia." They violated the principle which made the State the owner of the depersonalized slave — the subject, who must be held captive in the traditional village commune, and who must not be allowed to have any property of his own, since that would provide a material basis for individuality and personal freedom. In the permanently tsarist Russian system there is no room for individuals. The efforts of both Witte and Stolypin were after all along lines which would inevitably lead to the natural disintegration of "Russia", i.e. the dissolution of the empire. All those anxious to preserve the traditional concept of "Russia" — the Tsar and the monarchists, the "Revolutionaries" and the Socialists, even the Liberals under Milyukov — could not but feel themselves threatened by a genuine revolution which Stolypin's measures had initiated. As a result, Peter Stolypin, faithful supporter of tsarist rule and monarchist by conviction, member of a noble Russian family, was murdered by an agent of both tsarism and "revolution", and with him died the national spirit of his own people.

It is noteworthy that in the Duma of 1906 the liberal democrats, with Milyukov at their head, who were supposed to be extremely "Western" in their outlook, came out against Stolypin's reform and in favour of maintaining the old collective ownership of land by the village community. Even to these "europeanised" circles the "commune" was taboo. Their arguments were pretty confused; Stolypin's plan, it was said, was governed by the policy of the nobles, the landed gentry would be replaced by the kulaks, and it was tantamount to "destroying" the historically evolved "commune"...

The Leftists demanded that the allotments should remain the property of the village community as a whole and should not be allowed to be sold to individual peasants. They called for increased production by intensive farming, mechanisation and cooperative methods (P. Milyukov, *Memoirs*, Vol. 2). So we see that as early as

1906 the Left had kolkhozes, sovkhozes and MTS (i.e. machine and tractor stations) in mind.

It is significant that the death of Stolypin was sincerely deplored only in Ukraine. The villagers were grateful to him for making their economic emancipation from the empire easier, and the "Little Russian" nobility saw in him a man who could have brought about a healthy reorganisation of the empire and thus rendered it viable (at least for a time). The only monument erected to the memory of Stolypin in the whole of the empire therefore stood — until 1917 — in Kiev, in front of the town hall of the Ukrainian metropolis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Siegmund von Herberstein, *Rerum Moscoviticarum commentarii*, Vienna, 1549.
 Giles the Elder Fletcher, *Of the Russe Common Wealth: or, Maner of Governement by the Russe Emperour (commonly called the Emperour of Moscovia)*, London, 1591.
 J. Bouvet, *The Present Condition of the Muscovite Empire*, London, 1699.
 Awnsham Churchill and John Churchill, *A Collection of Voyages and Travels*, 6 vol., London, 1744-46.
 Edward Daniel Clark, *Travels in Russia, Tartary and Turkey*, Edinburgh, 1839.
 Astolphe de Custine, *La Russie en 1839*, 4 vol., Paris, 1843.
 Charles Quénet, *Tchaadaieff et les lettres philosophiques*, Paris, 1931.
 André Gide, *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.*, Paris, 1936. *Retouches à mon Retour de l'U.R.S.S.*, Paris, 1937.
 Gonzague Reynold, "La Formation de l'Empire", VI, *Le Monde russe*, Paris, 1950.
 Adam Olearius, *Offt begehrte Beschreibung der Newen Orientalischen Reise*, Schleswig, 1647, Other German editions: 1656, 1663, 1696. Translations into French, Dutch, English, Italian.
 Friedrich Christian Weber, *Das veränderte Russland*, Frankfurt, 1721.
 Johann Georg Korb, *Diarium itineris in Moscoviam*, Vienna, 1701. *Diary of an Austrian Secretary of Legation*, London, 1863.
 Johann Heinrich Blasius, *Reise im Europäischen Russland*, Braunschweig, 1844.
 Sir Galahad, *Idiotenfürher durch die russische Literatur*, Vienna, 1927.
 D. Dontsov, *Pidstavy nashoi polityky* (The Foundations of our Politics). Vienna, 1921.
 E. Malaniuk, "Peterburg yak temaistorychno-literaturna" (Petersburg as historical-literary subject), *Literaturno-naukovyy visnyk (LNV)*, 1931. "Peterburg-Petrograd-Leningrad", *Pamiętnik Warszawski*, Warsaw, 1931. "Dostoyevski", *LNV*.
 Jan Kucharzewski, *Od białego caratu do czerwonego* (From White to Red Tsarism), Vol. 1-7, Warsaw, 1923-1938.
 Petr Chaadayev, *Sochineniya i pis'ma* (Works and Letters), Vol. I-II, Moscow, 1913-14.
 Mikhail Lemke, *Nikolayevskiye zhandarmy i literatura 1825-1855* (The gendarmes of Nicholas and literature between 1825 and 1855), Ed. S. V. Bunin, St. Petersburg, 1909.
 D. Mendeleyev, *K poznaniyu Rossii* (To the Study of Russia), Publ. by "Milovid", Munich, 1923.
 G. P. Fedotov, *I yest' i budet; Razmyshleniya o revolyutsii* (There is and there will be; Thoughts on Russia and the Revolution), Paris, 1932. *Novyy Grad* (The new city), A collection of articles, New York, 1952.
 Alexander Saltykov, *Dve Rossii* (Two Russias), Publ. by "Milovid", Munich, 1923.
 V. N. Ivanov, *My* (We), Harbin, 1926.

D. DONZOW

WHY WAS PETLURA MURDERED?

Forty years have elapsed since that May of 1926. It was the year which brought dishonour to the wretched murderer of Symon Petlura, as well as to those who commissioned him to carry out the murder and to those who made a national "hero" of the murderer. Likewise, the jury, which attempted to justify that evil deed and declared its solidarity with the agent of the international murderers' clique in the Kremlin, fell into dishonour and disgrace.

Forty years! Long enough — one should think — to give a clear answer to the question: **Why was Petlura really murdered?** Unfortunately, however, so far no one has attempted to answer this question. In most cases, efforts were made to protect Petlura from the false and slanderous reproaches of his murderer and his admirers ("the pogroms!"). Hence, the impression was created that it was not the murderer who was on trial, but Petlura, together with the Ukrainian government, the Ukrainian army, i.e. the entire nation!

The verdict of the court, which justified Schwarzbart, followed by a cynical demonstration of the hysterical mob of his admirers, proved only too clearly that an innocent man had been murdered, that he had been innocently murdered by a degenerate creature, who was condemned as an ordinary thief by a Viennese court, and was a Communist agitator, who counted among his friends the Bolshevik agent, Volodin. As could be established only recently, the Kremlin had commissioned him to carry out this base deed. Regarding his elevation to "national hero" and "idealist", who acted from noble motives, O. Shulhyn, on the occasion of the trial, put the case quite clearly: "...Criminals are not generally idealists." But neither he, nor the "witnesses", who were quickly summoned in his defence, were able to give evidence of Petlura's "guilt" regarding the "pogroms", which were said to be inspired by the latter.

If this was the case, and it was so indeed, as is proved, among others, by A. Desroches in his book **Le problème ukrainien et S. Petlura**, why then and for what purpose was Petlura murdered? Why did Schwarzbart's friends and Moscow rejoice so enthusiastically over this outright murder? If it was to revenge the pogroms, why then did they not liquidate pogromists like Denikin or Budyonny (cf. Desroches)? Why did this so-called idealism suddenly die out when Moscow, and not Ukraine, was involved? Another question which seems to be even more important: Why did the "idealists" of the Schwarzbart camp never protest against the pogroms, which (as is also recounted in the above-mentioned book by Desroches) were organised by Trotsky-Bronstein or Rakovsky, and in which entire Ukrainian villages were massacred? Why didn't they protest against the big and little Khrushchovs and Kaganovichs, who artificially created famine conditions in which millions of Ukrainian farmers met their death? Hence, it becomes clear that the fact of Petlura's murder can be explained neither by Schwarzbart's "idealism", nor by Petlura's "anti-semitism."

"Idealism", "revenge for injustices", all these phrases, in the mouth of Schwarzbart's disciples, were nothing but an attempt to cover up the true motives of the murder; whereas the accusation of "anti-semitism" was nothing but a contrived pretence to hide the true purpose of this murder. In this connection we must also recall the slanderous and lying campaign against Petlura and the Ukrainian army. The purpose of this was to raise a hellish noise of the trumpets of Jericho and to drag our entire nation into dirt — our nation, which once again, by making heroic efforts, was about to tear itself from Moscow's strangling clasp. From the moment on, when the gang, led by the ideological leader of the Communist Party, Ulyanov-Lenin, and by the organiser of the Bolshevik army, Bronstein-Trotsky, began to rule in the Winter Palace on the Neva, an armed crowd of rabble, consisting of thousands of men, was dispatched to murder, to pillage and to enslave our nation anew, to destroy our culture, our venerable traditions, our religion and our church, and in this way to make a colony of Ukraine, a **ulus**, not of the "Golden Horde" this time, but of the "Red Horde" from Moscow. These "Bastards of Catherine" spread like a "locust plague" over our native soil. They were spiritual and consanguineous descendants, first and foremost, of Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchov, and their helpmates, Trotsky, Kaganovich etc., of these miserable **apparatchiks** of a Party dictatorship. To this very day, they are all, be it in the USSR or abroad, boiling with hatred against Ukraine, against her aspirations to liberate herself from the colonial yoke and to found an independent nation and a free state. Men like Schwarzbart on the one hand, and like Valyukh — who murdered Evhen Konovalets — on the other, were always to be found among them... **Here then lies the source of that disgusting crime in May of 1926 in the Rue de Racine in Paris.**

As far as Ukraine is concerned, her enemies have ever been unbending and ruthless in pursuing their goals. Peter I was guilty of kidnapping when he had Voynarovsky abducted abroad, a deed, in which he succeeded; whereas, after the Battle of Poltava, he failed to effect the extradition of Mazepa, in spite of his insistent demand... Catherine II had the pretender to the Ukrainian Hetmanate, Princess Tarakanova, the daughter of Rozumovsky and Elizabeth, kidnapped... Then came the various Valyukhs and Schwarzbarts, and simultaneous attempts to dishonour and slander our entire nation, her martyrs and heroes. For some — among them the “freedom-loving” Pushkin — Mazepa was a Judas, a traitor, whilst Tsar Peter I — the hangman of Ukraine — was “a great reformer.” In the eyes of the tsaristic Reds, the nationalists were “Mazepa’s pack.” It was for this reason that Yaroslav Stetzko was abused by the Bolsheviks and their representatives abroad, but, above all, by the head of the USSR, Khrushchov, for his attempt to revitalise Mazepa’s immortal idea in front of the sarcophagus of Charles XII. Ukraine and her leaders had to be soiled by those who consider Ukraine as their “promised land”, in which it was their privilege — they, a foreign and insignificant minority — to rule.

If Mazepa was a Judas to some, Hetman Bohdan was a bandit to others. In a Canadian school book, called **Life and Adventure**, edited by F. Penner and Edda Baxter, a story by Sholom Aleykhem tells of the terrible “Haman” (instead of Hetman) Bohdan Khmelnytsky who was a Ukrainian and who “rebelled against Polish rule”, who “plundered the people, and hid the plundered treasures in the ground.” “This Khmelnytsky plundered the gentlemen and numerous Jews” (who, by the way, supported the ruthless Polish magnate Jarema Wisniowiecki). This above-mentioned booklet already has gone through 36 impressions... (cf. **Novyy Shlyakh** of April 8, 1966). The circulation of this booklet, however, does not by any means want to sow hatred, God forbid! Quite the contrary! It only wants to stigmatise that disgusting “Haman” (just as a Petlura or a Bandera at the present time). If, however, some foreign “Haman” should come to our Ukraine and should rob, not the “gentlemen and numerous Jews”, but the poor peasants, then naturally the latter are the bandits and the foreign invaders (“Hamans”) are the “idealists” and the “fighters for freedom.” Not the modern “Hamans” are cursed, but men like Petlura and Bandera who want to liberate their nation from these “Hamans.”

Our entire past and our heroic history are slandered by the descendants of Lenin, Trotsky, Valyukh, the KGB, and of Schwarzbart. And, in their words, our freedom-fighters are Hitlerites and bandits. Our past must by all means be tarnished and soiled. Of course, this is necessary in order to settle down on our soil as a “locust swarm” and in order to maintain the rule of these new

"bastards."! Just as in Shevchenko's time (**The Hajdamaky**) today, in their eyes, the Ukrainians are "sons of Ham" as long as they "bend their backs" humbly and serve the foreign minority. Woe to them, however, when they, like Yarema, rise up for "holy justice and freedom", then naturally they are branded "robbers and bandits." It was always like that and is still so today. For this reason the Muscovites tortured men like Kalnyshevsky and Shevchenko to death, cursed Mazepa, sent out agents to murder Petlura, Konovalts and Bandera, labelled them "bandits", "pogromists" and "fascists" — but men like Schwarzbart "idealists."

This anti-Ukrainian power, which hides itself behind different masks and uses various catch-words, is brutal and ruthless toward Ukraine. One may wonder why? Solely, because here a fight between two forces, which are mutually antagonistic to one another, takes place. We must not forget "who we are, whose sons, who our fathers were, by whom and why we are put into chains"; we must not deny our ancestors and their mission. We must raise our banner, the banner of the old Kyiv, whose mission it is to fight the servants of Satan, and we must strengthen our belief and not be defeated by doubts.

On account of this mystic faith, without which, the politics of the word-juggling "experts" is illusory, the contemporary "blind, crippled and hunchbacked" organ-grinders of our time, hurl their attacks against us. For example in **Our Fatherland (Nasha Batkivshchyna)** of March 10, 1966 Jaroslav Stetzko is attacked because he "lives in a land of illusions", because he makes use of "a legendary mysticism about Kyiv", because he thinks in "metaphysical categories" and places all his hopes for the liberation of Kyiv in the "heavenly hosts." I myself am attacked for the same reasons: J. Stetzko and D. Donzow "live totally in the realm of their own political illusions"; they "disorientate" the masses and thereby substantially "damage our emigré society." It is alleged that their views are an "illusion", a delusion, "self-deceit, a subjective conception of men, who firmly believe in some creed, in a certain goal, a goal, which is their guiding star to the realization of their dreams and desires... At times their belief becomes fanatical and then their illusions are a dangerous weapon in the hands of fanatical illusionists..." This "sober and objective" author considers my firm conviction that "Communism is on its way out", that it stands on feet of clay, and "if not today, then tomorrow will tumble and break into a thousand pieces", for "its days are numbered", as my "chief delusion." In the eyes of this "introspective author", these "diagnoses and predictions with respect to the USSR" are a "complete bluff", just as my other predictions, and they claim that there is "nothing worse and more dangerous than to play the role of the false prophet: in ancient times such people were stoned"... It is obvious that our

"sagacious" word-twister is raving here, for in ancient times the stupid mob did not kill the "false prophets", but the real ones, and precisely because they saw what the deceived and blind mass of the "sober ones" was not capable of seeing; they were stoned because they disturbed the drowsy self-satisfaction and shattered the dreams that things will not be so bad in the coming Armageddon. And the stones were thrown, as was beautifully depicted by L. Ukraïнка in her **Cassandra**, at the heads of those, who were abruptly torn out of their idyllic dreams. Apart from the poetess, the coming Armageddon was seen also by Shevchenko, Franko and the poets of the twenties and thirties, who were grouped around the periodical **Visnyk** (The Herald), and who called those who were "blissfully asleep" to get ready to the inevitable reckoning with the forces of evil... I was by no means so terribly wrong in my "prophecies", when, for example, before World War I, I predicted that the hour of fight was close at hand: a fight not for the "Ukrainian schools", but for the separation from Russia. For this prediction, my "sagacious" fellow-countrymen, who firmly believed in Russia's power, threw stones at my head... although the Russians themselves (for example Lenin or Milyukov) had warned their people against my separatist "illusions." And I was also right in my attempt to smash the erroneous belief that Russian democracy and Bolshevism had feelings of brotherly love and sympathy for Ukraine. As is known, at that time I did not shrink from tearing the mask off the unchanging barbaric face of this Asiatic despotism with my "bluffs" and "delusions"... It was just those "sober thinkers" who indulged in errors or "delusions", for — as a result of their blindness and the lack of "illusions" and faith they led Ukraine to terrible disasters.

The dark forces which are bringing death to Ukraine, have their mysticism also, and they, too, believe in their mission, which they have to carry out as the "chosen" people (but chosen by whom?), i.e. to rule the world and, first and foremost, Ukraine. We have to meet their "delusion" with our "delusion", which means we have to confront it with our unshakable belief in the historical destiny of Kyïv. A belief, which in the words of Jesus Christ gives us the strength to pursue our course, to move mountains on our path and throw them into the sea and to walk over the lashed up waves of the sea, as if on solid ground, as was done by St. Peter, as long as his heart was not gnawed by doubts. This faith, this "delusion", was bequeathed to us by Shevchenko, with his resurrected "master-less Cossack", with his **Velykyy Lyokh (The Great Vault)**. The very same faith and the same "delusion" were given to us also by Franko in his **Moses** and by Lesya Ukraïнка: they instilled us with the faith in the "testament of the Spirit" which was given to our forefathers, and which will furnish us with the strength to force those nations who are bent on our annihilation to step out of our way like "base jackals." This faith was also given to us by the poets of **Visnyk**.

The Bolsheviks fear this faith of "Mazepa's pack." And the Communists constantly attack our mystic belief, together with our "realists", as was done, for example, by Yuriy Kosach. He writes that "Donzow's doctrine of an integral nationalism", of "mysticism as the source of politics", was a true gift of Providence to the enemies of Russia for "dozens of schemes and recipes could now be integrated in one single panacea... Everything is now covered with national mysticism... the Cross against the Devil... the ever-replenishing source of eternal Kyiv... Mazepa." (Yu. Kosach, "Vid feodalizmu do neofashyzmu" (From feudalism to neo-fascism). In this kind of "delusion" then, the servants of hostile forces see the greater danger.

Those who find this faith, this "illusion" fantastic cannot believe in the USSR's fall; and the "realists" rebuke those who "represent the Soviet Union as a terrible cannibal"; they rebuke the right-wingers because of whom "our activity, especially in the United States, as regards the political aspect, does not enjoy a good reputation, owing to its political profile — namely, the existence of extreme rightist groups" (anti-Soviet and anti-Russian). These "realists" declare, that the idea of an uncompromising fight against Russia is nothing more than "old phrases which belonged to an anti-democratic past." Hence, they advise us to "entertain all possible human contacts with our fellow-countrymen in Ukraine" — that is to say, with people like Korotych and Kolosova, "cultural" emissaries of the KGB... Among the "opponents" of the "delusion" and of the mysticism of the old Kyiv, we also find some "contemporaries" who, according to the directions of their friends, advise us to give up the idea of Kyiv as a capital (with its Lavra, its "mysticism" and other "delusions"), and to turn our face to the "East", that is, to Moscow, and to those who advise us to do so.

It is precisely owing to this spirit of an eternal Ukraine, its historical mission, its mystical power and readiness to meet the Devil with the Cross: this spirit which was embodied in Khmelnytsky, in Bayda Vyshnevetsky, in Mazepa, Kalnyshovsky, Petlura, Konovalets, Bandera, the monks of the Lavra, the Cossacks, who were resurrected in 1917, in the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) — it is precisely owing to this spirit that Ukraine is hated by all the sinister forces, with which it has to carry out a spiritual and physical struggle for life or death. The vision of the last act of this struggle is conceived by Shevchenko in the poem **The Great Vault**. As is written in the mystery of **The Great Vault**, this struggle will be fought not only against the hostile forces, which are assisted by the "hellish forces of evil", but also between twin brothers, between two Ivans, of whom one will "hang the hangmen", while the other will "help the hangmen."

This will be a fatal hour, not, however, for those who carry within themselves the mysticism and the "delusions", but for the others, —

those, who, after having lost all faith, rejected the mysticism to look for a "compromise with the Devil." The boot-licking greed for favour with the modern Pilates, Herods, Caiaphas, or the Pharisees, does not lead anywhere. Let us recall the warning of the great poetess Lesya Ukraïнка, who said: "the way to Golgotha demonstrates heroic greatness only if the man (or the nation!) knows consciously where he (or she) is going" — not, however, if, in a confused search for salvation, "without courage and struggle errs onto a wrong path leading to disaster, and shedding bitter tears allows itself be hurt by the thorns." It is fortunate for the Ukrainians that the number of those who become clearly conscious of their goal is increasing from year to year: people who are well aware of why Mazepa, whose memory will live forever, had to perish, why Petlura was destroyed, and why he lives in the minds of the new generation.

People like Kochubey, Halahan, Rozumovsky and Vynnychenko were living corpses while alive — in the minds of their descendants, they will remain dead. The above-mentioned "fanatics", on the other hand — these new followers of Mazepa and such prophets like Shevchenko, Franko, Lesya Ukraïнка — rise like a terrible nightmare before the eyes of the conquerors, and their names become symbols, which ever again animate the freedom-will of new generations with an indestructible faith that knows no doubts and inflame the hearts of new columns of martyrs and fighters for Justice and the great mission of Kyïv.

ARRESTS OF UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS

Kiev

The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of April 2 reported from Kiev the arrest of Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dziuba, prominent Ukrainian literary scholars and critics known for their independent thinking. They were detained at the time of Sinyavsky's and Daniel's arrest (September-October 1965). Altogether some 12 intellectuals and students were reported to have been arrested in Kiev and Lvov. Dziuba, suffering from acute TB, was apparently released. Another reliable report mentions 16 or 17 arrests in the Ukraine, while other sources mention arrests also in Odessa and Kharkov and give the names of eleven other detainees, among them another two literary scholars, Michael Kosiv and Michael Osadchy, Bohdan Horyn, an art critic, and Ihor Kalynets, a very promising young poet. On April 7, *The Times* and *The New York Times* carried similar news about Svitlychny and Dziuba, concurring with the N.Z.Z. report that they had been accused of smuggling out the late Vasyl Symonenko's diary and poems, described as "anti-Soviet" or "nationalistic." The first official admission of Svitlychny's arrest came in an interview given on April 21 to a *Daily Telegraph* correspondent by officers of the Writers' Union of the Ukraine, including the vice-chairman, Yuri Zbanatsky. They confirmed that the investigation of Svitlychny, arrested by the security police, was continuing (the earlier reports believed him to have been deported), and that he would soon stand a Sinyavsky-type trial.

Five weeks later came unexpected news from Moscow in *Le Monde* (May 29) of Svitlychny's release without having been formally charged or tried, although he had been accused of "having spread 'subversive' literature and having been in contact with anti-Soviet organisations abroad." *The N.Y. Times* of June 2 quotes sources in Kiev saying that Svitlychny "confessed to assisting western Ukrainian nationalist groups and arranging for the publication of anti-Soviet literature in European émigré journals. One of his literary colleagues said he had been released with a warning against continuing his anti-Soviet activities." His release seems incongruous in view of the reported allegations, which apparently correspond to the charges in the Western press in April of the smuggling to the West of Symonenko's works that were unpublishable at home. In the Soviet press, however, right up to the June issue of the Writers' Union

monthly *Vitchyzna*, this poet has been invariably extolled by writers, critics and Party officials (including Zbanatsky himself in *Literaturna Ukrayina* of March 4) as a faithful Communist poet whose ardent love for the Party was unquestionable. Therefore, naturally, the smuggling of the works of a writer thus esteemed could not — barring his radical re-appraisal — provide a basis for a formal charge, and therefore the prisoner was released (apparently after nine months — the longest legally admissible detention without charge). It is noteworthy, moreover, that although the deceased poet's mother denounced (*Radyans'ka Ukrayina* of April 15, 1965) Svitlychny as being one of those who had taken her son's manuscripts, some reports name another person — not a Soviet citizen — who carried them abroad, where they have since been broadcast and published.

It remains to be seen whether the "informal" accusations and warnings will not effectively debar Svitlychny from academic activity, and his work from being published. As regards all the others reported as arrested, their fate is still unknown.

(Reprinted from "Chronicle" of *Censorship*, a quarterly report on censorship of ideas and the arts published on behalf of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, No. 7, Summer 1966, pp. 48-49.)

PROMINENT WESTERN INTELLECTUALS PROTEST AGAINST PERSECUTION OF SVITLYCHNY AND DZIUBA

In the Free World the number of prominent individuals who are concerned with Soviet Russian persecution of literary figures in Ukraine is increasing. More and more prominent personalities are speaking out in condemnation of totalitarian persecutions and the colonialist policies of the Russian Communist empire.

Personally and as President of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, the well-known American scholar of Ukraine and East European history, John A. Armstrong, expressed the desire to be fully informed about the persecution of Dziuba and Svitlychny, with the intent to take the proper action to increase the intellectual freedom and personal rights of Ukrainian artists.

The prominent Swedish personality, Prof. Dr. Birger Nerman, associated himself with the proposal to organize a mass campaign to collect signatures for a petition on behalf of defending Dziuba and Svitlychny. This petition is to be sent to international institutions concerned with human and national rights.

From Denmark it is reported that a special article prepared by Jens Nielsen has been distributed to all Danish dailies as well as to some Norwegian newspapers. The Danish P.E.N. Club and the Danish Writers' Union are considering ways of protesting against persecutions in Ukraine by the occupation regime. Press items and articles about the demonstration at the Shevchenko monument at Kyïv, which was called "demonstration of Ukrainian nationalism", appeared in various Danish newspapers.

The noted British historian H. Seton-Watson associated himself with expressions of protest against Soviet persecution of Ukrainian literary critics. Professor Seton-Watson is of the opinion that the new wave of suppression of Ukrainian intellectuals should receive publicity in the West.

From Asia it is reported that the Republic of China condemned the persecution of Ukrainian literary critics. A strong protest was published in the periodical *Asian Outlook*, and the Chinese Chapter of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League (APACL) expressed its deepest sympathy with the oppressed Ukrainians.

In Italy, indignation against the persecution of Dziuba and Svitlychny was expressed by such prominent persons as Minister Ivan Matteo Lombardo, Hon. Paolo Rossi, Vice-President of the Italian Chamber of Deputies and former Minister of Education, and Prof. Leo Magnino of the International Institute for Studies of Ethnic and Minority Problems (Rome). Prof. Leo Magnino made it clear that Russian imperialism was responsible for the persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals.

In Sweden, the circles friendly to the Ukrainian liberation struggle are strong and popular. While mobilising public support for the persecuted Ukrainian literary critics, a campaign to revive historical memories of the glorious Ukrainian-Swedish alliances has been initiated. In this connection the Royal Ordnance Chamber approved a proposal to engage the noted Ukrainian sculptor, Hryhoriy Kruk, to erect a monument commemorating Hetman Ivan Mazepa, and thereby immortalise and strengthen Swedish-Ukrainian friendship. This will certainly be a noble act of sympathy with the enslaved, but freedom-fighting Ukrainian nation. There are clear indications that in the Scandinavian countries the periodic expressions of goodwill towards the peoples subjugated by Russian imperialism may soon lead to the establishment of a permanent organisation to supply information and offer supporting activity.

It must also be noted that a pro-Ukrainian group is being formed in Portugal. Interest in the Soviet Russian persecution of intellectuals, churches, and arts in Ukraine is growing in Portugal and is receiving wide-spread support. An article by Hon. Jaroslav Stetzko, former Prime Minister of Ukraine, entitled "Principles of Rebirth of Humanity", will soon be published in Lisbon. Such well-known personalities as the acting Foreign Minister, Gonçalves de Proença, Dr. Lino Netto, a prominent intellectual, and others have become interested in the Ukrainian liberation struggle. Slowly but steadily the Ukrainian national liberation struggle is receiving favourable hearing in the Free World.

A. W. B.

FROM THE INTERNATIONAL P.E.N. CONGRESS

The recent wave of arrests among Soviet Ukrainian intellectuals was brought to the notice of the Thirty-Fourth International P.E.N. Congress which met in New York from 12th till 18th June this year. The theme of the Congress was "The Writer as Independent Spirit", and the Congress called for re-affirmation of the principle in its Charter which pledges opposition to restriction of freedom of expression. This action followed a report by David Carver, general secretary of International P.E.N., on his recent visit to Moscow where, six months after P.E.N.'s first protest against the Soviet Government's persecution of Andrey Sinyavsky and Yuliy Daniel, he presented P.E.N.'s plea for clemency in favour of these writers. The Congress also "endorsed condemnation by the P.E.N. Writers-in-Prison Committee of repressive acts against authors by the Turkish, Ukrainian Soviet, and Peking China governments, and the fines totalling \$45,000 (£16,000) levied by the Spanish government against Catalan writers centered in Barcelona."

The Moscow paper *Literaturnaya gazeta* reacted to the P.E.N. Congress on 28th July in an editorial article. It contains a particularly interesting remark that the Congress, among other things, heard "slandorous declarations by Ukrainian and Estonian nationalists." This remark is of greater significance than may seem at first sight. On the one hand, it implies that the editor is familiar with the content of Ukrainian exiles' declarations bringing to the notice of the Congress the arrests by the Soviet authorities of Ukrainian writers and intellectuals M. Kosiv, M. Osadchy, B. Horyn, I. Kalynets; on the other hand, it implies that the editor believes these declarations to be slanderous, i.e. untrue; this, in turn, implies that he either knows or believes that these intellectuals are at liberty. If this is so, it would be very reassuring if the editor of *Literaturnaya gazeta* stated explicitly in one of the future issues of his paper that these people are free, and that their names may be expected to re-appear in print soon. Any such statement will be gladly reprinted in this journal.

Editors' Note.

In our previous issue (No. 2, p. 47) it was said that since June 1962 "nothing more has been heard of the two critics Svitlychny and Dziuba." In fact, Dziuba was re-admitted into print in the middle of 1964, while Svitlychny had at least one article published also in 1963. It seems, however, that nothing by these two critics has appeared since June 1965, and all mention of Svitlychny's name has been removed from Soviet publications since September 1965.

OPEN LETTER TO THE BOARD AND MEMBERS OF THE DANISH WRITERS' UNION

In 1931 the Ukrainian Writers' Union had a total of 246 members. By 1941 11 had disappeared without a trace, 17 were murdered by the communists, 4 had committed suicide, 1 had escaped abroad, 171 were in concentration camps of Siberia. 34 members only survived.

As late as 1948-50 Russian police and military killed more than 1 million Ukrainians, fighting the Ukrainian liberation movement. The so-called liberalisation of the Soviet Union has not caused any fundamental change for the Ukrainian people. Trials against Ukrainian intellectuals and writers is a regular occurrence. In one of these trials a few months ago the 42 year old critic Professor Ivan Svitlychny was sentenced to penal servitude, whereas the 31 year old writer Ivan Dziuba was released after illegal arrest because he had caught an incurable tuberculosis in prison.

I. Svitlychny was sentenced for having smuggled manuscripts of Vasyl Symonenko to the West. Symonenko died suddenly in December 1963 at the age of 29 years only. His poems are a protest against forced collectivization, the camps, Stalinism and the foreign Russian rule in Ukraine. Especially he protests violently against the forced Russification of the Ukrainian people. In one of his poems he says that in the eyes of Holy Mother Ukraine he sees the fire of revolution.

Protests against Russification (as we likewise hear from the Baltic countries) are numerous not only in the free world but also in the Soviet Union. On 7th April this year the Ukrainian Mykola Didyk committed suicide as a live burning torch in front of the ill-famed Lubyanka prison in Moscow.

On May 22nd hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals demonstrated in Kyiv before the monument of the Ukrainian liberation poet Taras Shevchenko.

The sentence against Svitlychny continues the line of sentences against Daniel and Sinyavsky etc. and this is all an expression of the hostile attitude of the so-called Soviet power against all free intellectual workers and the hostile attitude of the Russian Kremlin against the Ukrainian Nation. Therefore, the Board of the nation-wide organisation 'Demokratisk Alliance' appeals to all members and the board of the Danish Writers' Union to protest to the Soviet Writers' Union out of humanitarian and comradely considerations and thus add to the many protests inside and outside the Soviet Union against the sentence of Svitlychny, against the suppression of the free word, the free cultural exchange among nations and against the attempt to deprive the Ukrainian Nation of the right to express itself in its own language.

We appeal to all Danish authors and their Union to launch this protest to the Soviet Writers' Union to clearly demonstrate to the whole world that in this country — where KAJ MUNK sacrificed his life for freedom under German occupation — we shall not stand by in passivity while a great power tries to silence another nation and deprive the intellectual workers of the Ukrainian nation of their freedom.

July 26th, 1966

DEMOKRATISK ALLIANCE

For the Board:

Henning Jensen
(Chairman)

Valter Loll
(Secretary)

IVAN DZIUBA ON HRYHORY SKOVORODA

Biographical Data

Ivan Dziuba was born in 1931 in the village of Mykolayivka in the Donetsk region, Donbas. He completed his undergraduate studies at the Donetsk Pedagogical Institute and obtained a higher degree at the Taras Shevchenko Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR. He then worked as a member of the editorial staff of the journal "Vitchyzna."

When, in the latter half of the fifties the writers of the so-called "Sixties" group began to appear on the pages of the literary press, Dziuba turned to literary criticism. Besides a considerable number of reviews in newspapers and periodicals, he published a collection of critical articles under the title "An Ordinary Man or a Philistine" (Kiev, 1959).

Ivan Dziuba on Hryhory Skovoroda

(Translation of an essay, published 4 Dec. 1962 in "Literaturna Ukraina")

The life of Hryhory Varsava Skovoroda was a strange one, and strange is the fame he achieved after his death. Just as in his lifetime he had had more admirers than disciples, so after his death there were many who were fascinated by his personality and would honour his memory, but few who showed an interest in his works and became absorbed in his ideas. At least it is true that the average intellectual and the youth of our day are inclined to utter the name of Hryhory Skovoroda with reverence, but they are unlikely to become enthusiastic about his sayings or to turn to him for advice in matters of the heart and mind. Yet it was to Skovoroda that the best sons of the Ukrainian nation used to turn in times of suffering and of decision, at critical moments in history. We need only recall Kotlyarevsky and Shevchenko, Tychyna and his "Karmelyuk and Skovoroda", or think of V. Bulayenko. From a different aspect, the names of our own contemporaries, M. Vinhranovsky and I. Dratch, might be mentioned here.

Skovoroda was first and foremost a philosopher. Even as a poet he was at his best in his philosophical-theological works. Yet he is a philosopher of a singular kind, who is important not so much for working out generally valid systems and concepts, but for his poetic-psychological comprehension of the human soul, although he by no means neglected questions of a universal nature. Much has been written about his philosophy, and many different conjectures and comparisons have been made. He was hailed as the Ukrainian Socrates, the Ukrainian Plato; he was compared to Descartes and Spinoza, to Solovyev and Tolstoy. He was called a deist, a pantheist, a spiritualist, a psychological monist, a sensualist, the harbinger of

intuitionism or even of energetics, and one almost regarded him as the predecessor of Ostwald. The subject was most frequently discussed towards the end of the last and at the beginning of this century, when there was a sudden blaze of interest in Skovoroda's philosophy and when it was generally realized that Hryhory Skovoroda was no provincial philosophizing eccentric, but a profound and original thinker, a new and bold pioneer of human thought. The occupation with Skovoroda's work in those days did much to secure for him the place he deserved in the history of philosophic thought and to bring his ideas into relation with other philosophical concepts of the world. This has helped to elucidate the real stature of the Ukrainian philosopher. Of course, a lot remains to be done in that respect. We still lack a thorough analysis of Skovoroda's ideas in the context of all philosophy up to his time, in order to find out where he rose above the level that had been reached before him or, perhaps, did not come up to it. Another aspect, of extreme interest to us, is as yet unexplored. Up to the end of the 19th century Skovoroda was little known in the West and only therefore exercised no influence on European philosophy. Meanwhile, European thought in the 18th and early 19th century battled with the very same "confounded problems" that troubled Skovoroda's mind, and sometimes both sides came to analogous views. It would be interesting to discover how roughly similar and synchronous ideas developed in divergent ways and took on different meanings, dependent upon the problems raised by societies of a different nature and upon the subjectivity of the thinkers. It is, after all, the variety in expressing sometimes similar ideas, the diversity of the apparently similar, or of that which could be reduced to similarity, which contribute so much to the richness and attraction of the intellectual life of mankind. An interesting exercise is to compare Skovoroda's favourite themes with the ideology of early English puritanism, with "The Pilgrim's Progress" by John Bunyan, or with American transcendentalism (Ralph Emerson, Henry Thoreau, etc.) and its theory of "moral autonomy" and confidence in oneself and the search in oneself for a higher moral law. What matters in this comparison is not merely the agreement — though very striking at times — between individual themes and metaphors, but the fact that here we have the different, but sometimes edifyingly similar reactions to dissimilar but often tragically alike socio-historical processes, to the brutal attack by a base epoch upon the individual, the attack by vanity upon the conscience, the attack by false upon true values.

On the other side one ought to compare the anthropological element in Skovoroda's theology with the later and entirely anthropological concept of Feuerbach, or draw a comparison between Skovoroda and Dostoyevsky. Frequently Skovoroda and Tolstoy have been classed together, but this analogy is based on superficial traits. A deeper inner relationship exists, in my opinion, between Skovoroda and

Dostoyevsky, particularly with regard to the concept of God and the passionate search after religious truth, as well as in respect of the tense inner dialogue and the tragic conscience, though Skovoroda appears to be more lucid.

There is, however, one writer who is most closely related to Skovoroda, and that is Shevchenko. What the two have in common is the truly Ukrainian conception of truth and conscience as immutable human principles. These principles are echoed in the popular philosophy of Ukraine, in Ukrainian folklore: inner stubbornness and rebellious attitude, protest against the flouting of human dignity, disdain for the trivial and superficial, and, finally, the hard struggle of the soul in pursuit of the genuine and the hidden.

Now we come to a problem which has not been investigated so far and not even properly stated, namely Skovoroda as a specifically Ukrainian philosopher. He cannot, in fact, be understood outside that historical succession of national figures and personalities like Ivan Vyshensky, the controversialists of the 17th century, Melchisedek Znachko-Yavorsky, the Cossack chroniclers, the Haydamaks, the fighters against the policy of the empresses Elisabeth and Catherine and of tsar Peter I, a policy which sought to destroy the distinctness of Ukraine ("...so that there be no dissimilarity").

Did not this Ukrainian "otherness" appear with tremendous force in the shape of Skovoroda, that historical phenomenon so incomprehensible to many of his contemporaries? Is not his stubborn opposition to officious benefactions and political wisdom to be understood as an individual expression of the strong national resistance against being made "happy" by force, against social and national oppression, as evidence of the elemental power of that Ukrainian "otherness"? Only in this context and in the context of Ukrainian national philosophy and psychology can Skovoroda be grasped. For a full understanding of his work it is equally necessary to keep in mind the many important analogous examples in history of how the human mind and human conscience have withstood the pressures of a treacherous epoch.

Yet another problem needs to be explored, and that is the relationship between the intelligentsia and the people, and in particular between the Ukrainian intelligentsia and the people. Here we must keep before our eyes all that Skovoroda has said about the duties of "the educated and learned man" towards the people, as well as all he himself chose to do in a period when the foundations of Ukrainian life were under attack, when the Ukrainian intelligentsia morally decayed and tragically lost touch with the people, when an only recently revitalized civilization was dying down, and when only a very few had the wisdom and the courage to go to the common people, the Ukrainian peasants, and speak to them as Skovoroda did:

"The quibblings of the gentlemen, who maintains that the simple folk are vulgar and plebeian, seem to me ridiculous... They are splitting hairs: The common people are asleep... Let them, let them sleep the deep sleep of the heroes! Those who sleep are not dead, are not lifeless corpses. And from every sleep there is an awakening."

One final question: By whom, when and how were the young dissuaded from reading Skovoroda, especially his philosophical works? There is, surely, much to be gained from his books. His lively, angry and wonderful thoughts lead us straight into the wide and exciting world of the eternal aspirations of the human mind, his powerful and versatile imagination paints magnificent and strong poetic pictures, and in an irresistible succession of waves everything is impressed upon the reader's memory... It is said that the somewhat unwieldy and rather artificial language of Skovoroda makes it hard to read his works. Up to a point this may be so. But it is quite easy to get accustomed to his language. One must appreciate the difficulty of his task, since he had first to coin new words for a philosophical vocabulary in Ukrainian. Nevertheless, and despite the use of an uncommon vocabulary, Skovoroda's language is — in its structure, rhythm, spirit and intonation, not to mention its imagery — the language of Ukraine, deeply rooted in the national soil.

Many words from Old-Slavonic, words common to all Slav languages, as well as Russian words, lose, as it were, their specific meaning and acquire in Skovoroda's writing a somewhat different, Ukrainian significance. It would be interesting to make a study of these aberrations and to compare them with a language of a special kind, namely, the language of the peasant-philosophers who can still today be found living in the eastern parts of left-bank Ukraine, in the so-called Slobozhanshchyna and in the Donbas.

However, this is not the chief point. More important is the fact that our schools and establishments of higher education present to us far too little of the content and beauty of our literary heritage. In the days of the personality cult no effort was spared to make men live by dogma alone, to prevent them from thinking and to deprive them of the pleasure of drinking from the life-giving fountain of the human spirit. Our scholars, writers and teachers will still have a lot to do to make "our leading spirit", Hryhory Varsava Skovoroda, a daily necessity for every thinking boy and girl, to whom they can turn for nourishment of mind and conscience, and who will help them to find their way among the complex problems of the present and in its moral atmosphere. The name of Skovoroda must become to every one of us as meaningful as it was to Taras Shevchenko who first comprehended the full significance of Skovoroda.

A. W. BEDRIY

THE COLD WAR EDUCATIONAL GAP

With this slogan, 55 educational institutions and major organizations have established the Freedom Studies Center, located in the United States. It is a private "West Point" of psycho-political warfare. Its purposes are: 1) to train Cold War leadership for all segments of society in the Free World; 2) to study Communist strategies and tactics and 3) to develop and recommend programs for defending and extending the sphere of freedom. The above information is taken from a pamphlet issued by the Centre.

There are several quotations, intended to show the educational gap about the nature of present-day world conflict as existing in the United States: "The great majority of our citizens, I believe, want to understand the form and fashion of the challenge posed for us by Communism." (President Lyndon B. Johnson); "...many Americans have never fully understood the tragic harvest of human suffering Communism has reaped around the world, and the methods it uses..." (General Dwight D. Eisenhower); "The Communists have scored so many cold war victories since the close of World War II, because in the field of political warfare they have been professionals opposed by only amateurs" (Senator Thomas J. Dodd); "The Communists are winning the Cold War because most Americans neither understand nor know how to fight this kind of war" (Dr. Walter H. Judd).

In a sense, all these statements are true: the majority of the politically active Americans are ignorant of the nature of their real enemy. They do not know very much about the Russian messianists, who are the actual promoters of Communism and constitute the real power behind the so-called international Communist movement. Americans do not know or do not want to know that this "Communism" is a very brutal, but highly disguised colonial system of exploitation and genocide. They do not know very much about the terrible yoke under which scores of nations are pining — a yoke which is much worse than the known historical colonialism of Western nations.

On the other hand, one cannot help but doubt that the organizers of the Freedom Studies Center want to teach and to reveal to the American people **the whole truth** about Communism, about Russian imperialism, about all the nations enslaved within the Soviet Union, and about the national anti-colonial liberation struggle of these enslaved nations. Two reasons prompt this doubt. First, it is not at all mentioned in the pamphlet that Communism, in actual practice, has

a national power basis: in the USSR, Communism is the tool of Russian national power; in China, Communism is the tool of Chinese-Communist national power, etc. The Freedom Studies Center has fallen into the trap of its own educational gap by regarding Communism as an anational international movement. Furthermore, it carefully avoids mentioning the fact that under "Communism", scores of nations are colonially enslaved. The Russians have built and presently maintain the largest 20th century empire. To teach about Communism, without knowing anything about its imperialistic-colonialist foundations, means to teach inadequately, to maintain an educational gap. It is strange and at the same time frightening, that the Freedom Studies Center did not point out the necessity to teach about the liberation struggle of the peoples enslaved by this "Communism." Indeed, in the absence of such knowledge and in the absence of the necessity to support such a liberation struggle there is the greatest educational gap in the West. In short, the Freedom Studies Center fails to stress the necessity to teach the **three main** factors which constitute the problem of "Communism." The lack of knowledge of these three factors (Russian imperialism, enslaved nations, and liberation struggle) precisely constitutes the real educational gap.

Another reason which suggests that the newly established "freedom school" might not fulfil its purpose is the composition of the participating institutions. The organizers were right in basing the membership on a broad international scale. But it is difficult to account for the fact that they overlooked many important anti-Communist groups, especially those from countries within the Soviet Union. While inviting groups which do not oppose the coexistence policy and which do not strive to destroy Communism, they intentionally ignored the groups which belong to and support the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations. These groups fight to destroy imperialistic and Communist regimes and to establish independent national states for all the subjugated peoples. The Freedom Studies Center is evidently not interested in learning and teaching about the knowledge, experience and ideas of the ABN forces. This is an **a priori** exclusion of some vital truths concerning the problem of "Communism" and anti-Communist policies.

We will attempt to find out the reasons why the Freedom Studies Center was not willing to invite ABN to join its membership. One reason might be that ABN includes, among others, national independence movements, such as that of Turkestan, the Caucasian nations, Slovakia, Byelorussia, Croatia, Cossackia, that is to say, some of the nations which suffered most under "Communism." The truth about genocide policies against these peoples evidently does not interest the "Freedom Center."

Another reason is probably ABN's idea that national revolutions are the best means of destroying the Communist-Russian slave

empire. Evidently, the Freedom Studies Center does not like or does not wish to include this idea in its program. Persons composing the leadership of the Freedom Studies Center have the right to disagree with ABN ideas, but if there is to be a school claiming objective, all-round study of the problem of "Communism", it should study all aspects of this problem, and not merely those which fall into line with current US State Department policy.

Surely another reason for refusing to invite ABN is the fact that ABN proclaims that Russian imperialism is the chief enemy of mankind, and Communism is its tool. The Freedom Studies Center omits any mention of this fact. Hence, its program is one-sided and subjective, for the existence of Russian imperialism and colonialism is a fact.

The fourth reason is surely the clear identification of the idea of national independence, as the most powerful idea opposing "Communism", which however is not pointed out by the Freedom Studies Center. Acknowledgment of this idea requires acknowledgment of the necessity to dismember the Russian empire. It appears that the Freedom Studies Center is not yet ready to acknowledge, that the ultimate solution to the problem of "Communism" is the liquidation of the Russian empire.

There might be another reason why this Center is not willing to cooperate with ABN, namely, its unwillingness to join forces with ABN's leaders, especially the former Prime-Minister of the independent Ukrainian Government, Jaroslav Stetzko, as well as prominent Bulgarian, Slovakian, Byelorussian, Croatian, Turkestanian personalities, and many other persons, who never agree to any cooperation or coexistence with imperialists and Communists. On the other hand, it appears that the Center has admitted to its ranks propagators of coexistence with Communist regimes and tolerance of the Russian empire.

Summarizing, it is doubtful that the enslaved but freedom-loving nations can expect much from this Freedom Studies Center, although they expected that it would fill in the gap about "Communism." In the pamphlet of this Center it is clearly stated that its purpose is "to train Cold War leadership for all segments of society in the Free World", but not for all freedom-loving peoples, including those within the "Communist" domain. This Center appears not to be very much interested in the betterment of the chances of the enslaved peoples to liberate themselves from the yoke of "Communism." It is rather oriented in terms of the preservation of the division of the world into Free World and Communist world. It appears that the deficiencies of the educational gap will remain unchanged. It is hard to imagine how this Center can "develop and recommend programs for extending the sphere of freedom", as it professes, if it *a priori* excludes the ingredients required for successful advance of freedom.

Dr. Theodore MACKIW*
The University of Akron

WASHINGTON—PEKING—MOSCOW

The pages of the world's press are still reporting the possibilities of bringing about peace talks between Washington and Hanoi — attempts which up to now have not brought about the desired results. One attempt to bring about peace talks was made by the Italian minister of foreign affairs, but apparently he did not go about it as he should have and, as reported, the affair ended in Fanfani's resignation.

Nevertheless, the problem does not lie in whether or not the former mayor of Florence, Professor La Pira, repeated Ho Chi Minh's words truthfully or whether or not Fanfani conscientiously tried to bring the warring countries to some kind of understanding. The problem lies in the fact that Washington went to the wrong address in this affair; the U.S. should have gone to Peking, not Hanoi.

No matter how unbelievable it may seem, America is waging a war, not with North Vietnam or the Viet-Cong, but with Red China, the only difference being that America has not, as yet, bombed Chinese soil. However, Americans are dying daily in Vietnamese jungles, in addition to spending eighteen million dollars a day to wage war, while the Chinese, not having formally sent their own soldiers into Vietnam, are fighting in another manner: namely, by applying political pressure. As was revealed in an interview between La Pira and Ho Chi Minh it is no secret that as soon as Hanoi tries to use its own political initiative, Peking replies by increasing its pressure on Hanoi and Hanoi is forced to retreat.

The Vietnamese War is no ordinary war. This is evidence by the fact that up to this point, American diplomats have not yet succeeded in establishing contact with Hanoi so that peace talks may begin. In fact, this war is between two different ideologies and the outcome will determine the fate of Asia and possibly of the rest of the world. This fact was emphasized in December at the yearly conference of NATO when Defence Secretary MacNamara warned of the Chinese threat which is endangering Europe and called upon the European members of NATO to take an active part in the Vietnamese conflict.

On the other hand, on September 29, 1965 the Chinese defence minister stated that China is not only waiting for but hoping for an attack from America and that, furthermore, the Chinese nation is prepared for such an attack. This would mean a Third World War; in other words, the end of western civilization. The truth is, that although China cannot carry on an atomic war and cannot compare to American war technique, nevertheless, the masses of people in China, who now outnumber the total white population of the world, cannot be overlooked. In addition, it should be remembered, as MacNamara also stated at the aforementioned NATO conference, that in two years, China may have a reputable nuclear capability, including submarines, and that in ten years they will be able to launch intercontinental missiles and without doubt, endanger the entire world!

However, as long as China does not possess a nuclear capability as is the case for the time being, the key to the dilemma is found in Moscow. The world situation is very similar to the one in 1939. As Hitler then subscribed to the new world order, Mao now subscribes to the Marxist philosophy of world

*) Associate professor of Slavic Studies.

conquest. As in 1939, the key to war or peace lies now in the hands of the Kremlin, but with a major difference in 1966. In 1939, Stalin agreed to the Molotov-Ribentrop pact (August 23) and thus brought about the Second World War, calculating that as a third power he, Stalin, could, by the end of the war, gain Europe or even the world. Today, neither Brezhnev nor Kosygin can afford such a plan.

Let us recall, that in 1949, when Mao gained power in China, it seemed that a strong, unbreakable communist front was formed, posing a deadly threat to the free world. Fortunately, after the death of Stalin (1953), ideological and political differences between Peking and Moscow slowly came to light. The two friends became deadly enemies. It was thought that when Krushchev was ousted, the Soviet Union and Red China would reach an agreement, and in 1964 Chou En-lai, himself, came to Moscow to celebrate the anniversary of the October Revolution. Although both sides moved to reach agreement, nonetheless, they could not settle any of the primary issues. Chou En-lai demanded that Moscow recognize Peking as the centre of world communism and made it understood that China was awaiting the return of one-half million square kilometres of Siberian territory which Tsarist Russia had seized from China in 1689. Moscow could not accept the first demand, not to mention the second, and the gulf between Moscow and Peking widened further.

It is clear that, as the situation now stands, Moscow, the "brother" of China, would not help support Mao in a war with America and moreover, would not help China. This has already been exemplified in the Chinese-Indian conflict, during which Moscow clearly took sides with India, already supported by the U.S.

While the Soviet press does not condone American intervention in Vietnam, and although Moscow sends outdated armaments to Vietnam (for the shipment of which China demands dollars), it does not mean that Moscow wants war. The recent visit of Shelepin to Hanoi, as the press points out, does not necessarily mean that he went there to encourage Ho Chi Minh to escalate the war or to promise him assistance in the war. It is a likely possibility that, as Kosygin used his influence to restore peace between Pakistan and India in Tashkent (January 10, 1966), so too, Shelepin may have tried to persuade Ho Chi Minh to enter into talks with Washington.

However, only the future will tell, but at the present time, Red China's aggression must not be encouraged in Southeast Asia. Therefore, the United States cannot afford to retreat or give up South Vietnam without an honourable solution.

A.W.B. (USA)

PROBLEMS OF ACQUISITION OF MATERIALS ON UKRAINE IN THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

There are various problems which might be encountered and should be taken into consideration by librarians endeavouring to acquire Ukrainian materials. These problems apply to books, pamphlets, maps, manuscripts, and other library materials, that were a) written in Ukrainian or in other languages by Ukrainians and b) were published by Ukrainians. The scope of problems will be limited to materials in humanities and social sciences.

Libraries serving scholars and students who are interested in the areas enumerated below should be acquainted with acquisition problems of such works. These areas are: 1) Ukraine, 2) the whole subject complex of the Soviet Union, 3) aspects of Russian policies and activities in respect to Ukraine, 4) the territory between Turkey and Scandinavia, and between Germany and the Ural Mountains, and 5) the so-called Slavic area.

There are many reasons for the acquisition of Ukrainian materials: 1) Ukraine's colonial status was one of the causes of the downfall of the Russian tsarist empire, 2) The problem of Ukraine's conquest by Russia was one of the major reasons for the creation of the political structure known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. 3) "War Communism", NEP, the two big artificial famines of the 1920's and 1930's resulted from policy of the Soviet-Russian government towards Ukraine. 4) Russian-tsarist policy toward the Austro-Hungarian empire was thoroughly permeated by the conflict over domination of Ukraine. 5) Polish eastern history cannot be understood without a knowledge of the Ukrainian history. 6) One of the major reasons of the collapse of the Soviet-Russian front in 1941 was lack of willingness by millions of Ukrainians and other non-Russian soldiers in the Red Army to fight for the preservation of the Russian empire. 7) One of the major causes of German defeat in the east was the hostility of Ukraine and other peoples toward German desires to make out of them a German slave empire.

The material under consideration cannot be substituted by any other material for the following reasons: 1) There are relatively few translations of Ukrainian works into other languages. 2) Works by many writers are so voluminous that even in Ukrainian there are not yet sufficient bibliographical, analytical, and evaluative works about them. It will suffice to mention works of Ivan Franko (novelist), Lesia Ukraïka (poetess), Mykhailo Hrushevskiy (historian), Vadym Shcherbakivskiy (anthropologist), Volodymyr Sichynskiy (arts historian), Dmytro Dontsov (philosopher and editor), Viacheslav Lypynskiy (historian and political theoretician), and others. 3) There are very few studies by non-Ukrainians of those many important areas which are treated in Ukrainian writings, for example, Ukrainian historiography, Ukrainian periodical literature, Ukrainian political philosophers, Ukrainian nationalism, Ukrainian political movements, schools and education in Ukraine, Ukrainian anthropology and culture, church history and religious life in Ukraine, any aspect of Carpatho-Ukraine, Ukrainian-Polish relations, Ukrainian jurisprudence, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), Ukrainians in Russian (tsarist and Soviet) concentration camps, the famines in Ukraine during 1920's and 1930's, Ukrainian prose literature, Russian colonial discrimination in Ukraine, Russian prisons in Ukraine, history of Ukrainian armed forces. 4) Many important works were and are being published in periodicals, almanacs, calendars, and in series. Thus, if collections are not sufficiently comprehensive, these materials cannot be studied satisfactorily.

The problems of acquiring Ukrainian materials are the following:

1. Many books are rare, because they were published in small editions and are encountered in widely scattered places, whose existence is known only to a few well-informed specialists.

2. Nowhere in Ukraine today, in the legally existing libraries, will there be found even a substantial percentage of publications which are not Communist or are anti-Russian in content. Most such publications were systematically destroyed by the Russian occupation authorities. Their holdings by private persons in Ukraine is severely punishable by law. There is a strict censorship on publications of every kind which prohibits appearance of a most innocent national literature which does not comply with current Russian colonial policies. There are probably a few exemplars of each Ukrainian publication in special governmental libraries outside Ukraine (in Russia), access to which is permitted to trusted functionaries only. The present foreign-colonial regime in Ukraine will therefore hinder acquisition of materials which in its view are illegal and anti-governmental. In order to acquire these materials it is necessary to turn to Ukrainian libraries abroad or to foreign libraries. Ukrainian libraries abroad should be considered, therefore, not only as collections of writings of Ukrainian emigrés, but, more important, as depositories of all Ukrainian publications which are not kept in libraries in contemporary Ukraine.

3. A very substantial percentage of Ukrainian publications appeared and is constantly appearing outside Ukraine, particularly in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Austria, Canada, Italy, the United States, France, England, Rumania, Argentina, Hungary, and others. Emigré publications should be distinguished from publications of authors who were living in Ukraine but sent their works to be published abroad because various obstacles prohibited their publications at home.

4. Another problem is created by changes in statehood of various Ukrainian territories. For example, an author living in a part of Ukraine, say under Russian occupation, sent his work for publication to another area occupied by a different power, say Poland. Many works of scholars from Kyiv published their writings during the period between 1850 and the First World War in Lviv (then under Austria), or in Vienna, or even in Switzerland and France. The problem consists of bibliographic verification and where to find such works. An excellent instance is produced by current attempts of the Columbia University Libraries' Acquisition Department to order several volumes as replacements of a series published during the 1930's in Warsaw (Poland). When ordering the replacements it has not been considered that the present Polish Communist regime does not permit free public sale of Ukrainian books published before the Second World War. Besides, the institute which published the series does not exist any more. Exemplars of this series, can however be found abroad.

5. Bibliographies published in Ukraine under Soviet-Russian rule omit systematically to mention the majority of Ukrainian publications which were published abroad. This fact should not be interpreted that the exile publications are of poor quality. It happens because of political discrimination by editors of Soviet bibliographies. It is a proven fact that in some instances publications of exiles, who dispose of meagre resources, are more numerous and even more valuable than comparative works issued in contemporary Ukraine, whose "government" supposedly has at its disposal great resources of the whole state. Good proofs are the currently published Ukrainian encyclopedias, histories of Ukrainian churches, its armed forces, and arts, but also the quantity and quality of periodicals issued in exile and in Ukraine.

6. Because Ukraine during various historical periods was divided among foreign states, her boundaries were changing and therefore some publications are listed in bibliographies of different nations. For example, a book published before the First World War in Western Ukraine might be listed in a then Austrian bibliography, in the bibliography of the Ukrainian independent state of 1918-1920, in a Polish bibliography of the inter-war period, in a German bibliography of 1941-43, or in a bibliography of the Soviet Union of the post-World War II period.

7. In many instances imprint information was falsified in order to mislead occupation powers. For example, many publications of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Party (1900-1905) have publishing place somewhere in Ukraine under the then Russian tsarist occupation, but were actually printed somewhere in the Austro-Hungarian empire. Similarly, some Ukrainian publications which appeared during the period between the first and second World Wars with publishing place on Ukrainian territory under Polish rule were actually published outside the Polish state (in Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Italy, or Germany).

8. A very substantial percentage of Ukrainian publications during the 20th century was printed "illegally", in the underground, and thus the problem of acquiring such works is complicated, because they usually do not indicate publishing place and will not be listed in legal bibliographies of the time, but only in bibliographies published much later and most surely in bibliographies published abroad. This fact enhances the value of exile bibliographies.

9. Anonymous and pseudonymous works create another problem. There is a much higher percentage of such works among Ukrainian publications than

among Western, perhaps as high as 20 per cent. This phenomenon is explained by the colonial status of Ukraine. Occupation powers persecuted Ukrainian writers, tried to discourage them, intimidated them, imprisoned, exiled, or executed them. To acquire anonymous or pseudonymous works requires knowledge of authorship and/or good subject knowledge.

10. Among Ukrainians the periodical has traditionally a much more important role as medium of publishing than in the West, because conditions of enslavement in Ukraine made it very difficult to publish big voluminous books. So, many important treatises are contained in periodicals in the form of series of articles or chapters. In the West, periodical literature is considered usually supplementary to big book treatises. Therefore, more consideration should be given to acquire Ukrainian periodicals. Often more important materials are published in periodicals than in separate books.

11. A serious obstacle in acquiring good Ukrainian collections by foreign libraries is a lack of regular chairs or departments of Ukrainian studies at the big universities in the West, which would have systematic acquisitions on Ukrainian materials. Usually Ukrainian materials are treated as appendages to foreign works, when scholars and students are interested in obtaining such Ukrainian works, whose views correspond to theirs. If, for example, someone specializes in Russian affairs he might use such Ukrainian works, which directly touch the studied Russian problem, but rarely he will try to contrast the Russian view and situation with the Ukrainian view and treatment. If there were a special Ukrainian acquisition plan, its staff would obtain experience in solving the various problems, which cannot be done by accidental ordering.

12. Because of peculiar conditions, majority of Ukrainian works were and are published by various associations, institutions, or private persons, but not by professional publishing houses. Therefore, acquisition libraries should have in mind that often good literary or scholarly publications have the imprint of Ukrainian political groups, pedagogical-educational treatises and books on art are published by youth associations, while economic institutions may sometimes publish valuable books on culture, almanacs, and belle lettres. On the other hand, Ukrainian private publishers sometimes initiate publications of big scholarly and scientific treatises. In short, evaluation of books by their publishers should be different in respect to Ukrainian works than those appearing in Western nations. Very often, a well-known scholar may publish his works through the media of an institution, which has no direct relation whatsoever with his subject of work.

13. There is the problem of language. Among Ukrainian writers it happens more often than among Western writers that the original work is published in languages other than Ukrainian. Then, such work might or might not be translated into Ukrainian. Ukrainian bibliographies might list only the Ukrainian-language editions, or vice-versa, non-Ukrainian bibliographies might list only those Ukrainian works which appeared in their respective national languages. Thus we have the problem of completeness of bibliographies and the problem of originality. Often translations are edited to suit specific objectives of the translated edition.

14. Finally, more Ukrainian out-of-print publications are found in private collections than in public or institutional libraries. If necessity arises for a specific book, the best method to acquire it is to consult Ukrainian authorities in the field or various Ukrainian institutions which have their own libraries, rather than bookstores, publishers, non-Ukrainian libraries, or present-day libraries in Ukraine.

This outline of problems does not exhaust probably all of them which are connected with the acquisition of Ukrainian publications.

THE AMERICAN CHAMPION OF RUSSIA'S INDIVISIBILITY: GEORGE F. KENNAN

The Russian imperialists have seldom found such a stubborn champion of the indivisibility of the Russian prison of nations as the American professor and diplomat, George F. Kennan. We were of the opinion that Mr. Kennan had in the course of time learnt something from the experiences undergone in their struggle by the non-Russian peoples enslaved by Moscow. This opinion however was deceptive, for Kennan has remained the same: obstinate and seething with hatred towards all the non-Russian nations in the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is proved to us by his latest publication "On Dealing with the Communist World."

Mr. Kennan enlightens us as to how we have to behave towards the Russian Communists and even utters threats with respect to American politicians whom he finds unpleasant.

First of all Kennan believes that he can argue it out with those American politicians who had the law on the "Captive Nations Week" passed by the American Congress. Mr. Kennan believes that these politicians know nothing at all about these affairs and asks why do they interfere in affairs of which, he thinks, they have almost no idea at all. Still further, the fact that they want to see the traditional (sic!) Russian empire destroyed by the USA conjures up for him unheard of catastrophe for America. For the Russian imperium is ostensibly invincible. According to Kennan the nations quoted in the resolution on the Captive Nations have mostly never existed.

As for the Ukrainians, Kennan writes on page 24, *inter alia*, as follows:

"We have often been told that the Ukrainians demand without exception a full separation of Ukraine from the Russian state. Perhaps this is true! But who can know such a thing?"

Kennan goes on to quote that no test in the last 45 years has existed. Here Mr. Kennan is tremendously

wrong, for the countless victims of the best sons of Ukraine on the battlefields against the attackers of the young Ukrainian state, the State Acts of 22nd January, 1918 in Kyiv by which the Ukrainian State was called into existence, and of 1st November, 1918, in Lviv, when West Ukrainian Republic was set up as well as the Act of Unification of all Ukrainian lands into one indivisible Ukrainian State proclaimed on 22nd January, 1919, in Kyiv, represent an irreproachable plebiscite by the Ukrainian nation, showing that it wants to live independent life, in peace and freedom. Unfortunately the French leaders, and in part also the Americans, (in particular Colonel House, who used to give wrong advice to President Wilson), did not support the Ukrainians in their struggle for freedom (indeed even opposed it), as the former British Prime Minister and leader of the British delegation to the peace conference of Versailles, David Lloyd George, excellently expressed himself on this subject in his memoirs (*Memoirs of the Peace Conference*, New Haven, 1939). After the ending of the First World War, it was in reality not at all the spirit of resurrection of the enslaved peoples, but the law of the jungle which prevailed, a thing which caused extraordinary anger to President Woodrow Wilson. The unjust arrangements among the individual states which came into being after the First World War were able to claim for themselves merely about 20 years of existence.

Now Mr. Kennan wants to summon up further Russian wickedness in Eastern and Central Europe, but he will not succeed in this. For history teaches us that many seemingly invincible empires have fallen in the past centuries. Before this implacable march of world history the Russian colossus with feet of clay will not be able to preserve itself either.

W. Luzhansky

Ukrainian Chronicle

TERROR IN UKRAINE

Fresh reports are constantly received from Ukraine that, owing to growing Ukrainian national feeling and growing resistance, the occupation regime is so alarmed that it feels itself compelled to re-introduce terror.

In September 1965, some 50 intellectuals were arrested and charged with being Ukrainian nationalists and having contact with Ukrainian nationalist centres in the Free World. These young men were spending their holidays in the south of Ukraine. Unfortunately, they assumed that they were "in their own company", spoke openly about the exploitation of Ukraine by the Russians, about the intensification of the Russification process and similar matters. A traitor was among them, however, and their conversation was reported to the KGB. Such arrests take place in all parts of Ukraine; sometimes the arrested are charged with being involved in anti-Soviet activity and smuggling information abroad. Many are condemned and shot. Some young Ukrainian writers are also put under duress; this was the case with Svitylchyn and Dziuba, for instance. Only recently, more than a dozen writers, whose names are not yet known, were arrested.

In addition, there have been many trials involving former insurgents from the last war, more specifically, against people who have been charged with cooperation with the Germans. In Ivano-Frankivske (formerly Stanislav), on the 6th of November, 1965, Mykola Matsevych (Kozhushenko) from the district of Perehinsko was sentenced to death because, it was alleged, he had fought in the ranks of the UPA (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) against the Bolshevik-Russians. For alleged cooperation with the Germans in World War II, the following men were recently sentenced: Andreas Entze of Yasnopillia, Bere-

zivka district, was sentenced to be shot by a firing squad by a court in Odessa in March of this year; also in March, eight men were sentenced to be shot by a firing squad and three men were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment by a court in Mykolayiv (Nikolayev) on the Boh. On February 13, 1966, a court in Mineralni Vody in Stavropol province in the Caucasus sentenced five men to death: Matviy Hal, Yevhen Zavadsky, Kuzma Nahunenko, Yuriy Bozhko and Tymofiy Tarasov for alleged collaboration with Germans and participation in the liquidation of the Soviet Communist soldiers and young men. Petro Hrytsan was sentenced to 15 years imprisonment and confiscation of all possessions.

THE SOVIET PRESS ON OUN AND UPA

The Russian occupiers in Ukraine are well aware of the fact that the greater danger to their dictatorship in Ukraine is the inspiring force of the ideology and the political militancy of the OUN and the UPA, for they constitute the foundation of the newly-organised expression of the dissatisfaction and passive resistance of the people, which is being reshaped into an active anti-Russian power. The Russians know that the heaviest blow to their empire can come from this quarter. Hence a severe campaign against the Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and against the UPA is being carried out in the Soviet Press and in Soviet books.

In the January 1966 issue of the journal *Zhovten'* (October), there appeared an article entitled "The last error of Buy-Tur." Buy-Tur was the *nom-de-guerre* of Roman Shchepansky, a young teacher and well-known leading member of the OUN in the Lviv area and leader of a UPA unit, who was betrayed into the hands of

the Bolsheviks by the student Bohdan Stashynsky in the early 1950's. Later, under orders received from the KGB chief, A. Shelepin, B. Stashynsky murdered Stepan Bandera and Lev Rebet. In the above-mentioned article, Buy-Tur is characterised as a leader of bandits and Bandera followers are accused of brutal mass murders against the Ukrainian population; whereas, the truth of the matter is that Buy-Tur and the followers of Bandera are respected and admired as the defenders of the Ukrainian population against the Bolshevik KGB hangmen and murderers.

In the January 4, 1966 issue of *Literaturna Ukraina*, it was reported that a book by Oles' Lupiy entitled *Mylava* was published by *Molod'* Publishing House. The growth and spread of Ukrainian nationalism is depicted in this book. Among other things, it states that Ukrainian Nationalists maintain contact with "foreign centres" and that "These inhuman nationalists dream of a great Ukraine, but at the same time they think it nothing to murder and shoot large number of innocent Ukrainians." The OUN, the UPA and the Bandera followers are never described as anything but bandits and cruel enemies of the Ukrainian people.

RETURN TO STALINIST METHODS

At the 23rd Congress of the Communist Party in Moscow, it was formally declared that there would not be a return to Stalinism, but that Stalin's methods (which led to a one-man dictatorship and terror) are to be sanctioned. The former Stalinist titles were re-introduced into the nomenclature of the Party: Politbureau instead of Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Secretary-General instead of First Secretary. The Congress condemned every attempt to introduce and develop new ideas and expressions in literature and art as inadmissible. Brezhnev made it clear that artists and writers must follow the Party line: "The Soviet people cannot tolerate the shameful activity of those people who disparage the Party and the Soviet Union."

Brezhnev did not attack Peking in his speech, but spoke instead of the equal rights of all Communist Parties, and called for the preservation of unity in the Communist world. Only representatives of Communist parties from satellite countries — Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia and Poland — spoke out against Peking. The representative of the Vietcong was received with a storm of applause, and the delegates were informed that large groups of volunteers from the USSR were signing up for military service in Vietnam.

Minister of Defence, R. Malinovsky threatened to employ the most modern weapons against anyone and everyone who would dare to attack the USSR. Gromyko, on the other hand, took advantage of the de Gaulle-NATO conflict to demand that Europe be left to itself. He suggested that an international European Conference be convened to discuss disarmament and European cooperation.

Also in the press and television, the name of Stalin and his unsavoury co-workers are mentioned more and more frequently. In the February 16, 1966 issue of *Izvestia*, the brutal Stalinist hangman, Zhdanov, is extolled as a "faithful son of the fatherland." In actual fact Zhdanov always demanded complete Party and government control over literature and art. He was a bitter enemy of every free ideal; moreover, he had incarcerated and maltreated many outstanding people in GPU prisons and concentration camps, and caused the cruellest possible murders to be committed upon writers and intellectuals in concentration camps.

Khrushchov, to be sure, declared to the world that justice and "social equality" prevailed in the USSR and that concentration camps had been liquidated. In the meantime, however, new concentration camps have been erected. Highly-charged barbed wire encloses these concentration camps, in which hundreds of thousands of Soviet-regime opponents are languishing. Others, on the other hand, are declared mentally sick and imprisoned in mental institutions. The writer Tarsis who escaped to the West reported that he had spoken with many

young people who protested against being confined in mental institutions, for they were perfectly healthy, both physically and mentally. They had been told: "How can you be mentally healthy, when you are not happy to be able to live in the Soviet Union."

Notwithstanding intensive and widespread propaganda, the number of Christians is growing and the churches are being largely attended by older as well as young people. This was especially to be noted during the last Easter celebration.

EROSION CAUSED BY FALSE AGRICULTURAL TECHNIQUES

In the No. 10/1966 issue of *Literaturna Ukraina*, an article entitled "The Gardens of the Semiramis", was published. This article was written by Serhiy Skoryna, the director of the agricultural department of the Ukrainian Research Institute of Agriculture. Skoryna describes how the greatest treasure of Ukraine, its rich black soil, is being destroyed by the barbaric agricultural methods imposed on Ukraine by the Russian occupiers. This productive black soil constitutes more than 60% of the Ukrainian land-area. According to the estimation of experts, as a result of false agrotechniques, almost 5000 hectares of agricultural area, especially slopes and hills, are being washed into gullies every year; whereby erosion results. This rich black soil, which is due partially to the work of nature and partially to the expert cultivation techniques of the Ukrainian farmers, could be lost forever in a few years, if it is neglected or inexpertly cultivated. Primarily this results from the cutting down of the trees of the forests located on the mountainous slopes or from not using crop rotation. Owing to the above-mentioned reasons, the area of partial erosion is said to have spread over about 10 million hectares. To this must be added more than 350,000 hectares, which have been lost forever owing to complete erosion. Large areas of fertile black soil have also been flooded to create artificial lakes when hydro-power stations were built on the river Dnipro at Moscow's orders.

NO SOLUTION TO THE CONTRADICTION OF COLLECTIVISM

More than 30 years ago the Russian Communist Party imposed collectivism in the USSR. In the course of this imposition, the Ukrainians, who were resolutely and bitterly opposed to the collective system, lost more than 6 million victims. For more than 30 years the Communist Party has been racking its brains and making all kinds of experiments to make this system of agriculture work — but in vain and to no avail.

Cruel means were used to uproot the natural attachment and love of the farmer for his own farm and his fatherland. In place of this natural attachment and love, the Russians tried to set up a Socialist fatherland and to place the earth under a common, that is to say, all-Russian command. The endeavour was made to turn the free farmer, lovingly cultivating his own plot of earth, into a blindly obedient, will-less robot. Through an anti-social collectivism, the Russians thought to create, not a human society, but a human mass, or more specifically, a human horde. The agricultural robot was to become a state possession, a Party slave, and was to work for the Party and for the Communist state for a wage less than sufficient to keep body and soul together.

The results of all these experiments with human lives have been catastrophic. For instance, the grain harvest in the USA is three times that of the USSR, the turnip and sweet turnip harvest twice that of the USSR, the potato harvest two and a half times that of the USSR; and the productivity of cattle raising in the USSR is not at all comparable to that of the USA.

The Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Ukraine boasts that 420,000 Communists and 620,000 Komsomol members are employed in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Ukraine, "mostly in the most important production areas." To be sure — they direct, supervise, inspect and drive the actual workers in the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, of whom there are about 11 million in Ukraine.

And the harvests: In 1964, in the U.S.S.R. as a whole 68.2 million tons of grain were delivered to the state; 82.8 million tons remained for the needs of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The harvest figures for 1965 were not released, but, working with the harvest figures of the individual republics, experts calculated that the state received c. 53 million tons of grain and that c. 67 tons went to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. In some kolkhozes, after the distribution of small and insufficient quantities of grain to the kolkhoz farmers, there was not enough grain left over to be used as seeds, as a result of which they had to ask the state to sell them grain for seed purposes. In 1965, the kolkhozes requested 2 million tons of grain from the state for seeding.

At a plenum session, the Secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, Pavlov, stated that "in many kolkhozes the average age of the worker was over 50." He did not mention, however, that many kolkhoz and sovkhoz farmers, especially those of the young generation, fled from the farms, because they were opposed to collectivism. In many areas the number of kolkhoz farmhands was reduced by half.

In this crisis the Party is seeking a solution, but it never occurs to them to get rid of the collective system itself. Instead, they are convening a third Kokhoz Congress from all parts of the USSR, which "is to determine the concrete tasks of the kolkhozes in the building of Communism and help to organise a highly lucrative production system based on scientific methods." The Congress is to draft new regulations for kolkhozes, which are to be worked out by a government-appointed commission. This commission consists of 149 members, two-thirds of whom are leading Party members. According to the February 27, 1966 issue of *Pravda*, this commission, by working out new regulations, is to pave the way for the strengthening of the kolkhoz system, for this system constitutes "one of the greatest accomplishments of the Communist Party and the Soviet people." According to the new five-year-plan, agricultural production is to be increased 23% by 1970.

THE SLOGAN "FRIENDSHIP OF THE PEOPLES" IS TO SERVE AS A CAMOUFLAGE FOR THE RUSSIFICATION OF UKRAINE

As is evident from the press in the USSR, in addition to a centralisation in the agricultural field, the ruling clique in the Kremlin has also set itself the task of stepping-up the Russification and de-nationalisation of the subjugated peoples. Articles praising "the eternal and indestructible friendship of the peoples of the USSR", appear more and more frequently in the Soviet press.

In the January 27, 1966 issue of *Radyanska Ukraina*, for instance, F. Shevchenko, Doctor of History, published an article entitled "The Friendship of the Peoples of the USSR is Eternal and Indestructible." In this article Dr. Shevchenko sets forth the following thesis: "The mutual friendship between the two great peoples, the Russians and the Ukrainians, exists from time immemorial. These two peoples are related to one another by language, by their customs, as well as by their character and their history. Over the centuries the ties of friendship between these two peoples have grown stronger and more binding." Contrary to the actual facts, this author maintains that the most important Ukrainian poets and intellectual giants, such as Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko and Lesya Ukrainka, approved of Ukraine's absorption by the Russian empire and "in the name of progress called for unity and mutual action." In support of the contention that Ukrainians are for the preservation of the indivisible Russian empire, the author states: "The view of all progressive forces in Ukraine was expressed by the well-known publicist and scholar, M. Drahomanov, when he wrote that the Ukrainians could not separate themselves from the Russians, unless there was a world catastrophe." This is written at a time in which the remains of colonialism are being liquidated throughout the world. The USSR, to be sure, is taking an active part in this liquidation process. However, only outside of the USSR!

In this article, the USSR is described as "the voluntary union of peoples having equal rights in one state." This is lauded as "the triumph of Marxism-Leninism and as the most important accomplishment of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." It is stated, moreover, that in terms of industry, Ukraine had surpassed in a very short period a number of large capitalistic countries. There was no mention of the fact, however, that within the scope of the centralised economy imposed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Ukraine and the other Soviet Republics were denied the possibility of developing their own initiative and ingenuity to satisfy the specific needs of their own peoples. The non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union are forced to work and produce exclusively for the state and the ruling people, namely, the Russians.

Even as far as culture and science are concerned, Ukraine and the other non-Russian Republics are under Moscow's command, whose aim is to Russify these republics as soon as possible. A report on a scientific conference whose purpose was "To bind the socialist nations closer together and to strengthen the international character of the education of the workers in the present stage of Communism", was published in the January 25, 1966 issue of *Molod' Ukrainy*. In other words — to step up the Russification process.

CHANGES IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF UKRAINE

The names and positions of the members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, the so-called alternate members and the members of the auditing commission, all of whom were elected at the 23rd Party Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine, appeared in the Soviet newspapers of March, 1966. It is to be noted that the First Secretary of the Party, Shelest, carried out a thorough purge in the ranks of those closest to him, as well as among the candidates for membership of the Central Committee and members of the control commission. Of the 16

members of the presidium, only 5 old members remained: Shelest, Korotchenko, Kalchenko, Skyba and Klymenko. Of the 127 members of the Central Committee from 1961, nearly 50% were gone and 62 new members were added. Of the 75 old alternate members, 56 were gone. Among these "unreliables" are the former Minister for Foreign Affairs, Palamarchuk and Bilodid. Unexpectedly, Dmytro S. Bilokolos, who until now was practically unknown in political circles, was appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs; he was also elected a candidate for membership of the Central Committee. All the key positions in the Central Committee of the Party were taken over by the clique-members, who had long associations with the present Party bosses.

AGAINST WHOM IS THE FIGHTING CAPACITY BEING STRENGTHENED?

According to the Soviet Ukrainian news agency RATAU, two Party conferences of the army troops of Ukraine took place at the end of January, 1966: one in Kyiv at the Kyiv army headquarters and the other in Lviv at the Carpathians army headquarters. The purpose of these conferences was to develop the fighting capacity and to improve the ideological-political education of the military personnel. In Lviv there was an additional purpose: "In the critical evaluation of the results of the accomplished work, the delegates devoted their attention primarily to unsolved problems and to the removal of the deficiencies which are still to be found in Party political work." The main speech in Lviv was held by the Commandant of the Carpathian army headquarters, Colonel-General P. M. Lashchenko. The Minister for Defence of the USSR, Malinovsky, who came to Lviv specially to attend this conference, also held a speech.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE UKRAINIANS IN THE USSR, EXPLOITATION OF UKRAINE BY RUSSIA

It is well known that the USSR is a state in which all important matters

are determined by the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. According to *Sotsialisticheskii Vestnik*, the Great Russians constituted 62.7% of this Central Committee in 1959 and the non-Russians taken together constituted the remaining 37.3%. In other words, the great Russians hold the absolute majority in the Central Committee. It must also be kept in mind, moreover, that the above-mentioned non-Russian members of the Central Committee are elected by the Russian majority; which means that only those men who have totally adapted themselves to the Russians and are servile

to the Kremlin bosses are selected. Hence, at one and the same time, Russian predominance is secured in the USSR and the deception is created that the Party has an international make up.

The centralisation of all power in the hands of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union plays an especially important part in the discrimination of the Central Committee against Ukraine. This is best illustrated by the index figures which are based on the official Soviet publication, *Political Economy of the USSR*, from 1960 and 1963.

	Great Russians	Ukrainians	Ukrainians in % to Great Russians
Population according to the census of 1959, in thousands	114,114	37,253	32.6
Technical secondary school students in 1963/64, in thousands	1,909	463	24.2
University students in 1963/64, in thousands	1,987	476	24
Scientific workers, end of 1963, no. of persons	373,498	59,221	15.9
No. of books published in 1963 in the language of both peoples	58,158	3,325	5.6

With reference to this last figure, it must be pointed out that one third of the books published in Ukraine are translations from the Russian. All of this is planned, authorised and directed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Even the allotment of paper for printing purposes is determined by Moscow. Little paper is allotted to the Ukrainians and the number of copies of some books printed are strictly limited.

Ukraine also contributes far more to the common treasury of the USSR than it receives. After the fiscal expenses of Ukraine are covered — including the defence expenditures of the USSR for Ukraine and the support of the Union government — the sum of almost 6,000 million rubles remains in the hands of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. This sum is not reimbursed for the needs of the Ukrainian population. This is

about 36% of all revenues, which is produced by the agricultural labour of the Ukrainian people — a clear colonial percentage!

In conclusion, it must be pointed out that according to official USSR figures released on January 1, 1966, Ukraine produced (in million of tons) last year: pig iron — over 32, steel — 37, sheet metal — 30, iron-ore — 84, coal — 195, grain — 32 (of which 15 million tons was wheat), sugar — almost 7. Ukraine produces more pig iron, steel and rolled metal than the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain or France. It is no secret that iron and steel are the bases of wealth of a modern state.

Notwithstanding all this, the Ukrainian people are mercilessly exploited by the Russian Communist occupiers, must contribute their full energy to their oppressors, while they themselves scrape along without many essentials.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN THE USSR

Officially, the Soviet government declares that freedom of religious belief exists in the USSR; in actual fact, however, the government carries out a ruthless and barbaric fight against the churches, religion and religious people.

From Moscow, it was reported that shortly before Easter of 1966, the presidium of the Supreme Soviet published an edict on a new anti-religion action, according to which the following new methods of religious persecution were to be employed:

It is strictly prohibited to have rallies of any kind for church and religious purposes. The distribution of religious brochures, pictures, crosses and similar materials will be punished with long terms of imprisonment and internment in concentration camps. Any kind of religious procession or open church services are also prohibited, because, apparently, they are a "disturbance of the peace." Religious education for minors is also strictly prohibited. It is also prohibited to miss a day of work or school for religious reasons. Until now, "violation of the law concerning the separation of state and church", was punished with up to 6 months arrest, according to paragraph 142 of the criminal code. Now, however, violation of this law will be punished with up to 3 years forced labour in a concentration camp.

Interestingly enough, the Soviet Union signed the convention of the United Nations regarding discrimination in the field of education, in which it is stated: "The parents must be guaranteed the freedom to bring up their children according to their own religious and moral convictions." And in the Soviet newspaper, *Science and Religion*, no. 6/1966, p. 36, it is admitted that: "There are millions of religious people in our state." Their interests, however, are not safeguarded and protected by the state.

In the *Militant Atheist*, no. 1/62, p. 14, we read: "If we cannot succeed in re-educating the religious parents, then it is best to take their children away and put them in a boarding-school." In *Science and Religion*,

no. 4/1965, p. 16, we read: "In Stavropol, the students Androsova, Podhaskaya and Ivleva were excluded from the institute because they professed religious beliefs." In the *Agitator*, no. 16/1960, p. 58, it was reported: "In 1960, 500 orthodox churches were closed in Ukraine." To explain this action, it is shamefully maintained that "the workers demanded it."

In 1964, 70 anti-religious films were shown in various cinemas and 300 anti-religious books — more than 6 million copies — were published by national Soviet publishing houses.

RESISTANCE TO RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS AND GROWTH OF RELIGIOUS FAITH

A long letter by a Mrs. Kuchkin from Lithuania entitled "An almost incredible story", was printed in the *Komsomolskaya Pravda* of January 18, 1966. In her letter Mrs. Kuchkin tells about the sect, the *Pentecostals*, which has a wide-spread following in the USSR, especially in Lithuania and in the Smolensk, Kaluga, Leningrad, Riga and Bratsk areas, and includes among its members not only older people, but also middle-aged and young people.

The letter describes a court trial against members of this sect and reports the following incident: "When the verdict was read, one of the condemned young men declared in a loud voice, 'I give myself in God's hands! I thank you with my whole heart, Lord, that you have given me the grace and dignity to suffer for religious faith.'" Whereupon, as if upon a given signal, all those who had been condemned, fell on their knees and began to cry out, to moan and to pray.

They had been condemned for having engaged in an active fight against the regime and partially for having distributed leaflets summoning the people to rise up against the Communist dictators.

In her letter Mrs. Kuchkina quotes from one of the leaflets: "O sufferers, patriots of Christ's Army! You have no fatherland here on earth! You have nothing to defend here!... And

when you see the Lord's great army advancing from the West in a decisive battle against Satan's war-mongers, then take up your weapon to help smash the head of the Red dragon, which has been choking almost the whole of Europe for half a century."

Similar trials were held in various other cities of the USSR. A police informer who entered the sect to spy on it and who even succeeded in becoming a priest in the course of time, was called upon as a witness at the trial and betrayed everything. Subsequently, he was shot twice; the second time he was critically injured. The culprit voluntarily gave himself up to the police and declared: "I was the author of this act!" The job of a police informer or traitor has become dangerous in the USSR.

TARSIS CONFIRMS UPRISINGS AMONG THE UKRAINIANS AND OTHER SUBJUGATED PEOPLES

In his press releases the well-known Soviet writer, Valeriy Tarsis, who has defected to the West, confirmed the fact that there is active resistance on the part of the Ukrainians and other subjugated peoples. He wrote:

"It appears to me that the main evil today is the fact that the Western democracies overestimate the power of the Communists. The majority of the population in the Soviet Union hate Communism; a revolutionary consciousness is also growing, especially among the youth. We will never be able to forget that Hungary and Poland would already be free from the Communist yoke, if the great states of the West had not demonstrated an inexcusable indifference so often. Have not the revolutions in Indonesia and Ghana been instructive enough? When the developing peoples of Asia and Africa are capable of breaking the chains of tyranny, then we Europeans should certainly be able to mobilise all our forces to shake off the hated yoke.

"I know from personal experience that all the peoples of the Soviet Union — Ukrainians and Russians, Latvians and Lithuanians, Georgians and Azerbaijanians — hate, more and more, the Bolshevik villains who have assumed power in our unfortunate

country by the use of violence. I've also had the opportunity of speaking with Poles, Hungarians and Czechs — they are thinking solely of liberation. In the so-called socialist camp there are many underground organisations. There have been many uprisings and strikes in the Soviet Union during the past years. In Novocherkask, Tbilisi, Donbas and Odessa, these uprisings were especially strong. I am convinced that if all the insurgent forces would join together, the Communist culprits, on whose account the entire human species is threatened with annihilation, could be delivered a death blow.

"Every mature person, every people should fight for his natural, fundamental rights, and not to sell these rights for a bowl of soup of false Communist happiness."

LEAFLETS AGAINST THE REGIME

In its February 18, 1966 issue, *Pravda Vostoka*, the official newspaper of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, reports on the condemnation of a kolkhoz farmer by the name of Yuldash Melikov who was sentenced to three years imprisonment for distributing leaflets protesting against kolkhoz abuses and the arbitrary procedures of the Party leaders. Over a four year period, Melikov had sent these leaflets to district centres, the administrative centres in Karshi, Tashkent and Moscow and to various other addresses. In all, he had sent out 1500 leaflets during this time. By his initiative he brought about many revisions in the kolkhoz system and a restriction in the arbitrariness of the local kolkhoz bosses — all of which led to an improvement in the living conditions of the kolkhoz farmers.

There are many other cases of leaflet distribution in the USSR; leaflets having a political anti-regime content are also addressed to various authorities and editorial offices. The Soviet press seeks to conceal these cases, or writes about them only when they have become generally known. The author of the leaflets is then described as "a slanderer" but the people know the truth of the case well enough.

THE ROLE OF SUBSIDIARY FARMS IN UKRAINE

Approximately 5.7% of the total farmland, comprising the so-called private subsidiary farms, are privately cultivated by the farmers, workers and employees in Ukraine. Notwithstanding the fact that these are very small plots of land — about an acre in area on an average — and are cultivated manually without the aid of any machinery, they account for a substantial percentage of the total farm produce of the Ukrainian Republic. For instance, in 1940, 1950, 1960 and 1964, they accounted for: potatoes 74%, 76%, 65%, 61%; vegetables: 46%, 34%, 32%, 30%; fruit produce: 71%, 62%, 75%, 59%. In 1940, they produced 4.6 million tons of grain, and in 1964, 1.1 million tons (which is 4% of the total harvest). In 1941, 1957, 1961 and 1965, respectively 84%, 77%, 43% and 38% of the country's cows were privately owned; pigs: 63%, 42%, 33% and 28%; fowl: 79% in 1961 and 85.5% in 1965. The decline in production is accounted for by the fact that Krushchov forced a reduction in privately-owned farms as an act of retaliation. The present rulers are returning to the pre-Krushchovian private possession quota.

EXPENSIVE COAL INDUSTRY

On January 27, 1966, a conference of the Party scientists took place in the Donets Basin to discuss the improvement of coal extraction and the improvement of the quality of coal. In comparison to petroleum and gas, coal constitutes 72% of the total fuel balance of Ukraine. In the conference report it was pointed out that "more than half of the collieries in the Ukrainian Republic had not reduced the cost prices which had been called for in the plan, as a result of which state expenditure rose considerably."

THE UKRAINIANS IN POLAND

The Polish trade union newspaper *Głos Pracy* brought a report on those

areas in the West Carpathians, which had been inhabited for thousands of years by Ukrainians, but from which they had been expelled by the Polish authorities after World War II. The newspaper states that these areas have remained since almost desolate and unsettled until now. The Polish government is actively trying to induce Poles to settle in these areas, which contain 30,000 hectares of good soil. The Polish colonists are guaranteed great relief measures, for instance, relief from taxation, long-term loans, etc., but the Polish farmers are not interested and do not want to settle in these areas which are historically and lawfully Ukrainian, as a consequence of which they remain desolate.

Among other places the Ukrainians who have been expelled from these areas have been forced to resettle in the areas of East Prussia which are now attached to Poland. At present there are about 60,000 Ukrainians living in that part of East Prussia. The German newspaper *Das Ostpreussenblatt* of March 12, 1966 reported that the Ukrainians in East Prussia do not feel at home, and yearn for their native country, notwithstanding the fact that their existence in East Prussia is not at all bad. They want to return to their native land. Formerly the Polish government did not allow this, but now, allegedly, it does. Quite apart from this, the Ukrainians in East Prussia have a good reputation as industrious and thrifty people who hold together. The relationship between the Ukrainians and the Poles, while at first strained, is said to have improved now.

A SOVIET ECONOMIST ON THE STATE OF ECONOMY IN THE USSR

The Soviet economist and director of the Department of Economy of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in Novosibirsk, Prof. Aganbegian, sent a memorandum on the present state of economy in the USSR to the Soviet Prime Minister, Kosygin. In his memorandum, Prof. Aganbegian stated:

The rate of growth of the Soviet economy has declined by two thirds within the last 6 years in agriculture, by nine tenths (from 8% to 0.8%). In the heavy engineering industry, only half of the machines are operating — the other half are unusable, or are in repair. As a result of poor and negligent production, unusable and incompletely finished wares and products are piling up in the warehouses of the USSR, running into 3 billion rubles. No one wants to make use of or buy these products.

Unemployment is growing in the USSR and runs as high as 8% in the large cities and 25-30% in the middle-sized and smaller cities. The one-sided promotion of the armament industry has a negative effect on the USSR economy. The Soviet expenditures for armament are about the same as those of the USA, though it is to be noted that the economic potential of the US is double that of the USSR. 30 to 40 million workers are employed in the Soviet armament industry who could be better employed elsewhere.

Soviet export trade is also in a poor state, because the USSR exports primarily raw materials. Finished Soviet products find hardly any market because of their poor quality. In the agriculture sector, the state collects half of all revenues, 11,000 million rubles, in taxes and price machinations. The other half is not sufficient to cover the most pressing expenditures of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, as a consequence of which the situation becomes worse from year to year.

Most of all Agenbegian criticised the system of Soviet planning, which, among other deficiencies, is based on false, highly exaggerated index figures.

A PREMIUM FOR CALUMNIES

The most dangerous forces within Ukrainian society of which Russian imperialists are afraid are the revolutionary nationalism and the Christian religion. This fact can be again ascertained from a recent book of a Soviet propagandist, Dmytro Tsmokalenko, entitled *Tayemnytsi dalekykh berehiv* (*Secrets of Far-away Shores*),

published in Kyiv, 1966. It is a collection of articles, based on author's impressions from a tour of Canada.

The main purpose of this book consists of the intention to demoralize and to weaken the nationalist and religious attitudes of the Ukrainian emigrés and to urge them to recognize the "inevitability" of Ukraine's dependence upon Russia and the "hopelessness" of the Ukrainian national liberation struggle.

The author endeavours to achieve his purpose by dividing Ukrainians into "progressives" and nationalists. "Progressives" in his view are those who recognize the Russian domination over Ukraine and the Soviet-Communist regime. Nationalists are "traitors" of the Ukrainian people, who are in service of foreign imperialists. Among the most dangerous people to the Soviet government in Ukraine there are such persons, as Metropolitan Ilarion of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and Jaroslav Stetzko — President of the A.B.N. and a leader of the O.U.N. To denigrate them, Tsmokalenko throws all scruples to the winds, does not shrink away from using false statements, employing vulgar and slanderous expressions, typical, of course, of Russian Communist political phraseology.

It is characteristic, that although upon direct orders of Alexander Shelepin — one of the chief leaders of present-day Russian elite, the Head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists — Stepan Bandera — was assassinated and the end of the Ukrainian underground nationalist movement was proclaimed by Moscow many years ago, the attention given by Moscow to the activities of Ukrainian freedom-fighters is increasing constantly. This proves, that the Ukrainian national liberation movement, popularly named after Bandera, has new outstanding leaders, particularly in the person of Jaroslav Stetzko, President of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

The assassin of Stepan Bandera was rewarded with an Order of the Red Banner. Similarly, the hireling Dmytro Tsmokalenko received a Yaroslav Galan prize for his worthless "assassinating" exercises.

FREEDOM DAY BANQUET IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Washington, D.C. — The Ukrainian Freedom Day Committee and the Organizations of the Ukrainian Liberation Front sponsored a banquet observing the 25th Anniversary of June 30th Declaration of the Ukrainian Independence, June 30, 1966 at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

On June 30, 1941 in the City of Lviv, Ukraine, at 8.00 p.m. the Hon. Jaroslav Stetzko, newly appointed Prime Minister of the Ukrainian Provisional Government, proclaimed the restoration of the Ukrainian Republic to the people of Ukraine, an act which clashed with Nazi-German plans for Eastern Europe at that time. The Hitlerites brought another occupation for the people of Ukraine.

Now 25 years later the Ukrainian people celebrated with their friends the anniversary of a day they hold dear in their hearts. The banquet honouring this historic day and the spirit of freedom among the Ukrainians all over the world was opened with the American National Anthem. Invocation was given by the Rev. Theodore J. Danusiar of Holy Family Ukrainian Catholic Church, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Zenon R. Wynnytsky, master of ceremonies, welcomed more than 250 guests on the occasion of the Ukrainian Freedom Day. He gave a brief exposition of that Ukrainian Independence Day which was followed by a dreadful occupation of Ukraine by Nazi-Germans and later by the Red Russians. Dr. Walter D. Jacobs, professor of political science, Maryland University, and chairman of the AF-ABN in Washington, D.C., presented an excellent, academic review of the struggle of Ukrainian people for freedom while the Western powers watched it and eventually ignored their fight. Another after-dinner speech was delivered by His Excellency, Dr. Chow Shu-kai, Ambassador of the Republic of China. He emphasized the similarities between the fate of

his country and Ukraine. In the after speech comment the master of ceremonies called for an everlasting friendship between American and Chinese peoples, as well as between China and Ukraine in the near future, after the threat of the communist world domination is finally abolished. The Chinese ambassador stated that... "peace without freedom and justice is a fraud." His speech was warmly applauded.

The Ambassador of the Republic of Vietnam, His Excellency Dr. Vu Van Thai, who attended the banquet with his beautiful French-speaking wife told us in an unprecedented manner of all the sufferings of Vietnamese people dedicated to the cause of freedom and to the fight against the aggression of Moscow and Peking communists. He highly appreciated the efforts of Ukrainian-Americans to secure the victory of freedom loving people of South Vietnam in their military conflict with communist aggressor. The next speaker was a guest from Europe and distinguished leader of the Organization of the Ukrainian Liberation Front in Western Europe, Mr. Osyp Tiushka who spoke in Ukrainian.

The Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski, Member of U.S. Congress, was the principal speaker of the evening. He said that 25 years ago "Ukrainians naturally looked to the Western powers for support in their resistance against Russian and Nazi subjugation alike. Unfortunately, the Western allies did not understand the Ukrainian people's fight for liberation then. *It is our task — our responsibility — that they understand it now.*" He went on to say, "the great devotion to human freedom is not irrelevant to our times." Preceding that statement he gave an example of the June 26, 1954 massacre of 500 Ukrainian women in the Soviet concentration camp of Kingir who facing a death underneath the Red Army tanks sang the Ukrainian National Anthem, "The Ukraine is still not dead..." One could have seen unashamed tears on the

cheeks of women and men of the audience. He ended by saying "...the next opportunity which may come soon is one we must not miss."

Dr. Lew Dobriansky, National President of UCCA, delivered a splendid extemporaneous allocution. Dr. Nestor Procyk, National Chairman of the Ukrainian Freedom Day Committee, presented the concluding remarks and a resolution in support of President Johnson's Vietnam policy and an American global commitment against the communist wars of aggression, which was spontaneously adopted by the audience.

Other guests of honour receiving public recognition were the Hon. Michael A. Feighan of Ohio with his wife and son William, the Hon. Edward J. Derwinski of Illinois, Mr. K. H. Chang, first secretary of the Embassy of the Republic of Korea, Dr. Arnold Spekke, diplomatic representative of the Republic of Latvia in Washington, Dr. S. A. Baskis, representative of Lithuanian Legation in Washington, Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, Col. Philip J. Corso, and Mr. David Burger, representative of the National Press Club. All of them were cordially welcomed by Mr. Wolodymyr J. Majewsky, secretary of the United Committee of the Washington Organizations of the Ukrainian Liberation Front.

Messages were read from the Most Rev. Archbishop Ambrose Senyshyn, Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Ecclesiastic Province of Philadelphia; the Hon. Jaroslav Stetzko; the Hon. Everett Dirksen, U.S. Senator, and several other members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives including those from Hon. Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania and Hon. Edna F. Kelly of New York City.

The famous Ukrainian mezzo-soprano, Alicia Andreadis of the Great Theatre Colon in Buenos Aires, Argentina, performed then a few works of Ukrainian and Italian composers with piano accompaniment by Madame Maria Tsukanova. A benediction was said by the Rev. George Huley of the St. Andrews Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Washington, D.C. The program was ended with the

Ukrainian National Anthem. This event was covered by the "Washington Evening Star" of July 1, 1966.

MR. STETZKO'S MESSAGE TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE BANQUET

Munich, June 28, 1966

Mr. Chairman,
Your Excellencies,
Very Reverend Fathers,
Honourable Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Dear Friends and Co-Fighters,

The essence of June 30, 1941, the day of the proclamation of the re-establishment of Ukrainian independence in the darkest period of World War II, when the two strongest military powers, the Germany and Russia, clashed together — clashed, as a matter of fact, on Ukrainian soil, — the essence of the meaning of this day lies in the fact that the Ukrainian people, by proclaiming their will to independence, demonstrated the courage to take a war on two fronts upon themselves: a war for a new, just order in the world, founded upon national independence. The dissolution of the imperium and the re-establishment, or, to put it another way, the achievement, of national sovereign states for all peoples, is that which June 30, 1941, stands for.

This act of the Ukrainian nation, at a time when practically all the states of the European continent — Petain's France included — had capitulated before the overwhelming power of the Nazi-Germany, confirmed the uncompromising will of the Ukrainian nation to fight for a just world order, for national independence, personal freedom and human dignity, for God and country. This act took on world-wide importance, and has become the model of world development.

At that time our watchword was: A common front consisting of freedom-loving peoples together with the peoples subjugated by Nazi-Germany and Russia, against *both* tyrannies — and not an alliance with the Beelzebub Stalin against the Devil Hitler.

When I, as the Prime Minister of Ukraine at that time, rejected Hitler's government's ultimatum to dissolve the government and to annul the proclamation of the re-establishment of the Ukrainian state, and chose instead of capitulation imprisonment in a Nazi Concentration Camp, I gave expression, not only to my personal conviction, but to the will of my people.

Is not the West repeating the mistake of more than 25 years ago? Even today it aligns itself with one tyranny in the delusive hope of being able to put down the other. Today it is more than just a question of transitory, earthly values. It is a question of the victory of absolute truth, justice, freedom and human dignity. It is a question of the victory of the idea of national independence and a divine order: of the victory of Christ over the anti-Christ.

In this sense I extend my greetings to you, friends and co-fighters, as he who proclaimed the re-establishment of the Ukrainian state against tyranny of any kind and against godlessness. This is not solely the public property of Ukraine, but of all subjugated peoples and of all forces which affirm God, Nation and Man in the world.

Ex Oriente lux — but from the underground of the East, from the catacombs of the martyred churches, from the heroic peoples and their freedom-fighters, from suffering Christianity comes a stronger influence on the world than from triumphant Christianity.

For God and Country!
For the Freedom of Peoples and Man!

Yours Faithfully,

(*Yaroslav Stetzko*)
Former Prime Minister
of Ukraine

FREE UKRAINIAN VOICE IN INDIA

It is indisputable that through the services of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations the Ukrainian national liberation effort is slowly but steadily gaining new friends in the world.

One such recent achievement is the establishment of active cooperation with the Indian Chapter of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League under the leadership of Honourable Rama Swarup of New Delhi.

Mr. Swarup recognized that Russian imperialism is the enemy and threat to India. This imperialism has already enslaved many nations, including Ukraine, Caucasian peoples, Turkestanians, and many others. His enthusiasm for the liberation struggle of the enslaved peoples Mr. Swarup manifested by joining the ABN-Delegation at two recent Conferences of APACL and by accepting the position of Representative of ABN in India.

The Indian Chapter of APACL is an active group, publishing a periodical, various pamphlets, participating in international meetings, delivering lectures, etc.

In its January and February issues, "The Free News & Feature Service" (official weekly bulletin) Mr. Swarup published two articles on Ukraine. The first was about the Ukrainian Independence Day (January 22, 1918), stressing the fact that the Ukrainian Peoples' Republic was a sovereign and really national Ukrainian state, which later was invaded by Red Russian armies and made into a slave colony. Several quotations are produced of Lenin, Piatakov, Karl Radek, and Stalin, which reveal that the invasion was a Russian imperialistic war against Ukraine.

The second article is about a publication of the U.S. Senate on Soviet Russian terror activities directed against freedom-fighters and especially against Ukrainian nationalists. Upon orders of the Soviet Russian government there were brutally murdered Symon Petlura (President of Independent Ukraine),

Col. Evhen Konovalts and Stepan Bandera (both were successive Heads of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists), and planned to murder Hon. Jaroslav Stetzko (former Prime Minister of Ukraine).

The Indian Chapter of APACL informs about its plan to publish soon a whole series of articles on Ukraine and Russian colonialism. It would gladly establish contacts and cooperation with Ukrainian institutions in the free world. Various Ukrainian institutions are encouraged to use this wonderful opportunity to establish close friendship with prominent Indians and to contribute collections of literature on Ukraine to Indian scholarly centres.

The Liberation movement of the enslaved 45-million Ukrainian nation desires heartily to form common political front directed against Communism and Russian imperialism with all nations of Asia!

A. W. B.

RUSSIAN GENOCIDE AND SUBJUGATION OF UKRAINE PUBLICLY DENOUNCED IN CANADA

On the occasion of the debate in the Canadian parliament on so-called hate literature and agitation against people because of their race, nationality or religion, the Canadian Member of Parliament, Hon. John Yaremko, who is also Ontario Province Secretary and Citizenship Minister, held a speech in which he called to mind Moscow's artificial and intentionally caused famine in Ukraine in the Thirties, in which 7 million Ukrainians died of hunger. In 1941, hundreds of thousands of Latvians, Lithuanians and Estonians were cruelly deported to Siberia by the Russians. They have never returned.

In commemoration of the Ukrainian declaration of independence, the Canadian Senator Hon. Paul Yuzyk, held a speech in Ottawa in which he stated that Canada should seize the initiative on an international plane to renew Ukraine's declaration of independence of January 22, 1918. Senator Yuzyk went on to say that a

demand must be made upon Moscow before the UN, in which Moscow must acknowledge and respect the right to freedom and independence of the subjugated peoples, of Ukraine, as well.

WASHINGTON HONOURS THE MEMORY OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

On March 10, 1966, a festive ceremony took place at the memorial of the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko in Washington, at which the members of the US Congress, M. A. Feighan and B. O'Hara, together with ABN President, Y. Stetzko, placed a wreath of blue and yellow flowers at the foot of the memorial. The ceremony was opened by the Chairman of the Washington Branch of the Organisation for the Defence of Four Freedoms of Ukraine, W. Mayevsky, followed by a prayer by Prof. M. Voynar. Mr. Stetzko then held a speech in Ukrainian. Mr. M. A. Feighan, the present Chairman of the Immigration Commission of the US Congress, also made an inspiring address. In conclusion, the Member of Congress, B. O'Hara also spoke.

IVAN FRANKO QUINQUAGENARY CELEBRATIONS IN LONDON 1966

To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the death of Ivan Franko the second most important poet of Ukraine, a Reading in the English Language was given at 49, Linden Gardens, London, W.2., the Headquarters of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Limited, on Sunday, May 8th, at 4 p.m. The translations were by Vera Rich — well known in Ukrainian circles for her translation from Taras Shevchenko — and read by distinguished members of the Poetry World and the Stage.

With Volodymyr Bohdaniuk in the Chair, the large and appreciative audience, which soon had the 'house-full' notice up, so to speak, settled down to an afternoon of sheer enjoyment starting with the Chairman's address of welcome and explanation followed by Vera Rich's delightful

exposition of Franko himself, his place in the poetry of Ukraine and in the general European Literary scene.

In selecting the items of the programme Vera Rich had not so much arranged the poems in their chronological order as selected them to illustrate the poet's life and works and, at the same time, symbolise the progress of Ukrainian national renaissance. This was a felicitous arrangement since it made abundantly clear to even the most casual listener not only the life of the poet but the Ukrainian Cause as well. Thus the programme commenced with *The Spring Song* (*Vzhe sonechko znov po luhakh*) with its ironic contrasting of the abundance of spring with the poor life of the Ukrainian farmer, the joy of awakening nature with the 'bowling along' of the tax collector on his way from village to village to exort the crippling levies. This was sensitively and admirably interpreted by Miss Diana Ollsson, famous actress of Radio and Television.

From *Out of the exam room* (*Z ispytovoyi kimnaty*), we were given a glimpse of the corrupt foreign educational system in which Franko and indeed all West Ukrainian intelligentsia found themselves involved. Mr. Ted Hazleton, Poetry Society Gold Medallist and Examiner, made the most of this situation clearly interpreting every facet of the words.

The Idyll (*Idyliya*) symbolising the upward path of the new generation of Ukraine 'towards the golden sun', was read with feeling and deep understanding by Robert Armstrong, General Secretary and Treasurer of The Poetry Society, then followed a selection from *Prison Sonnets* (*Tyuremni sonety*), read excellently by John Nicholson, with Diana Ollsson giving us *The Legend of Pilate* (*Legenda pro Pylata*) to symbolise the final overthrow of injustice.

To follow, as a relief from this somewhat profound theme, a selection

of some of the most famous love lyrics from *Withered Leaves* (*Ziv'yale lystya*) was read by the gentleman readers, then came the prologue and the parable of the trees from the great narrative poem *Moses* (*Moysey*), the prologue read by John Nicholson and the parable by Diana Ollsson. The last item was the deeply moving Easter sequence from *The Lord's Jest*s (*Pans'ki Zharty*) read by Elizabeth Anne Harvey.

To sum up, both readers and audience found this poetry in translation an exciting new experience, an insight into the way of life of a friendly, kindly people, and something to think upon, if the conversations extant during the excellent tea provided by the Ukrainian Women's Association was anything to go by. More and more of these occasions from both the English and the Ukrainian side should be arranged so that poets and poetry lovers of both countries could meet and talk and listen to the poetic tradition of the other. After the hospitality of this evening one hopes that in the not too far distant future our own Poetry Society will be hosts to the Ukrainians when we shall once again be permitted to hear the works of the great writers of this most talented people and perhaps to hear passages from the works of our own Shakespeare, Tennyson, Byron, Moore, Hood, Shelley to name but a few which Franko and others have rendered into Ukrainian.

*

The second celebration in London in honour of this anniversary took the form of a concert at The St. Pancras Town Hall on Sunday September 25th at 4 p.m. After the initial address by Professor W. Shayan, there followed an afternoon of sheer delight when Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian alike could enjoy not only the undying poetry of Ivan Franko, but the music of his compatriot composers to accompany his words.

Sung by M. Skala-Starycky of the Brussels Opera and two charmingly attractive young singers, Ulyana Chaykivska and Odarka Andriyishyn, we heard that fine Prologue from *Moses (Moysey)* set to the music of O. Bobykevych, and *Flow With The Wind (Rozvivaysya z vitrom)*, *Your Eyes (Tvoyi ochi)*, *O Earth of Mine (Zemle moye)*, *Unfold Thy Leaves O Willow Tree (Rozvyvaysya, lozo, borzo)*, *When Thou Hearest In The Night (Yak pochuyesh vnoch)*, and *O my Song (Pisne moye)*. A duet between the two sopranos was charming, then the three singers, with the Boyan Mixed Choir, gave us the unforgettable, *O Ruler of Earth and Heavens (Vladyko neba i zemli)* from *Cossack Beyond the Danube*, truly appropriate for a people exiled from their homeland. The Choir also gave us *The Eternal Revolutionary*, their harmony a revelation for those making a first visit to a Ukrainian concert.

Oksana Hutsul, an engaging young reciter, gave us *Moses and the Children (Moysey i dity)*, and young Olya Andrusyshyn, The Easter Sunday sequence from *The Lord's Jest* (*Pans'ki zharty*), and Miss Rosamund

Greenwood, famous actress of English stage, screen and television, *The Idyll (Idyliya)*, beautifully rendered in the English translation of Vera Rich. The Conductor was M. Solomka, the accompanist Miss Grace Shearer. The stage was tastefully arranged by Professor R. Lisovsky.

It was an afternoon that might well be termed a festival of poetry and music with professional artistes giving of their best for the love of the cause in the way the Stage always has and always will so generously give. To those new to Ukrainian circles it was a revealing insight into the serious culture of a talented people known mostly for their folk-lore and exciting folk-dancing. Here we saw and heard something of their more serious moments and their more serious music, an afternoon I would like to see repeated over and over again and perhaps one day, a full-scale staging of one of their operas, for if *Cossack Beyond the Danube* is a typical example, such a staging would be an event for the opera-loving public of Covent Garden and Glyndebourne.

Elizabeth Anne Harvey

RESOLUTIONS

Adopted by the Ukrainian Youth Association, Assembled in Paris on May 28-29, 1966

The delegations of the Ukrainian Youth Association in exile, assembled in Paris during Pentecost in order to commemorate the President of the independent Ukrainian State, Symon Petlura, assassinated in Paris by an agent working for Moscow, on May 25, 1926, pay tribute to the memory of the illustrious statesman and to all the heroes fallen in battle for the freedom of Ukraine.

— On this occasion, the Ukrainian Youth sends its filial salutations to the Hierarchies of both Ukrainian Churches, Orthodox and Catholic. It greets its valiant people in Ukraine and in exile, and especially sends its warm greeting to the patriotic youth of Ukraine, worthy guardian of the Ukrainian language and the Ukrainian cultural treasure.

— Inclined before the tomb of Symon Petlura, the Ukrainian Youth, by its representatives, assures its people and the Ukrainian spiritual and political institutions that it will remain faithful to the message of liberty, fraternity and justice relayed to us by T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, E. Konovalets, Taras

Chuprynka-Shukhevych and by all the illustrious Ukrainian personalities who have dedicated their lives for their people.

— Examining the life and work of the youth in Ukraine, we state that it is deprived of all the most elementary conditions which would permit the full blooming of its creative powers and its natural rights. It does not enjoy the freedom of opinion, of creed and confession, of expression and free association. Evidence: the interdiction to publish the works of young authors like Vasyl Symonenko whose themes are not within the framework prescribed by socialistic realism; the imprisonment of the literary critics Ivan Svitlychny and Ivan Dziuba; the arrests of students accused of "antigovernmental nationalism" because they placed a wreath at the monument of T. Shevchenko (in Kiev), or because they expressed their desire to erect a monument to I. Franko (in Vorochta).

As a result of the above mentioned, we declare that:

— The puppet Government of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Ukraine does not represent the will of the Ukrainian people. It is only the instrument of Moscow, whose aim is the Russification of Ukraine and the other republics of the Soviet Union in order to subdue them to Russian imperialistic design.

— The Ukrainians are targets of constant and systematic national discrimination. To be Russian and to love the Russian people, is, according to the general line of the regime, a natural and positive sentiment. To be Ukrainian and to openly manifest Ukrainian patriotism, is branded as "bourgeois nationalism", and condemned to total destruction. As a result, there occur massive arrests, deportations to Siberia and crimes of genocide.

In view of these facts, the Ukrainian Youth assembled in Paris:

— vigorously protests against the international murders, perpetrated in the name of the Bolshevik regime, of eminent Ukrainians such as Symon Petlura (1926), Eugene Konovalets (1938), T. Chuprynka-Shukhevych (1950), Lev Rebet (1957), Stepan Bandera (1959) and so many others;

— demands the intervention of the International Court of Justice in order to condemn the guilty;

— condemns the regime in Soviet Ukraine for its subservience to Moscow, considers it responsible for the Russification of Ukraine, for the interdiction of non-communist literary works, for the arrests and secret trials of young Ukrainian intellectuals and their practical elimination, such as I. Svitlychny and I. Dziuba;

— accuses the regime of locking up into psychiatric institutions those who are hostile to it and of persecuting all the persons who respect and honour the national poets and defenders of Ukraine's freedom;

— appeals to the public opinion of the free world and particularly to its youth in order that they show their solidarity with the exiled Ukrainians for the reestablishment of the fundamental freedom in Ukraine;

— declares that the cultural exchanges between the peoples must promote a better international understanding. However, they must be carried out in a universal manner and on the basis of sincere and loyal reciprocity, in accord with Human Rights;

— demands the intervention of UNESCO in order that this Organization institutes proceedings for the liberation of imprisoned or deported Ukrainian writers and critics;

— deems necessary a permanent action in the sense of a united Europe into which would enter Ukraine, and this, on the basis of the principles of liberty of the persons and the nation, of equality before the law, of spirit of collaboration and of respect toward the national cultures of each country;

— demands free elections in Ukraine in order to restore democratic order, conforming to the universal principles of the right of people to govern themselves.

A book packed with hard facts and revealing unpleasant secrets hidden behind the façade of the USSR

R U S S I A N O P P R E S S I O N I N U K R A I N E

Reports and Documents.

This voluminous book of 576 pages + 24 pages full of illustrations contains articles, reports and eye-witness accounts drawing aside the curtain on the horrible misdeeds of the Bolshevik Russian oppressors of the Ukrainian Nation.

*Published by Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,
200, Liverpool Road,
London, N.1.*

Price: 36/- net (in USA and Canada \$8.00)

MURDER INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Murder and Kidnaping as Instrument of Soviet Policy.

Hearing before the Subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act and other internal security laws of the

**Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate,
Eighty-Ninth Congress, First Session,
March 26, 1965.**

**Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary
U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington 1965.
176 pages, price 50 cts (3s 6d in U.K.)**

Contains hearings of testimonies by former Soviet secret service agents, Petr S. Deriabin and Bohdan Stashynsky, the murderer of Stepan Bandera and Lev Rebet.

**Order from *The Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,
200 Liverpool Road,
London, N.1.***

***Printed in Great Britain by Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,
200 Liverpool Road, London, N.1.***