



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 4—5

LONDON, APRIL — MAY 1953

Price 1 sh

NEW NAME, OLD CONTENTS

A New Change in A.C.L.P.R. which does not solve the Problem

The "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" (A.C.L.P.R.) in New York changed recently its name into "American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, Inc." (A.C.L.B.). This was announced by a special Press release of March 25th, 53, sent to all interested circles. This is the third change of the name of this organization. At its inception in February 1951 it was called: "American Committee for Freedom for the Peoples of the U.S.S.R."

These frequent changes of the name of this institution reflect pretty accurately the inward American difficulties at the programmatical solution of the so-called "Russian problem". In this respect the American policy hovers unhappily till this very day between the anvil and the hammer: the rightful demands of the non-Russian nations for liberty and freedom inclusively the right for the secession from the Russian empire, and the lordly claims and pretensions of the Great Russian nationalists and chauvinists in various "democratic" disguises who are trying, after the expected downfall of the bolshevism, to secure with the help and concurrence of the Americans the unity and indivisibility of the Russian empire.

The first change of the "American Committee" was enacted by the Americans under the pressure of the Russian right-wing chauvinistic elements who could not stomach the name and even the indication of the possible future union of the nations or the republics in these realms of the globe. They wished the reestablishment of the "traditional, historical, age-honored" name of *Russia*, as to indicate by the name itself that the coming, past-bolshevist State would have to be one and undivided empire and undoubtedly the property of the "Big Brother"—the Russians, or better to say, the Muscovites. And the *Russian imperialists*

Continued on Page 16

PROBLEMS OF UKRAINIAN FOREIGN POLICY

It is certainly no simple matter in this place to present the Ukrainian problems of foreign policy in their entirety or even to make a prognosis over their future possibilities. An attempt that would lead to clearly defined and also detailed formalisation would be, from the very beginning, doomed to failure. This state of affairs is conditioned by the present general political situation in the first place and the status quo in the Ukrainian S.S.R. in the second. The Ukrainian political emigration is moreover confronted, in their position of representatives of Ukrainian political interests in the West, by a strong Russophile current in the Western camp, and must therefore build up their positions in the sphere of external politics from a quite different starting point. From this, the single traits of the Ukrainian foreign policy are more comprehensible.

The Principles

If one proceeds from the preliminary condition that, firstly, the foreign policy arises out of the workings of the internal policy, secondly, only an active and concentrated internal policy forms a genuine basis of power for a foreign policy promising of success, and thirdly, the latter has its specific forms, one can say that the majority in the Ukrainian political emigration are convinced of the necessity of a positive, but strong, foreign policy.

There are in fact two tendencies in Ukrainian policy: one counts on the possibility of war between the West and the U.S.S.R. which will bring about the liberation of Ukraine. That is the *interventionist conception*. The other depends primarily on the own strength of the Ukrainian nation and intends to bring about Ukrainian independence in a *revolutionary way*. The overwhelming majority of Ukrainians incline to the second idea. It deserves to be mentioned that both tendencies are differentiated only on the plane of the tactics and strategy of the Ukrainian liberation struggle.

Both tendencies, as well as all the Ukrainian politicians, are one in principle. This principle is: *the political independence, sovereignty and unity of Ukraine*.

The second principle which is generally recognised by all Ukrainian political groups is the opinion of the *necessity of dissolving the Soviet empire and realising the political independence of all peoples of the present Soviet Union*.

The third, and just as important, principle which is likewise shared by all the Ukrainian political groups, is the integrity of *Ukrainian national interests*. Apart from the way in which this or that Ukrainian political group, party or organization formulates its programme they all recognize the *Ukrainian national interests* as the highest, most valuable, and most worth striving for goal. This Ukrainian, national interest does not demand that the Ukrainians should not live in peace with our neighbour nations, or even closely co-operate with them. It may be said that the Ukrainian nation enjoys great fellow-feeling for various neighbours (e. g. Byelorussians, Slovaks, etc.). The neighbours of the Russians, however, can in no way be described as their friends.

It must, however, be quite unequivocally stated that, in all the political dealings of all Ukrainians, the Ukrainian national interest will take priority, whereby Ukraine's relations with her neighbour nations will remain a positive one. Out of that national interest also arises the present trends of Ukrainian policy.

The Trends

One of the most important aspects of the Ukrainian foreign policy is the co-ordination and strengthening of the anti-bolshevist campaign among the subjugated nations. The attempt of American circles to solve this problem by themselves has not yet been crowned with success.

Continued on Page 16

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

THE DEATH OF STALIN

or

'WINNING THE RUSSIANS OVER'

BY DNISTROVIUS

Two American Experiences

The American strategy of the anti-bolshevik psychological warfare maintains to have appropriated two basic experiences, both deriving from the history of the II World War. Both may prove to be decisive for the whole future of America's foreign policy.

The first experience won by America's own mistake stems from the allegedly wrong and unjust identification of the German population with the Hitlerite regime. This identification, as later events inferentially proved, had devastating consequences. It led to America initiating the demand for Germany's unconditional surrender. This unnecessarily prolonged the war, as the Germans, seeing no chance for a honourable truce and peace, fought desperately to the last cartridge. This deprived American policy of a chance to drive a dividing wedge between the Nazi rule and the non-Hitlerite mass of the population. Germany was deprived of her lawful government. Hence the four-partite occupation of the country became unavoidable. This allowed Russia to become firmly entrenched in the midst of Europe—with further detrimental consequences which soon enough became only too obvious.

The second experience was not by America's but by Germany's even more devastating experience. Hitler allegedly lost his war against bolshevik Russia because he advanced and behaved like a *conqueror*, not like *liberator*. Beside his racism, debasement of human dignity, extermination of millions and severe economic exploitation, Hitler allegedly entered upon the course of the dissolution of Russian empire. Especially this last design should have been, the contention goes, one of the main reasons of the popular hatred and the resistance that soon arouse against the Germans throughout the whole Russia. Soon strong armed partisan movements were developed which at last submerged vast regions in the rears of the German armies. These movements proved to be decisive for the ultimate outcome of the war.

"We would make it quite differently"

If America was forced by Moscow to a large decisive armed struggle, taught by the above experiences, the further contention goes, the U.S.A. would know to avoid the both described main mistakes. The present American psychological "know-hows" are eager to stress that in handling the Russians, first, they would refuse to identify the bolshevik regime with the Russian people, and second, if

they were forced, to make war and to advance, the Americans would come to Russia as *liberators* and never as *conquerors*. All this boils down the slogan: "to crush the bolshevik regime, to win the people over!" The best way to crush the Soviet regime is seen in separating the ruled masses from the ruling communist party.

All this sounds very fine. It is not the task of this article to analyse how far the present American opinion is justified that the identification of Hitler's regime with the German people was wrong. Still the truth remains that as long as Hitler won his wars, the crushing mass of Germans supported Hitler with delirious enthusiasm. But let us take for granted that in the case of the Germans this identification of the nation with the regime was wrong. Does this constitute the cogent proof that the identification of bolshevik regime with the Russians, or better to say with the Muscovites, would be wrong, too?

Living already now under the American psychological suggestion that "the Russian people are right, the regime is wrong" the average American imagines the Russians as a silent, reticent, evasive crowd all continuously scared, with sullen eyes and dreary faces, circling the next cop if possible in half a mile distance. The idea is that the regime is deeply hated, only the people dare not to express this openly. The further idea is that everything that happens in the U.S.S.R. happens only under the constraint, the direction, the impulse from above, that this is a community of slaves and robots, hence—the American liberation of the Russians from their tyrant rulers would be accepted with open arms.

An unexpected spectacle

But the death of Joseph Stalin must have revealed to the Americans a new shocking experience. They had to learn that the reaction of the Muscovite at the news of the death of the tyrant was by far not that of an overwhelming joy and exuberance as it ought to have been. Quite the contrary. But let us have the testimony of an eyewitness. We learn from a special correspondence to the *New York Times* of March 8th, 1953 under the title "*Crowds 8 abreast pass Stalin's bier*" the following:

"Procession surpassing the throng that honored Lenin in 1924 streams by, day and night.

"Hour after endless hour, Moscow's mourning millions march past the bier to the man they revered as their great leader Stalin.

"Soldiers, ordinary citizens, mothers with their children, generals and diplomats have been passing since 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon through the Hall of Columns in the heart of Moscow.

"In the memory of the living Russians there has been nothing before like this spectacle. . .

"The crowds converge on the Hall of Columns from all points of the compass. . . and from all the streets that lead into the center of the city. . . The converging lines are led into the hall in a procession eight abreast to file through the solemn chamber where Stalin lies in state. . .

"The deeper one penetrates into the place of mourning the stronger becomes the ceremonial atmosphere of grief. . . the air is laden with the perfume of thousands of mass blooms banked together with red purple and orange flowers of paper, wax and silk.

"Enormous flood lights have been placed to illuminate the shuffling throng. . . On a stage to the left a symphony orchestra plays funeral music.

"Stalin lies with his face quiet and peaceful, surrounded by banks of flowers. On the breast of his generalissimo's uniform gleam multicoloured ribbons and many orders and medals.

"Stalin's hands lie before him, and about his figure there is an air of peace and repose.

"The mourning columns pass from the room where Stalin lies and go out to the back of the building into the open air again."

They reasons to be agrieved

So they marched past Stalin's bier day and night, through interminable hours, nearly 4 million of them. This, at least, is the estimate of Moscow's foreign pressmen. They report that many people, and not only women cried openly and quite infelicitly. The Russian grief, sorrow and affliction seemed to be quite spontaneous and genuine. It can hardly be assumed that they all marched past Stalin's bier being driven by the terror and the anguish before the retaliation of M.G.B. if somebody dared not to come. They marched voluntarily, and they would have marched some another 60 hours—if they were allowed.

These Russians, the Muscovites, the inhabitants of the Russian metropolis had all reasons to be grieved and openly to cry. Before Stalin no other tsar nor tyrant has ever procured for the Russians proper, the master nation of the Soviet empire, so many new territories, conquered so many new peoples, brought in so much booty, gained so great an influence and world-wide fame—and nobody was so terribly feared as he was, he simply satisfied all natural, all deepest wishes of

this nation, except maybe the personal liberty—the latter never being too highly rated in the history of Muscovy.

The beloved Tyrant

Strange as it may seem to Americans, Stalin was a tyrant, but although superstitiously feared one, still a loved, respected, even highly venerated tyrant. This picture of the mourning Moscow's millions never ought to be forgotten in the U.S.A. Facing this fact, it is hard to find out how American psychological "know-hows" will "alienate" this people from its regime? How will they not identify the one with the other? At this mourning, sorrowful hour all of the Muscovites identified themselves with Stalin and his regime only too openly and too evidently. There can hardly be seen even a small split anywhere between the one and the other, where an American psychological weapon could be driven. Stalin carried out his terrible, world endangering policy not alone, but with the help, the knowing support and the ready concurrence of all this mourning Muscovite people. He, who cannot see and understand this open political language of the Russians is politically blindfolded.

It is their national constitution

The possibility of psychologically splitting up the Russo-bolshevik regime lies never between the tyrannical Russian regime and the Russian nation, as perhaps it may have lain between the regime of Nazis and the masses of Germans. The Russians are different. The bolshevik regime is the genuine, natural, national regime of Russians. The only real psychological split which need not be produced because it exists already, but which could and should be developed, exists only between the master nation of the Russians, and non-Russian nations subjugated and enslaved by Moscow. Who counts upon a possibility of winning over real Russians in their expected but never proved opposition to their own regime, and who by such a policy jettisons from his bandwagon the non-Russian nations, makes a wrong policy. The Russians never can be won over, except in case of the promised further aggrandizement of their empire.

Germans promoted no Dismemberment of the Russian Empire

One of the most brazen lies of the Russian political propaganda lies in the contention that during the World War II the Germans allegedly pursued the policy of the dismemberment of Russian empire. *This was never the case.* On the contrary. Advancing into the U.S.S.R., the Germans unwittingly quenched from the very beginnings all hopes of the non-Russian nations for their political and social liberation. Neither the Balts, nor the Belorussians, nor the Poles, nor the Ukrainians, nor the Caucasus peoples were ever

allowed to restore under the German protection their independent national states. All these nations had been transformed in various sorts of German "Kommisariats". The Germans needed no liberated, free countries. All what they needed were colonies, *the whole* of the U.S.S.R. was seen as only one large colony, at best separated in its interior only by the administrative boundaries of the "Kommisariats". Russia as a colony was to be kept whole and undivided. Later on, as the Germans tried to secure the co-operation of the so-called "local population" and embarked upon the attempts of winning over the collaborators, their choice fell upon the Muscovite General *Andrey Vlassov*, a staunch Great-Russian chauvinist, who agreed to co-operate with the Germans only under the express condition that the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. never would be freed and that Russia would never be divided. The Germans acquiesced. Practically, all credit and support was given in the further course of events to the unitarian Vlassov movement. On the other hand the true leaders of the non-Russian nations were kept immobilised in the German concentration camps.

The course of history would have been different

And now, in the face of all these absolutely indisputable facts come the Russian propagandists maintaining that one of the reasons of the anti-German wrath of the "entire Soviet populace" were the German attempts to "dismember Russia". Quite the contrary, the Ukrainian independentists now maintain that, had Germany honestly and faithfully embarked upon the course of the liberation of the non-Russian nations from under the iron heel of Moscow, the Germans would have won the support of 100 million people. In that case the course of the World War II in all probability would have taken a thoroughly different direction. But the Germans "knew it better": they counted upon the unitarian General Vlassov who, by the way, betrayed the Germans at the first occasion, and they jettisoned the non-Russian "nationalists". The balance was: they never won over the Russians, but they lost the "nationalists".

American standpoint at Stalin's death

Strange as it is the truth still remains that the American public opinion swallowed the Russian lie about the German "dismemberment of Russia" without the criticism and resistance worth mentioning. The average American is really convinced that "Hitler tried to dismember Russia" and "because of that suffered a crushing defeat". In further consequence, should there come an involuntary war with bolshevism, the American policy would arrange all this "in a quite different way", i. e. "it never would try

to dismember Russia, it never would try to provoke by this the wrath of the whole Russian nation".

Only upon such a psychological background can be understood one of the most strange pronouncements ever voiced in the U.S.A.. By this is meant the declaration of *President Eisenhower* issued immediately after the death of Stalin. Here it is!

"At this moment in history when multitudes of Russians are anxiously concerned because of the illness of the Soviet ruler the thoughts of America go out to all the people of U.S.S.R.—the men and women, the boys and girls,—in the villages, cities, farms and factories of their homeland.

"They are the children of the same God who is the father of all peoples everywhere. And like all peoples, Russia's millions share our longing for a friendly and peaceful world.

"Regardless of the identity of government personalities the prayer of us Americans continues to be that the Almighty will watch over the people of that vast country and bring them, in their wisdom, opportunity to live their lives in a world where all men, women and children dwell in peace and comradeship."

Leaving to Russian Masters their Empire

In this official American document there exist no *many peoples* of the Soviet Union but only "all the *people* of the U.S.S.R.", just one people, there exist no *many nations* but just only "the multitudes of Russians", consequently all are "Russians" and nothing save "Russians", the multitudes living in this vast "one country" are just "Russia's millions", "the identity of government personalities" is not so much important as the one Russian people itself, these are only the Russians who count.

The political logic of the careful wording of this presidential pronouncement is only too obvious. Not in vain, nor even the slightest hint is made of the existence of non-Russian peoples in "that vast country", one country. The obvious aim is to reassure the Russians that America does not intend in that critical hour to question the entity and the unity of their empire. All the peoples once pressed some way or other into this empire are simply moulded and melted into one mass of "Russians"—whether they like it or not. The declaration of President Eisenhower just simply recognizes and in positive terms accepts this status of Russian domination. This is a political pronouncement of very far reaching importance.

A Bad Balance in Making

Of course, it is very reassuring for the Russians as the master nation of the empire. But it is far less reassuring for the

A MISSION TO MOSCOW:

CHARLES E. BOHLEN

OR

THE CAREER OF AN AMERICAN IMPERIALIST

One more Act of Appeasement

The free Ukrainian public opinion in exile pursued with attention and ever growing concern the fights and debates in the Congress of the U.S.A. regarding the appointment and the confirmation of Mr. Charles E. Bohlen to the highly responsible post of the U.S.A. ambassador in Moscow. The free Ukrainians could not help to regard this unfortunate appointment as one American step more, this time one of eminently Republican brand, on the long and bitter road of the consequent American *appeasement* of Moscow.

The Ukrainian public opinion was the more startled and depressed, as the confirmation of Mr. Bohlen followed immediately after the Presidential resolution proposing the repudiation of the enslavement deals of Yalta and Potsdam, had been killed and buried in one of the many Congressional subcommittees. In both these tightly interlocked moves the free Ukrainians believed to be justified to see not only the unexpected abrupt cancellation of the once planned Republican *policy of liberation*, but also a clear *return to the policy of appeasement* as symbolized by the names of Yalta and Potsdam.

Co-Responsible for Yalta

The degree of Mr. Bohlen's personal responsibility for Yalta is of small account. What matters is that along with

A Bad Balance in Making

(Continued from Page 3)

non-Russians. The Americans intended "to make it all in a quite different way". Still they repeat the old mistakes. They are trying to separate the Russian ruled from their bolshevik rulers—where no such separation is possible. And leaving to the Russian master nation her empire, they are trying in vain to win the Russians over. They cannot be won over, exactly as the General Vlassov could not have been. Even by America's "different approach" the final results would be exactly what they were in the case of the Germans: they never won over the Russians, but they lost the "nationalists". Yet only the non-Russians of the U.S.S.R. could be the real and reliable allies of the U.S.A.

The old Romans maintained that "historia vitae magistra est", history is the teacher of life. But they added: "that teacher gets always unserviceable pupils". There are reasons to be afraid that the truth of the above maxim would be once more corroborated in the case of Americans.

the names of Messrs. *Edward E. Stettinius*, *Harry E. Hopkins*, *W. Averall Harriman* and all the others, Mr. Bohlen's name, too, became history—and a programme.

Much fuss had been made about the question whether Mr. Bohlen is a 'career' or a 'political' diplomat. The underlying idea of this "distinction" is that being a professional diplomat, Mr. Bohlen is not expected to possess his own opinions but instead is expected to do and to represent what he is told by his superiors. Consequently, Mr. Bohlen will represent the Republican line of thinking with the same vigour and adroitness as previously he represented the Democratic policy conception.

This line of reasoning is not convincing. Mr. Bohlen is not simply a mechanical transmitter. He started his diplomatic career in early thirties with the Democratic ascension to power. During the 20 years of his professional advancement he owes everything to Democrats and has clear emotional and the intellectual identity with the Democratic Party ideology. He cannot be expected to stand politically for something different than the Democrats stood for. Mr. Bohlen does not even try to deny this.

This has a special bearing with regard to the American policy towards Russia. Being interrogated by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 2nd, 1953 in matters of the Pact of Yalta, Mr. Bohlen made it plain to the U.S.A. senators that he never would join in Republican condemnation of the wartime Yalta agreements. Mr. Bohlen asserted abstinately that neither the Yalta arrangement in itself nor any interpretation of it was to blame for the subjugation of the peoples that followed Yalta. The Russians and the Russians alone were to be blamed—maintained Mr. Bohlen. *New York Times* writes about these Committee hearings: — "Mr. Bohlen minced no words in his defence of Yalta pact".

In Defence of Slavery

But for all nations and 100 million European people who in consequence became the prey of Moscow's imperialism, not "Russians alone" were to be blamed. The proper source of all evil in Yalta lay in the outrageous haughtiness, the arrogance, the contempt for the weak and powerless, with which the Big Three, all of them concurrently, took upon themselves to decide and to settle among themselves singlehandedly and onesidedly the lots and destinies, of a hundred of million people—without ever asking anybody whether they liked their decisions,

or not. The Western Big Two do excuse themselves now that they "trusted Stalin". Yet in 1945, after more than 30 years of the rule of Stalin and his Bolshevik Party, the Western Powers ought to have known sufficiently with whom they are arranging their deals. They ought to have known—and practically they knew—that the peoples thus entrusted to the "care and protection" of Moscow inevitably would be enslaved and mistreated. And even if the Western Powers did not know it, the ignorance does not deliver from responsibility.

There never was a more blatant breach of the principle of the self-determination of nations than was knowingly applied in Yalta. Still, Mr. Bohlen finds even today, after the 8 years of Cold War which originated from the spirit of Yalta, that this Pact with its principles of the "extra responsibilities" and the "upper-hand" of the Big Powers, was morally all right, "only the execution was a bit wrong". Mr. Bohlen knows exactly that the basic principle underlying the Yalta agreements is the Western legitimization of the existence of the Russian bolshevik empire; it involves especially the Western acknowledgement and acquiescence for Moscow to keep its so-called "sphere of influence", i. e. its booty, i. e. so many nations in obedience and submission.

The Imperialistic Angle

The most frightful thing about the nomination of all people just of Mr. Bohlen to Moscow, is that he is a man who till this very day supports the ideas of these 'extra responsibilities' and 'extra rights' of Big Powers, i. e. sees the world with the eyes and from the angles of the Big Empires—among them, of course, the Russian Empire. If there ever was a man thoroughly imbued with the classically imperialistic way of thinking, Mr. Bohlen is the one. He belongs quite openly to the category of the so-called "sceptical realists" from the ideological school of Mr. *George F. Kennan*, who advise the American nation—against all her noble liberty traditions—"to stick to realities", i. e. to the existing powers, and "not to hunt idealistic imageries".

The power and the dominance of the Russians, or better to say, of the Muscovites in the U.S.S.R., is for Mr. Bohlen—as it was for his friend and predecessor Mr. Kennan—such an "obvious reality". But is it indeed? Mr. Bohlen's nomination was "justified" by his sponsors and supporters with the indication that he "speaks Russian fluently", is a man who devoted much of his life to the study of the Soviet problem" and is rated as "an outstanding Russian specialist". But how much does he *really* understand of the U.S.S.R. in general, and Russia proper, the Muscovy, in particular? The Ukrainians doubt very deeply his expertness and knowledge. If he knew the world

behind the Iron Curtain well he would have never advocated and supported the rightness and the sagacity of the Yalta agreements. He would have known that this Pact was begotten and born with the incurable cancer of evil and self-destruction.

A Step Backwards

This is now for the seventh time that Mr. Bohlen goes to Moscow. But except for this show-window of the Russian empire, he obviously has not seen and experienced very much else of that country. It apparently escaped him thoroughly that this is no free federation of peoples but a prison of nations dominated by the Russians and that their liberty can never be won and established upon the basis of the "one and indivisible" Russian empire. For instance, there is not one trace in all his career that Mr. Bohlen understands and evaluates properly the problem of the enslaved nationalities in the U.S.S.R. Mr. Bohlen has some working knowledge of the town of Moscow and of some side-scenes of Kremlin, lesser of Russia herself, scarcely of the whole empire. He has seen, encountered and experienced only the Bolshevik displays of the Russian state power—the N.K.V.D., M.V.D., M.G.B., the Communist Party, the Army. But there are absolutely cogent reasons to maintain that he never peered behind this outer wall. He never saw another powers existing in the U.S.S.R. behind this outer wall, powers much more compatible to the American ideals of liberty and humanity than the imperialistic "ideals" as expressed by the settlements of Yalta. The non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. are such a power.

Mr. Bohlen's tenacious support of Yalta betrayed and uncovered him as a determined Russophile and a staunch imperialist. It is not much of a question what place Mr. Bohlen would represent: the American ideals of liberty before the peoples of the U.S.S.R., or vice versa, the imperialistic Yalta "ideals" of Moscow before the American nation. He chose Yalta.

The Ukrainians have no doubts about the leanings, sympathies and the future policies of Mr. Bohlen. This nomination instead of being a step ahead towards the liberation, in reality is a step backwards towards the reaction and the affirmation of the Russian slavery. The Ukrainians regret it deeply.

Read!

Read!

"A.B.N.-CORRESPONDENCE"

Published by

Central Committee of Antibolshevik
Bloc of Nations

Dachauerstr. 9/II
München 2
Germany

THE GREAT GAME

By A. Kaminsky

UKRAINIAN PUBLIC OPINION DOES NOT BELIEVE IN THE FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE OF RUSSIAN POLICY AND REGARDS IT ONLY AS A TACTICAL MOVE

"Be cautious: Russia is only,
exclusively *only* propaganda..."

L. Michelet, 1864

Kremlin's Peace Offensive in the West

The latest transformation of Russian command, caused by the death of Stalin, and the subsequent peace offensive of the Kremlin, have given occasion for a series of varying political speculations in the West whereby, in the opinion of many circles, especially in France and not least in England and the U.S.A., the conditions have been created for the re-birth of a new appeasement-containment policy. Although there has been, until now, no rapture in most of the responsible circles in the western politics over these advances which are, at least temporarily, peaceful and conciliatory, there continues to exist, however, the danger of the change of policy in the West, particularly in the event of a further intensifying of the Russian peace offensive. This, moreover, can safely be expected. There are many politicians in the West who seem to be prepared to regard the arrival of Mr. Bohlen in Moscow as the beginning of a new phase in the East-West relations and are convinced that it will not be long before peaceful co-existence can be realised in a world split into two camps.

It is self-evident that there is a general lack of the erewhile trusting, made in 1942-47 by admirers of "mighty Russia", her social "progress" and "part in the common victory", as well as "her government".

An attempt is being made, however, to inquire by coldly-reasoning and sober methods into the causes of the recent trends in Russian policy and to find these in the weakness and re-organization of the new regime.

Malenkov's "ceding" of the post of the First Secretary of the C. P. to Nikita S. Khrushchev and other replacements and appointments in many of the highest military and administrative posts, then the re-organization of some of the highest organs, the new amnesty, the release of the doctors, severe censure of Ignatiev and Ryumin and much else, is interpreted as being the product of an internal, if not weakness, then of an instability of the new regime, which will lead to a new course, not only in the internal policy, but also, as a consequence, in the external. The recent trends in Russian foreign policy are therefore regarded as functions of this internal indisposition of the regime, in which is to be sought real reason for the new and peaceful form of East-West relations.

No interpretation of recent happenings, however, could be more incorrect, and it is just the very aim of the Russian government to give rise to such an explanation in the West.

There are, unfortunately, people in the West who wish not only to prophesy future for the status quo, but also want to believe in the possibility of a further weakening of the U.S.S.R. which would be accomplished, through the sui generis "Titoisation" of the satellites without any special efforts on the part of the West, and possibly also a liberation and democratisation, perhaps even Titoisation, of the Soviet Republics themselves. In this case, all further endeavours of the West to make itself a strong bulwark against the Russian imperialism, naturally, appear superfluous, and this is just the target at which the Russians are aiming.

What has actually happened in the U.S.S.R.?

According to sociological laws, it would be quite wrong to expect Stalin to be succeeded by someone exactly similar. It would, however, also be wrong to over-estimate, after his death, the part played by one single man, and likewise to overlook the importance of the Soviet system with powerful machinery, which is still functioning.

The structure of this system, and its attitude, has in no way been robbed of its basis by the death of Stalin. Stalin's collaborators and likewise his successors, bound together by a common crime, were, by reason of their high positions, peaceable and docile among themselves, and the whole apparatus which the U.S.S.R. is ruled remains unchanged and unaltered. This system of force with all its factors will not totter for a long time.

It would be incorrect to assume that it can be shattered by any kind of internal differences in the Kremlin in the present situation, even on the part of the army. Moreover, it would be rather naive to look for some big anti-regime conspirators within the regime, say, for a Russian Stülpnagel of the necessary stature in this matter, and even more to look for a Russian Canaris. The mental and social structure, the historical development and the psychological attitude of the German army towards the Nazi Party (N.S.D.A.P.) were quite different from those of the Red Army towards the C. P. of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Army has been formed by the Party, developed, "school-ed", infiltrated and purged by it. This should not be forgotten. Nor the fact that it was Stalin himself who clung firmly

to the old tradition of Russian, that is, military policy, the consequence of which was complete elimination of the so-called international line everywhere, especially in the army. Through Stalin the Russian imperialistic-chauvinistic elements were decisively established in power, which gained for the regime support from the Russian nation. And this conditions still exist.

The fact that Khrushchev, according to Russian insinuation is said to be an Ukrainian is less expressive than the fact that Stalin was a Georgian by birth. Comrade Khrushchev, moreover, has shown by the ruthless things he has done to the Ukrainian people in Ukraine that such a position was primarily to his personal advantage. In connection with this, we are not of the opinion that, in the event of the centre of gravity of the Communist Party power passing to the Presidium of the C. P., this would also mean weakening of Malenkov's position.

In short, the general situation of the internal forces in the U.S.S.R. upon which the structure of the regime is based have experienced no considerable changes. They consist, on the one hand, of the system and its machinery supported by the great-Russian people, and, on the other hand, the front of the nations subjugated by Russia, and of the satellites.

No Real Liberalization Possible

It would also be foolish to expect the new rulers to feel compelled to a new internal policy of relaxation and liberalization, or even a certain N.E.P. policy. There exist no reason for it and a policy like that would bring about a situation which would have dangerous consequences for the Kremlin that cannot be ignored.

The Kremlin remembers only too well the N.E.P. times previous to the thirties, and knows quite well that they led, in all spheres of life, and particularly in those of culture and politics, to the development of separation from Russia of the non-Russian republics. It was the leading intellectual Ukrainian communist Khvylovy, who demanded at that time a reorganization of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic towards the West, and created the slogan: "Away from Moscow".

It cannot be excluded that further development of that kind would have led to the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. and it is Stalin and his present successors who have, by means of a ruthless centralistic policy, put an end to this process.

That is also why this category of people have been excluded from the recent amnesty, i. e. those, who were condemned for so-called "banditry" and "counterrevolutionary crimes", and among whom were many members of the underground movements of the subjugated nations, and their fellowcountry-

men. This applies primarily to the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.).

This goes also, in the long run, for the aggressive foreign policy, which, without its imperialistic trend, would have to climb down, which would inevitably mean its end.

One should also not forget that, in its relatively short, 35 years history, the Russian post-revolutionary government has made, in internal policy, so many zig-zags from one opposed line to another, that there is no sense in ascribing any particular meaning and value to the latest changes in the Kremlin. The sudden, sometimes apparently "radical" breaks of the years 1929-30 and 1936-38, as well as of 1942-45, were certainly not of less importance and significance as those of today.

The reversions of policy, coming one after the other and accompanied by all the familiar innovations, re-organization, purges and the like, have already become indivisible characteristics of the system and will remain so. As regards the severe censure bestowed upon Ignatiev and Ryumin, incidentally, this causes no particular indication in the Russian firmament, and it is perhaps right to mention in this place that, shortly before Stalin's death, a good friend of the comrades Ignatiev and Ryumin—comrade Abakumov, chief of the recently reunited M.V.D., was liquidated.

Where is the Rub?

Russian policy is always accustomed to act on the principle of killing several birds with one stone. An amnesty, the lowering of prices (from which, by the way, the working man or peasant has little to expect), and suchlike are self-evidently not at all superfluous at the present moment, or ever. They are useful, however, for underpinning the new foreign policy and aim at lulling into security the newly awakened western initiative.

It is, therefore, no coincidence that, in the course of the new career of the Soviet Union, 14 liberated Frenchmen and 7 British, with a few women from North Korea, came to Paris and London via Moscow, and the pardoned English sailor, George Robinson, arrived in London too. It is exactly the same with the new "conciliatory" tone of the Russian Press towards the West, which Press is simultaneously attacking most brutally the German Federal Republic and its Chancellor Dr. Konrad Adenauer. This may be connected with the Russian comments on the possibility of the talks of the Four Occupying Powers on air security and the expanding of the conversations on Germany as a whole. It would be foolish, by valuing the bare-handed saluting by a Russian military policeman of an American, to overlook the serious facts, such

UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

Published by

UKRAINIAN PUBLISHERS LTD.

237 Liverpool Road

London, N.I. Tel. NORTH 1828

as for instance, the continuous prosecution of the Church in the East Zone.

The negotiations in Korea were only instituted when the U.S.A. made it clear that it was in earnest in combatting the red danger in Asia. In conclusion, an armistice and a complete cease-fire in Korea would find a good echo for the U.S.S.R. in the U.S.A., yet there still remain Formosa and Indochina to connect Moscow with Peking in the same way. Even the liberation of the imprisoned in Moscow doctors, which is regarded as a sign of the "end of anti-semitic campaign" in Russia, is only for export, particularly to the U.S.A.

What is actually the matter with Russia is the potential power of N.A.T.O., eventually of E.D.C. with the inclusion of Japan and Germany which looms heavily over the heads of the Kremlin dictators. The overthrowing of the U.S.A. new defence and mobilisation plans and the accompanying wresting of the newly-acquired initiative from the hands of the West—that is real task of all the internal and external events of late in the Soviet Union. No peace but the demobilization of the West, pure and simple. Thus, as in every great and good game, all factors, including Stalin's death, are being exploited.

Caution hidden

Should the West join in the latest game of the Russians, the consequence of such a step would be of far greater importance for the whole world than those of 1941/45.

The present Russian warpotential should in no way be regarded as weakened. Therefore the present period of the Cold War should be regarded as the most dangerous for the West.

For we must expect more Russian "peace-advances", with every possible and mysterious combination, whereby the eye of the Kremlin is especially trained on Paris.

It would, therefore, be fatal should the West cease to build up its strength. It is now, at this time, that it must be ready, not only to negotiate with strong words, but also to fight with strong weapons.

POST-STALINIST EPOCH OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

The whole world, both within and outside the frontiers of the U.S.S.R., is watching with intense interest the development of affairs in the U.S.S.R. and is attempting to foresee the future conditions in that area. I have considered Stalin and his epoch to be the era of the greatest achievements in the history of the Russian empire, with regard to expansion, but it must be taken into account that, through this, the internal forces have been weakened, as well as alliances. It was, moreover, clear that Stalin, in his lifetime, had withdrawn from the "accomplishing of the Moscow mission", which for centuries had been the manual of Moscow policy. In the course of the last war, Moscow attempted to leave troops in Persia after it had the chance of ordering them there, in order to employ them in a "liberating-action" against Persia. This had already been begun by means of "national liberation movements" in the North of that country.

The western allies of the U.S.S.R. proposed the withdrawal of the troops from Persia quite unmistakably; otherwise there would have been war. Russia withdrew; Stalin had put up with Tito's "rebellion" and relinquish the "liberation" of the rest of the Balkans; the same thing applies to the attempt to incorporate Finland into the Russian empire. In the Stalinist epoch a peace offensive was begun by Stalin himself, the saviour of the empire in the years 1917/20 and its greatest 'expander'; temporary cessation of armed expansion, for the purpose of internal imperial stabilisation and 'mastication' of the conquered, as well as simultaneous 'peaceful penetration', the analysis and internal preparation for his successors, and then, after some time, the 'liberation' of more nations and countries. The chief of the general staff of the Red Army, Sapozhnikov, declared in his analysis of the cause of the failure in the war with Poland in 1920, that Poland had not been sufficiently prepared by Russia (by the fifth column) in political — moral spheres.

Moscow needs a certain time for the preparation of new areas for the "liberation" that will follow. The regions that have been most actively prepared in this way are those of Persia, the Asiatic countries, and Africa. This political moral preparation of the fresh areas and nations in readiness for the Muscovite "liberation" is, as far as we can see, being carried out by quite peaceful means, and without direct military intervention from Moscow. Therein lies the meaning of the "Cold War" or that which Moscow names the "peaceful co-existence" of the two systems—"the capitalist and socia-

list". Stalin's and his successors' statements concerning the Soviet Union's efforts towards "peaceful co-existence are in this sense true and sincere, for Russia needs some time of "peace", in order to reduce the social political life of the prospective victims of this "liberation" to such chaos that the average person will get to the stage of saying to himself: "even worse, but at least different". When such political-moral conditions prevail within a nation, it is then ripe for "liberation".

Moscow needs peace in order to be able to create dissension in the nations and peoples by which it is surrounded, and then operate correspondingly. We shall not, in this place, reiterate the generally well-known facts that the "Union of Socialist Nations" has revealed itself to be a soup-bubble or that the 'socialist' economy suffered a crisis after only a few month of war and then had to be balstered by the "capitalist" allies. These facts have a decisive effect upon the present policy of Moscow, and the post-war, quite hysterical fight with the "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" and the national feeling of the other subjugated people is a result of the former obvious and convincing experiences in the last war.

The Moscow population statistics of the U.S.S.R. for the year 1926 were as follows: total population 147 millions, of which 77 millions, or 53 p. c. of the total, were Russians; in the year 1939 the total population was 170 millions, of which 99 millions, or 58.4 p. c. were Russians; i. e. the number of Russians has increased by 22 millions. The Moscow statistics for Ukraine for the same period are as follows: in the year 1926, 32 millions, or almost 22 p. c. of the total population; in the year 1939 (within the territories of the U.S.S.R. in the year 1939), 28 millions or 16 p. c. of the total of the U.S.S.R. It is obvious from this that, the population of Ukraine has decreased by 4 millions. Without further comment regarding the well-known Muscovite methods of calculation and the falsification associated with them, and considering the normal growth of population which, in this empire, has been 1.8 p. c. annually, there would have been 94.7 million Russians in 1939, and not 99 millions.

This statement is valid, even when one remembers, on considering the matter, the fact that, in the Stalinist epoch, fearful massacres and weakening of the population in Ukraine and other non-Russian lands were carried out on the ground of the "Stalinist national policy".

That was physical elimination, limitation of the normal increase in number of the non-Russian peoples by collectivisation and reducing them to the level of

beggars. These results of the Stalinist national policy did not, however, preserve the empire from defeat in the national question during the past war.

At that time there were directly incorporated in the U.S.S.R. (besides the satellites) 23.5 millions of the populations of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and the western parts of Byelorussia and Ukraine, i. e. non-Russians. One thing, however, cannot be disputed, and that is this nationality problem in the empire has become more intense and complicated in the succeeding 10 or 15 years, and a certain time is necessary before the "genial Stalinist national policy" is carried out and everything is in the same state as in 1939.

The nationality question in the empire is at the moment so critical that is acting as a preventive of open war and prompting endeavours towards "a peaceful co-existence of two systems".

In the years between the two world wars, there was much ado in the U.S.S.R. about the 'solution of the bread problem'. There was hardly any speech or writing of Stalin in which there was not to be found Stalin's thesis, "we have solved the wheat problem". What are the real facts? As revealed to us by the B.S.E. (Bo'shaya Sovietska Encyklopedia), the situation was as follows: "In year 1913 were exported from the empire such agricultural products as: 648 million pud (pud—16.4 kg) wheat, 18.4 million flax fibre, 3.4 m. pud hemp, 4.7 m. pud butter, 3.5 m. pud eggs.

At the present moment practically no agricultural products are being exported from the empire.

The reason for this is not, as Moscow propaganda asserts, that the population has begun to live better and that life has become happier, but that the general output of agricultural products has fallen. Even if the Stalinist propaganda regarding the "solution of the wheat-problem" is correct when it states that the general wheat-output of the empire has scarcely reached the level of the year 1913 only in proportion to the increase in population, it should be mentioned that all other branches of agricultural production, especially cattle-rearing have fallen by a third, or even a half.

This fact is no secret to anyone in the West, and Moscow is very well aware of the fact, especially after the experiences of the last war, when even the army was so occupied with the problem of hunger, to say nothing of the civil population.

After the last war, Moscow began to expand and establish the great system of "building up Communism and reconstructing nature". All these reconstructions were carried out primarily in the territories of the subjugated peoples (Ukraine, Caucasus, Central Asia and lower Volga) and have as their aim the mecha-

nical raising of the productive capacity of the farms in those lands, which have been undermined and destroyed by collectivisation, and the subsidiary aim is the increase of the production of food-stuffs.

Simultaneously with the daily struggle, in all spheres of life, with "bourgeois nationalism", and especially the Ukrainian, Moscow's whole attention is directed towards the increase of food-stuff production in the peripheral areas. If one takes the annual meeting of any Soviet newspaper in Ukraine, especially of the area—or district-newspapers, no other problems are discussed there but the "annihilation of the nationalists" and the "production of more bread, milk, meat, sugar and eggs". The whole activity of the Soviet party-machinery is concentrated on these two problems.

Moscow must have been convinced during the last war that the deficiencies in its economy, especially as regards food production were even greater and more perilous than had ever been imagined. On account of the disorganization of Soviet economy in the sphere of agriculture, this has not yet improved. The B.S.E. writes the following on the post-war problems in agriculture: "The expansion of the cultivated areas in the post-war Five Years' Plan (1946-1950) took place at the cost of the renewal of the areas of cultivation which had already existed before the war and less at the cost of the new areas of cultivation'. Thus the fact of a profound crisis in agricultural production is quite obvious when one considers that a whole Five Years' Plan is necessary to restore the pre-war cultivated areas.

Agricultural production, which even before the war was inadequate and in a state of decline, is today in a still worse condition, and the constant foodstuffs crisis which arises out of that is one of the causes of the "peace offensive" of Moscow.

The alterations which have taken place in the Kremlin since the death of Stalin, particularly the nomination of Khrushchev as first secretary of the C. C. of the Soviet Communist Party, induce various trains of thought, sometimes shadowy, which look for rivalry among the individual despots in the Kremlin. The post of General Secretary of the Communist Party is one of the most important in the whole system of the U.S.S.R. Stalin's position was, among other things, due to the fact that he was the "specialist" in the national question from the very beginning, even in the time of Lenin. The decision to transfer this post to Khrushchev after the death of Stalin is the cleverest thing that Moscow clique could have done, because Khrushchev is the greatest "specialist" in the national question and collectivisation. His experience

MEMORABLE DAYS

COLONEL EUGEN KONOVALETS

The Ukrainians all over the world have to commemorate a sad anniversary: 15 years ago—on May 23, 1938—just on the eve of the outbreak of the World War II, Colonel *Eugen Konovalets* one of the most outstanding Ukrainian national leaders in modern times, fell the victim of a devilishly engineered bolshevik plot. He was literally blown to pieces in one of the streets of the Dutch Rotterdam by a time-bomb, practiced into his pocket in the form of a large packed of cigarettes.

In this way Moscow got rid of a man whom Stalin and his Russians had all the reasons to fear as the most intelligent and potentially the most dangerous enemy of the Russian-bolshevik empire. The Kremlin always knew that if there is a man large enough to cope with the tremendous task of the destruction of the Russian prison of nations, Colonel Konovalets was such a man. In the mortal combat between him and the Kremlin, led for the most part in the darkness of the anti-communist revolutionary conspiracy, he was personally annihilated before having obtained his ultimate goal: along with the liberation of Ukraine also the liberation from the Russian yoke of all other non-Russian nations of the Soviet empire.

Colonel Eugen Konovalets had in him the stuff to become the Leader and the Liberator of the enslaved non-Russian

in these matters he gained in the highest position in Ukraine. The national question, of which Ukraine forms the most dangerous aspect, and also the problem of food-production for the empire, is fundamental, very important and dangerous, as also, in this connection, is the collectivisation of Ukraine and that is one of the reasons why this post has been given to the greatest expert in these questions, Nikita Khrushchev.

Moscow needs time in which to "intensify" the "Stalinist national policy" in Ukraine; that means the solution of the problem of the unity of the empire—liquidation of the Ukrainian nation and the assurance of Russia's food-supply.

In the post-Stalinist epoch the Russian empire needs some time of rest for the improvement of "internal affairs" and the preparation of the areas outside the borders of the U.S.S.R. for further "liberation".

The nomination of N. Khrushchev to this post in the Kremlin symbolises that best of all.

A. O.

(From *Ukrainian Thought*, No. 14-15)

nations. But he was not beaten, nor eliminated by his premature death.

Kremlin rejoiced far too early. Colonel Konovalets continued to live and to fight after May 23, 1938, by his plans and ideas, and first, by the settlements and organizations he erected during his lifetime of 54 years, all of them created to continue the struggle for the liberation of Ukraine.

Eugen Konovalets, the son of a West-Ukrainian teacher, was born in the village of Zashkiv, near Lviv, capital of Ukrainian Galicia. Very early, already as a college student, he devoted his life to the cause of the liberation and independence of Ukraine. The smart, intelligent, energetic brown-eyed boy soon betrayed his natural leaning towards a soldierly life. The World War I and the Great Eastern Revolution opened before him adequate chances. 1918 he became one of the top organizers of the Ukrainian "Sichovi Striltsi" ("The Sich Riflemen"), a shock troupe of the Ukrainian national revolution. He fought valiantly, acted further as the liberator of Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine, from the resurgent Russian occupation. At one time he was the garrison's Commander of Kyiv and took care for undisturbed and peaceful deliberations of the Ukrainian national parliament, the Rada.

After the collapse of the Ukrainian liberation wars 1917/20, Colonel Konovalets refused to accept the defeat. Along with innumerable Ukrainian patriots and sympathizers he decided to continue the liberation struggle in form of underground revolutionary liberation of Ukraine. At the position of Ukraine in 1920, Poland got the second large chunk with 8 million Ukrainian inhabitants. Here Colonel Konovalets organized in 1920 the "Ukrainian Military Organization", the later famous "U.V.O."; soon these three capitals became a dread and a terror for the bolshevik and Polish oppressors.

The revolutionary activities of U.V.O. grew in scope and nature so fast and spanned so large territories that soon it became necessary to complete the U.V.O. with a political overstructure. Thus 1929 the "Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists" (O.U.N.) was born, during a clandestine Congress in Vienna, at which the delegates from all parts and corners of Ukraine attended. In the course of the next 10 years the O.U.N. developed to the most powerful, and undoubtedly the leading Ukrainian national non-communist political organization.

Between 1920 and 1938 Colonel Konovalets led the life of an eternally hunted political exile. He was forced to change

THE DAY OF THE SEA

The twenty-ninth day of April is one of particularly solemn remembrance in the consciousness of free Ukraine. On this day 35 years ago, the Ukrainian national flags were hoisted up on the ships of the Black Sea Fleet, in accordance with the decree of the Government of the Ukrainian National Republic. This historic event is of special importance also to all the other nations in this quarter of the globe, for here begins a new era of their living-together. From this moment the Black Sea was not to be any more the instrument of Russian imperialism, but a peaceable connecting path between the nations that live on its shores.

Peter the 1st was the first to discover the importance of the Sea for Russian expansion. He not only broke through "the window to Europe" on the Baltic Sea, but also attempted to gain a second "little window" on the Sea of Asow. His plans were begun to be realised by Catherine II and later Tsars. The war-years of 1787/91, 1828 and 1853 are witnesses to the development of the Russian expan-

sionists efforts. These years and the following were confirmation that the Russian strivings for the domination of the Black Sea were continuous. When, at the Congress of Paris, certain embankment measures were undertaken against Russia, the latter did not wait long before breaking the treaty (1871). In their ambitious plans they always employed the Black Sea as a means of making further conquests: they were impelled by the mystical urge to possess Constantinople and the political to obtain mastery of the Mediterranean Sea. The importance of the Sea reached its climax in recent times in connection with the plans of the red rulers, to whom it presented a means of subjugating the world. In the 19th century the Great Powers of Europe were able to take suitable security-measures, which is to-day not so simple to do.

The geographical position of Ukraine is very closely bound up with the Black Sea. The longest part of its shore is Ukrainian territory and almost all the rivers of this country flow into it. One must also take into account its position, which makes it the way to the ocean for the eastern peoples which secures also those on the Don, Volga and the Arabian Sea. These vital interests see to it that none of these nations treads in the steps of the Russians. The aims of the future Ukrainian foreign policy in this area can and must be only of a peaceable nature. The permanent armed readiness against the Russian arch-enemy in the North carries with it, automatically and necessarily, a sincerely peaceful attitude towards the South. In this way the Black Sea would be transformed from an instrument of conquest into a way to understanding and alliance with all southerly neighbours. In this, equality of rights and common control of the straits would be pre-conditional.

The problems which would remain to be solved would be the expansion of traffic on the most important rivers of this region, such as the Danube, Dnieper and Don, and also the organization of close cultural and economical relations.

The contrasting attitudes of the Ukrainians and Russians to the Black Sea influence the form of future conditions. The common endeavour of all Black Sea nations should, in our opinion, be the complete exclusion of the Russians from these waters, in order to secure peace here and equality of rights for all interested nations.

R. Jendyk

DEATH OF A PATRIOT:

PROF. DR. h. c.

BORYS Y. IVANYTSKY

Ukrainian Scientist, Man of Letters
and Politician

(1878-1953)

The free Ukrainian scientific and political world suffered a most deplorable loss: on April 4th, 1953 died in Detroit, Ill., U.S.A. 75 years of age, one of the outstanding leaders of the contemporary free Ukraine: Prof. Dr. h. c. Borys Y. Ivanytsky.

The deceased was born on March 21st, 1878 in the town *Gumy, province Khar-kov, Eastern Ukraine*. He was the descendant of an ancient Ukrainian family of warriors, priests and scientists, a family which always tended and nursed the traditions and reminiscences of the Ukrainian life in a free, from Moscow independent, democratic, Cossack national State.

This is why from the incipient years of his adolescence, just starting in his school bench, he led a cognizant and devoted Ukrainian political life directed towards the liberation of Ukraine from the Russian dominance. Very early he joined the Ukrainian student's fighting liberation circles and was repeatedly arrested by the organs of the Okhrane, i. e. the tsarist political secret police. 1901-1902 he was personally confined to live in the town Poltava under constant police surveillance.

Borys Y. Ivanytsky studied forestry of the Imperial High Institute for Forestry in St. Petersburg and absolved his studies 1902 with the title of a "learned forester", the practical forestry from 1903 till 1917 in leading posts in vast regions of the pre-revolutionary Russian "imperial forests", and in the recent times there was scarcely a scientist, but also a practitioner, who knew the forestry in U.S.S.R. better than he did.

At the outbreak of the Revolution 1917 Borys Ivanytsky put himself forthwith at the disposal of the Ukrainian National Government which was formed in Kyiv. Here he helped substantially at the organization of the Department of the Forestry of Ukraine; in May 1918 he headed the Department. As during the revolutionary events the Ukrainian National Government was forced to leave Kyiv and transitory to settle down in the town Kamyanets Podolsk Borys Ivanytsky became simultaneously first the lecturer, then the teacher at the Ukrainian University of Podilya. This started his proper scientific career.

After the Russians and the bolsheviks conquered Ukraine in 1919, Borys Ivanytsky went with the Ukrainian National Government in exile. At first he lived in

constantly the place of his residence. His name became a symbol, a synonym of liberty throughout the whole of Ukraine—and far beyond Ukraine. With passing years and growing tasks it became apparent that Colonel Konovalets was not only a good soldier but also a good, or maybe, even better diplomat. Innumerable threads united in his hands; he was the center of a widely spread net of connections throughout the whole world, and he had his stakes wherever he saw a chance to work and to gain friends for Ukraine.

The more the inevitability of the outbreak of the World War II became apparent, the more reasons had the Kremlin to fear the personal qualities and the connections of Colonel Konovalets. Stalin knew exactly that Colonel Konovalets was great enough, to revert the first defeat of communism in Ukraine into the greatest victory of Ukrainian liberty and independence. Colonel Konovalets was a born, predestined leader for Ukraine's final fight for liberation. Consequently Kremlin had to try everything to annihilate him timely.

But, as was already stressed, Stalin succeeded only a small degree. The testament of Colonel Konovalets continues to live and to work among Ukrainians. Its contents being: to fight and to strive incessantly till the very last verstiges of the Russian domination are for ever removed from the earth of Ukraine.

Poland, in the town *Turnov*, Western Galicia. Here he became the co-founder of a "*Ukrainian Society of Aerocultural Technicians*"; later on this Society developed to the size of the Ukrainian Economic Academy, since 1922 with the seat in Podedbrady, near Prague, Czechoslovakia.

In April 1922 Borys Ivanytsky reaches the title and the position of the ordinary professor of the forestry at this Academy; 1923 he became its pro-rector. From now on, in the course of the next 26 hard working years, Professor Ivanytsky attains the status of one of the higher qualified scientist in specialists in the realm of the agriculture and the forestry of Ukraine. He left behind him 36 specialised scientific works, some of them translated in German, English and Czech. With special care he worked on the problems of the forestial policy and the conservation of vastly devastated forests of Ukraine.

In 1928 Prof. Ivanytsky was first elected the Rector of the Academy; he kept this post till 1935. Concurrently he worked at the "*Ukrainian Technical Husbandry Institute*" in Prague. He was the co-founder and 1934-1935 the first President of the "*Society of Professors of the Ukrainian Economic Academy*".

His basic scientific work is: "The forests and the forestial economy of Ukraine" published as the Vol. XIV of the "Works of the Ukrainian Scientific Institute" in Warsaw. Of outstanding and lasting value are his manuals: "Course in Forestry", 3 Vol., and "Dendrology" 1 Vol. He contributed heartily at the publication of the "*Ukrainian General Encyclopedia*", 3 Vol. 1949-1952.

The World War years 1939-1945 heavily impeded the Ukrainian scientific work in the exile in Czechoslovakia. The German Nazi regime hampered sorely the development of the free Ukrainian scientific work. 1940-1944 Prof. Ivanytsky lived transiently in Lublin, Poland.

The "Ukrainian Economic Academy" as well as the "Ukrainian Technical Husbandry Institute" were reviewed only after the downfall of Nazi Germany, 1945-1953 in Munich, Bavaria. Alternately he was the Rector, resp. President of these Ukrainian scientific institutions. In appreciation of his scientific achievements, on occasion of his 70th birthday, 1947 was bestowed upon him the title of the "Doctor honoris causa" of the Academy.

Much less important and outstanding were his political activities and contributions. He always remained faithful to the Ukrainian political camp as represented by the remnants of the Ukrainian National Government, the so-called "Ukrainian National Republic" ("*Ukrainska Narodna Respublika*"). He was regarded as an "Ukrainian elder statesman" and in this character was elected 1950 to the post of the President of the exile "Ukrainian National Council" in Augsburg,

Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn

NEO-CLASICISM IN THE MODERN UKRAINIAN NATIONAL POETRY

Anyone who has not already, to a certain extent, studied the Ukrainian intellectual history of 20th century, can generally not fail to be amazed when he discovers that, in the Ukrainian literature of the early twenties (thus in the very first years of the Bolshevik Soviet domination) there had been formed an expressly classically-inclined school of poets under the name of Kyiv Classicism. This school, despite of the short duration of its literary efficacy, which was only conditionally half-tolerated by the Soviet authorities, exerted no less than an immense influence on the later development of Ukrainian poetry and prose and, at least abroad and in the political emigration, still continues to do so. At the first glance, the historical connection seems paradoxical enough; there seems to be no reason why classicism and the Bolshevik social revolution should be able to be united. From the beginning they have had nothing in common and have been irreconcilable enemies—as the expressions and developments of a National Ukrainian and of a Muscovite way of thinking and attitude towards life.

In contrast to what happened in the actual Russian (i. e. ethnically "Great Russian") lands of the Tsarist empire, the chief process in Ukraine, just as in all the non-Russian territories which were robbed of their freedom and independence by the Tsars (and even in West-Ukraine, which was incorporated until 1918 in the Habsburg empire), was not a social revolution, but a struggle for liberty which was prepared and introduced by the entire cultural movement of the second half of the 19th century; and thus the total collapse of the Tsarist rule in 1917 let loose, in all the non-Russian lands of the enormous empire, an anti-Russian national fight for liberty and independence, but

it was the Muscovite Soviets who brought with them the social revolution "on the points of their bayonets" in the course of an armed invasion—it is true, not without certain support from de-nationalised (and therefore russified) and thoroughly demoralised elements of the Ukrainian population, particularly the socialistic left wing. That does not in any way alter the fact that the creative forces of the Ukrainian cultural life were markedly nationally inclined, and it is from this very attitude that Kyiv neo-classical school of poetry is to be recognised as a powerful upsurge of national literature, which enriched Ukrainian poetry with an abundance of artistic expression and philosophical depth of thought which were on level with the modern west-European literary art.

The rise of this school of poetry in the Pan-Ukrainian political and cultural metropolis of Kyiv has, therefore, no direct connection with the Bolshevik social revolution which was forcibly imported from the North by the Muscovite Red Army, but with the restoration of the Ukrainian Sovereign National State (1918-1921)—the National State which was destroyed by the military supremacy of the Soviet-Russian Communism only after a heroic four-years' campaign for liberty. The historical connection between that new, absolutely "westerly" and aesthetically inclined Renaissance movement in the Ukrainian poetry and the political restoration of the Ukrainian State is obvious. It is true that one must take into consideration the fact that here lies more of a relationship of identity rather than one of causation. The same generation, the same national 'elite' who restored the sovereignty of the State, created simultaneously the literary neo-classicism, brought it into the foreground of the Ukrainian intellectual life of that time and supported it in the battle of public opinion. Naturally there belonged to this group also the artistically valuable exponents of other varieties of style in the Ukrainian poetry of the same fertile pre-revolutionary years—the same national-political and cultural opinions. The intellectual-aristocratic culture-ideal of the neo-classical literature, which is worthy of being placed on the same level as European art, influenced numerous representatives of other literary tendencies, either as regards form (such as the symbolists, Oleksa Slisarenko and Volodymyr Svidzinsky and the expressionists, Mykola Bazhan and Todos Osmachka) or philosophically (as the impressionists, Yevhen Pluzhnyk and Mayk Johansen, or the neo-

Germany. Here, among the 6 participant exile Ukrainian political parties he regarded his duties mainly as those of an impartial referee.

In 1950 Prof. Ivanytsky resettled as one among more than 40,000 Ukrainian DP/Refugees, to the U.S.A. Here he lived and dosed his life at the home of his son, an engineer. Till his very last days he worked incessantly at the revival and the building up of the Ukrainian institutions and the scientific life in the U.S.A. Except bolsheviks he had no enemies. Professor Borys Ivanytsky faded away true to his principle he cherished during the whole of his life: "*Always and everything for Ukraine!*" He was highly venerated by Ukrainians and would remain unforgettable.

romantic, *Yury Yanovsky*.) On the other hand, not only the European world of ideas of the neo-classical style, but also its artistic perfection of form were, as such, banned and persecuted by the Ukrainian "National-Communist" as well as the so-called "Proletarian" fellow-travelers and followers of the Soviet-Russian Communism, primarily on the grounds that they were "Nationalistic" and "counter revolutionary". Finally, almost all in Kyiv neo-classical poets were either physically eliminated (*Mykola Zerov*, *Pavlo Fylypovych*, *Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara*) or forced to recant and to direct their political opinions into the Soviet channel (*Maxim Rylsky*). Those few of them who succeeded in escaping to the West, such as *Yury Klen* and, much later, *Mykhaylo Orest*, have found here, in the Ukrainian emigree community, a new and highly productive field of activity.

It would be indeed thoroughly false to represent the artistic development, and the literary influence bound up with it, of the Kyiv neo-classicists as a formal return to the rigid rules of the Western classicism of the 17th and 18th centuries, or even as imitation of the French neo-classicism of the middle of the 19th century—the so-called Parnassist School of Poetry (although it were prominent members of this very school, *Ch. Leconte de Lisle* and *J.M. de Heredia*, who actually exerted a very considerable influence on most of the Kyiv neo-classicists).

Moreover, the French Parnasism was (among others) an indeed illustrious example to the Kyiv poets, but yet no standard; the Ukrainian neo-classicism was—and remained—just classically inclined, yet not ruled; and it had in no way rejected a certain enrichment, as regards content and form, from the later poetry styles of Europe—from the impressionist, symbolistic, and to a certain extent, the expressionist or surrealist—as far as this last is able to produce anything perfected in form. Yet, in order properly to estimate the actual multiplicity of Ukrainian literary creations, for which the neo-classical poetical ideal paved the way, we shall first append a short character study of the most well-known representatives of that school of poets, which was indeed held together only by artistic principles.

Professor *Mykola Zerov* (born 1890) was the actual founder and the generally recognized ideologist and real tactical leader of the Kyiv neo-classical school of poetry. He was an exemplary poet, translator, critic and literary historian, and he rendered extraordinary services to the Ukrainian literature by making accessible the old classics as well as French classicism and Parnasism. After quite a long academic activity in Kyiv, he was, in the year 1935 (although personally uninterested in politics), incarcerated in the notorious island-prison of Solovki in the White

Sea. In 1937 all news of him ceased; it is highly probable that, in this year, he was shot without trial by bolshevist assassins. Of his original poetry, hardly any has been able to be published under the Soviets; fortunately his poetical legacy was saved in manuscript, and has been published in its entirety among the Ukrainian emigration; "*Camena*" (Cracow-Lviv, 1943), "*Sonnetarium*" (Berchtesgaden, 1948), "*Catalepton*" (Philadelphia, 1952). He was a great master of the sonnet and the Alexandrian Couplet, and an illustrious leader of the Ukrainian National-Cultural "westernisation".

Even more famous is *Maxim Rylsky* (born 1895), the artistically most unique and versatile among the now living Ukrainian poets. He, more than anyone, has imprinted upon the Ukrainian neo-classicism his own individual characteristic style, by introducing certain symbolistic elements of the style of the French, Polish and Russian origin, and working them together harmoniously. His poetical influence on contemporary Ukrainian poets was, and still is, very great. From 1931 onwards, continuous persecution on the part of the Soviet-Russian tyrants forced him, in order to save his life and his nominal liberty, to forsake neo-classicism and any kind of genuine poetry and to sink, since the middle of the thirties, to the level of an artistically almost worthless tool of Soviet propaganda, which, moreover, was for him only a very inadequate protection from further political accusations. Among his numerous anthologies, the following should be noted as artistically valuable: "*Under the Autumn Stars*" (Kyiv, 1918 and 1926); "*The Blue Distance*" (Kyiv, 1922); "*Through Storm and Snow*" (Kyiv, 1925); "*The 13th Spring*" (Kharkiv, 1925); "*Where the Ways Unite*" (Kyiv, 1929); "*Sound and Echo*" (Kyiv, 1929).

Pavlo Fylypovych (born 1891) was the second most eminent member of the Kyiv Neo-Classical School of Poetry. For a considerable time he worked also as a literary historian; he displays in his formally exemplary lyrics a strong, symbolistic tendency. Although averse to any kind of political activity, he was imprisoned in 1935 together with *M. Zerov*, and it is highly probable that he was shot with him, in 1937, without the trial. His anthologies: "*Earth and Wind*" (Kyiv, 1922); "*Space*" (Kyiv, 1925). His manuscript works were destroyed by the Soviet authorities.

Mykhaylo Dray-Khmara (born 1899), Kyiv poet and philologist, was gradually converted from his originally symbolistic style to neo-classicism. In 1935 he was sent on an empty pretext (but mainly on account of his sonnet, "*Swans*", in which he had glorified the Kyiv "Poetical Quintette"—*M. Zerov*, *M. Rylsky*, *P. Fylypovych*, *Y. Klen-Burghardt* and himself

in allegorical form in 1929) to Kolyma in East-Siberia to forced labour in the mines. There he died in 1938 or at the beginning of 1939 from starvation and exhaustion. His anthology: "*The Shoot*" (Kyiv, 1926). His manuscript works were destroyed by the Soviet authorities.

Oswald Burghardt (1891-1947), was of German origin, being born in Podolia, and, as an Ukrainian writer, was known under the nom de plume of *Yury Klen*. He was engaged in literary work in Kyiv until 1931 and was greatly devoted to the Kyiv neo-classical school of poetry until the end of his life. As a poet, translator and philologist alike, he has performed very great achievements, and also left quite a number of novels and highly interesting literary memoirs. Since his migration to Germany in 1931, which was caused by Bolshevik terrorism, he has given unforgettable service to the Ukrainian literary world, especially on account of his role as a link between the Kyiv neo-classicism of the twenties, and the marked national-Ukrainian poetry (so-called Prague Classicism) in the emigration. His published books of poetry: "*The Damned Years*" (Cracow, 1943); "*Caravellas*" (Prague, 1943). His chief work, the historical epic "*The Ashes of Empires*" still remains mainly unpublished; numerous excerpts from it were printed in the Ukrainian emigree Press from 1946 to 1948.

After the death of *Yury Klen*, *Mykhaylo Orest* (born 1901) living in Bavaria since 1946, as a political refugee, has remained the last survivor of the Kyiv neo-classical generation, and is generally acknowledged as the leader of that school of poetry which has been so afflicted by the Soviet terror. His poetical characteristics are primarily a pantheistic kind of spiritualism and a philosophical feeling for nature, which are conditioned by his idealistic attitude towards mankind as an incomplete manifestation of a cosmic being, and which are marked by a strong emphasis on the purely ethical view-point in the valuation of social life. *M. Orest* is generally recognised as one of the most sensitive connoisseurs and utilizers of the Ukrainian literary language, which he himself has greatly enriched. His anthologies: "*Echo of the Years*" (Cracow-Lviv, 1944); "*Soul and Destiny*" (Augsburg, 1946); "*The Realm of the Word*" (Philadelphia, 1952); and "*Guest and Homestead*" (Philadelphia, 1952).

There is, of course, no lack of individual poets from West-Ukraine, (as *S. Hordynsky*, *B. Kravtsiv*, *T. Kurpita*) who have been influenced by this classicism, nor of younger poets of the "new" (post 1941) Ukrainian political emigration who owe much to the classical principles of form (*Yar Slavutych*, *Oleh Zuyevsky*, *Ihor Kachurovsky*). What holds the neo-classical school of poetry together, even now, is not only the highly aesthetical fec-

ling for form and consequent European attitude towards Ukrainian politics and culture-politics (with the elimination of any Slavophile and Pan-Slavistic tendencies), but also their markedly Pan-Ukra-

inian feeling, which acknowledges no kind of varieties, dialectic or regional, in Ukrainian literature, and thus is forming within itself a cultural stronghold of Ukrainian national and political ideals.

Yury Klen

THE DELUGE

I

*When filled to brim and burning was the jar
Of wrath of God repenting, — seething over,
And Angel of the Doom was sent to pour
It out, the Lord bade Noah: "Build the ark!"*

*Abyss grew strong, the disk of sun turned dark,
The cruel storms tore shore after shore,
Insatiate depths washed out the rocks and roared,
Devouring mountains, shapeless and bizarre.*

*The vessel then, whilst hail and thunder blew,
Was floating stately, saving from the vial
Of wrath, in holds besmeared with pitch her crew*

*Of animals and birds, who after trial,
When sun will bless renaissance after strife,
Will procreate on earth the bliss of life.*

II

*Thus we do float through lifeless space of years,
Above the towns submerged, the towers deep on ground,
The churches ghastly dead, the cities drowned;
Their purple evening died in waters cold and clear.*

*And over empty seas our ark we steer,
And under empty skies we find no ground
To save immortal cargo,—future bound,
The heritage of ages,—treasures dear.*

*To save them for the future is our duty:
The miracles of all the ages we have seen,
In soul preserved, engraved on magic screen.*

*And of this boon of indestructible beauty,
When dawn will break, and skies turn blue,
We will create the human thought anew.*

*Translated from the Ukrainian by
V. Shayan*

Mykhaylo Orest

THE REALM OF THE WORD

*In rainbows of bliss and glory
The Word is born on the earth,
New Realm — Eternal and Holy
Is brought to light by its birth.*

*And those, who created its coming
And longed in prophetic dreams,
Behold the fiery summit,
Engulfed by ecstatic streams.*

*Its halo scents over mountains,
Embracing angels and doves,
The down-break wells from its bounty,
Each petal lives by its love.*

*And from the graves of forgotten
Rise thousands of hands in pray,
White lilies, by blessing begotten,
Are greeting new gospel: hail!*

*Translated from Ukrainian
by V. Shayan*

GERMAN-UKRAINIAN PSYCHOLOGICAL CONGRESS

On the 7th and 8th of March, 1953, the German Psychological Association and the Institute of the Ukrainian Free University held a congress to discuss the question of: "The East-West tension in the light of psychology". This Congress lasted two days, and ended with prolonged discussion and an assurance that this marked only the beginning of a work that must at all costs be continued.

Generally speaking, all the Ukrainian psychologists held similar opinions, and it must be stated that these opinions were shared by their German colleagues too. In the discussion of the contrast between the East and the West, general opinion seemed to prevail that there are actually few typical characteristics of the East in the Ukrainian psyche, and that the Ukrainians as such show no really close kinship with the East but, on the contrary, have much in common with the West, as well as with the western philosophy and the way of thinking. The German speakers maintained that it was a difference between these two worlds that was under discussion and Prof. Zeise emphasized, as an example, the diversity of the two churches, and stressed the fact that a consideration of the diversity of the two worlds did not refer to Ukraine. They were, in general, familiar with the problems of the East and seemed to have a sober view of the conditions prevailing there.

Prof. Dr. I. Mirchuk, as chairman of the meeting and the first lecturer, gave an introductory review of the question to be discussed by the congress, welcomed the guests, and read various messages of greeting, among them being one from the Prime Minister of Bavaria, Dr. Einhardt. In his review, he dealt with the relationship of Ukraine with the West in the course of her history, and attempted to point out that Ukraine was clearly oriented westwards. The Ukrainian ruling princes had tried to maintain friendly relations with the western dynasties; the Mohyla Academy had been founded after the pattern of western schools, including the use of Latin for teaching, and Mohyla himself, despite his loyalty to the faith of his fathers, was expressly western in orientation. The Magdeburg city statute was of fundamental importance in Ukraine. In the 16th century, the Union of Brest united Ukraine with Rome, therefore with the West and not with Moscow. The Ukrainian clergyman, W. Dovhovich, wrote in the fastnesses of the Carpatho-Ukraine, commentaries on the works of Kant, and in this way had occupied himself with the theoretical, speculative philosophy which on the general was quite alien to the Slav soul. Young Ukrainians studied

NOTE: "The Realm of the Word" by M. Orest was first published in No. 8. of the Ukrainian edition of "The Observer" (Under the title of "The State of the Word")
Yury Klen

at western universities, and this was caused, not only very often by the enslavement of the free sciences in their own land, but also by their interest and attempts to include themselves directly in the western world. Ukrainians today identify themselves with the cultural processes of the West, and are trying in the emigration, despite difficult circumstances, to co-operate with them.

Ukrainian artists were active in western operas, theatres, choirs and churches, and the same applies to the ballet. Painters and sculptors have been represented at exhibitions, and women have been occupied in introducing the native art into the western world. Books, newspapers and journals have been published in both the Ukrainian and foreign languages, in order to acquaint the western world with the Ukrainian problems. In addition, the educational system and the activities of the scientific institutes and clubs made great progress.

Further talks were given on the psychological aspects of the tension between the East and the West. The speakers suggested various reasons for this tension, as well as ways by which it might be reduced. They were generally agreed that the mental crisis which appeared in the post-war period has to an extremely great extent, combined to deepen this tension. In seeking for the causes of this tension, they dwelt on the causes of the present general mental crisis. One of the fundamental causes was held to be the advance in technics, which had condemned mankind to a soulless existence, to which remains only a functioning of civilisation and its apparatus. Man is no longer immersed in the past, but strives after the mastery of economic conditions. In his theoretical strivings after knowledge, man has however gone too far and become the victim of technics. As a productive producer he is becoming superfluous; those people who have been replaced by inventions can find no use for themselves in the face of the general unemployment. Mankind has created, by means of the natural science, a picture of nature in which no place is left for man himself.

A further reason for the present crisis is the "revolt of the masses". The ruling human type is becoming the proletarian, who, for the time being, has not yet been able to gain a leading position in the West, but in the East this process has advertised itself as the "social revolution of the masses".

The western Church as well is fundamentally different from the eastern. It is, firstly, more enlightened, because it has passed, during various periods of reform, through a process of rationalisation. The western Church stresses the importance of the individual with his personal consciousness, his personal development and

personal responsibility. This doctrine finds expression in the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and above all, in the Calvinist beliefs. The eastern Church is less enlightened, because it has not experienced the whole religious development: the ancient and scholastic, the Reformation, and the democratic estimation of the worth of the individual has touched it hardly at all. The eastern Church senses, but does not understand, the meaning of the Bible. When it suffers, it does so because it cannot help itself with the aid of rational elements. The difference between the rational structure of the western reformed Church and the less enlightened eastern Church arises as a result of this tension, which could be lessened by a combination of the rational superstructure of the West with the emotional, religious mysticism.

The western type of man presents a contrast to the eastern. One can describe him as "ratio", while the eastern man shows himself more as "emotio".

The individual, as the fundamental starting-point for western thought, stands in sharp contrast to the typical masses of the East. One can in no way make the peculiar consciousness of self and desire for self-betterment agree with the collective consciousness and the subordination of self to the will of force, which the eastern despotism renders possible. Resistance against the will of power is described as rejection of God, from whom all power derives. The collective forms of eastern economy meet with no resistance from the masses and can be easily made the pattern of life. The Ukrainian farmer, however, has offered stern resistance to the liquidation of his individual independence and to his inclusion in the "grey whole".

The conception of dynamism is characteristic of the West: deeds and active participation is most highly esteemed in the West. Every form of dynamism is completely alien to the East. It is regarded negatively there, and the most highly desirable condition is thought to be tranquility.

The more detailed problems of the East-West tension were dealt with in speeches by Prof. Vetter, Dr. Zeise and Dr. Janiv. And in close connection with these two more talks given by the Ukrainian Prof. Kulchycky, who spoke on the "Occidental and non-occidental components of the mind of the Ukrainian", and Dr. Smalko, who dealt with the position of the greatest Ukrainian philosopher, *Skovoroda*, in the light of the East-West tension.

In his consideration of the eastern and western elements in the Ukrainian mind, Prof. Kulchycky employed the genetic method, and analysed varying aspects — geo-psychic, historical, socio-psychic, cultural-morphological and deep-psychological. He referred to the three important

conceptions which play the decisive part in the psyche of the Ukrainians: the *will*, by which the Ukrainian understands far more than the Westerner—all the values that lie in the sphere of freedom; *truth* which for the Easterner does not necessarily coincide with reality, but is the moral-ethic order of things; and *destiny*, which is considered by the Ukrainian to be in a certain sense pre-determined, and that, which is given by the will of God cannot be shaped objectively.

After this analysis of the position of the philosophy of Skovoroda, Dr. Smalko attempted to prove the community of this philosophy with the West. His was a strongly individualistic attitude, similarly to that, which since ancient times has formed the fundamental basis of western philosophy; his anthropology, which directs us quite clearly to western philosophical mysticism; his religiousness, which is related exclusively to the content and not to the form; moreover, his dualism and symbolism of God can, almost in its entirety, be brought into harmony with the traditions of the western Church, and to the ancient Fathers and western mysticism. The eastern components that appear in him are a strong preponderance of emotion over intellect, which primarily finds expression in his philosophy of life, whose aim is the realisation of an ethical order and was able to achieve little understanding for theoretical speculation, a negative valuation of the will, whereby the possibility of an active attitude to life is excluded, and, finally, an extremely idealistic attitude which essays to trace all manifestations in the world back to the psychic element and makes knowledge independent from the psychic "ego" of the individual and does not class it with the necessities of reality.

Numbered also among the questions discussed at this congress were two papers read by Dr. Lickert, on American psychology, and Prof. Vashchenko, on Soviet psychology, respectively. Dr. Lickert based his theses primarily on observation of American people and reviewed the most important characteristics of the American psyche.

Prof. Vashchenko, in his lecture, reviewed the conditions of psychology in the Soviet Union since the beginnings of bolshevism. The beginning of the 20th century was marked by the struggle between two tendencies—the idealistic and the materialistic. Among the intelligentsia, the idealistic tendency, with a religious accent, was characteristic. After the October Revolution, all psychologists with idealistic views were removed from the universities; a portion of them went over to materialism and built up the philosophy of reactology. The fundamental tendency was a materialistic one, represented by Pavlov and Bechtiarev, who traced man's whole behaviour back to reflexes. In the thirties began the fight against these ten-

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

THE NATIONAL POLICY OF THE SOVIETS IN UKRAINE

The Soviet Press is, at the present moment, dealing in great detail with the problems of national policy. Whether it be *Radyanska Volyn* (The Soviet Volhynia) *Molod Ukraina* (The Youth of Ukraine), or the *Radyanska Ukraina*, they are all giving an extraordinary amount of space to the "bolshevist nationality policy" and the "Soviet fellowship of nations".

Today it is quite obvious that the Soviets have played themselves out in the sphere of the national problems of the West, above all in Asia. They are trying to conceal their own difficulties by clumsy falsification of history, distortion of facts, and the alleged love and regard of the Soviet Union's nations for the Russians.

A gross example of such proceedings is the leader of the *Radyanska Ukraina* of Feb. 28th, 1953, No. 50(9565), "The all vanquishing power of the fellowship of nations". It is here attempted to stress the latter's "uses" and to land it as one of the highest achievements. "The power which cements the friendship among our countries is the great Russian people, the Russian nation which has been described by comrade Stalin as the most productive of the Soviet Union."

The pride of Ukrainian nation is based on the fact that they have come out of the same nest as the Russian and Byelorussian nations. The Ukrainians, with love and kindness, call the Russians their elder brothers'.

The constant stressing of the independence, alliance and co-operation with the Russian nation shows a continued emphasis on the Russian master-part in the Soviet sphere of power. The Russian nation alone merits the leading role; it is the most talented and competent of all the Soviet nations. No-one else can hope to equal, yet alone surpass her.

"After the liquidation of the bourgeois and nationalistic parties, and after the establishment of the Soviet order in our countries, new socialist nations formed themselves and developed on the basis of the old bourgeois nations". It is astounding how the Russian-bolshevist theoreticians are able to bring the socialist conception of the development of the nations into harmony with the Russian imperialist power-politics. Apparently only through complete misrepresentation, distortion and typical bolshevist "scientific methods". This dialectic passes anything that one could imagine.

"In the ideological work of the party-organizations of our republic there are not less valuable and worthy examples of the training of the workers in a spirit of love and regard for our elder brothers—the talented Russian people, and all the peoples of our fatherland".

German-Ukrainian Psychological Congress

dencies, and above all against reflexology, and its exponents were blamed for the mechanisation and deviation from dialectical materialism. They were removed from their posts, arrested as "perverters of the people", and later liquidated. Later began the period of materialistic psychology, which was marked by extreme dogmatism and a blind faith in the classical writers of materialistic doctrine. Characteristic of all Soviet psychologists is their radical attitude towards "bourgeois" psychology and their simultaneous glorification of the Soviet, which, by suppressing other tendencies, greatly limits their possibilities of meditation.

The Russian nation always takes the very first place among all the other nations of the Soviet Union, and will in all probability be cited as an example for all her wars of aggression, raids and similar "famous deeds". All her foes must be bitterly combatted, and this to be done as follows: "Simultaneously with the spreading of propaganda concerning the achievements of the Leninist-Stalinist nationalities, all manifestations of hostile ideology, the remnants of and relapses into Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, Zionism, and cosmopolitanism must be ruthlessly exposed. One must consider the fact that the nationalists and cosmopolitans are the damnable foes of our fatherland, act as deadly opponents of peace and democracy, and, at the same time, as servants of American imperialism. The nationalists of every colour, after selling themselves, body and soul, for bloody American silver, are concentrating all their activities upon murder, espionage and subversion, and are aiming their ideological spear at the fellowship of nations, which is the basis of the power and might of our fatherland".

All are damnable and must be rooted out—only the Russians are good. What an irony!

STALIN AND UKRAINE FROM THE PRESENT SOVIET VIEW-POINT

Thirty-five years ago there appeared an article by Josef Stalin called "The Ukrainian Knot". On the anniversary of that event the *Radyanska Ukraina* of March 14th, 1953, No. 63(9578) devoted a detailed article to the problem of "Stalin—the Liberator of the Ukrainian People". It is striking that, after Stalin's death, his person should again and again be held up to the Ukrainians as an example in connection with the Russian nation. R. Symonenko, the author of this article, has assigned to Stalin all credit concerning the Ukrainian national development, and has depicted him in this light.

"Like all other people of our fatherland, the Ukrainian nation is indebted to Josef Stalin for all that is good, radiant and happy in its life. It is the national pride of the Ukrainian nation that it was the first to follow the Russian nation on the path of Soviet and socialist development".

Above all, Stalin is given credit for smashing the Ukrainian Central Rada, which fought for the political and national independence of Ukraine. "To Comrade Stalin belongs the credit for the leadership in the victory of the Soviet domination of Ukraine, in the destruction of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, these menial servants of international capitalism. The most important counter-revolutionary force in Ukraine was the nationalistic Central Rada, which was created by the Ukrainian bourgeoisie for the purpose of separating Ukraine from the great Russian nation. It was responsible for the maintenance of capitalists and oppressors in Ukraine and the transformation of this country into a base for the fight of international imperialism against Soviet Russia."

It was also a historic service on the part of our immortal leader that he has revealed the treacherous part played by the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists and the criminal connection of the Central Rada with foreign imperialists, and thus proved the boundless hostility of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists towards the labouring masses".

It is true that the Ukrainian Central Rada has worked for a complete separation from the old Russian empire, but it has never enjoyed any kind of help from "international imperialism" or such like capitalism. It must be said that, on the contrary, the western allied forces at that time supported the "white" armies of various Russian generals, who, on their side, bothered little about Communism, but were interested in further oppressing the insurgent national States.

After further attacks on Petlura and Vynnychenko, who are described as "servants of international ca-

pital" and are reproached at every opportunity with "selling their fatherland", "treachery", and other "crimes", Stalin is finally lauded as the "great liberator of the Ukrainian people", who has, more than anyone, "supremely championed", together "with the great Russian nation", the national and social interests of Ukraine".

* * *

CONVENTION OF ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

On March 24th, 1953, there ended in Kyiv the two-day convention of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

The Moscow *Pravda* of March 25th, No. 84 gives the following account:

"The convention has exposed serious deficiencies in the work of the Academy. Sharp criticism was levelled at both the Presidium of the Academy and the directors of the various departments and institutes. Serious defects were pointed out in the distribution and training of the scientific minor officials and in the weakly developed criticism and self-criticism."

The continued criticism of the Ukrainian scientific institutes, the teachers at the universities, and, so-called "carelessness" in the training of the rising generation of scientists has reached its climax in the attack upon the Academy of Science of the Ukrainian S.S.R. The Soviet culture policy remains the same as it was before Stalin's death. It would be completely abortive to think that any relief in the sphere of the sciences would come about.

This new criticism reveals far more the opposite to any alteration and makes it quite conclusive that the "purges", "criticism" and other dissatisfaction on part of the party-leadership will continue to play the most important part in the future.

* * *

VOLHYNIA—INACCESSIBLE TO COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY

One of the most difficult tasks of Soviet internal politics is, without doubt, the continuous emphasis on the ideological problems. The Soviet Press and party-organizations are at the moment busying themselves with these questions, and are devoting to them much attention.

In the latter half of last February there took place the plenary meeting of the district party-organizations of the Province Volhynia. The secretary of the C. P. of Volhynian Province of Ukraine, I. Hrushetsky, wrote, on this occasion, a fundamental article in the *Radyanska Ukraina* of Feb. 24th, 1953, No. 46(9561), under the heading "Ideological work—Top Task of the Party-Organizations", in which he dealt with the "inadequacies" and "deviations" in this sphere.

"An under-valuation of the ideological work is gaining ground in the party-organizations of the Province of Volhynia. The department for propaganda and agitation of the district-organization of the C. P. of Ukraine was directing the work of party-education only superficially. The representatives of the department had, on their journeys through the individual areas, paid little attention to the quality of that which they had learnt from the communists, and had confined themselves exclusively to information and the compilation of long reports". The party-officials seemed to bother themselves very little about the "ideological line", and, since, the posts which they occupy are well-paid, they devoted their leisure to the writing of long reports, in order at least to give an appearance of activity.

In order to illustrate the gigantic machinery and the little interest taken by the population in this ideological work, it is worth while to consider the present number of schools, courses and of participants in these organizations. "The party-organizations have concentrated their attention primarily on the improvement of work in party-education. For this purpose more than 20,000 people, including eight thousand communists, have been gathered together. In the province are functioning 856 political schools and departments for the study of the biographies of W. I. Lenin Marxist-Leninist philosophy, besides 30 night-schools of the Party and one university for the study of and J. Stalin, the history of the C.P.S.U. and the

Marxism-Leninism. In addition there are 13 seminars for party-activists. . . .

It is immediately evident from these statistics how much trouble, time and money is being expended by the Russian-bolshevist regime in order to bring the province of Volhynia "up-to date" in ideological sphere. And from these figures it is easy to picture the true state of affairs. The setting of the aims, as well as the tendency of this party-work, is to direct itself against the foes of the Soviet regime and to uncover their activities. The recipe has been concocted by the party-secretary of Volhynia, as follows: "Propaganda, agitation and ideological work must take the offensive, and must aim at the exposure of the imperialistic ideology and policy of the Anglo-American war-mongers and their agents—the Ukrainian and Jewish bourgeois nationalists".

Not even the most energetic agitation and "propagation" of the ideological work is able to conceal the real weaknesses of the Soviet-Russian regime.

THE COURSE OF THE PRESENT RESEARCHES INTO UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Lately there has been a great deal of criticism directed at Ukrainian Scientists and, above all, at experts in language and literature, who work as lecturers at Ukrainian Universities. The philosophical faculties of the Universities of Kyiv and Odessa have suffered most frequently from this. In the "Kadyanska Ukraina" of Feb. 13th and 14th, 1953, No. 37 (9552) and No. 38 (9553), appeared two fundamental articles dealing in detail with the "ideological deviations" in the field of the study of language, and literature, and, at the same time, formed an analysis of the conditions of the researches in this sphere.

The first of the two was especially directed against appearances of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" in the study of language. The lecturer, *I. Hreciutenko*, criticised most severely the conditions in the philosophical faculties of Odessa University, and devoted himself to a radical criticism of the lecturers in Ukrainian philology. "In spite of the fact that the teaching of the Ukrainian language has recently been brought almost to a complete destruction, the governing body of the Universities and the Ministry of Culture of the Ukrainian S.S.R. has not devoted sufficient attention to this matter. Until now there has been a lack of scientific teachers." The reason for the unusual and penetrating criticism is given by the works of the lecturer, *A. A. Moskalenko*, in whose "manifestations of bourgeois nationalism", influences of "the nationalist bourgeois theories" and "the lack of a Marxist Socialist point of view" are so clearly seen. The mistakes arise out of the "inadequate pointing out of the unity of the Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian languages, who share a common origin". The present Soviet culture-policy is attempting with all the means in its power, ruthlessly to introduce this completely misguided and scientifically untenable theory into the Ukrainian Universities. Moreover, it is seeking at every opportunity to prove the connection between the Russian and Ukrainian languages, and to give the Russian language a much higher value, and to hold it up as an example for all linguistic developments in the Slav world.

The recently published "Scientific Contributions", which is the 16th Volume of the 4th Philological Series was submitted to an annihilating criticism by the reviewer *P. Hrycenko*. The editorial staff, composed of Professors *F. Polischuk*, *P. Wolynskyj*, *D. Shutenko* and the lecturer *F. Hrim* were branded as "adulterators" and "malevolent perverters" of the Ukrainian language problem. *P. Wolynskyj*, first of all, received sharp censure for his contribution "Literary and Theoretical quotations from Ukrainian writers of the 1st quarter of the 19th century", because he had not depicted the figure of the founder of modern Ukrainian literature, *I. Kotlarevskyj*, in the light of the Leninist-Stalinist theory. Especially the description of the national question is thorn in the side of the bolshevist critic, and is therefore all the more bitterly attacked. The author was charged with being influenced by bourgeois nationalist writers and theoreticians, and their false attitude to these

THE EIGHTH GENERAL ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIANS IN GREAT BRITAIN

On the 27th and 28th of March, 1953, in the Kentish Town Hall, London, Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd., which is a Company Limited by guarantee and not having a share capital, incorporated the 20th December, 1947, and registered under the War Charities Act, 1940, held its 8th Annual General Meeting.

The Meeting was attended by 104 legally elected by the Branches delegates, representing 222 votes. Apart from the delegates there were many individual members and guests present.

After the preliminary formalities, President of the Association Dr. O. Fundak opened the Meeting and called for a minute of silence in memory of those members who died during the year, among them, Very Rev. E. Korduba, member of the General Council.

Reports of General Council, Tribunal, Finance Control Committee and Auditors (Reports of Executive Committee was published in "Ukrainian Thought" in full before the Meeting) were unanimously approved by the Meeting and the President and the General Council retired.

The following were the incomes of the Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain in the year 1952:

a) Central Fund	£ 13,509
b) Invalids' Fund	8,363
c) Mutual Aid Fund	2,291

problems. The contribution of the Ukrainian Literary historian, *I. Bilhuk*, entitled "Shevchenko and Belynskyj", is described as an example of an "exaggerated nationalistic and chauvinistic presentation of literature". "The Soviet community has already often criticised *I. Bilhuk* for his bourgeois nationalist perversion in his works. He has, however, done very little to read the path of a Marxist-Leninist view of language and literature". This author is reproached with having thought to work out the contrast between Shevchenko and Belynskyj according to a nationalistic interpretation, and thereby has shown the relationship between Russian and Ukrainian literature in a false light. Also the other contributions of scientific work are written "on a low ideological and theoretical level". They all displayed a nationalistic point of view and the authors are incapable of a "critical" valuation. Mistakes are also present in the articles of *F. Polischuk*: "M. Horkyj and the development of Ukrainian National poetry". The author could find no better sources for this work than the primitive nationalistic writings of *D. Kosarik*, whom he praises above measure. From this false position, ethnographical works of the bourgeois nationalists Antonovych, Hrinchenko and Drahomanov. "Political lack of principles", "lack of Soviet patriotism and too little respect for the Russian nation" are the fundamental evils with which both the communist and the Soviet scientist have to fight.

When one submits the relationship between Russian and Ukrainian literature in the 19th century to a thorough, scientific, objective and correct scrutiny, one will see that the majority, indeed all, of the noted Russian literary critics have most bitterly attacked almost every newly published Ukrainian literary work, in order to suppress the increasing Ukrainian national-consciousness, together with the Tsarist officials. Belynskyj was the very one who attacked all Shevchenko's creations with his tirades of hatred and treated the Ukrainian language in its entirety to adverse and nasty remarks.

The present purges in the Ukrainian faculties are directed at limiting even more the already curtailed and consciously suppressed researches into Ukrainian language and literature and finally at bringing even them into service of Russian political and scientific aspirations.

d) Houses' Fund	5,485
e) Students' Relief Fund	694
f) "Ukrainian Thought" Fund	4,883
g) Bookselling Fund	5,342

Total: £ 40,567

The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain is the possessor of the Invalids' Home which is worth £9,600

The Association also owns 8 houses worth £ 16,000

Balance Sheet figures for the year 1952 are: £44,700

Mr. W. Lisewych (Lawer) has been elected as the new President of the Association.

The General Meeting accepted resolutions, expressed and sent greetings to: Ukrainian People and its Insurgent Army (U.P.A.), which is heroically withstanding the Communist oppression in Ukraine; to the Hierarchy of both Ukrainian Churches; to all Ukrainians abroad, greetings and expression of gratitude to Her Majesty Queen Elisabeth the II, the Queen of Great Britain, Head of the Commonwealth, to Her Majesty's Government and to British People for their help and great hospitality extended to Ukrainians in this country.

General Annual Meeting was ended with Ukrainian National Anthem.

FIFTH MEETING OF UKRAINIAN YOUTH ASSOCIATION (S.U.M.) IN GREAT BRITAIN

On Feb. 28th and March the 1st of this year, 38 delegates from various towns of Great Britain came to London to hear the report on the one-year activity of the Ukrainian Youth Association (S.U.M.) in Great Britain and to elect a new Committee for the year 1953-54. The Ukrainian Youth Association in Great Britain has a membership of 2,072 young Ukrainians, who are grouped together in 62 sub-sections. They continually carry on cultural and educational work, give various performances, have their own choirs, dancing- and dramatic-groups, and hold various courses. Moreover, the Ukrainian Youth Association tries to get its members to attend various English evening-schools and classes, as well as to learn the Ukrainian subjects. Last year the Branches of the Ukrainian Youth Association in Great Britain held altogether 777 meetings.

The Ukrainian Youth Association in Great Britain works in co-operation with various youth organizations and takes an active part in combatting the attitudes of the communism in the West. During the communist "Youth Peace Festival" in Sheffield members of the Ukrainian Youth Organization distributed leaflets which contained true informations concerning the actual intentions of the communists.

The Ukrainian Youth Association was also the initiator of the creation of a common front of youth of the peoples subjugated by Moscow in the form of the organization of youth of A.B.N. in Great Britain. Much attention has also been devoted to the publishing problem and there has been published, among the other things, a scientific work by that famous pedagogy Observer. Gal. 40.

and great friend of youth, Prof. Vashchenko, which is entitled, "The Training of Will and Character".

Collections have been made by the Ukrainian Youth Association for the benefit of needy Ukrainian youth in Germany and Trieste and consignments of books have been distributed. For the purpose of promoting the cultural and educational work, the Committee of S.U.M. in Great Britain has produced a film-projector of its own.

After the submission of the report on activities, the Ukrainian Youth Association elected their new Committee under the chairmanship of *J. Deremenda*.

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE IN LOURES

The Ukrainian seminary, which has as its task the training of Ukrainian priests for the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the emigration also for the future

liberated Ukraine, has just finished its scholastic year. During this year, 35 young Ukrainians studied at the seminary. The majority of them come from poor Ukrainian families, and their parents were not able to pay for their studies. They were therefore assisted from a fund which is subscribed to by Ukrainians living in various countries.

The famed Ukrainian sculptor, *Alexander Archy-penko*, who is at present living in the U.S.A., has produced a new work. It is the bust of the great Ukrainian poet, *Taras Shevchenko*. At the delivery of the work, the great master said: "We knew that Ukrainian men of genius have created, but we ought to be able to see their countenances which reflect their thoughts and their spirit".

The scientific "Shevchenko Society" (N.T.Sh.) has published a report on its library, which is now situated in Philadelphia, U.S.A. This library is composed of a collection of Ukrainian prints, books, newspapers, journals, various bulletins, maps and illustrations which have appeared in Germany, Austria and other European countries since the year 1945. The library contains current new publications, which, in the course of the year 1952, numbered 654 books, 1,255 numbers of various journals, and 492 smaller prints. It is to be transferred in the near future into the "House of Ukrainian Culture" in New York.

The World-federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations, which has hitherto included eleven Ukrainian women's organizations, has been joined by the women's section of the Ukrainian Agricultural Union in Brazil, who thus make the twelfth member of these Ukrainian organizations. It runs its own page in the weekly, *The Farmer* (Chliborob).

The Association of Ukrainian Physicians in the U.S.A. now has 260 members. There are altogether 550 Ukrainian doctors living in the U.S.A. This medical association was founded two years ago in New York, and has its branch-organization in Detroit, Chicago and Philadelphia. It assists young doctors to acquire comprehensive and specialised knowledge and to obtain suitable position in the U.S.A. At the last convention, which took place in New York on Feb. 28th and March 1st, the following projects for the future work were put forward: the building of a Ukrainian hospital, the uniting all Ukrainian doctors in a society, and the formation of a world-federation of Ukrainian doctors. The present chairman of the Association is Dr. *Roman Osyphuk*.

According to the latest statistical publications of the Canadian Government, the Ukrainian population in Winnipeg has increased almost 20,000 in the last 20 years. In the census of 1941, there were 23,249 Ukrainians in Winnipeg, and, in the census of 1951, 41,537. Of these, 26,855 are Greek Catholics, and the rest belong to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and other confessions.

From March 25th-28th, 1953, there was held the national congress of Belgian students, to which Ukrainian students from the Central Union of Ukrainian Students (C.E.S.U.S.) were also invited. The Ukrainian Central Committee accepted this invitation and delegated Ewhen Fedorenko, Borys Makarenko and Nadia Ripak to represent the Ukrainian students at this congress.

The American citizens of Ukrainian origin celebrated this year the diamond jubilee of the *Ukrainian National Association*, which was founded in the State of Pennsylvania in the year 1864 as an insurance company. Its first president was *Teodozy Talpash*. At the present moment, the directing body is under the chairmanship of Mr. *Dmytro Halychyn*. The Ukrainian National Association numbers about 70,000 members, who are distributed in 494 branches throughout the U.S.A. and Canada. At the end of January, 1953, this organization possessed property to the value of \$ 14,304,974.15.

PROBLEMS OF UKRAINIAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Continued from Page 1)

had had their way; the name of the "American Committee" was changed with accord to their chauvinistic, unitarian wishes.

But the consequence was that all the non-Russian nations who were meant to participate in the common front of the anti-bolshevik campaign, simply revolted with anger and indignation against this chauvinistic Russian imputation. Except some corrupt and venal Russian stooges who sold themselves out to the Russians to "represent" in the "common front" the non-Russian nations, no self-respecting representative of a non-Russian nation gave his consent to participate in the planned common endeavour under such politically humiliating conditions.

The further consequence was that by the absence of the legitimate representatives of the non-Russian nations at the "Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-Bolshevik Struggle" this "Center" became crippled and thoroughly ineffective at its very start. It became the domain of the monopolistic rule and patronage of the purely Russian "democratic" parties. At that all this Russian elements, politically ambitious as they were, proved to be for the most part personally of very low professional and cultural standards. Greedy as they were for power they were not in the position to fill the "Radio Liberation" with adequate political and cultural programmes good enough to cope satisfactorily with the incessant pressure of the bolshevik propaganda. Thus the Russians alone proved to be a remarkable failure. The Americans had to reach the conclusion that this sort of setting will not work.

The present change of the name of the "American Committee" represents some sort of American concession towards the viewpoint of the non-Russian nations. The ominous, controversial and deeply hated name of "Russia" was dropped. What remained is the indication that in the future the "Committee" would try to avoid the nationality problem but would concentrate its endeavours and activities solely upon the fighting of bolshevism. This was meant to build a "golden bridge" for the abstaining non-Russian nations to join the "Co-ordinating Center".

But the nations in question still refuse to join. They coincide that the change of the name is a well-meant American concession. Yet these nations fight not only the outward appearances, like the names but also the substances of the Russian imperialism and domination. The fact remains that in consequence of Russian-

NEW NAME, OLD CONTENTS

(Continued from Page 1)

because they begin at the wrong point and furnish assistance to Russian imperialistic circles. There exists no clear British attitude to this problem, as the Britons are now primarily interested in pacifying and co-operating with the present Moscow. The Ukrainian version, which is the combining of all the anti-bolshevik, non-Russian forces, has not yet been fully solved, but can look back upon a certain degree of success. Hitherto no better idea has been proffered from any other quarter.

The second aim which the Ukrainian foreign policy seeks to achieve is the formation of a basis for closer co-operation with the Central and East-European nations, as well as the Soviet-dominated Asiatic nations, grounded on the fundamental of equality of rights and a genuine partnership. Since Russian policy renders impossible the fulfilment of the demands of this partnership, by reason of its imperialistic ambitions, we put forward the view that the Russians cannot co-operate in an alliance of the above-mentioned nations.

The third set of problems of the Ukrainian foreign policy are presented by the question of the Black Sea. The Ukrainian attitude towards this is, in short, as follows: all nations that border the Black Sea are, by means of treaties and agreements, possessing the right to a common use of this sea. Thus the justified Turkish, as well as all other demands for security from Russian imperialism, are to be met by a system of treaties and genuine co-operation among all the Black Sea partners.

The clarification of these questions naturally depends on circumstances, and requires a thorough, factual and correct examination. In our journal we will attempt to present these problems, which touch Ukraine and her neighbours, in such a manner.

friendly statutes of the "Co-ordinating Center", the Russians possess a statutory guaranteed preponderance in this institution. This or that way the non-Russian nations still would be dominated, commanded and exploited by the Russians. And this they refuse. They demand real independence, i. e. a separation even from the slightest vestiges of the Russian built rule and domination. What the non-Russian nations demand is at least an organization upon the principles of the United Nations, i. e. that each nation is represented only by one representative. This would have to apply also to the Russians.



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 6—7

LONDON, JUNE—JULY 1953

Price 1 sh

CONTENTS:

THE SOLITARY STRUGGLE	1—2
U.P.A. MAJOR POLTAVA	2—3
THE STRUGGLE OF THE UNDERGROUND UKRAINE	3—5
The enemy is mistaken	
A difficult winter	
Heroic sacrifice	
Deportation, Terrorism, Death	
Revolutionary Tactics	
Moral Support	
The activities of the Underground	
John F. Stewart	
APPROACH TO RUSSIA	5—7
MOSCOW'S NEW AND OPEN	
DEFEAT IN UKRAINE	7—8
Melnikov's Removal	
The Real Cause of Melnikov's Misfortune	
Melnikov's National Policy	
The Collectivisation of West-Ukraine	
The Famine in the Years 1946-47	
Results of Melnikov's Leadership	
Z. Poray	
PAX PONTICA	8—9
DANGEROUS	9—16
H. J. Olezhko	
UNPLEASANT PROSPECTS	10—11
NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV	11—12
A Wrong Statement	
Never was a Ukrainian	
A Relation of Mutual Hatred	
A Ruthless Careerist	
Breaking the Peasants	
Flattering Ukraine	
The Scourge	
TRAGEDY OF THE YEAR	
1933	12—13
Mme. Woropaj	
THE DREADFUL YEAR OF	
1933 IN MY VILLAGE	13—14
JUNE 30th, 1941	14—15
UKRAINIANS ABROAD	15
UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN	16
BOOK REVIEW	16
If War Comes Tomorrow	

THE SOLITARY STRUGGLE

The news which has recently arrived from Ukraine testifies to an unremitting, obstinate war, waged with the utmost severity by the Ukrainian nation against the Russian-bolshevist occupiers. It is not only a fight with material weapons which is carried on by the Ukrainian revolutionary, underground U.P.A. (Ukrainian Insurgent Army). It is also being fought out on the political and ideological plane, which increases its significance and importance.

Immediately after Stalin's death, members of the Ukrainian underground O.U.N.—U.P.A. carried through, in various parts of Ukraine, a strengthened anti-Soviet action. In many towns, the posters bearing the picture of Stalin and the proclamation of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. were torn down and in their place were stuck three letters. These were —U.P.A. Such incidents occurred in Sniatyn, Kalush (District Stanyslaviv) and Lviv. In the city of Lviv, intensified anti-bolshevist activity was kindled, the results of which were the destruction of the offices of the Communist newspaper, *Lvivska Pravda* (The Truth of Lviv), the tearing down of Stalin's portraits and the announcements concerning the special memorial meetings which were to take place on the occasion of Stalin's death. In another part of our publication, in the article, "*The Struggle of the Underground Ukraine*", we shall deal with the fight of the Ukrainian underground O.U.N.—U.P.A. in more detail.

Here, however, must be illustrated the fact of the great Ukrainian resistance, which still persists in Ukraine, and must be an immeasurable factor in the anti-bolshevist struggle. We have already often stressed the fact that the West does not take this factor sufficiently into the consideration and even, under the influence of Russian imperialist circles, underestimates and seeks to belittle it.

It is often doubtful whether the western, and above all the American, anti-

Soviet propaganda departments are not suffering from Soviet infiltration and, for this reason, take no notice of O.U.N.—

U.P.A., the all-important nuclei of the anti-bolshevist struggle. The painful fact that the Ukrainian patriots' long struggle has met with no recognition can only be explained by a completely anti-Ukrainian attitude in the West. When one considers that every flight of Communist collaborators from Czechoslovakia or of M.V.D. officers is commented upon in the western Press and on the wireless as a great event, and that, on the other hand, the fight of the U.P.A. and O.U.N. merits not one mention, one is justified in asking if the West is at all interested in combatting Communism and Russian imperialism. And even the circles which profess the anti-bolshevist struggle to be their special concern are doing their best to ignore the Ukrainian liberation efforts. They are trying to "construct" a resistance movement in the U.S.S.R. with the assistance of unreliable Russian fascist elements (e. g. N.T.S., etc.). Simultaneously, they are busying themselves with Communist deserters, to whom they are lending moral and material support, and hope that this will provide the right recipe for an eventual democratisation of the Kremlin.

The only thing to be said about this is that these elements are anything but suited to perform this task. It is our view that the most well organized armed resistance in the Soviet sphere is being conducted by the O.U.N.—U.P.A., and that on Ukrainian territory. Only from that starting-point can the anti-bolshevist struggle develop with any success.

In the liberation-struggle against the Russian occupation for an independent Ukrainian State, the following nationalist-revolutionaries have died a hero's death:

Continued on Page 2

Continued from Page 1

Petro Poltava—First Deputy Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.), Head of the Information Department of U.H.V.R., Head of the Political Section of the General Staff of the U.P.A., Member of the Executive Committee of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), Head of the Propaganda and Information Department of the O.U.N. In late autumn, 1951, in Ukraine.

Bayrak—Leader of the Provincial Executive of the O.U.N. C.C. In autumn, 1951, in Ukraine.

Netchuy-Netchuyenko—Liaison Officer of the Foreign Units of the O.U.N. In summer, 1951, in Ukraine.

Pomsta-Ternyk—Sergeant in U.P.A., leader of a detachment of the Liaison Service of the O.U.N., decorated with the Silver Cross for Service in the Field, 1st class. In June 1951.

Boyko—Leader of district executive of O.U.N. In spring 1949.

Nestor—Leader of district executive of O.U.N. On Feb. 17th, 1950.

Bohdan—Leader of district executive of O.U.N. In spring, 1950.

Kobsar—Member of Security Service Autumn, 1952.

Veres—Sergeant in the U.P.A. September, 1951.

Berkut—Sergeant in the U.P.A. Summer, 1951.

Sokil—Sergeant in the U.P.A. Autumn, 1952.

Myron — Liaison Service of O.U.N. in Ukraine. Autumn, 1952.

Bohdan — Liaison Service of O.U.N. in Ukraine. Autumn, 1952.

Ihor — Leading member of the Liaison Service of the Foreign Units of O.U.N. Autumn, 1952.

Moros—Soldier of the U.P.A. and Liaison Service of the O.U.N. December, 1951.

Klem—Soldier of a district cell of Security Service. Autumn, 1952.

Skory—Soldier of a district cell of O.U.N. Winter, 1950.

Lastivka—Soldier of a district cell of O.U.N. Winter, 1950.

Hayduk—Soldier of a district cell of O.U.N. Winter, 1950.

Orest—Soldier of a district cell of Security Service. June 1951.

Beresa—Sergeant in U.P.A., member of Liaison Service of O.U.N. Summer, 1951.

In June 1953

Executive of the Foreign Units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Z.Ch. O.U.N.)

U.P.A. MAJOR P. POLTAVA

After long months of uncertainty, the news has finally reached us that, in the late autumn of 1951, Major of the U.P.A., *Petro Poltava*, known also by the name of *Petro Volansky*, fell in the fight against the Russian-bolshevist occupiers, aged 35 years. The news of Major Poltava's heroic death arrived from Ukraine a year ago, but has only lately been officially confirmed.

Major Petro Poltava has been since his earliest youth in the ranks of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.) In the year 1939, during the first occupation of the West-Ukraine by the Soviets, he remained behind in his homeland and worked intensively on behalf of the rising generation of Ukrainian nationalists. He studied later medicine in Lviv, but nevertheless expended much time and

energy on the work for the youth of the O.U.N. He moreover published for the youth the organ of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists; he also wrote many articles for the publications of the

O.U.N. Under the German occupation, he went on with his work among the youth, despite the fact that, in 1944, he had to fill other posts in the O.U.N. Major Poltava always remained in closest contact with the young people and their problems.

P. Poltava's actual field of activity was programmatical work, propaganda and publicity. One may say that he was one of the most prominent and remarkable Ukrainian revolutionary publicists.

Among his most important works are: *"The Ideal of an Independent Ukraine and Basic Tendencies of the Political Development of the Present-day World"*, *"Elements of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Nationalism"*, and *"Who are the Banderivtsi and for what are they fighting"*. After the death of many prominent personalities of the O.U.N. and U.H.V.R., he took over more and more important tasks.

At the moment of his death, Major P. Poltava was the First Deputy Chairman of the General Secretariate of the Ukra-

nian Supreme Liberation Council, the so-called U.H.V.R., member of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.), head of the latter's information office, head of the political section of the General Staff of U.P.A., member of the directing committee of the O.U.N. and head of the Department for Propaganda and Information of O.U.N.

The figure of Major P. Poltava will never be forgotten among the Ukrainian people, for whom he lived and died.

In order to make a short study of the publicity work and, above all, of the political opinions of Major P. Poltava, which reflect, at the same time, the views of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground movement, we give here a few excerpts from his publication *"The Ideal of an Independent Ukraine and Basic Tendencies of the Political Development of the Present-day World"*:

"The ideal of an independent Ukraine, for the realisation of which the Ukrainian nation is now fighting, is therefore, above all things, a manifestation of the natural desire of the Ukrainian people for their independent national life, which has been peculiar to them since the beginning of their historical existence.

The liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation is only a part of the great historical process which is going on all over the world, so that the struggle is, from the standpoint of this process, a completely legitimate phenomenon, called forth by forces which are great and, measured by a universal yard-stick, invincible.

The force which operates parallel with the idea of nationhood is the idea of the constitutional, parliamentary State, the ideal of democracy. Moreover, the idea of nationhood is, to a great extent, indebted for its appearance to the democratic ideal. Without the ideal of equal rights for all citizens, the ideal of national sovereignty could not prevail. The struggle for democratic reform, which, in the 19th century, developed among all the nations of Europe, was never directed against the idea of national independence for the peoples. On the contrary, this struggle embraced the broad masses, increased national consciousness, contributed to the soundness of internal conditions, and thus strengthened the nation as such. One can quite logically say that the ideal of nationhood can exist only with the ideal of political democracy.

The idea of the destruction of the bolshevist prison of nations by means of revolutionary struggles, as well as the idea of rebuilding the U.S.S.R. on the principle of self-determination for the peoples is gaining more and more recognition. Today the bolsheviks do not know what to do about the national liberation-struggle of the Ukrainian and other oppressed nations. When all the oppressed nations of the U.S.S.R. take up the struggle—and this moment is coming, as

an inevitable result of the entire bolshevist policy—the bolshevist prison will then meet its end.

From all that has been said it may obviously be deducted that the ideal of nationhood takes the dominating place among all other factors which influence the course of history. It is the greatest force of the historical process, and all other forces which are directed against it capitulate when it comes to a conflict. It thus marks the fundamental development-tendency of the historical process.

The nation and national independence. They are today, as they always have been, things most valued by all mankind which acknowledges them without reservation and is prepared to die for them.

The fundamental tendency of the modern world's political development is the tendency of all nations to form new national States. All social problems are being decided within the framework of single national States. The aim of this social transformation is the elimination of class-antagonism in the name of the strengthening of the national community in its entirety.

The ideal of nationhood thus achieved decisive power, because it fulfils the inherent, natural longing of all peoples—the longing to create their own, individual, independent national life.

After the First World War, the idea of a closer co-operation of States and peoples was born. It is not difficult to understand, if we contemplate the matter theoretically, that the ideal of international co-operation is objectively a progressive idea, which does not contradict the ideal of nationhood. Experience, however, shows that the international organisations which were created for the task of realising and cultivating this ideal, are not fulfilling their task. These international organizations are not working for the realisation of the high principles which they have professed to be the leading principles of their activities. The U.N., like the League of Nations before it, has not brought it about that, in reality, "friendly relations will be developed between the nations on the basis of the principle of equality of rights and the self-determination of the peoples", nor that "the realisation of international co-operation will be strived at in the stimulation of the development of respect for the rights of man and of basic freedom for all". The bolshevist U.S.S.R., a member of the U.N., is today enslaving the nations of Eastern Europe, and those of the Caucasus and Asia. The ideal of international co-operation can be realised only when the principle of self-determination for all peoples is carried into effect. So long as there are ruling and ruled nations, so long as some nations oppress other weaker than themselves, one cannot speak of general trust among the nations of the

THE STRUGGLE OF THE UNDERGROUND UKRAINE

The struggle for the national-political liberation goes on in Ukraine, despite the stabilisation of the Moscow bolshevist regime

Editors' note: We are here publishing items of information which our editorial board has received, for publication purposes, from the Press Bureau of the Foreign Branches of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Z.Ch.O.U.N.). The position of the Ukrainian Underground in Ukraine is very serious and often passes beyond human conception. Despite very difficult circumstances and unfavourable conditions, the fight continues without cessation and with the firm belief in a successful termination.

* * *

The enemy is mistaken

The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.) are fighting, under quite unparalleled difficulties, without cessation for the liberation and the independent formation of the Ukrainian national State. The methods and manner of this fight have been altered in recent years and adapted to the new conditions. The enemy was mistaken when he assumed that the battle was ended. As long as there is any armed resistance or invisible hands distribute the literature of the O.U.N.—U.P.A.—U.H.V.R. (Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council), Moscow knows—the whole Ukraine knows—that the revolutionary struggle has not been interrupted for an instant.

The actions of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground movement are all the more worthy of admiration because they are carried out under intensified Moscow-bolshevist terrorism, while the M.G.B.—M.V.D. are simultaneously trying to filter into the most intimate corners of Ukrainian life.

The bolshevist radio and press announcements, however, were wrong when, in the autumn of 1952, they stated that

world. Without such trust among the nations, one cannot speak about effective international co-operation.

The ideal of an independent Ukraine is becoming the basic element of the plan for breaking down the bolshevist prison of nations, which is today the nest of the most disgraceful reaction and dangerous aggression in the world, and is becoming the basic element of the new order in the Eastern Europe and part of Asia.

The construction of the independent Ukrainian State by the Ukrainian people will be a gigantic step forward towards the creation of a real balance of power in the world and the assurance of a lasting peace among the nations".

the Ukrainian revolutionary underground was "liquidated" and "there were no more Banderivci", "we (the bolshevist) will nevertheless not relax our vigilance for a moment".

For, in spite of all "vigilance" and "precaution", as well as other acts of terrorism, the enemy has not succeeded in doing away with the Ukrainian underground.

A difficult winter

Like all other winters in the underground, that of 1952/1953 was especially hard for the Ukrainian revolutionary and brought many losses. The bolsheviks carried out in that winter many widespread search-actions in various districts of Ukraine. One of the forms of the total control are mass cross-examinations, in which tens of thousands of people from one district are taken to task in the expectation that some woman, child, or some incautious person will say something suspicious that might lead to a clue. These questions are not only intolerable to the population, but they also make things difficult for revolutionary work, because they disturb, although do not break, the communication system.

Another and even more difficult problem is the provision of food. The kolkhos-system is the great obstacle here. The position was quite different when there were still private farmsteads in the townlets and villages. The kolkhos economy is under the tightest control, so that the great majority of the population, who obviously sympathise with the underground fighters, are able to help them with food only by stinting themselves, and then can only give a little. The revolutionaries are forced to capture their food and clothing by force of arms from the Soviet warehouses.

While procuring food in winter, one of the foremost revolutionaries, the leader of a group of *IHOR*, fell in an armed skirmish with M.V.D.—troops, together with the comrades whose duty it was to protect him.

Heroic Sacrifice

In the past winter of 1952/1953, the bolshevist tried to liquidate the underground once and for all—about which they made extraordinarily many reports. Searches and cross-examinations reached a hitherto unheard-of intensity.

The following people, among others, fell in the actions of the past winter: a district leader of the O.U.N., an area leader, and two group-leaders of this organization whose names cannot be published. In addition, the revolutionary

KLEM, of the group of the O.U.N. area-leader, fell in executing an armed action against the M.V.D.

Especially distressing was the death of three O.U.N. couriers in the late autumn of 1952. They had to bring organizational and propaganda material from Ukraine to the West, and lost their lives in Czechoslovakia.

It is the couriers who have to exercise the greatest caution with regard to communications. We read in one report: "On the return journey from our leader in late autumn, we fell into a trap. One was killed and one wounded". Such sentences are to be found in the most of the reports.

Deportations, Terrorism, Death

These were not all the losses for the year 1952. In the summer of 1952 mass-deportations were carried out, especially in the Carpathian area. Similar bolshevist actions were carried out in West-Ukraine, the most severely affected districts being those of Zolochiv and Sokal. Just as unfortunate was the turn of the year, 1952/53. The O.U.N. lost notable leading figures. The fallen are: Major P. Poltava, rural leader Bayrak (the latter in autumn, 1951). The leading men were, however, soon replaced, partly from the ranks of the Foreign Branches of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Z.Ch.O.U.N.); of these men, some have already fallen.

Despite the fact that new leaders from the revolutionary underground are filling the places of the fallen, one can detect a certain scarcity of leading officers, especially in the province of organization and strategy.

Revolutionary Tactics

In spite of the fact that, for some time, conspiratorial underground tactics have replaced the former insurgent and militant ones, the armed skirmishes have not ended. The revolutionary fight is being continued in all possible forms and frameworks. It has primarily a defensive character, in order to protect the population and the revolutionary cadres, who are supporters of the ideals, from reprisals. This does not act as a set-back to revolutionary activities, least of all as regards the strengthening of propaganda actions. The offensive, armed actions which arise out of this, even when of limited extent serve the purpose of testifying to the unbroken national desire for the attainment of sovereignty. The actual weapons are always the real and actual guarantee of national sovereignty. Therefore the Ukrainian underground cannot renounce the continuation of the armed struggle, even if it is limited and only a symbol of lasting revolutionary activity.

They need weapons

One of the greatest problems which confronts the Ukrainian revolutionary

underground is the *acquisition of weapons*. The lack of necessary weapons is of great disadvantage. Formerly, when the U.P.A. operated in large detachments, they had better opportunities to capture weapons from the enemy and to fight on with these arms. By reason of the change of revolutionary tactics, which were adapted to the new conditions, armaments cannot be captured from the strong detachments of the enemy, who is equipped with heavy weapons. The things most urgently needed by the underground are: weapons, ammunition, medicines against wounds, T.B., rheumatism, concentrates, food and money. Besides these, spiritual weapons are required—literature, which proves to the people that they are not standing alone.

The stupendous fight that is here being waged is all the more difficult because it has to rely upon its own resources. It is tragic to read the letters written in blood and to consider how the West is pouring weapons money and fighting-forces into countries which have no interest in the struggle against bolshevism and in which communists, and workers instigated by communists, are sabotaging the unloading of supplies of armaments. And this at the same time as *Ukraine needs and cannot obtain weapons against the common foe!* It is incomprehensible to the men in the underground that the West does not want to make common cause with them against the common foe. In various lands, even, agreement with the Soviet Union is being sought at any price. Ukraine, however, fights on, relying on herself.

Moral Support

Despite all difficulties, dangers and losses, *fighting Ukraine* is not losing courage. In every word that comes from the underground, one finds the same steadfast faith in the triumph of truth. The fighters rejoice greatly over every piece of news which comes from abroad and signifies for them spiritual confirmation. Under the difficult conditions of bolshevist isolation, the arrival of new people from abroad is of the highest importance. This moral support, which comes to them from Ukrainians scattered all over the world and does everything to make clear to the West the significance of this struggle, is of the greatest importance to the fighters.

The arrival of members of the Z. Ch. O.U.N. is a very strong factor in binding the homeland with Ukrainians in the West.

The Activities of the Underground

Despite all the obstacles and terror, the 10th anniversary of the foundation of the U.P.A. was, on Oct. 14th, 1952, celebrated in the revolutionary underground with all solemnity. At the right moment, instructions were published concerning this celebration and placed at

the disposal of the active members.

Speaking generally, intensified training is being undergone by the members of the U.P.A.—O.U.N. This is intended primarily for the purpose of revolutionary activity and enlightenment of the population. Suitable literature is naturally applied to this purpose, as was also done formerly. The issuing of such publications is being increased. The O.U.N.'s most important work is now the propagation of our ideals, the political-ideological fight against the enemy, resistance in all sectors of national life (particularly the fight against the exploiting system of kolkhoses), armed defensive actions, to a small extent, propaganda activities among the officers and men of the Soviet Army, and other long-term actions.

One of the surest proofs of this unceasing struggle and, at the same time, a measure of its extent, is the publication and propaganda material which is issued in the underground. In order to illustrate this best, we are giving here a list of those publications which will be obtainable by the public in the near future.

In the year 1950.

- 1) Suggestions for propaganda in the year 1950.
 - 2) Robert (Yaroslav Melnyk).
 - 3) The massed armed struggle behind the Curson Line.
 - 4) Colonel Rizun-Gregit.
 - 5) Memoirs.
 - 6) To the Nation.
 - 7) Yurko Berezynsky.
 - 8) Captain Chernyk.
 - 9) Our Struggle and the Cadre Problem.
 - 10) Towards Relief—Journal for Youth (For July 1950).
 - 11) For the Great Ideal.
 - 12) For a Monolith of Unity.
 - 13) Bolshevik Solution of the National Question.
 - 14) The Conception of an Independent Ukraine and the Basic Tendency of the Political Development of the Modern World (P. Poltava) New edition.
 - 15) Colonel Ivan Bohun.
 - 16) The Structure of the O.U.N. for the Achievement of the Independent and United Ukrainian State (U.S.S.D.) are the only right ones.
 - 17) For what is the U.P.A. fighting.
 - 18) Bulletin of the Information Office of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.) for March, 1950.
- In the year 1951:
- 1) In an Epoch.
 - 2) Why are we for the Independent Ukrainian State (U.S.S.D.) ?
 - 3) Our Plan for the Liberation of Ukraine under present conditions, by P. Poltava.
 - 4) Wirka
 - 5) Bloody Years.
 - 6) Bulletin of the Information Office

APPROACH TO RUSSIA

In any approach to Russia, surely the West will never ask the Russians what they want, but will tell them emphatically what the West wants, and the first and most vitally important demand is the restoration of complete sovereign independence to all the non-Russian States in the U.S.S.R. or dominated by Moscow.

It does not seem to be remembered or recognised that it was Lenin himself who not only destroyed Tsarist regime, but dissolved the Empire into its component States—Russia for the Russians, and all the States according to their nationalities. These States will be free again one day, with or without outside help, and their peoples are not likely to forget who were for or against them, and will be apt, with their enormous natural wealth, to favour the "fors". This will apply not only to Europe but to Siberia, where there will be a strong non-Russian State.

of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council for May, 1951.

In the year 1952:

1) Organizational report for the second half of 1951 to September 1952 from ...

2) Plan of General Organizational Work for Summer, 1952.

3) Plan of Propaganda Work for the period June 15th—Sept. 30th, 1952.

4) How we receive news of our people's reaction to our literature.

5) Why and how protocols on conversations are to be written.

6) Our Slogan—Liberty for Nations and Individuals.

7) The Programme for Conspiratorial Training, No. 1.

8) The Programme for Conspiratorial Training, No. 2.

9) Instructions for the Celebrations of the U.P.A.

10) Training in Organization.

11) Jetons for 5 and 100 Karbovanci.

12) Pamphlets for Youth.

13) Two pamphlets for Peasants.

14) The U.P.A. to the Ukrainians of the Eastern Province.

15) The Ukrainian Partisans (S. F. Chmel).

All publications which come from the Ukraine speak to the all-round development of the publishing activity in the Ukrainian revolutionary underground.

The Ukrainian publicists in the underground, who are fighting side by side with the soldiers of the U.P.A. even in the hardest fight, provide the best proof of the continuity and energy of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground.

The O.U.N.—U.P.A. are today the only actual wagers of the anti-bolshevist fight in the Ukraine as well as in the rest of the Soviet Union.

with the control of unlimited natural wealth, with which they might trade. The elements of this State are on the spot—voluntary immigrants and their descendants from Ukraine, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Georgia and others, already forming over half of the whole population. And even more, a pro-West policy in Siberia would have brought other gains, non-Chinese countries which had been conquered by the Manchu dynasty, such as Tibet, Mongolia, Sinkiang and many others would have clutched at Allied support, and established their independence, and so saved China from Communism.

As you know in the consequence of national revolutions in 1917-18 there have been re-established several independent and sovereign non-Russian states, the peoples of which, after having accomplished their revolutions now were striving to secure their freedom, peace and prosperity under their own National Governments.

The strongest of these was Ukraine, with its enormous natural wealth and its population of 45 millions, the largest in Europe next to Germany, and their story is that of the rest. Here it is.

Its Government was recognised by Soviet Russia, and, among others, by Great Britain, which also promised support. At the same time we secretly sent unlimited help to the White Russian Army under Denikin in money and military equipment, ostensibly to fight Germany, but, actually, to establish again the Russian Empire—"Holy Mother Russia One and Indivisible", this meaning the reenslavement of the non-Russian peoples.

After Trotsky had reorganised the Red Army, Moscow gathered a few Ukrainian Communists (there are Communists in every country) and called them the "Ukrainian Soviet Government", the usual puppet, which invited Moscow to accept Ukraine into the U.S.S.R. Moscow sent Red troops to attack the National Government. They could have been beaten off, but by this time Britain's real protégé also entered Ukraine as an enemy, destroyed all the Government institutions which had been established, confiscated all the lands and severely punished all the National Army soldiers it could capture. So Ukraine had to fight on two fronts. And now France, which had also recognised the legal Government of Ukraine, took a hand, and sent a large Polish army, trained in France, and handsomely equipped, under General Haller. France was aspiring to the hegemony of Central Europe. And then Rumania joined in to get a share of the loot. So the young State had to fight, meanly equipped, on four fronts, with the inevitable

result—it succumbed. But the only one who profited was the Bolshevik Moscow, which drove all the others out and occupied Ukraine. Ukraine could have beaten off the Reds, and other attackers would not have dared to move had Britain merely called them off. So it was the British Government of Mr. Lloyd George, in which Mr. Churchill was War Minister, which established the Bolsheviks with all the misery which has resulted.

At the time we acted in the same way in supporting, this time with the French and Americans, Admiral Kolchak, in his attempt to reestablish Tsarist Russian rule in Siberia, either oblivious of or disregarding the fact that the foundation had been laid of a great Siberiak Republic, anti-Communist, anti-Bolshevik and strongly anti-Russian, desiring no association with Moscow. The result of the Allied occupation was that the Reds took advantage of divided control by Allies to enter Siberia, defeated the Siberiaks and Kolchak, whom they executed, and caused the most ignominious evacuation by the Allied armies, who went home.

In the course of some investigations I became curious to know exactly what had happened in regard to the British treatment of Ukraine under its National Government. A high authority told me confidentially that I could get a copy of the document recognising Ukraine by applying to our Foreign Office; so I did. After repeated requests, and long after, I got a reply, not from the Librarian but from Mr. Eden, the Foreign Secretary, saying that there was no trace of any such document. I therefore sent the Office a copy of the letter of Sir Picton Bagge, the British Representative in Ukraine. Here it is:—

"I have the honour to inform you that His Britannic Majesty's Government has appointed me by cable as the sole Representative of Great Britain at present in Ukraine. I am directed by my Government to inform you of its good will. It will support the Ukrainian Government to the utmost of its ability in the task which it has undertaken of establishing good Government maintaining order, and resisting the Central Powers who are the enemies of democracy and humanity. As far as I personally am concerned, I have the honour to assure Your Excellency of my wholehearted support in the realisation of our common ideal".

(Signed) Picton Bagge,

British Representative in Ukraine,
Kiev, 7th January 1918.

In plain, but not Foreign Office English, this would imply recognition and promise of help and encouragement to go on fighting. The Foreign Office informed

me that (1) Britain had never recognised Ukrainians, (2) that no Ally had ever done so, (3) that Sir Picton Bagge, who had conveyed the recognition did not represent the British Government, (4) that after Ukraine had gone over to the Germans Britain had sent no further aid.

This last seems deliberately designed to mislead and put any inconvenient enquiry off the scent—Britain *never sent any aid* at any time. Sir Picton Bagge had been British Consul-General at Odessa till he was transferred to Kiev. He called on the Ukrainian Foreign Minister as British Representative, he hoisted the British flag over his Residency, his Official Documents and Notepaper had the printed heading "Representant du Gouvernement Royal Britannique au Ukraine", he took part in the Union of Foreign Representatives in Kiev, and, in that capacity presented himself to the Ukrainian Premier and the Foreign Minister. In the letters of the Foreign Secretary Mr. A. Eden addressed to me one might almost believe there never was such a person as Sir Picton Bagge. But I was able to contact the gentleman who was then Foreign Minister of Ukraine; he knew Sir Picton very well, and received him both officially and unofficially.

The French Declaration of Recognition, a copy of which I also have, was contained in a typically flowery speech by General Tabouis, the French Representative in Ukraine. As to no Ally having recognised Ukraine, both Poland and Argentina, who fully recognised the independent Ukrainian State, were Allies. I have the Argentinian Declaration, which is quite unambiguous, before me now.

With the fall of independent Ukraine, all the other newly-established States which had been in the Russian Empire, fell one after another—Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Cossackia, Idel-Ural, Turkestan and all the others.

Surely, with Britain's long tradition of liberty, it was British policy and British interest to have supported, not the restoration of a half-savage Russian monarchy, a slave state and a prison of nations, but all those young nations, "rightly struggling to be free". Had we done so, and refused to be dragged at France's tail as later at America's tail, and kept our promise to Ukraine, it would have stood firm and fought on, as would all the other non-Russian States which had set up their own National Governments, with the unanimous support of their peoples. Together with Britain they would have formed a Power which would have been unconquerable and a barrier between Russia and Germany which neither could have penetrated for purposes of aggression. The opportunity was thrown away.

As for the Foreign Office statement to me that the Ukrainians had gone over to the Germans, this is another example of its falsity. The exact circumstances were that, in 1918, Russia wished to get out of the war, and to make peace with the delegates of the Central Powers who met at Brest Litovsk in January of that year, and Trotsky was appointed the Russian delegate to the Conference. Ukraine, which at that time had its own National Government, learned that Trotsky professed to represent Ukraine, and, to prevent any misunderstanding, sent two young men as its representatives to watch its interests. The Central Powers made the Treaty of Brest Litovsk with Russia, but threatened Ukraine with invasion. To avert this, Ukraine signed a Pact with Germany to supply a million tons of wheat. Ukraine had no choice, it was either that or invasion and destruction of Ukraine; there was never any question of military help, and yet the British Government chose to treat Ukraine now as an enemy. But, in August 1939, Russia volutarily made a Pact with Germany by which she supplied unlimited wheat, oil and all other military requirements to enable Germany to fight this country and so became her ally. By the West, Russia was neither declared nor treated as an enemy, and this hypocrisy furnished one reason for the deterioration of British prestige in Eastern Europe. And so tragedy descended on the world, through British ignorance or prejudice, and failure to honour its word.

There was no excuse: Ukraine had a capable and stable National Government, supported by the entire nation. I have before me the Report of a high-ranking American officer who was sent to Ukraine at the time to investigate the position and to report to his Government on the stability of the State and the competence of its new Government. The officer personally met all the members, and made a highly favourable Report.

Two extracts from the writings of our own great statesman and one of the greatest Foreign Ministers of all time seem to me particularly apposite:—

"There is no deeper baseness than (1) The wordy friendship which, implying the promise of aid, without formally pledging it, beguiles the weaker combatant into fatal trust in its ally, and then deserts him". (2) "If, having deferred to our counsels, she were afterwards abandoned and crushed in the unequal conflict, a stain which time could not efface would lie upon England's honour". Lord Salisbury might have been writing of Ukraine and England.

An opportunity occurred during the Second World War to remedy the error, when Ukraine was again able to to establish its National Government, but it was neglected by the British Government and

Russia marched into the heart of Europe in consequence.

Still another opportunity occurs at the present day, when the death of Stalin and the immediately following inner situation has shattered for the time being the power of the Kremlin to resist pressure by the West, to restore independence to *all* the non-Russian countries she has overcome. And, even from the most selfish point of view, it is a *British* interest that they should be free. They would all trade with us as Russia never will, and with their enormous natural wealth and their population of 150 million—twice that of Russia, what that would mean to this impoverished island is almost beyond imagination.

It is urgently to be hoped that Sir Winston Churchill, in dealing with Moscow, instead of even remotely suggesting appeasement or giving more, will demand the confinement of the Russians to Russia. As far as I know, even although he is held responsible more than any other for the fall of Ukraine in 1917—1920, he is still the only name that counts among the Eastern and Central Europeans by which justice and freedom might be attained, and they look to him.

Instead of giving in in any way to Russian demands, it is worth while just to consider what we have already presented or acquiesced in presenting to Moscow during and since the late war: Mongolia, Korea, Kurile Islands and the rest of Asia; Albany, Czechia, Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, the vital Danube Basin, Finland, the Baltic States, East Prussia, Danzig, Austria, Koenigsberg, East Germany, East Berlin, a ring right round all Berlin—the imagination boggles at what Stalin must have thought. From the point of view of America, one of the most amazing surrenders was that of the Kurile Islands, a perfect base for an attack on America's back door.

I would like to add that the Germans recognised, but too late, the importance of making these non-Russian countries free, when they would have collaborated with Germany, and it is unlikely that Germany would have lost the war. A detailed plan was submitted to Hitler and approved by some of the best German authorities on the East Europe, including great soldiers, but Hitler was by that time apparently mad, and, at a secret meeting, of which I have the minutes, he declared against it, and ordered that the peoples must be treated as slaves. As soon as this was known, the non-Russian extended their underground warfare against the Germans, and, when Hitler's power had gone, Himmler tried to revive the project, but it was too late. By that time all German leaders in the army and outside, recognised that *no* victory could ever be obtained against

MOSCOW'S NEW AND OPEN DEFEAT IN UKRAINE

Melnikov's Removal

On June 12th, 1953, Moscow radio and later also the press reported that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, *L. G. Melnikov*, had been removed from his post and that *A. I. Korychenko*, the former Second Secretary had been named as his successor. The report also added that *Alexander Kornijchuk*, a Ukrainian writer, who held the post of the first deputy chairman of the Cabinet of the Ukrainian S.S.R. had been appointed a member of the bureau of the Central Committee.

The cause of these changes was declared to be the lack of "leadership" on the part of Melnikov, as well as his "great blunders in the selection of cadres and in the carrying out of the national policy of the party", which had been quite "anti-national", particularly in Ukraine. In short, Melnikov's "deviations from the Leninist-Stalinist national policy" had been found out, and his blunders with regard to the collectivisation in West-Ukraine came on top of that.

Although, since Stalin's death, very many changes and reshuffles have taken

Russia without the active co-operation of the non-Russian peoples.

It is the restoration of independence which is the only guarantee of peace for the world in the future, and which can end the eight centuries-long Russian aggression and menace to the world.

If Sir Winston does discuss anything with the Kremlin, he ought to go there with the solid support of the whole British nation to demand the removal of the Russian grip on these peoples. Only so will the world be saved, a hideous war averted in which our youth will be destroyed, and an armaments race which will bankrupt this country averted.

I do not know of any leader in any country who could bring this about except Sir Winston Churchill, of whose Party I am not a member. Only he has the courage to admit past mistakes and to take drastic measures to remedy them, only he, at any rate, could inspire the British public to accept them. Let us hope he will, as he has done before, rise to the great occasion and abolish the slavery under which these peoples suffer.

June, 1953.

Ashfield,

Juniper Green,

Edinburgh.

John F. Stewart

Honorary Editor,

Foreign Affairs Information Series.

place in the U.S.S.R., and are still continuing to take place, and the western world has already become accustomed to it, it would be quite wrong to ascribe this last happening, as usual, to the "intimate" situation in the Kremlin itself and to say that it was occasioned by the personal and "clique" factors which appear as the consequence of a collective dictatorship.

The Real Cause of Melnikov's Misfortune

The cause is of a completely different nature and lies much deeper. The true reason for Melnikov's removal was not his personal deficiencies and mistakes, but the defects and unsuccessfulness of the Russian policy in Ukraine, which Melnikov has until now tried to execute at the orders and under the supervision of the Kremlin. This last happening is not the personal misfortune of Melnikov as a person or as one of Melnikov's strongest exponents, but is the failure of the whole Russian policy in Ukraine, and must lead to a transformation of the future lines of the Russian occupation strategy in this land.

In order to make it clearer, we find it necessary to point out a few important developments in Ukraine since 1944/45. It turns on the "national policy and collectivisation in West-Ukraine" mentioned in the Moscow Communiqué and on the unmentioned famine in the Ukrainian territory east of the Dnieper in 1946/47.

Melnikov's National Policy

The aim of the Russian "national" policy, after the occupation of all the Ukrainian territory was completed as a consequence of World War II, was to Russify, as quickly and radically as possible, Ukraine, which according to the old Tzarist recipe was to be made a "southern district of Russia". This policy was carried out with all means and with such an expenditure of men and material as had never been seen before. Task No. 1. It was the elimination of the Ukrainian Underground Movement, which seemed to the Russians to be the strongest bulwark of Ukrainian national feeling and political consciousness. Next followed the widely-organized Russification of cultural life; the population-policy, which was based on the mixing and deporting of the Ukrainian population and, finally, on economic oppression which, by means of a further tightening-up of life in the collective economy in the East-Ukraine and the organization of new collectivisation in the West-Ukraine, was to lead to general poverty, which also caused a severe weakening of the economic basis of the Underground.

The large and small actions against the U.P.A. and O.U.N. in the years 1945/47 and onwards, for which at first military units and then only M.V.D. and M.G.B. troops were employed, has not yet attained their end. All Moscow's measures up till now against the new strategy and tactics of the Ukrainian Underground, which consist of operations in small groups and in deep underground work which has been well calculated and contrived during long years, as well as in the strong support of the whole population, have, despite numerous victims from our side, been on the whole unsuccessful. In 1949, *Kovalchuk*, the Minister of Security of the Ukrainian S.S.R., spoke of a wide amnesty for all U.P.A. units which is still valid today. The foe suffered in these actions not only materially, but particularly morally, because the innumerable actions "infected" even M.V.D. and the M.G.B. units, which were, as a consequence, often changed and "purged". The most important thing is that the myth of the invincibility and superiority of the Soviet regime in the interior was destroyed, not only in Ukraine, but among the other nations, and the internal ferment, instead of being damped down, was intensified.

Melnikov's Cultural and Population Policy

The cultural policy, which was based on the idealisation, glorification and general exaltation of the Russians as new supermen, has produced quite contrary results, although purely propagandist action and suitable material steps, such as higher subsidies, wages and the like for the Russians, were taken, and, on the other hand, strong moral and physical terror has been applied to the Ukrainians. This policy was so crude, standardised and primitive, à la Hitler, that it has not only offended the national feelings of the Ukrainians and, ipso facto strengthened them, but also evoked a loathing for any kind of Russian culture.

The population-policy also failed. It was impossible to annihilate a nation of 40 millions either by genocide or by the adulteration. The adulteration and other Russian practices have not only claimed victims from both sides, but have contributed to the spread of the revolutionary national ferments, which had shown themselves in no way positive towards the Russians.

The limitation of the economic life in the collective industries and towns has, in connection with the Russian superman policy, only served to strengthen Ukrainian resistance, and turned hate against the Russian nation. Such measures as an intensified, often mass "importation" of Russian elements into Ukraine and the occupation by the same of the most important posts in every sphere of political life, whereby they are granted,

a "displacement allowance", a whole series of privileges (higher salaries for the same work, special concessions, etc.), have destroyed from the beginning any "friendship" for the great Russian brother-nation".

The Collectivisation of West-Ukraine

The collectivisation of West-Ukraine has claimed all too many sacrifices from the Russians, in time, men and material although it has not attained the actual goal, the eradication of Ukrainian ideas of liberty in this area and has only caused Moscow moral damage. So these territories became a new, unextinguishable fire of resistance on behalf of the village population, and its influence has reached far over the borders of Ukraine.

The Famine in the Years 1946/47

Although the famine in the Ukrainian territories east of the Dnieper in the years 1946/47 caused great material harm to the population, it is, however, necessary to point to another side of this occurrence. This famine set up a small internal migration of Ukrainians, who, driven by hunger, went into the West-Ukraine, where, thanks to the preservation of the private property and a relative weakness of the Russian regime at this time, conditions were much better. This led, however, not only to bread, but also political nourishment, being brought into every corner of Ukraine. It must not be forgotten that the Central and Western Ukrainian territories had at their disposal the political and military activities of the U.P.A.—O.U.N. which opposed the Russians almost recklessly.

Results of Melnikov's "Leadership"

Moscow's Ukrainian policy has up till now been a failure. Instead of Russifying Ukraine, it has only strengthened national consciousness, caused the whole population to revolt, and led to a political and economic tension, which may have unforeseeable consequences. Moscow had to realise that this could not continue.

It would be wrong to assume that the new tendency of the "national policy" is caused by internal transformations of the new dictators in the Kremlin. Quite the contrary. The present despots, who lived through the N.E.P. policy and afterwards helped in the centralistic, Russian-chauvinistic tendency, know all too well non-Russian nations, especially the Ukrainians, would lead only to a secession of them from the U.S.S.R. Yet, in considering the complete failure of the policy up till now, they are forced to adopt a new course. It is still difficult to see how far they will go on the new course. It is, however, safe to assume that they will try, at least temporarily, to lessen the complicated situation by means of deceptive manoeuvres. Every deception ma-

PAX PONTICA

The Foreign Policy of Ukrainian Nationalism is working towards the Creation of a new constructive and peaceful order in Eastern Europe

By Z. Poray

The Soviet empire consists roughly of 100 million Great Russians who feel, and are, the master nation of the State, and 100 million non-Russians who feel, and are, enslaved, forcibly Russianized, and heavily exploited. Some 45 million of Ukrainians are the largest, comparatively best organized, socially and culturally highest developed nation among their other non-Russian fellow-nations. The existence of the Russian empire was always, and with the passing of time, becomes more and more hard and intolerable for all non-Russians; since 1945 approximately 90 million further Europeans, who became the spoils of Russia as a consequence of the pacts of Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam, have been added to this empire.

This is veritably a prison of nations. The Western peoples have already some notions and observations how arduous and difficult the life of these nations in Russia always was, and how much harder and severer it became under Russian bolshevism. And yet, the Western nations still do not know the whole truth about the slavery and oppression of nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Thus, the whole world sincerely wishes these nations all *liberty* and *freedom*—but always in very general terms only. The picture of the Western general goodwill towards these nations—changes abruptly when it comes to the specification of the principal terms and conditions of that "liberty" and "freedom"; for everybody understands something different by that.

Especially Western public opinion recoils from the idea of the *dismemberment of the Russian empire*. This empire is generally but wrongly regarded as an "organic", historically grown *entity* and the right solution seems to be, not the dismemberment, but the democratisation and the liberalisation of the Russian regime; this allegedly would "guarantee" the needed liberty and freedom for all individuals as well as the whole nations.

This idea is erroneous. The Russian empire cannot be *democratized* nor *liberalized*; it was built up by fraud and brute force and can continue only by protracted fraud and brute force; there are no inward positive moral forces in

this structure which would justify its further existence. It is not accidental that tyranny, white or red, has for long centuries been the basic constitutional attitude of the Russians; the tyranny is a precondition for the existence of the empire. The Ukrainians would never rely upon the "democratical spirit" and the "liberalism" of 100 million Great Russians; the Ukrainians have had too many and too bad experience for that during their 300-year "peaceful historical co-existence" with the Russians.

The Russian imperialists try to denote the "keeping of peace in one sixth of the globe" as one of the main positive moral forces justifying the existence of the Russian empire. As the "frightful dilemma" they indicate the danger of the "*Balkanization*" of one sixth of the world and conjure up a picture of "interminable wars and revolutions" which may ensue between all these present "Russians". They try to sell the idea of some sort of "*Pax Russica*", the Russian peace, as a positive contribution to the life of mankind.

The historical truth is different. The Russian empire never was synonymous with peace and liberty. This empire grew up solely out of interminable wars and conquests. In Russia there never was peace, inwardly or outwardly. Since the ascension to power in 1533 of the Tsar *Ivan the Terrible* till this year, 1953, during the past 420 years only each fourth year was one of peace; for far more than 300 years there was always some war somewhere in or about Russia.

Most significant for this "peaceful" style of Russian imperial life is the history of the *Russian Black Sea relations*, and especially the history of the attempted Russian penetration of the Black Sea Straits (Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). This was also the history of the interminable Russian heavy pressure upon Turkey, combined with the slow but consequent step-by-step liquidation of the Ottoman Empire. Since 1786, i. e. the first Russian-Turk war, till 1945, there had been in the course of 175 years 7 big Russian wars on Turkey and 46 treaties and conventions concerning the Black Sea Straits. This is the proper measure of the typical Russian pressure and unceasing unrest. No, the Russian empire is never a guarantee for peace; it is always a guarantee of war.

Propagating consequently the idea of the dismemberment of the Russian empire, the foreign policy of the Ukrainian nationalism is *eo ipso* consequently propagating the idea of permanent peace in

noeure, however, is doomed to failure in view of the present situation, just as every previous attempt was, such as e. g. the affairs with special flags, ministries, hymns and the like for the Ukrainian Soviet Republic.

these parts of the world. It is not true that the existence of the Russian empire is the only possibility for the establishment of an integrated political and economical order in Eastern Europe and Eurasia. The Ukrainian nationalism embraces a thoroughly mature conception of what sort of really peaceful order should here be established after the dissolution of the Russian empire. There would be no "Balkanization". What comes would be the peaceful co-operation of the regional blocks of the independent nations, accordingly to the natural conditions of their economical, social and cultural landscapes.

This idea can be best exemplified by the case of the Black Sea nations and Black Sea Straits. This sea had been for centuries the arena of the most ruthless Russian assaults and contests. The Ukrainians, one of the main inhabitants of the Black Sea shores, wish most sincerely and genuinely to change thoroughly the whole previous vexatious course of the Black Sea history. Instead of using that sea as an arena of wars and conquests, they wish to transform it into a sea of deep friendship, security, well-being and understanding among all other participating nations. One of the first acts of the independent Ukrainian national State would be the solemn proclamation of the *Pax Pontica*, the Black Sea Peace, followed by the adequate diplomatic understanding to secure this peace for centuries by a set of pertinent treaties and alliances.

The Ukrainians understand that the existence of the independent Ukrainian State on the northern shores of the Black Sea is in the most vital interests of Turkey. This gallant nation enjoyed peace and security as long as Russia was absent from the Black Sea. The Russian troubles of Turkey started in exactly 1721, only 12 years after the *Battle of Poltava* (1709) by which Ukraine as a State lost her independence. An independent Ukraine can never become a danger for Turkey. But a Russian empire, regardless of hue and colour, would always be a mortal danger for Turkey. An independent Ukraine would always be forced to face the inexorable Great Russia, the Muscovy, and fight for her life; she would be deadly interested to have her back free and secure from Turkey. It was a reciprocal tragedy of Ukraine and Turkey, that instead of giving Ukraine in the past centuries all possible aid in her independence struggle against Russia, Turkey often and thoughtlessly weakened the position of the Ukrainians by rash local assaults and strifes coming from the South.

The main vital problem of Ukraine always would be the legal and power situation of the Black Sea Straits. Ukraine can keep her political and economi-

cal independence and can stand up to Great Russia solely under the conditions that she has both ways a thoroughly free passage through the Black Sea straits. This is simply a question of free breathing. Without free access to the Mediterranean and the Seven Seas of the World, Ukraine would never be in the position to build up an economic strength sufficient to stand the continued imperialistic pressure of Russia, and partly also of Poland.

In the year 1356, the Turks occupied and immediately closed the Straits. They remained closed for 418 years till again they were opened by Turkey under the pressure of the Russian Katherina II. ("The Great") and her Chancellor count *Rumyantsev*, after a lost war with Russia, in consequence of the peace treaty of Kuchuk Kunardji, July 10th, 1774. Yet the Turkish closure of the Straits for more than 4 centuries was of deadly consequences for the independence of Ukraine. Not being able to export her products freely to the Mediterranean and the other countries of the world, Ukraine was not able to stand the Russian pressure. The tighter the Straits are closed, the deeper becomes the dependence of Ukraine from Russia; between these both phenomena there is a deep, historically evident, interdependence.

The Russians tried to solve the problem of their free passage through the Straits mostly by the use and application of brute force, though coated by such propagandistic devices as "protection of eastern "Christendom", or "Slavophilism", or "communism". The Ukrainians are resolved to solve this problem by peaceful understandings and treaties supervised by such international bodies as, say, the United Nations.

The Ukrainians reject the idea of the monopolistic dominance of a single power over the Black Sea. The historical monopolistic dominance of Turkey over this sea had been one of evil. An analogous monopolistic dominance of Russia (or Ukraine) would have been equally evil. The Ukrainians regard the Black Sea as the common property of all adjacent nations, all of them equally interested in free passage through the Straits. Although formally a part of Turkish State territory, the Straits must become spiritually and mentally internationalized in the sense of common participation of all adjacent nations.

The common danger of Russia and the common participation in the use of the Straits are the main factors which create from all Black Sea nations a genuine *community of life*. Though separated by different languages, religious creeds, cultural ways of life and customs, they have many more common interests than differences. It is simply inconceivable for Ukrainians that in the future they should

DANGEROUS

According to information from U. P., A. P. and Reuter, as well as from the Moscow papers *Pravda* and *Isvestiya*, of May 27th, 1953, which is founded on the report of the Soviet Ministry of Interior, "four American agents" who are alleged to have jumped by parachute on the night of April 25th—26th from a four-engined aeroplane over Ukrainian territory, have been sentenced to death. The sentence has already been carried out. The four alleged agents, *Alexander Vasilyevitch Lakhnov*, *Alexander Mikolaiyevitch Makov*, *Serge Zosimovitch Gorbunov* and *Dmitry Mikolaiyevitch Remiga*, are said to have been trained at a suitable terrorist college in Bad Wiessee under the direction of a captain in the U. S. Army, named Holliday. They further declared that several such colleges exist in the American Zone of Germany. The head of one of these schools is said to be a certain Major Ronald Otto Bollenbach, who was deputy American attaché in Moscow from 1946-47. The four condemned also said that, shortly before taking off, they were provided with American weapons, poisons, radio-equipment, maps, money, and similar things. They were to perform espionage in the territory of the Soviet Union, and were moreover directed to make their way to Kyiv and Odessa, in order to commit sabotage in these two towns.

The spokesman of the State Department, Lincoln White, described the bolshevist accusations as "false and fantastic".

We would assume that the explanation

Continued on Page 16

wage wars against the Turks, or Rumanians, or Georgians, etc., and vice versa.

A tightly-knit Bloc of Black Sea nations, bound together by very strong cords of mutual sympathies and interests, would be for the Ukrainians much more adequate and natural than the unwanted, coercitive, always repudiated "brotherly federation" with Great Russia.

The Ukrainians envisage the dismemberment and the reconstruction of the Russian empire on such lines as—e. g.—the creation of the Bloc of Black Sea Nations. Thoroughly conceivable and desirable is the analogous creation of a Bloc of Baltic Nations, then a Bloc of Turkistanian Nations, etc. All of them would be much more natural creations than the old Russian prison of nations. These regional Blocs would be an incomparably better guarantee for the preservation of peace than the war-eager blood-stained "Pax Moscovitica". The Ukrainians really believe and maintain in all earnestness that the dismemberment of the Russian empire would be a benefit and blessing for the whole of the tormented and fear-ridden mankind.

UNPLEASANT PROSPECTS

Is Moscow going to meet us halfway? Has it shown any intention of decreasing and finally relaxing world-tension?

Internal political complications and the permanent, even if invisible, fight for power in the Kremlin are making it impossible for Moscow to continue and extend the aggressive policy which they have hitherto pursued.

That the political line of the Kremlin is undergoing certain changes admits of no doubt. And here is nothing novel or unexpected. It was bound to come after the death of the dictator. One could predict it much earlier, even before the 19th Party Congress six months ago, when it became obvious that Malenkov's struggle for power was reaching the stage of superseding Stalin. The fact that a certain relaxation of tension has come about, thus showing an alteration in tactics, awakens no stirring interest on our part, all the more when much will be decided on the grounds of developments in the near future. It is uncontested, and all are agreed, that the new course of Kremlin policy is in some way connected with what is going on there. This is shown, not only by the facts which are there coming to light, but also by the circumstances in which they are coming to light. It is characteristic that the attitude of the West in judging the new course in the Kremlin is to attempt, despite recognition of the mutual influence exercised by the above-mentioned factors, to separate this course from its causes, and to be prepared to accept it as an independently operating factor.

The assumption that this change of policy has come about by reason of the western world's firm attitude with regard to defence against Communism is completely groundless. With the best will in the world, one cannot discover anything which the West has done that might have caused the Kremlin to retreat. There is, therefore, no reason for regarding Moscow's new course as an abandonment of its attitude as the result of western pressure. And, for the reasons already mentioned, there are no suppositions for the estimation of the new course as a retreat. It is no retreat, but only a manoeuvre and change of tactics, caused by internal complications on the one hand, on the other, by the possibilities which the democratic camp is now opening up to bolshevism. One cannot therefore assume that the Kremlin is prepared to give anything back. It is also necessary to ascertain what Moscow is willing to give up, and what price it wishes to receive for it.

One receives the impression that there is no direct danger of war. But how is one to judge this? It is quite obvious that

the bolsheviks do not desire an armed conflict with the democratic world, because they are aware of the mortal peril to themselves which would arise out of such an occurrence. What does suit their plans is always "little" wars with alien forces supported by the national liberation movements of the dependent countries. The present internal situation of the U.S.S.R. makes it impossible for Moscow to kindle a third World War.

Considering these circumstances, is Moscow going to surrender anything? No. We know with what blind longing Western Europe is seeking for a possibility of excusing, at least in its own eyes, this lack of sacrifice, in the name of the strengthening of defence. One may be certain that Western Europe will always be seeking for new opportunities to set aside the ratification of the treaties, repeatedly write codicils, and to curtail the budgets for defence purposes. It is not by chance that, in the opinions of responsible persons in the U.S.A., the indispensability of realising the aforesaid plans is emphasised without taking any notice of Moscow's new course. The bolsheviks are, therefore, actually surrendering nothing, but are able to count on continuing with: weakening of Western defences, psychological disarmament, widening of the rifts between the western Allies, and thereby strengthening those who are orientated eastwards or are interested in creating a second Korea on German soil and are striving for the inclusion of the satellites in the Soviet political structure.

Peace in Korea? It is not only possible, but also highly probable. But can one describe this eventual peace as a real triumph for democracy, by reason of the new policy. Above all, how will matters stand in Korea, where for three years a struggle has been taking place between two systems. In any case, the result of this struggle cannot be regarded as a victory for democracy. The peoples of Asia and all those concerned can draw far-reaching conclusions from that. Secondly, everyone is occupied in concluding an armistice for South Korea and forgetting North Korea, which has been waiting for liberation.

There is no reason to cast doubt upon the good intentions of the U.S.A., which aim at the uniting of Korea and the assurance of liberty for the people. One wonders, however, what these good intentions will look like in practice. Moscow will not consent to this voluntarily, and if the U.S.A. again decides to use force, one may assume that, in the present political situation in the world, and in the atmosphere which has formed around the Korea War, the entire U.N. will not take the same course.

One can safely say that, as compensation for the peace in Korea, Moscow will demand the admission of Red China to the U.N. This question stands, not for the first time, on the agenda of the U.N. From now on, however, it will appear in a quite different light. Formerly, in the treatment of this problem, the position of the countries, primarily England, who recognised Red China, was quite different from what it is today, because their position was acknowledged to be wrong and this negative attitude had to be explained. Now it may be expected that these countries, impelled by the desire to end the Korean War, and from the above-mentioned motives, will endeavour to satisfy the bolshevik wishes.

Moscow's new course, which has met with unconcealed satisfaction, if also with reservations, in the democratic world, and especially in Western Europe, carries with it a monstrous peril. This peril lies not in the course as such, because its only realisation on the part of bolshevism could be only deception and revolutionary work. *The peril lies much more in the world's reaction to this course, in a new Yalta and Potsdam.* The combatting of it should be taken in hand all the more vigorously as all Moscow's success in the post-war years have been produced by catastrophic mistakes on the part of the democracies. But now arises the question whether the western world's attitude can in any way be changed—its desire for quiet and its unwillingness to see the danger and make sacrifices? An answer to this can be found only with difficulty. In any case, one cannot exclude the fact that the ending of the Korean War will have an effect upon American economy. Such a background, and the attitude towards budget-cuts, and the American taxpayer's unwillingness to make further sacrifices in the interests of a thus opinionated Europe, can lead only to serious curtailments, if not the complete cessation, of help for this Europe. This will strengthen the desire for prevention of political tension at the cost of further concessions to the Communists.

Stalin's death has once more opened to the world the way for an annihilating hitherto permanent retrogression. It is tack upon Communism instead of the quite clear to everyone that the fact that communist aggression is taking this form, and no other, is conditioned by internal conditions in the U.S.S.R. If this were not so, Moscow could make, with one blow, an end of the free world, which, by its very existence, undermines the whole doctrine of communism. What except internal conditions held Moscow back from conquering the whole of Europe, when this continent was completely defenceless after the War? And what other than the internal situation activates and creates this new course of Moscow's?

THE CAREER OF A RED SATRAP:

NIKITA S. KHRUSHCHEV

Moscow's Most Efficient Extortioner and Tormentor of Ukraine

A Wrong Statement

(U.O.) Commenting on the death of *Joseph Stalin* and evaluating the personal possibilities of the power ascension in the Kremlin the *New York Times* of March 5th, 1953 gave the best chances to *Georgi Malenkov*—"because he apparently has the backing... of the only other member of the Secretariat (of the Central Committee) who was a member of the old Politbureau—*Nikita S. Khrushchev, a powerful Ukrainian*". . . .

Although generally correct, the cited article of the *New York Times* is wrong in naming *Nikita S. Khrushchev*—now, indeed, one of the most powerful men in Moscow—a *Ukrainian*. Naming him "a Ukrainian" the article quite obviously suggests that the Ukrainians possess in the highest posts of the Soviet hierarchy influential people; being Ukrainians they, of course, may quite naturally intercede in favour of their home country, trying to help, to protect and to promote her. Each real patriot of his narrower community, say, of his town, county, country etc. would, self-evidently do this.

Never was a Ukrainian

This contention is with regard to *Nikita S. Khrushchev* thoroughly wrong. Although born in Ukraine, in the Donets River Basin 58 years ago, *Khrushchev* neither was, nor is a Ukrainian. He never felt, nor feels as such. His family of peasant ancestry, (he himself has consequently and pointedly maintained) were Russians; no other language than purely Russian was ever spoken in their home. In later years, although working for more than one decade (1937-1949) as the 1st Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, *Nikita Khrushchev* never bothered to learn Ukrainian. How deeply and purely Russian he was, can be seen from the fact that *Stalin* and his prevalently Russian oligarchs never hesitated to entrust

One should know that the nature of this new course forces us to regard this manifestation, not as isolated, but in connection with what produced it. And if everyone were agreed that there exists internal pressure upon bolshevism, the following inference would inevitably be drawn: to do everything to intensify this pressure and to forward its growth. And that means that the political line of the fight against bolshevism should be orientated on revolutions, and on such revolutions that bear the marks of the present epoch: national and social liberation.

H. J. Olezhko

(Condensed from *Homin Ukrayni* of May 2nd, 1953)

to him in 1949 the post of the 1st Secretary of the Communist Party of the *Moscow region*, the last being some sort of "empire state", the "heart region" of the whole Union. No Ukrainian, and no other national "minority" member could ever dream of such a favour.

A Relation of Mutual Hatred

Concerning Ukraine no love's labours were ever lost on the part of *Nikita Khrushchev*. And vice versa. Only one feeling ever prevailed and continues to prevail, now for the decades, between both parties—that of a stinging mutual hatred. Scarcely is there at present in the U.S.S.R. another man whose bald, bullet-shaped head is envisaged by millions of Ukrainians, especially the peasants, with more repugnance and disdain than *Khrushchev's*. And he deserved it copiously.

As each Soviet magnate, *Khrushchev* too relishes in stressing his proletarian background and his "laborious youth". He gladly calls himself a miner, especially "a pickman". But he scarcely had time to get calluses and weals. He joined the party 1914 at 18—and since that time entered upon the road of a typical party bureaucratic career which 39 years later led him up to one of the highest posts in the empire. Intellectually primitive and clumsy, always despising "ideologists", *Khrushchev* made his way as a typical "aparatchik", an apparatus-man who chopped his way ever higher up and up through cunning, slyness, an assuring instinct for personal connections, singleness of purpose, ruthlessness and cold brutality.

A Ruthless Careerist

Right and left of his career road there were left behind him innumerable victims, especially the Ukrainians. Moscow never had better, a more devout Russian imperial governor in Ukraine, than him. His motto was: "everything for the metropolis, nothing for the colony". He always knew that Ukraine is the toughest spot, the most dangerous ground, the most unreliable nation of all peoples in the Union. Hence—the right place to show to his superiors the ruthless implacability of his Russia and party loyalty and devotion. He decided just to make of Ukraine the showplace of his "bolshevik hardness"—and career. And as it proved later, he knew what he was doing.

There were hard and ruthless Russian bolshevik "statthalters" in Ukraine long before *Khrushchev*. 1st Secretaries of the C.P. of Ukraine, sent by Moscow, were e. g. *Stanislav Kosior* and *Pavel Postishev*. Yet they soon proved not to be hard, persevering and efficient enough for Moscow's tastes. The yearly yields of the

heavily, exploited Ukrainian colony apparently was for Moscow not sufficient. During the great Stalinist purges they both were liquidated. Then came *Khrushchev*, kept this post for 12 years and later was kicked up to a better position. This is a bolshevik's best testimony.

Ire Against Intellectuals

Khrushchev literally proved to be dead-ly efficient. During his reign, Ukraine proved to be one of those strange republics of the Union where there was "no natural growth of population", the basic quota always remaining the same; for the former Soviet Ukraine (up till 1939) always 32 millions. The solution of this "riddle" is known to every Ukrainian: because what of the "surplus" was not murdered, or in some other way liquidated, was deported to Siberia, Kazakhstan or some other places of the vast Soviet land of forced labour camps. In such a manner more than 7 million Ukrainians had been 1939-1949 "sapped away" by *Khrushchev*.

Especially two categories of Ukrainian people "enjoyed" *Nikita Khrushchev's* hateful attention: the intellectuals and the peasants. In case of errors and trespasses the proper Russian, the Muscovite writers were always only criticised and reprimanded, but the Ukrainians were invariably shot. During *Nikita Khrushchev's* iron rule such Ukrainian outstanding writers had been executed: *Hryhory Chuprynka*, *Hryhory Kossynka*, *Oleksa Vlyzko*, *Dmytro Falkivsky*, *Kost Bureviy*, *Ivan* and *Taras Krushelnysky*, *Mykola Zerov*, *Mykhaylo Pluzhnyk*, *Mykhaylo Filansky* etc. And invariably the same charge: "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism". During *Khrushchev's* commissariat in Ukraine, not one University, Academy, high art school, no scientific research institution of some standing, no theoretical center was ever created. The Ukrainian learning had to serve solely the practical purposes of the productive expediency.

Breaking the Peasants

Khrushchev always knew that one of the strongest sources of the Ukrainian national independence and statehood is the Ukrainian property-minded, individualistic peasantry. The breaking up and the extinction of the Ukrainian peasantry was in *Khrushchev's* mind identical with the breaking up and the destruction of Ukrainian nationalism. Hence *Khrushchev's* single-minded purposeness in the promotion of the agricultural collectivisation of Ukraine. The "Kolkhos" should have been the means to break the stubborn Ukrainian individualism, to break the family units, as he himself has once put it,—"to disperse this matted breed". Yet the village collective farms soon were not enough for him; they were still too "narrow", too "family-bound", too "nationalistic" economical units. In consequence *Khrushchev* became a fanatic of the "agro-gorods" mam-

moth collectives, no more than grain-factories, erected to the clear purpose ultimately to alienate the people from the good earth, or as Khrushchev liked to put it: "to cut them from the soil". On the way to his "agro-gorods" Khrushchev ardently propagated that even the individualistic small vegetable plots, until now allowed for peasants family units should be withdrawn.

Flattering Ukraine

Khrushchev, too, can boast of another "achievement": he fulfilled to the last comma and point the demand of Moscow, again to revert Ukraine into a land of raw and half-raw materials and farming monocultures; during his rule the industrialisation of Ukraine has abruptly been either reverted to the Russian north, or thoroughly stopped. The trend to Ukrainian farming monocultures goes so far that the Ukrainian collective farms are no more allowed to plant their own orchards, or to breed poultry, which allegedly contradicts the "state production plan". They have to produce the wheat, or sugar beet, or sun-flowers only—and depend on the State that it will deliver the rest. This is the way to make Ukraine dependent from Moscow even in her need of the last pound of apples. Nikita Khrushchev was the most ardent executor of this sort of Russian policy.

The Scourge

After the World War II Ukraine once again became "nationalism-ridden", restive, unruly, seditious. Khrushchev who previously won high decorations as political commissar during the battle of Stalingrad, once again was sent to Ukraine "to quench the mutiny". In the course of one and a half year Khrushchev ejected from the party ranks resp. liquidated 38 p. c. of all regional secretaries, 64 p. c. of all executive committee presidents, 67 p. c. of machine and tractor stations managers. And once again the Ukrainian intellectuals had to prostrate themselves before this Moscow-sent bully in admitting publicly all possible sins, errors and other crimes and in promising repentance and correction. The Moscow-sponsored and Khrushchev-directed moral flagellation of intellectual Ukrainians reached its most spectacular peak in 1950/1951.

Reaching The Summit

Thus Nikita Khrushchev became a well deserving man in the eyes of Kremlin. No wonder that after the death of Stalin, as the big reshuffle in the party has started, Khrushchev was entrusted by his close friend Malenkov with the highest available party post, that of the chief of the now reorganized 5-men all-Union party Secretariat. He proved to be Moscow's and Party's devout follower and reliable beyond even the slightest doubts. This stern disciplinarian who proved to be so efficient for Moscow in Ukraine,

TRAGEDY OF THE YEAR 1933

The revolution of 1917 forced the Russian bolsheviks to make sure of the material means of continuing the wars of aggression against the non-Russian nations of the old Tsarist Russian Empire, who had restored their national States. In 1918, therefore, they introduced militant "communism", which entailed the nationalisation of all private trade and industry, the prohibition of the holding of markets and the creation of institutions which deprived the peasant population of almost all their foodstuffs.

Moscow began the introduction of the "militant communism" in Ukraine, not only in order to exploit the material resources of the country, but also to break the Ukrainian resistance towards the new Russian occupation. The result of this "militant communism" was, until 1921, the ruining of Ukrainian industry. The Donbas area was the only industrial centre in the whole U.S.S.R. which was able to continue its production. The agriculture of Ukraine was completely exploited, and this fact was also the reason for the great famine which prevailed in the steppe area of Ukraine in 1933. In order, however, to achieve a temporary stabilisation, the "New Economic Policy" (N.E.P.) was adopted, which permitted private industry once more. Ukrainian economy recovered during this period, and in 1930 reached the standard of 1913. The Ukrainians, however, not only made economic progress during this period, but also exploited this same period of Moscow's economic weakness for other purposes. The rapid economic and cultural development of the Ukrainian nation had also a political manifestation. This aroused enthusiasm even in the Communist Party cadres, who included people such as Skrypyk, Volobujev, Chvylovij etc. This naturally led to a sharp reaction on the part of Moscow, especially as the Kremlin's policy in the whole U.S.S.R. was taking a different course.

At the 16th Conference of the Communist Party in the Year 1929, the first "Five Years' Plan", the industrialisation of the

Russian Communists, was adopted for the purpose of the militarisation of the U.S.S.R. This militarisation was, according to the Kremlin's plan, to be brought about at the cost of the Ukrainian economy. This could best be achieved by means of the collectivisation of Ukrainian agriculture. This collectivisation was to provide Russia with foodstuffs free of charge and, in addition, bring in numberless slave-workers from Ukraine.

The collectivisation plans, however, met with resistance in the Ukrainian territories. For this reason, the Ukrainian peasants were, after the autumn of 1929, forcibly sized for the collective industry. The farmers were influenced with exceedingly heavy taxes and hundreds of thousands of well-situated land-owners were deported with their families to the North and to Siberia. These actions of Moscow were, however, even more strongly resisted by the Ukrainian peasants, who, even in single villages and districts, rose in revolt.

Individual and group terrorism no longer sufficed to break the resistance of the Ukrainian peasants to collectivisation. Moscow began to apply economic terrorism against the entire Ukrainian population. The Kremlin sent into Ukraine tens of thousands of Russian Communists from Moscow, Leningrad and other Russian cities, as well as numerous O.G.P.U. detachments, who carried out suitable action. Special detachments, composed mostly of Russians, took all the grain away from the population in the years 1931/32. This resulted, at the beginning in 1932, in a famine in Ukraine which, in 1933, had reached an unheard-of extent and led to the extinction of millions of people.

There is a great deal of literature on the subject of the Ukrainian famine in the years 1932/33, and tens of thousands of Ukrainians, who came to the West in course of the World War II, are living witnesses of this great famine.

The results of the census in U.S.S.R. in 1936 were not published, as they would most clearly have illustrated the effects of the famine. In 1939, a new census was taken. This showed that, in spite of the "improvements", the Ukrainian population amounted to only 28 million, which was exactly the same as 13 years ago, in 1926. (This census refers only to East-Ukraine, as the West-Ukrainian provinces were not incorporated until later). From this it may be seen that the Ukrainian population had not increased at all in the course of 13 years, while, in the same period, the population of Russia proper had increased by 21,5 millions. (77,5 millions in 1926 and 99 millions in 1939).

will prove to be no less efficient working now in the realm of the whole Union.

In view of this record and past party achievements, to call this Russia's abject careerist "a powerful Ukrainian" is not only a misrepresentation. It is hoax, and a bad hoax at that. One has really to wonder at the otherwise highly reliable *New York Times*. Khrushchev never was a Ukrainian; instead he was one of the worst enslavers of Ukraine, ever known in her history. If in the times to come this unhappy land will retain a memory of him, it will always be accursed and resentfully ill-famed.

From the figures given it is evident, that, by normal development, the Ukrainian population should have increased to at least 35 millions by the year 1939. That clearly proves that 4.6 million people lost their lives in this artificial famine. Many authors maintain that, in the years 1929—30, by reason of terrorism and hunger, 2 million people fled from Ukraine into other republics of the U.S.S.R., particularly Siberia. Should these assumptions correspond with the truth, at least 5.5 million people must have died in the famine. This genocide which was committed by Moscow in Ukraine in 1932/33 has nothing equal in modern history. The famine was arranged by the Kremlin only in those districts inhabited by Uk-

rainians while, at the same time, there was no distress in Russia. One cannot say that it was only economic motives that induced Moscow to take this step, for, beside the serious economic crisis, the Kremlin was thinking primarily of the political subjection of the Ukrainian nation, and wanted in this way to check the Ukrainian endeavours to attain independence.

Even Arthur Koestler, in his book, "The God that Failed", has stated that he could not speak to any famine in Russia in 1932/33, but only in Ukraine. This famine was in no way a natural catastrophe, as occurred in the years 1921-1922, but one of the greatest genocides ever organized by Moscow.

THE DREADFUL YEAR OF 1933 IN MY VILLAGE

Address by Mme. Woropaj

at the Commemoration Ceremonies in Memory of the Six Million Ukrainians who died in the tragic famine organised by Moscow during the years 1932—1933, held by the Association of Ukrainian in Great Britain, Regional Council in Scotland,
on Sunday, 26th April, 1953.

(Mme. Woropaj is a Ukrainian who, like so many witnesses of the terrible Ukrainian tragedy, was living in her homeland during the *Famine*. What she describes is the result of her own personal experiences and may be accepted as typical of conditions in Ukraine at that time).

"Forgive me, Ladies and Gentlemen, if the pictures which I will describe to you are not only ugly but almost unbelievable to the people of the West. It was the authorities—occupants of my native country who were responsible for that ugliness.

In 1933 I was 15 years old. My parents were teachers in the country and as members of the intelligentsia were getting a ration of flour once a month. For this reason we were better off than the peasants who alone did not receive any rations. We were only half starved but being in the country gave me the opportunity of seeing all horrible things that happened there in that year.

Our village was situated in the South of Ukraine. The cases about which I will tell you now, happened in our village. I will try to describe to you a few scenes.

Winter. About six of us, young girls, gathered in one small hut. It belonged to one of us and to her three sisters. We were expecting the shock brigade which was going round the village, collecting corn and in some houses also all the clothes. That is why our hostess opened the trunk with their Sunday clothes and all of us put on three skirts, blouses and

shawls. It is very cold outside but inside the hut it was hot especially for us with so many clothes on. We wanted very much to help our friend keep her best clothes. The brigades were seizing clothes from wardrobes and trunks, but they did not undress people. We waited till midnight. Nothing happened. Our friend and her sisters were lucky. But in many houses brigades did take away all the clothes.

Second winter scene. A village meeting. To the village came the representative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party from Moscow. Nothing like this ever happened before in this village and everybody was curious as to what the man from Moscow would tell them. Certainly, he would stop this nonsense of the brigades and the seizure of all corn and not only corn but very often flour. The meeting took place in the school building. It was evening. The big room was full of people in winter coats. In the far end of the room stood a table and on the wall hung an oil lamp. On the table stood the Moscow's man. He was talking about storing up corn reserve (chlebozhotovka), asking why the village did not fulfil the plan and what was being done to correct it? How many persons had been shot for it? None? Then you have done nothing to help the Government that needs your corn so much. Four of us young people were standing there, not far from the door and at the moment when the man from Moscow was talking about shooting we felt cold shivers going down our spines. We were young and we did not like to hear a man talking about death, especially in such a cold-blooded manner. We hurriedly left the room. It was cold and dark outside. In silence we parted and went home where we went to bed and tried to forget the impression made by that dreadful speech

by the representative of the "most progressive and peaceful" Russian nation.

The village lay in an uneasy silence except for the dogs which barked at the shock brigades. It was a time when dogs were still alive; later in the spring they were eaten by their masters. The next morning the pupils found three bags of wheat in the school garden. Some peasants had been frightened by the speech of the Moscow's man and preferred parting with their last corn and to suffer starvation than to be sent to prison or even condemned to death.

Spring. Until the coming of spring the people managed somehow. They managed to keep alive by slaughtering their last live-stock and by consuming their stocks of garden vegetables, but now, upon the approach of spring when all the stock were exhausted and the sun began to shine and the wind to blow, the mass starvation of people started.

They had absolutely nothing to eat. They could only move very slowly and in appearance they were like ghosts. When the grass grew they started to eat it and their limbs started to swell. The colour of their skin was now almost blue. I think that most of you have seen pictures of the victims of the Concentration Camps in Germany. When I was in Germany I often thought how similar they were to the victims of famine in Ukraine during 1933.

As I have said, people who started to eat grass started to swell. The skin broke in some places and they gave out a terrible smell. They started to die in February and March but the worst came in May and June.

The Scenes of the Famine.

My father brought home some flour which he got in a special new shop, the torgsin. You could get there all the food you wanted but only for gold or for dollars. My father had got it for two golden rings and two or three small crosses that we used to wear. My mother made for me some little cakes and I took a few of them to the boy next door, a lad of 19, the brother of my best friend who was dying of starvation (their father has died a month before). When I came to this house nobody was in but the boy. He was lying on the small bed very thin and almost blue. I gave him the cake I had brought. He put one piece of it into his mouth but he was too weak to chew it. With the piece of cake in his mouth he told me, he is going to die. I tried to comfort him and told him that soon new corn will be ready and then he will get well again. But he said "no", and once more tried to chew the cake. But he could not do it and died with this cake in his mouth. I remember his funeral very well. There was no good wood for the coffin and the people made it from a very old one. The coffin kept together till the cemetery all right, but when they start-

JUNE 30th 1941

ed to put it into the grave the body fell first and all the coffin in pieces on top of it. But that was not the worst case, because many dead bodies were buried just wrapped in cloth or even without it.

A girl about 17 years old was standing on the wall that separated the garden from the street and was trying to get green cherries from our garden. I shouted that it is our garden and she should go away. She did. The next day we stumbled on her body in the grass not far from the path. I could not forgive myself that the day before I had been shouting at her. This girl was from a large family all of whom died that spring. As usual, first the male side of the family died, then the children. The mother buried all of them but when she died there was no one to bury her and her body was lying more than a week in the empty house. It was in June, and people whose duty was to take away the bodies of the dead had to get drunk and only then it was possible for them to collect the body of this unhappy woman.

A crippled shoemaker and his wife in our village lost their only son. He ran away for fear of starving to death. The mother was desperate because she could not feed her family, and tried to exchange some potted plants for milk. My friend's father owned one of the few cows that were still alive, and so deal was arranged through my friend. When my friend and I went to tell the cobbler's wife that she could have the milk, I stayed outside the small white house, while my friend went inside. In a few seconds my friend ran out of the house and told me that the cobbler was hunched over the table, his head in his hands, while his wife lay dead on the bed. On the table lay the bones of the dog, and with them its skull. We fled in horror from this house of death.

A man ran away from our starving village to Donbas and started to work down the mines. But at the mine it was found out that he ran away from the farm and he was sacked. That meant that his ration book was taken from him away and he was left to starve. Then he tried to get back to his village but on the way as a result of the starvation he almost died but not quite. He fell on the road. People collected his body thinking he was dead. But on the way to the cemetery they found out that he was not quite dead. They took him off the cart and put him into the standing corn. It was the end of June and the ears of the corn were already swollen. The man had enough strength to reach the ears and started to eat them. And in such way he saved his life.

A girl who very often used to help my mother in the house was married to a man in another village. She had 3 or 4 children with whom she had been star-

The regaining and the renewal of Ukrainian national independence has not been rendered futile by the lost liberation struggle of 1917—21. The aims of the Ukrainian liberation-movement remain, regardless of the unfavourable world-political constellation and the difficult situation in Ukraine which was caused by the occupation, on the same plane. The revival of political nationalism in Ukraine is lending strength to these Ukrainian political exertions and has created new foundations for the concentration of the fight to obtain the long-desired independence.

In this, the Ukrainian Military Organization (U.V.O.) and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.) played a prominent part and prepared the ground for the recovery of Ukrainian independence.

After the outbreak of the Second World War and the occupation of Western Ukraine by the Soviets, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.) came out into an open, total and intense warfare with bolshevism. The political situation in general was, in the first two years of the war, not favourable for Ukrainian endeavours. On the contrary, all signs pointed to an anti-Ukrainian attitude, not only in Nazi Germany, but also in the camp of the Western Allies.

Neither Hitler's urge towards the East nor Roosevelt's positive attitude towards the Soviets and his idea that here was a possibility of a "co-operation between free America and socialist Russia" could find any room for Ukrainian interests. From all these arguments the conclusion may be drawn that the circumstances were anything but favourable for the re-

ving all the spring, but somehow she got through it. But in May it was very bad. All dogs, cats and birds which it was possible to catch were eaten. The mother of the children was half mad from hearing all day long: "Mother, something to eat, please, mother, please". And there came even a time when she would have liked to give them her own flesh to eat. But it could not be done. Then came to her insane mind another horrible solution—one of her children. And it was done. The mother was arrested and taken away together with the rest of her children and nobody heard about her any more.

After the dreadful year of 1933 our village looked so shabby and neglected, all overgrown with gigantic weeds, that even the Russian occupants were ashamed of it. In fact, in 1940 they transported the rest of the population of our village to Bessarabia. Our land was given over to the neighbouring collective farm".

storation of the Ukrainian State. The Russo-German War also brought with it no fundamental change in the general state of affairs; it caused only a rapid development of these conditions.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war, on June 30th, 1941, the Ukrainian National Assembly in Lviv restored the Ukrainian Independent State, at the initiative of the O.U.N. and with active co-operation of all Ukrainian classes and political parties.

"1. In accordance with the expressed wishes of the Ukrainian people, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), under the leadership of Stepan Bandera, proclaims the restoration of the Ukrainian State, for which the entire generations of Ukraine's finest sons have fallen.

The O.U.N., which, under the direction and leadership of its leader, Evhen Konovalets, has during the last centuries of bloody, Muscovite-bolshevist oppression, waged an uncompromising fight for liberty, summons the Ukrainian nation not to lay their weapons aside until a sovereign Ukrainian supreme power has been set up on all Ukrainian territory.

The sovereign Ukrainian power will ensure for the Ukrainian nation order, right, all-round development of all its powers and the furthering of its interests.

2. In Western Ukraine, the Ukrainian executive power is arising, which will place itself at the disposal of the Ukrainian national government which will be formed in the capital of Ukraine, Kyiv.

The Ukrainian national-revolutionary army which is being formed on Ukrainian territory will continue to fight against the Muscovites for a sovereign and united State and a new and just order in the world.

Long live the sovereign Ukrainian State!

Long live the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists!

Long live the leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists—Stepan Bandera!

Given under our hand in the city of Lviv, June 30th, 1941.

Jaroslav Stetzko

Chairman of the National Assembly".

The two heads of the Ukrainian Churches, Metropolitan Andrej Sheptycky and Bishop Polikarp, issued, on July 1st and July 10th, 1941, suitable pastoral letters requesting the Ukrainian people to orderliness, obedience and co-operation with the newly-formed Government.

The temporary Ukrainian Government was formed by Mr. Jaroslav Stetzko,

who was, at the same time, Chairman of the National Assembly. Those taking part in it included members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), the Ukrainian National-Democratic Union (U.N.D.O.), the Ukrainian Radical-Socialist Party (U.S.R.P.), the National Unity Front (F.N.E.) and independent members. The formation of a coalition Government met the demands of the hour, and was approved by the Ukrainian public. The composition of this Ukrainian Government was as follows: *Yaroslav Stetko* (O.U.N.)—Premier and Minister of Labour and Social Welfare; *Prof. Dr. N. Panchyshyn*—(independent)—First Vice-premier and Minister of Health; *Mgr. Lev Rebet* (O.U.N.)—Second Vice-premier; *I. Klymiv-Legenda* (O.U.N.)—Minister of Political Co-ordination; *Volodymyr Stachiv* (O.U.N.)—Foreign Secretary; *Dr. Kost Pankivsky* (independent)—First Deputy Foreign Secretary; *Dr. Maritchak*—Second Deputy Foreign Secretary; *Dr. Lysyj* (U.S.R.P.)—Home Secretary; *M. Lebid* (O.U.N.)—Minister of Security; *Dr. W. Horbovyj* (O.U.N.)—Minister of Justice; *Gen. Vsevolod Petriv* (independent)—Minister of War; *R. Shuchevych*, later General Taras Chuprynka, C-in-C U.P.A., (O.U.N.)—First Deputy Minister of War; *O. Hasyn*, later Chief of Staff, U.P.A., (O.U.N.)—Second Deputy Minister of War; *Ing. Chraplywyj* (U.N.D.O.)—Minister of Agriculture; *J. Piasetzky* (F.N.E.)—Minister of Forestry; *Ing. J. Pavlykovsky* (U.N.D.O.)—Minister of Economic Affairs; *Mgr. D. Jaciv*—Deputy Minister of Economic Affairs; *R. Ilyntzky*—Second Deputy Minister of Economic Affairs; *Ing. Olchovyj* (independent)—Minister of Finance; *Haj-Holovko* (independent)—Minister of Information and Press; *St. Lenkavsky* (O.U.N.)—Deputy Minister of Information and Press; *J. Staruch* (O.U.N.)—Second Deputy Minister of Information and Press; *Prof. Dr. Radzykevych* (independent)—Minister of Education and Culture; *Prof. Turchyn* (independent)—First Deputy Minister of Education and Culture; *Dr. M. Rosliak* (U.S.R.P.)—Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Temporarily as the legislative body existed the Ukrainian National Council under the chairmanship of Dr. Kost Levitzky (U.N.D.O.), the senior Ukrainian politician; it was composed of representatives of all Ukrainian parties, social classes, and churches.

The newly-formed Ukrainian Government began at once to build up the apparatus of State and endeavoured to develop Ukrainian political life. It wanted to create a basis for the strengthening of the Ukrainian State and, in addition, to continue the fight against bolshevism.

After the crafty arrest of the members of the Ukrainian Government, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, sup-

UKRAINIANS ABROAD

HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP MGR. IVAN BUCHKO

His Holiness Pope Pius XII has nominated, by the decree of the congregation, the Right Rev. Bishop Ivan Buchko as Titular Archbishop of Laodicea for the Eastern Church. This elevation of a dignitary of the Ukrainian Church has underlined the special position of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and given moral support to the millions of Ukrainian Catholic believers who are suffering under the bolshevist terror.

PLENARY MEETING OF THE LEADERS OF THE UKRAINIAN YOUTH ASSOCIATION (S.U.M.)

Between May 21st—25th there took place in London the plenary meeting of the leaders of the Ukrainian Youth Association (S.U.M.) at which were present members of the Central Committee and other leaders from England, Belgium, Germany and France. At the meeting were discussed the results of the work of S.U.M. in the past year, as well as plans for the future. In making his report, the chairman of the Central Committee of S.U.M., *O. Kalyynyk*, said that in this Youth Association were united 7,829 young Ukrainians, living in 14 countries of the free world and organized in 198 groups. At the plenary meeting, the following resolutions were made:

1. The publication of text-books and other teaching materials for the Ukrainian youth.
2. The publication of at least 4 books for the youth, as well as a magazine for the youngest members of S.U.M.
3. Co-operation in the general Ukrainian action to commemorate the famine which was artificially produced in Ukraine by Moscow in 1932/33. It was resolved to hold the next, i. e. the fifth, Congress of S.U.M. in January, 1954.

DIAMOND JUBILEE OF THE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY OF VASYL AVRAMENKO

The well-known Ukrainian dancer and teacher of Ukrainian folk-dancing has celebrated his artistic diamond jubilee. During recent years he has been busy with the production of Ukrainian films and, in the last few months, has worked on television. He deals principally with Ukrainian folk-dances and runs a dancing school in the U.S.A. In addition, he is now arranging courses for the spreading of Ukrainian national art.

UKRAINIAN STUDENTS CONGRESS OF AMERICA Outstanding Success

THE FIRST CONGRESS OF UKRAINIAN STUDENTS OF AMERICA took place on April 10-12,

ported by the entire Ukrainian nation, took up the uncompromising struggle, on two fronts, against Nazism and Bolshevism.

In this struggle, the Ukrainian nation stood quite alone in Europe. The West-European nations, such as France, lay beaten to the ground and were not able, at this time, to offer any kind of assistance. The Western Allies, the U.S.A. and Great Britain, were on the side of the Soviets. Ukraine was quite on her own, and remains so until this day. The 30th of June, 1941, today symbolises the Ukrainian nation's fight, despite all obstacles and attacks, for the attainment of an independence which is based on the liberty of all peoples.

1953, and was judged by all who attended as a success, which far exceeded the expectations of those who planned and organized the Congress. Attended by delegates, representatives and guests from all over the United States, the sessions took place on the campus of famous Columbia University in New York City, N.Y.

The programme was skilfully planned and executed by a temporary Executive Secretariate, which was appointed at the Cleveland Conference of Ukrainian Students in November, 1952; the members of the Secretariate deserve a most sincere vote of thanks and appreciation.

The sessions were formally opened on Saturday morning. The report of the Credentials Committee named 80 delegates who represented 22 American Universities in the East, Middle-West and West of U.S.A. Honorary guests at the Congress represented Ukrainian American fraternal, scientific, academic youth organizations.

The delegates elected officers of the Congress, who were *M. Dmytro Hryhorchuk* (Chicago, Ill.)—Chairman, *Miss Eleonora Kulchitsky* (Philadelphia, Pa.) and *Dr. Orest Ryzhij* (New York, N. Y.)—Vice-chairmen; *Eugenia Kovalsky* (New York, N.Y.) and *Catherine Kochno*,—Secretaries.

After luncheon at the Columbia University John Jay Hall, four guest-speakers addressed the Congress: *Michael Piznak*, General Councillor of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, *Prof. Philip E. Mosley*, Director of the U.S.S.R. Research Institute at Columbia, *Dr. John S. Reshetar, jun.* of Princeton University and *Ivan Fizer*, Ph. D.

Mr. M. Piznak, commending the young people's efforts to organize, stressed today's need for well-qualified and acknowledged students, scientists and professional people who, in their own special field, will contribute to the advancement of the truth about Ukraine.

Prof. Mosley spoke on the nature and activities of American student organizations. He urged those present to take an active part in campus and community activities other than those of a purely Ukrainian nature in order to make their contribution to American life and to carry their special message to the American people.

Dr. Reshetar of Princeton University offered sage words of advice concerning the future activities of the organization. He depicted their purpose and nature: convincing Americans that the Soviet Union is one and the same with Russia; acquainting Americans with Ukrainian culture and history in a dignified, mature manner; working for the introduction of Ukrainian language courses in the curricula of American Universities.

Mr. Fizer, Ph. D., in his speech, devoted his attention to the review of the Ukrainian students' achievements in the past and spoke of their potential future role.

The goals of the Federation, as stated in the Constitution, are: to represent the interests of Ukrainian American students, to further the recognition and understanding, on the campuses of American Universities, of the Ukrainian nation's struggle for freedom from tyranny, to propagate Ukrainian cultural, moral and intellectual traditions in America to foster the intellectual and professional development of its members in order to equip them for their future roles as citizens, to co-ordinate the work of its member organizations and to co-operate with the existing Ukrainian American organizations.

As President of the Ukrainian Students' Federation of America was elected *Miss Eleonora Kulchitsky*.

ULAS SAMCHUK

The well-known Ukrainian writer, *Ulas Samchuk*, visited Ukrainian settlements in Canada in May of this year. He travelled in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, and many others, in order to lecture on Ukrainian literature to the Ukrainians living there.

Samchuk is the author of many well-known literary works, such as "Volhynia", "Maria", "The Mountains Speak". He is at present living in Toronto, Canada.

O.U.N., have for many years been engaged in a direct conflict with the danger of world Communism and Russian imperialism. They are dependent on their own strength, and, despite considerable difficulties and an ever-increasing opportunist attitude in the free countries of the Western hemisphere they have been waging this war with their own forces. The Ukrainian attitude which stresses national independence is, however, in no way based on any inability on the part of the Ukrainian nationalist independence movement to win the support of some Western partner or other, but has originated out of the experiences of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground movement and has finally become the **guiding principle of Ukrainian national interests as far as political theories are concerned, a principle which has found expression in the conception of independent and national strength.**

This conception does not oppose the inclusion of external political factors in the political calculations of the Ukrainians. It does however exclude a political orientation in a certain Western or other direction and prevents any renunciation of principles which are in the interests of the Ukrainian nation in favour of some political power or other. The plan of action of Ukrainian nationalism is thus obvious to all elements and supporters of the Ukrainian fight for freedom.

In essence Ukrainian policy will always remain independent, regardless of the wishes and demands of the "strong countries of the world". And neither temporary failures nor the unfavourable foreign political situation can change this fact. The aims of Ukrainian policy and of the Ukrainian fight for freedom will continue to find expression in the struggle which is being waged against bolshevism by the Ukrainian themselves. And this fact was realized and stressed by the members who participated in the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists.

Foreign Policy

Ukrainian foreign policy is the result of the inner strength of the Ukrainian nation and reflects the essence of the fight for freedom which the Ukrainians are conducting on their own strength. And this was admitted to be the case by the members of the Conference. If Ukrainian foreign policy in its essence is not dependent on temporary trends and situation then the Ukrainian politicians can also deal with problems the solution of which is perhaps at present not realizable. On the other hand, however, Ukrainian policy

concentrates on matters which are at present of primary importance in the political situation.

The first of these problems is the creation of good neighbourly relations with the nations of the Black Sea Block (Turkey in particular), which aim to achieve a close and mutual co-operation and as a block constitute an important counter-balance to Russian imperialist ambitions.

The second problem to which considerable attention was devoted at the Conference is that of the countries of Asia. These countries are subjected to the constant influence of the Russian-bolshevist neutralisation policy, which aims to separate Asiatic nations from the free countries of the world and at the same time finds an excellent foundation in the imperialist and colonial policies of various individual European countries.

The bolsheviks, by applying their "Leninist-Stalinist national policy", are turning this weakness to good account, and are thus able to extend the sphere of their influence more and more with the motto of "national liberation" and "social justice". They have even succeeded in combining the Communist Parties and the national independence movements and in this way have managed to build up an unheard of dynamic and aggressive political force. Not only would it be an noble task on the part of Western policy to free these national forces from the pressure of Russian Communist claims to power but it would also be in starting the struggle against bolshevism.

The free countries of the world have tried by various means and ways to combat and to halt the Communist danger, but so far they have never succeeded in evolving any definite plan by which this danger could be halted or eliminated completely. As a rule their efforts were limited to uniting the individual forces into internationalist groups, which, however, had neither the necessary forceful power and strength nor a guiding and effective ideology. It can be foreseen with some degree of certainty that the individual international (socialist and liberal) and the European federalistic movements will never succeed in setting up a definite, effective and far-reaching policy.

The reason for this lies in the essence of every form of internationalism which is in incompatible with the national interests, which in their turn constitute the basis for a foreign policy that can only be national in character and finally because every form of internationalism is harmful for liberation policy. And this fact is also recog-

nised by the majority of the leading Ukrainian groups. Internationalism is no guarantee for a constructive collaboration between the nations as is proved by the example of the European federalistic movements.

The principles which were also defined at the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of O.U.N. reveal the actual essence of Ukrainian policy, which is independent, concrete, drawn up on a large scale in keeping with political events and facts, and free of every kind of internationalist Utopia.

The internal political aspect

The fact has already been mentioned that the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists represent a homogenous part of the entire Organization, and this is also of decisive importance in determining the relation of the Z.Ch. O.U.N. to other Ukrainian political movements and parties. As regards home policy the binding principle is freedom of speech, of publication, of political meetings, and of political parties and organizations. The aspect from which the individual Ukrainian parties and groups are considered is that of their relation to the revolutionary fight for freedom of the Ukrainian Nation **and to the foremost principle of the Ukrainian political ideology, namely the conception of Ukrainian national independence.**

A constructive and regular collaboration with these Ukrainian political groups is to be desired since it would strengthen opposition to Russian imperialism and would also guarantee a successful foreign policy. It is most certainly a fault of Ukrainian political activity that some of the opportunistic Ukrainian political splinter-parties would like to pursue a foreign policy of intervention and for this reason are unable to reach an agreement with those organizations which uphold the principle of independent strength and pursue a policy which is not dependent on the Western powers.

The Conference, naturally, also dealt with the problems of Ukrainian cultural life, the nature of the Ukrainian trade unions in foreign countries, the possibilities in connection with the educating and training of Ukrainian youth, and also with the training of new personnel to undertake organizational work. All these aspects of home policy were dealt with earnestly and frankly.

And until such time the efforts of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and of the Ukrainian community which is so closely linked to the former will be directed towards a successful realization, as soon as possible, of the task before it.

PRINCIPLES OF UKRAINIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), which was held in June 1953, stressed the significance of the Ukrainian work of liberation in relation to the general political situation and defined the principles governing the policy and activity of the O.U.N. abroad.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists pays homage to the memory of those who died on the field of honour and those who were tortured to death in the cause of freedom for Ukraine; it admires the heroic struggle of the Ukrainians against bolshevist tyranny in their native country and honours the self-sacrifice and bravery of the members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and of all those unnamed persons fighting in the cause of freedom.

The Conference conveys its sincerest greetings to Col. V. Koval, the Acting Chairman of the Executive of the O.U.N. to all the Executive Committees of the O.U.N. in the Ukrainian countries, to all friends and members of the O.U.N. and the insurgent groups, to the Supreme Command of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, to the soldiers and commanders, and to the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.); the Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists wishes our indomitable insurgents strength and endurance so that they may continue to overcome all the hardships and difficulties in the war they are waging against a tyranny such as never before has existed in the world, and is utterly convinced, that by the mutual efforts of all our people, we shall achieve our aim.

In an era in which those who desire truth are persecuted with every possible means a spirit of faith in justice, freedom and self-determination pervades the Ukrainian underground movement and the courageous struggle of the Ukrainians against the tyrants; and it is this spirit which moves men to sacrifice all for the sake of their native country.

The faith of the Ukrainian underground movement gives those of us who are in foreign countries and cut off from our native country strength and ensures the triumph of noble values and ideas throughout the whole world.

The members of the conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, since they are one with the insurgent groups, in keeping with the aims of the Ukrainians fighting for their country, take upon themselves the duty of supporting the Ukrainian re-

volutionary struggle of liberation to an even greater extent than was hitherto the case in order to lighten the heavy burden of the insurgent groups at home.

This is the highest proof of esteem on the part of the foreign groups on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the O.U.N.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists exhorts all Ukrainians living in foreign countries to support the struggle of the Ukrainians at home to the utmost, to concentrate all their efforts on the measures undertaken for the benefit of the latter by the Western communities, and to combat bolshevism and its fifth column in the Western hemisphere by every possible means. Despite the present critical political situation the time is more than ever favourable for the Ukrainian work of liberation since our enemy—Moscow and its bolshevism—, now the only occupation power in Ukraine, has become the enemy of all mankind.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists affirms its solidarity with the anti-bolshevist organisations of those countries in Europe and Asia which are either the victims of bolshevism or are directly threatened by its terrorisation, and in particular with the nations of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations (A.B.N.).

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists welcomes the attitude of the South Koreans in their refusal to accept a compromise and their unswerving resolve to wage a war which has as its objective an independent and unified Korea and will not be terminated by means of any half-measures as far as a truce is concerned.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists stresses the significance of the revolt of German working classes and the mass resistance of the German people against bolshevist tyranny in Eastern Germany as measures which strengthen its own Ukrainian anti-bolshevist front.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists appeals to the Western political powers to take the present situation which has arisen in the U.S.S.R. as a result of the fight for freedom of the subjugated nations into account and to participate actively in the war which is being waged against the bolshevist regime and thus prevent the bolsheviks from consolidating their forces.

The Resolutions passed at the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

1) Foreign Policy

1) In accordance with the principle of revolutionary struggle of liberation conducted by the Ukrainian people of its own strength, the O.U.N. realizes its liberation policy, independently of external forces and international political constellation, by relying on the activity and strength of its own insurgent groups. The O.U.N. regards external forces and the international political situation as variable factors which can only be of subsidiary significance as far as our fight for freedom is concerned.

2) The main objectives of our political activity abroad are as follows:

a) that our conception of the reconstruction of Eastern Europe and Soviet Asia, as opposed to all the conceptions directed against the welfare of Ukraine, in particular to the Moscow conception of a "centralized and undivided" state, be recognized and accepted by the free countries;

b) that the other nations should recognize and respect the national fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people and should realize its potential significance for the future.

c) to gain allies for the struggle against Moscow.

3) The Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists approves of the course pursued so far and the foreign activity of the Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, and confirms the foreign political resolutions passed at the Third Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists as still holding good.

The following supplementary measures, however, are stressed as being imperative:

a) the elaboration of our constructive plan to further mutual relations on all sides in the future, in particular as regards the Block of Black Sea countries, as one of the most vital factors in Ukrainian foreign policy;

b) the furtherance of our foreign political activity in the Far East and Near East and in particular in Turkey since good neighbourly relations with the latter are most essential for a future mutual understanding between the Ukrainian and the Turkish States.

Neutralist and pro-Moscow influence is in evidence in the Far East and Near East as well as in Southern Asia which is inhabited by half the free peoples of the world. These countries play an important part in the war against bolshevism because of their human and econo-

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

"THE BLUNT EDGE OF SATIRE"

At the end of last year, there appeared in Kyiv a collection of pamphlets, humorous sketches and satires under the title of "*Satire and Humor*". The collection is composed of the works of "Ukrainian satirists and humorists". The *Isvestia* of April 17th, 1953, made a study, on the basis of this anthology, of the position of Ukrainian satirical literature. In the volume are works by Yaroslav Halan, *Osyp Wyshnia* (satires), *A. Malyskko* (poems), *S. Oliynyk* (poems), *A. Kornychuk* (publicistics), *Y. Smolych*, *Al. Junov*, *D. Bilous*, *S. Voskresenko*, *P. Stendyk*, *P. Hlazov*, *T. Masenko*, *H. Brezhnev* and *H. Deravianko*. But the critics are not satisfied with these authors. The writings of Halan and others, which are directed "against capitalism" are still being put up with, to a certain extent, but what concerns the "unmasking of the bourgeois nationalists" is found by the critics to be anything but satisfactory. Moscow says that the "greatest task of the Ukrainian satirists" consists of the "constant and ruthless combatting of the Ukrainian nationalists" and their ideology. *Isvestiya* quotes the words of M. Horsky, who recommended the Ukrainian writers to use the lethal weapon of satire against Petlura.

The critic goes on to say that the "Ukrainian satirists' choice of subject is very limited". They write mostly about idlers, thieves, bureaucrats, liars and other types that are now to be met with in the Ukraine. (Naturally only after the Russian occupation). It is naturally wished that they should make much in their writings of the "combatting of Ukrainian nationalism and its agents, which are being brought into Ukraine by Americans". *Ostap Wyshnia* is criticised most of all, because he does not write with sufficient "clarity". It now should be mentioned that this Ukrainian satirist spent 10 years in Russian concentration-camps and probably avoids "clarity" for that reason.

* * *

The Moscow *Isvestiya* of April 24th of this year reports that, in the current year, 100,000 cubic metres more wood than in the previous year have been obtained from the Carpathian area and the upper Dnieper district. The exploitation of this region is being carried on much more intensively than in the recent years. The transport of this wood has already begun.

* * *

In the second half of April there took place in Kyiv the plenary meeting of the Komsomol. It was stated that the "political-educational work" among the pupils of the technical and railway-schools of the districts of Lviv, Stanislaviv, Dnipropetrovsk, etc. was being wrongly performed.

* * *

The Kyiv factory "Transsignal", has constructed new installations for the Moscow Metro, and "the Ukrainian scholars are greatly helping the builders of the Kuybishev and Stalin hydro-electric stations". The Moscow *Pravda* of April 9th, 1953, reports. The Ukrainian scholars must therefore "be ready to help with advice and assistance".

* * *

All visitors from the countries of the "People's Democracies" who come to the U.S.S.R. in order to learn something, are sent by the Kremlin into Ukraine. In spite of the fact that Ukraine suffered the heaviest damage in the last war, Moscow is convinced that the foreign visitors will find more imposing things there than in Russia itself. Skilled metal workers recently came from China and Bulgaria in order to make themselves familiar with the knowledge possessed by their Ukrainian colleagues. This will probably be interpreted later by the Soviets, and perhaps in the West as well, as the "goodness and hospitality of the great Russian nation".

DANGEROUS

(Continued from page 9)

of the American State Department reflects the truth and discloses a new bolshevist provocation.

Should the facts, however, change to coincide with the Soviet announcements, the following remarks must be made: Ukrainian territory is, firstly, no field of endeavour for various agents and propaganda services. Secondly, it deserves to be mentioned that, it is through such unprepared and completely harmful actions that the Ukrainian population is exposed to inevitable Soviet reprisals.

Moreover, the anti-bolshevist fight is only hindered by such behaviour, when one considers that the real revolutionaries are already fighting in Ukraine and no agents are needed there.

BOOKS REVIEW

IF WAR COMES TOMORROW

The publications of O. Honcharuk, a leading underground publicist and distinguished member of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.) and Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.) which first appeared in the organ of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.), *Samostijnist* (Independence) under the title "The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.), the Standardbearer of the Ideas of Liberation and Friendship of the Peoples", has now been published in English in Toronto by the Society of Veterans of Ukrainian Insurgent Army in Canada. It contains 63 pages with numerous original pictures. The introduction, by Mr. Yaroslav Stetzko, serves at the same time as an introduction to the problems of the Ukrainian Revolutionary Army.

At the very beginning, O. Honcharuk describes the significance and aims of the U.P.A.: "The U.P.A. is a revolutionary and truly national army. Being the army of a subjugated nation, it sympathizes with the liberation struggle of other peoples, who are either enslaved or menaced by Soviet Imperialism. Moreover, U.P.A. consistently and emphatically stresses the necessity of the closest co-operation between them and of a co-ordination of their efforts..."

From that one can see the actual efforts of the U.P.A., and can understand also how it has succeeded in winning other subjugated nations for this struggle. The U.P.A. addresses itself primarily to

The jam-factories in the Ukrainian S.S.R. are preparing for the preservation of the fruit from this year's harvest. This is taking place particularly in Cherkassy, Cherson and Nizhen. The Moscow administration intends, according to the announcement of *Pravda* of May 5th, to import 25 million more jars from the Ukraine than in the last year. As we see, this is all being carried out in Ukraine.

UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

Published by

UKRAINIAN PUBLISHERS LTD.

23/ Liverpool Road

London, N.1. Tel. NORTH 1828

the officers and men of the Red Army of other subjugated nations, in order to win them for the common fight.

In the same way, detachments of the U.P.A. have succeeded in establishing positive contact with the Polish population and winning over, by means of raids and other propaganda actions, a great proportion of the Polish population to common action.

"Following their shortsighted leaders, many Poles at first looked upon the Soviets as their liberators and not as imperialists and enemies of both the Ukrainian and Polish peoples". In time, however, they became convinced who the real enemy was, and in the year 1946 close co-operation was often encountered between the Ukrainian and Polish underground".

The author deals exhaustively with the activities of the U.P.A. in various Ukrainian districts and furnishes original material concerning individual actions and tactics of the U.P.A. This booklet should illustrate to the western reader in particular the possibilities of waging war in the U.S.S.R.

The political aim of this fight of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army is formulated by O. Honcharuk as follows:

"The U.P.A. fights for a Ukrainian State without the exploiters and the exploited, where all citizens will enjoy full civil rights and liberties, where nothing will be done to build up a machinery of oppression, and where all efforts will be directed towards social and economic advancement. Human dignity will be restored and the individuals will enjoy all human rights and a high standard of living. The cultural achievements of their own people, as well as those of all civilized mankind will be accessible to them.



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 8—9

LONDON, AUGUST—SEPTEMBER 1953

Price 1 sh

CONTENTS:

FACTS OF UKRAINIAN POLICY ... 1-2

(Comments on the Fourth Conference of the Z.Ch. O.U.N.)

PRINCIPLES OF UKRAINIAN FOREIGN POLICY ... 3-8

The International Situation and the Ukrainian Cause

Two contradictory processes

Half measures

Moscow's strength and weakness

The Korean War

Threat to the Western Communities

The Ukrainian revolutionary fight for freedom

Jaroslav Z. Pelenskyj

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS ... 8,16

The Tenth Anniversary

L. P. BERIA'S CAREER AND DOWNFALL ... 9-10

A Ukrainian Viewpoint

THE 30-YEAR JUBILEE OF THE UKRAINIAN CENTRAL STUDENT ORGANIZATION (C.E.S.U.S.) ... 10-16

Antares

"ALL IS QUIET IN THE WEST" ... 11-12

Ukrainians resent the continued American and British Policy of appeasement with regard to the U.S.S.R.

P. Stepanenko

THAT HAPLESS "COMMITTEE" ... 12-13

"American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism" faces the third anniversary of continuous banging and frustration.

Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn
THE HUMANE SCIENCE IN POST-WAR SOVIET UKRAINE ... 14-15

Archaeology and Pre-history
UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN ... 15-16

FACTS OF UKRAINIAN POLICY

Comments on the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, (Z.Ch. O.U.N.)

When the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), in which delegates from five European and two overseas countries took part convened in June 1953, in one of the Western cities, it was confronted by the difficulty of discussing and finding a solution to the extremely complicated problems which have arisen in the course of the post-war years. The Conference not only had to make a survey of the activity so far of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and of the present position, but it was also obliged to examine the status of the Ukrainian national fight for freedom in relation to international events in order to be able to draw up the corresponding principles to be adopted in the future with regard to home and foreign policy. The passing of a corresponding statute for the Units Abroad of this Organization, the election of new members for the Executive Committee and for other central committees of the Organization were measures which were of special significance for the future development of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. It was ascertained with the greatest satisfaction at the Conference that the members of the Organization were closely united, and it was stressed that the Organization was allied with the Ukrainian Nation in the unrelenting struggle to obtain national independence.

The Aims

We have often discussed the position of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in Ukraine in our journal and have ascertained again that this political organization constitutes the basis of the Ukrainian fight for freedom,

and together with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.) and the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.) is effectively defending itself against Russian-bolshevist occupation under the most difficult conditions.

It is the special duty of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, as an inseparable part of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in Ukraine, to defend the interests of this political organization in the free countries of the Western hemisphere. Although this Organization is striving to bring about the attainment of national and political freedom not only for the Ukrainians but also for the other nations of Eastern Europe and Asia, which have been subjugated by Russian imperialism and bolshevism, it meets with considerable opposition in the free countries of the West and in some cases with open attacks, due to the fact that various Western circles are collaborating with Russian imperialist emigrants. The Ukrainian nationalist underground movement has, in numerous publications and reports clearly defined the political and social aims of the Ukrainian independence movement and has in particular stressed the fact that the future independent democratic Ukrainian State will bring about a close co-operation with those nations which at present subjugated and also with all the nations that will respect Ukrainian independence.

In order to achieve this aims, however, an effective policy is needed, which is not interested merely in bringing the conflict with bolshevism to an end, but which combats all the elements of bolshevism. The Ukrainian Nation and the actual promoter of its national and political aspirations, the

O.U.N., have for many years been engaged in a direct conflict with the danger of world Communism and Russian imperialism. They are dependent on their own strength, and, despite considerable difficulties and an ever-increasing opportunist attitude in the free countries of the Western hemisphere they have been waging this war with their own forces. The Ukrainian attitude which stresses national independence is, however, in no way based on any inability on the part of the Ukrainian nationalist independence movement to win the support of some Western partner or other, but has originated out of the experiences of the Ukrainian revolutionary underground movement and has finally become the **guiding principle of Ukrainian national interests as far as political theories are concerned, a principle which has found expression in the conception of independent and national strength.**

This conception does not oppose the inclusion of external political factors in the political calculations of the Ukrainians. It does however exclude a political orientation in a certain Western or other direction and prevents any renunciation of principles which are in the interests of the Ukrainian nation in favour of some political power or other. The plan of action of Ukrainian nationalism is thus obvious to all elements and supporters of the Ukrainian fight for freedom.

In essence Ukrainian policy will always remain independent, regardless of the wishes and demands of the "strong countries of the world". And neither temporary failures nor the unfavourable foreign political situation can change this fact. The aims of Ukrainian policy and of the Ukrainian fight for freedom will continue to find expression in the struggle which is being waged against bolshevism by the Ukrainian themselves. And this fact was realized and stressed by the members who participated in the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists.

Foreign Policy

Ukrainian foreign policy is the result of the inner strength of the Ukrainian nation and reflects the essence of the fight for freedom which the Ukrainians are conducting on their own strength. And this was admitted to be the case by the members of the Conference. If Ukrainian foreign policy in its essence is not dependent on temporary trends and situation then the Ukrainian politicians can also deal with problems the solution of which is perhaps at present not realizable. On the other hand, however, Ukrainian policy

concentrates on matters which are at present of primary importance in the political situation.

The first of these problems is the creation of good neighbourly relations with the nations of the Black Sea Block (Turkey in particular), which aim to achieve a close and mutual co-operation and as a block constitute an important counter-balance to Russian imperialist ambitions.

The second problem to which considerable attention was devoted at the Conference is that of the countries of Asia. These countries are subjected to the constant influence of the Russian-bolshevist neutralisation policy, which aims to separate Asiatic nations from the free countries of the world and at the same time finds an excellent foundation in the imperialist and colonial policies of various individual European countries.

The bolsheviks, by applying their "Leninist-Stalinist national policy", are turning this weakness to good account, and are thus able to extend the sphere of their influence more and more with the motto of "national liberation" and "social justice". They have even succeeded in combining the Communist Parties and the national independence movements and in this way have managed to build up an unheard of dynamic and aggressive political force. Not only would it be an noble task on the part of Western policy to free these national forces from the pressure of Russian Communist claims to power but it would also be in starting the struggle against bolshevism.

The free countries of the world have tried by various means and ways to combat and to halt the Communist danger, but so far they have never succeeded in evolving any definite plan by which this danger could be halted or eliminated completely. As a rule their efforts were limited to uniting the individual forces into internationalist groups, which, however, had neither the necessary forceful power and strength nor a guiding and effective ideology. It can be foreseen with some degree of certainty that the individual international (socialist and liberal) and the European federalistic movements will never succeed in setting up a definite, effective and far-reaching policy.

The reason for this lies in the essence of every form of internationalism which is in incompatible with the national interests, which in their turn constitute the basis for a foreign policy that can only be national in character and finally because every form of internationalism is harmful for liberation policy. And this fact is also recog-

nised by the majority of the leading Ukrainian groups. Internationalism is no guarantee for a constructive collaboration between the nations as is proved by the example of the European federalistic movements.

The principles which were also defined at the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of O.U.N. reveal the actual essence of Ukrainian policy, which is independent, concrete, drawn up on a large scale in keeping with political events and facts, and free of every kind of internationalist Utopia.

The internal political aspect

The fact has already been mentioned that the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists represent a homogenous part of the entire Organization, and this is also of decisive importance in determining the relation of the Z.Ch. O.U.N. to other Ukrainian political movements and parties. As regards home policy the binding principle is freedom of speech, of publication, of political meetings, and of political parties and organizations. The aspect from which the individual Ukrainian parties and groups are considered is that of their relation to the revolutionary fight for freedom of the Ukrainian Nation and to the **foremost principle of the Ukrainian political ideology, namely the conception of Ukrainian national independence.** ...

A constructive and regular collaboration with these Ukrainian political groups is to be desired since it would strengthen opposition to Russian imperialism and would also guarantee a successful foreign policy. It is most certainly a fault of Ukrainian political activity that some of the opportunistic Ukrainian political splinter-parties would like to pursue a foreign policy of intervention and for this reason are unable to reach an agreement with those organizations which uphold the principle of independent strength and pursue a policy which is not dependent on the Western powers.

The Conference, naturally, also dealt with the problems of Ukrainian cultural life, the nature of the Ukrainian trade unions in foreign countries, the possibilities in connection with the educating and training of Ukrainian youth, and also with the training of new personnel to undertake organizational work. All these aspects of home policy were dealt with earnestly and frankly.

And until such time the efforts of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and of the Ukrainian community which is so closely linked to the former will be directed towards a successful realization, as soon as possible, of the task before it.

PRINCIPLES OF UKRAINIAN FOREIGN POLICY

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), which was held in June 1953, stressed the significance of the Ukrainian work of liberation in relation to the general political situation and defined the principles governing the policy and activity of the O.U.N. abroad.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists pays homage to the memory of those who died on the field of honour and those who were tortured to death in the cause of freedom for Ukraine; it admires the heroic struggle of the Ukrainians against bolshevist tyranny in their native country and honours the self-sacrifice and bravery of the members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and of all those unnamed persons fighting in the cause of freedom.

The Conference conveys its sincerest greetings to Col. V. Koval, the Acting Chairman of the Executive of the O.U.N. to all the Executive Committees of the O.U.N. in the Ukrainian countries, to all friends and members of the O.U.N. and the insurgent groups, to the Supreme Command of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, to the soldiers and commanders, and to the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.); the Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists wishes our indomitable insurgents strength and endurance so that they may continue to overcome all the hardships and difficulties in the war they are waging against a tyranny such as never before has existed in the world, and is utterly convinced, that by the mutual efforts of all our people, we shall achieve our aim.

In an era in which those who desire truth are persecuted with every possible means a spirit of faith in justice, freedom and self-determination pervades the Ukrainian underground movement and the courageous struggle of the Ukrainians against the tyrants; and it is this spirit which moves men to sacrifice all for the sake of their native country.

The faith of the Ukrainian underground movement gives those of us who are in foreign countries and cut off from our native country strength and ensures the triumph of noble values and ideas throughout the whole world.

The members of the conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, since they are one with the insurgent groups, in keeping with the aims of the Ukrainians fighting for their country, take upon themselves the duty of supporting the Ukrainian re-

volutionary struggle of liberation to an even greater extent than was hitherto the case in order to lighten the heavy burden of the insurgent groups at home.

This is the highest proof of esteem on the part of the foreign groups on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the O.U.N.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists exhorts all Ukrainians living in foreign countries to support the struggle of the Ukrainians at home to the utmost, to concentrate all their efforts on the measures undertaken for the benefit of the latter by the Western communities, and to combat bolshevism and its fifth column in the Western hemisphere by every possible means. Despite the present critical political situation the time is more than ever favourable for the Ukrainian work of liberation since our enemy—Moscow and its bolshevism—, now the only occupation power in Ukraine, has become the enemy of all mankind.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists affirms its solidarity with the anti-bolshevist organisations of those countries in Europe and Asia which are either the victims of bolshevism or are directly threatened by its terrorisation, and in particular with the nations of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations (A.B.N.).

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists welcomes the attitude of the South Koreans in their refusal to accept a compromise and their unswerving resolve to wage a war which has as its objective an independent and unified Korea and will not be terminated by means of any half-measures as far as a truce is concerned.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists stresses the significance of the revolt of German working classes and the mass resistance of the German people against bolshevist tyranny in Eastern Germany as measures which strengthen its own Ukrainian anti-bolshevist front.

The Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists appeals to the Western political powers to take the present situation which has arisen in the U.S.S.R. as a result of the fight for freedom of the subjugated nations into account and to participate actively in the war which is being waged against the bolshevist regime and thus prevent the bolsheviks from consolidating their forces.

The Resolutions passed at the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

1) Foreign Policy

1) In accordance with the principle of revolutionary struggle of liberation conducted by the Ukrainian people of its own strength, the O.U.N. realizes its liberation policy, independently of external forces and international political constellation, by relying on the activity and strength of its own insurgent groups. The O.U.N. regards external forces and the international political situation as variable factors which can only be of subsidiary significance as far as our fight for freedom is concerned.

2) The main objectives of our political activity abroad are as follows:

a) that our conception of the reconstruction of Eastern Europe and Soviet Asia, as opposed to all the conceptions directed against the welfare of Ukraine, in particular to the Moscow conception of a "centralized and undivided" state, be recognized and accepted by the free countries;

b) that the other nations should recognize and respect the national fight for freedom of the Ukrainian people and should realize its potential significance for the future.

c) to gain allies for the struggle against Moscow.

3) The Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists approves of the course pursued so far and the foreign activity of the Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, and confirms the foreign political resolutions passed at the Third Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists as still holding good.

The following supplementary measures, however, are stressed as being imperative:

a) the elaboration of our constructive plan to further mutual relations on all sides in the future, in particular as regards the Block of Black Sea countries, as one of the most vital factors in Ukrainian foreign policy;

b) the furtherance of our foreign political activity in the Far East and Near East and in particular in Turkey since good neighbourly relations with the latter are most essential for a future mutual understanding between the Ukrainian and the Turkish States.

Neutralist and pro-Moscow influence is in evidence in the Far East and Near East as well as in Southern Asia which is inhabited by half the free peoples of the world. These countries play an important part in the war against bolshevism because of their human and econo-

mic potential as well as their geographical and political position. It is particularly important for the furtherance of our anti-bolshevist movement and policy that the idea of the downfall of the Russian empire be propagated and that these countries be made to realize the imminent danger of a Soviet aggression.

4) The Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists supports the A. B. N. as a centre of co-ordination for the various revolutionary organizations and at the same time is of the opinion that co-operation with these organizations should be intensified in view of the Ukrainians' fight for freedom at home.

We regard the A.B.N. as an organizational and political structure of the common front of the revolutionary liberation movements and organizations of the various nations. The most important factor is that they are agreed in their aims, namely the building up of independent national States, a common course to be pursued, a revolutionary war, waged without compromise, against Russian bolshevism, and political activity and forcefulness. The fact that all the political forces of the various nations are represented in the structure and political activity of the A.B.N. is, however, of little significance.

5) The propagation in the Western hemisphere not only of the motives which prompt the Ukrainian fight for freedom as such but also of those ideas and principles which constitute the strength of this fight and make the participants immune to Moscow's destructive bolshevist ideas must be intensified.

6) It is imperative that this fight and propagation of the motives prompting it as well as plans for the future when the fight is ended be scientifically elaborated to an even greater extent. It is likewise imperative that pro-Russian tendencies in the West and a pro-Russian attitude on the part of the Western world as regards Eastern problems be scientifically opposed and that the problems of Eastern Europe and of those parts of Asia dominated by the Soviets be clarified by revealing them in their true light.

7) The Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists recommends that, in connection with foreign political activity in all spheres, activity as regards the sphere of the trades unions be increased which will make it possible to fight Communism on the front on which it is most vulnerable and to win over an element which, as far as the policy of every nation in the Western world is concerned, is most important for the Ukrainian work of liberation.

8) It is essential that co-operation with those institutions and prominent personalities of the Western world that regard

our cause favourably be furthered and that their position and influence be strengthened.

9) As regards the present significance of the Ukrainian work of liberation in relation to the international political situation the Fourth Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists stresses the following points in particular:

a) that the governments of the Western major powers still do not support the idea of partition of the U.S.S.R. into independent national States either by a definite or by a practical and active policy;

b) that the political leaders of the Western powers must by now be well aware of the nature of the Ukrainian fight for freedom and its significance for the world-struggle against bolshevism and the status of the political forces of the world, and that any fundamental mistakes these leaders make in this respect cannot therefore solely be due to lack of information;

c) The co-operation of certain Western politicians with persons who, a short time ago, collaborated with bolsheviks, and with the "Quislings" of various nations and the fact that these same politicians have refused to have anything to do with genuine representatives of these nations is proof that they do not seek collaboration with political opponents but with agents.

10) The so-called psychological war which is at present being conducted by the Western powers and in particular by the U.S.A. against bolshevism is, however, only being conducted on the level of the limited and tactical objectives of Western policy and has not as its aim a serious incorporation of the aims of the fight for freedom of the nations that have been subjugated to Moscow tyranny. In view of this situation there is no point in the revolutionary liberation movement allaying its policy which aims at national independence and its anti-bolshevist activity abroad to the propagandists and other activities of the so-called psychological war.

11) The so-called Co-ordination Centre of the anti-bolshevist Campaign (C.C.A.C.) and the organizing and supporting of the same by the "American Committee for the Fight against Bolshevism" is an activity which runs counter to the aims of the Ukrainian fight for freedom, inasmuch as the claims to sovereignty of the Ukrainian nation and of the other nations subjugated by Moscow are denied; and this activity may prove to be a negative influence in the anti-bolshevist struggle, since it aims to break up the independent front of the national groups abroad, a fact which would be to the advantage of bolshevism.

The Conference of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists

therefore rejects and opposes all such endeavours which run counter to the aims of the Ukrainian people and are an obstacle to the progress of the world struggle against bolshevism and Russian imperialism. For this reason it approves of the attitude of the Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in this respect and of the action taken by the same against the C.C.A.C.

We regard the course we have taken, in principle and without compromise, regarding the fundamental questions of a policy of liberation and independence as fixed and unchangable. We oppose all measures which threat the fundamental questions of the Ukrainian policy of independence as if they were matters to be decided by strategic moves and by bargaining.

The International Situation and the Ukrainian Cause Facts and their importance

If the quintessence of the political progress of mankind lies in the fact that the greater the progress the more people and nations can enjoy the benefits of freedom then the past decade is one of the most reactionary periods in the entire history of the world.

Russian tyranny has subjugated countless new nations, which a short time ago were still free, by turning to its own advantage the erroneous policy of the Western powers which made this possible instead of aiding the nations subjugated by Moscow.

At present, as never before in the history of the world, the world is split into two halves: the subjugated nations and peoples, and those threatened by the danger of servitude. More than a third is ruled by tyranny.

Under these circumstances the problem of the oppressed nations has become one of the most important of all world-wide problems.

Two contradictory processes

Based on the conflict between the major powers a process has taken place in the non-communist countries of the world which has as its aim the attainment of independence by dependent nations and which has determined their transition to the status of independent States; simultaneous with this process of national emancipation in the non-communist countries of the world a contradictory process is also taking place, namely the process of enslaving more and more nations in those parts of the world ruled by bolshevism. And the past decade in the history of the world is characterized by the ceaseless fight for freedom of the many nations that have been subjugated by Moscow imperialism and Communism.

The Western major powers accept the national liberation movements of those nations in Asia and Africa which hitherto dependent on them, and in this way acknowledge the primary importance and value of the conception of national freedom in its relation to present world events.

On the strength of these obvious facts it is thus contradictory for the Western major powers to underestimate the far stronger and, to judge from their results, far more extensive national liberation movements of the ancient and highly civilized nations in those parts of the world ruled by Bolshevism. And it is this fact which is the main cause of the present world crisis and of Moscow's daring in the face of the free countries.

Two poles and their opposite interests

The concentration of the greatest economic, military and political forces has intensified the partition of the world into two halves. The hermetic isolation of 3/4 milliard people and the natural riches of their countries from the free countries of the world and the transformation of their man-power and their economic potential for the purposes of a terrible system of ruin and war, promoted by the most destructive of principles, has as its aim the creation of a crisis, the elimination of the Western block, namely the U.S.A. as the world rival of Moscow, and, once the whole world has been conquered, the setting up of a world union of Soviet Socialist Republics as the sole universal empire in which the Russian nation rules supreme. This always was and still is the irrevocable aim of bolshevism.

In the Soviet block only the Muscovites (the Moscow Russians) are hostile in their attitude to the Western block, whereas countless millions of the people enslaved by them might under certain conditions become allies of the West. In this respect therefore the nations subjugated by bolshevism represent a key position for their liberation will mean the downfall of Moscow's imperial forces.

The most effective and logical anti-bolshevist policy has recently been pursued by the U.S.A. inasmuch as its policy is objectively delaying the imminent danger of further subjugation of the world by bolshevism. On the other hand, however, the present American principle of "united and indivisible", which runs counter to the liberation of the subjugated nations of Russia, is harmful to the progress of the anti-bolshevist national forces in the U.S.S.R. and impedes the attempts to overthrow Russian imperialism, which remains a constant threat to the rest of the world.

Half measures

The fact that the U.S.A. does not support the principle of separation of the

Ukrainian nation and other nations from Moscow nor the idea of national independent States, but at the same time, on the other hand, aids the process which has as its aim the attainment of independence in the non-Communist countries of the world is indicative of a policy which furthers the partition of the world into two halves. For this reason the U.S.A. aims to persuade those nations of the non-communist world which are still dependent to pursue a pro-American policy, but at the same time aims to preserve the bolshevist empire as a second world power.

The policy that the communist regime be maintained in the satellite States on condition that the Moscow factors be removed (that is to say on condition that Moscow puts up with a special kind of Tito-ism in these States) and an equally significant diplomatic game as far as Germany is concerned have as their aim a provisional agreement on the strength of the partition of the world into two halves.

The tendency of America's policy to preserve a weakened Moscow empire within those limits which existed prior to 1939 is contrary to the realization of the national independence of those nations in the U.S.S.R. which have been subjugated, and erroneously relies on the Russians as being the main anti-communist force in the U.S.S.R. It is furthermore proof of the erroneous economic policy pursued by the U.S.A. in connection with the eastern territories.

The method of the so-called democratic reconstruction in the eastern territories beginning at the lowest level and under American control would be quite in keeping with such an erroneous policy.

States that are nationally independent provide a better basis for economic relations as well as a greater and more effective success than do dependent countries.

The erroneous conception of a balance of power in the world based on a partition into three parts

The efforts of Great Britain to secure for itself and for Western Europe the role of an independent mediator between the two greatest powers by means of a compromise with the U.S.S.R. at the expense of the nations subjugated by bolshevism would have the same results as the Munich Agreement, since bolshevism is not striving to attain peace but world domination. Any shifting of the scene of the conflict can only prove an advantage to bolshevism since it gives the latter a chance to slow down the national revolutionary process and continue to strengthen and increase its own war potential. Any partition of the world either into two or three parts gives bolshevism an opportunity to undermine and weaken the inner political structure of the West-

ern powers and also shatters the confidence of the subjugated nations in the Western countries. It is precisely by politically supporting the fight for freedom of the nations subjugated by Moscow—contrary to the present American political principle of "united and indivisible"—that Great Britain and Western Europe could secure for themselves an active part in the final game between the West and the U.S.S.R. as well as in the future distribution of power.

Moscow's strength and weakness

1) In these days when the conception of the freedom of nations and of mankind has reached its highest level nations can only be subjugated either by deceiving them with lies or by enslaving them by means of totalitarian practices, namely by a system of collectivism without exception, a Soviet regime, and a general subjugation of the individual.

a) The bolshevist social economic system is in the first place a form of national subjugation, suppression and exploitation of nations and individuals. The fact that certain circles in Western Europe approve of the collective economic system and other forms of the present system applied by the bolshevist regime must be regarded as a desire to maintain a well tried system of exploitation in those countries which may possibly be liberated from bolshevism. Nazism, too, although it was anti-Marxist, did not radically destroy the communist collectivist economic system, but likewise restored to it in order to enslave the individual and subjugate nations.

b) Bolshevist ideology has no power of attraction; for this reason the bolsheviks camouflage their Russian imperialistic Observer. Gal. 15.

aims as regards the dependent nations of Asia and Africa with slogans of national fight for freedom and a war against material need,—proof of the ineffectuality of communist, internationalist, and Russian "Messianic" ideologies.

c) New forces have made their appearance on the world stage with the birth of a new national consciousness and the ever-increasing endeavours on the part of the nations to assert themselves and safeguard their independence. The communities of the Western world—under pressure of scepticism, standardization of all values, and disbelief—are not in agreement with the ideas which prompt these endeavours. For this reason the Western world is not capable of taking the offensive as far as ideas are concerned in order to combat bolshevist propaganda tactics, which adapt themselves to the above-mentioned processes and endeavours.

d) Civil wars and armed offensive constitute Moscow's aggression against the free world. The principle of guerrilla warfare has determined bolshevist strategy in Asia. Political offensives, demoraliza-

tion, internal conflicts, the furthering of antagonism within any one nation, social chaos, armed clashes and peripheral wars are the fundamental factors of the third world war which bolshevism is beginning to wage. The temporary cessation of some peripheral war or other in no way changes the fundamental attitude of bolshevism, namely to conquer all free countries in the world, for this attitude is based on the very essence of bolshevism and Russian imperialism.

2) The 19th Party Rally of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has defined its instructions as regards Moscow and world Communism in the immediate future. Bolshevism makes no attempt to conceal its intentions and methods.

a) The 19th Party Rally of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has proved how treacherous the suggestion is that a peaceful agreement between the "capitalist" and "communist" countries might be possible, for it has adopted the false and crafty theory maintained by Stalin that there is more likelihood of a conflict occurring within the Western block than between bolshevism and the Western world, and has thus set about furthering a process of disintegration on the united front of those countries which are free. This process on the one hand is being conducted within the free countries themselves, and on the other hand is noticeable in the attitude of estrangement on the part of the nations subjugated by Moscow towards the West and in the mobilization of the coloured races against the West.

b) As far as its strategy to conquer the world is concerned Moscow adheres steadfastly to Lenin's theory, namely one step backwards, two steps forwards. This theory was applied after the epoch of military communism and later on also in connection with the Berlin blockade, etc., and now it is once again being repeated in the same way in conjunction with the present world conflagration.

c) Regardless of any temporary truces Moscow, in keeping with the theories of Lenin and the Moscow tsars, will not desist from its intention to conquer Asia and thus subjugate Europe and the entire world completely.

3) a. The national liberation movement of the Ukrainians and of numerous other nations are disintegrating the U.S.S.R. internally, a fact which not even the bolshevist can conceal, for, at the 19th Party Rally of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, they stressed as the main point of interest the "*friendship of nations—the strength of the U.S.S.R.*" Thus the foreign policy pursued by the U.S.S.R. is not merely determined by some international constellation or other, but is necessitated in the first place by the internal pressure of the subjugated

nations. The foreign political manoeuvres of the bolsheviks and all their affirmations of being willing to co-operate are dictated as it were by the national revolutionary liberation process and by the possibility of the Western powers adopting a definite attitude in this aspect.

The Moscow Empire will continue to remain an idol with feet of clay. Its strength is based on the weakness of the Western powers and on the erroneous attitude of the latter to the national fight for freedom of the nations which have been subjugated by Moscow. Moscow is well aware of the fact that its own weakness lies in the problem of the nations it has subjugated and in the possibility of their collaboration, as opponents with equal rights, with the free countries of the world. And it is not the duty of the freedom-loving peoples of the world to assuage Moscow's fears in this respect but rather to increase them.

b) Neither the bolshevist regime nor the realm of Greater Russia can ever become democratized for this would mean their downfall. The realm of Greater Russia and democracy are two ideologies that are incompatible. To quote Witte, "The Russian Empire can only be preserved by despotism".

c) The conflict between the Russians and the nations that have been subjugated by Moscow has now reached a state of tension hitherto unheard of. The basis for the bolshevist regime in the Russian nation and the policy of the Kremlin takes this fact into account, whereas on the other hand, however, those elements among the peoples subjugated by Moscow that were formerly led astray by communism now are opposed to it since they have recognized the true nature of communist practices and have realized that the methods of Russian subjugation consists in the massacre of individuals and nations. In essence as well as in form the policy of the Kremlin is Russian and imperialistic. The purpose of the intensification of Russian influence, the glorification of all that is Russian, above all the glorification of the tsarist past as an epoch which was in keeping with the spirit and character of the Russian nation, is to mobilize all Russians for the defence of the empire. The present attitude of opposition on the part of the Russians, of the relatively small number of persons who are incorruptible, and of the many millions of persons who are not Russians is creating a crisis, politically, economically and in military respect, in the U.S.S.R. and the satellite States and proves the futility of the international catchwords of bolshevism.

The Kremlin's final game in strategy
Stalin's death presented a long-awaited opportunity to find a new scape-goat for the crimes committed by bolshevism both

at home and abroad.

a) The Kremlin is stalling for time in order to deal with the situation at home effectively. In "clinging" the ranks of the supreme rulers of Russia, allegedly in order to right the wrongs which have been committed and thus lay the blame for the past on Stalin, the bolsheviks are introducing certain changes in order to use this opportunity to ascertain those rebellious elements which have recently come into evidence and will later on be exterminated, and in order to create political illusions for the Western world.

b) Bolshevist Moscow is endeavouring to bring the national liberation process, which is steadily increasing in strength, to a halt by promises of peace. As a result the Western powers, by signifying their willingness to guarantee the status quo, are beginning to desist from a liberation policy in favour of the nations subjugated by Moscow. And this fact is being utilized by Soviet propaganda as much as possible in order to demobilize the nations subjugated by Soviets, not only by convincing these nations of the peaceful intentions of the Soviets but also by destroying all their hopes of help in their fight for freedom.

c) The purpose of the promises of peace on the part of the Kremlin is to instil in the nations subjugated by Moscow a feeling of distrust towards the Western powers, inasmuch as these promises aim to show the subjugated nations that they are after all only an object for bargaining for the West and also aim to disintegrate the Western world by making use of the conflict of interests among the Western major powers in order to win over some of them to the side of the Kremlin and thus prevent the re-arming of those anti-bolshevist nations, such as Germany and Japan, which were defeated in the last war.

d) The aim of all the apparent concessions on the part of the Kremlin in the satellite States, concessions which are effected against the wish of the population, is to neutralize various Western countries, to increase defeatism, and to prevent Germany from re-arming and the European Defence Community from materializing.

e) The friendly game which the Kremlin is playing with Turkey and Japan has the same aims, namely to spread confusion, to sow down the seed of defence programmes, to disintegrate political unions, and then, when a favourable opportunity presents itself, to attack the disintegrated and unarmed countries, which at present are still free, and to subjugate them by disposing of one opponent after the other.

f) Furthermore the possibility of a military invasion of the West by the allegedly peace-loving Kremlin in the near future must not be excluded, when once

the West has been demobilized and the individual countries have been isolated.

The Korean War

1) Moscow decides to make a truce in Korea:

a) in order to bring this armed conflict to a temporary standstill since it is giving rise to a feeling of insecurity on the part of the nations subjugated by Moscow as far as the relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are concerned and in order to foster the hopes of the nations fighting for freedom in their lone struggle, namely that this conflict may lead to a final passage at arms between the free countries of the world and bolshevism.

b) a truce on the strength of the status quo despite the fact that the manpower of the U.S.A. and the U.N. has been put into action against North-Korea; further the non-attainment of the aims of a war of liberation, that is to say a united and independent Korea, and finally degrading truce terms as far as the prisoners-of-war are concerned, coupling with the fact that certain countries in the West will still continue to sell their raw materials to Red China, etc.—all these factors undermine the authority of the Western world in the face of the Asiatic nations.

The resistance of free Korea to the truce indicates that the anti-bolshevist forces in Asia are unwilling to accept any compromise whatsoever.

2) Peripheral wars are in the interests of Moscow provided the latter can get other people to wage them for it and provided it suffers no losses itself. In fact it derives advantages from such wars, whereas the Western powers on the other hand are obliged to fight their wars on their own. In view of the inadequate support given to the national forces in Asia and in view of the erroneous policy of the West it is futile for the U.S.A. to hope that the national forces in Asia will succeed in defeating bolshevism and imperialism in Asia, for Russian communism, which claims to support the national aims and endeavours of the peoples of Asia, has a much stronger position. If the world aims to free itself from the constant oppression and fear on an aggression and desires to safeguard a permanent peace, then the final battle with Moscow must be fought on the latter's own soil and against its own forces.

The increase of the Communist Threat to the Western Communities

a) A sound economic system and recovery aided by material help on the part of the U.S.A. will not bring the desired results, since communism is not only a social and economic but above all an ideological and political movement. The most important prerequisite in building up a successful resistance to bolshevist aggression in a spiritual re-birth, and

this is what the West needs even more than economic expansion. If there is no spiritual re-birth then the countries of the Western world will more easily fall a victim to bolshevist aggression, and the material aid they have received from the U.S.A. will indirectly serve to increase the bolshevist war potential.

b) Whilst the U.S.S.R. is disintegrating the West by means of the Communist Party and the fifth column and is ascertaining the military secrets of the former by employing agents of the Communist Party and the fifth column, and at the same time is isolating itself from the free countries of the world, it is increasing its own military strength to an unparalleled degree, partly by keeping the standard of living of its own people unbelievably low;

c) The efforts of the Western world to defeat the ideas of bolshevism behind the Iron Curtain by resorting to the help of one of the varieties of bolshevism, namely Titoism, which is apparently in opposition to bolshevism, shows that the Western world has failed to recognize the true situation and the importance of political factors behind the Iron Curtain;

d) The fact that nationalism has been branded as undesirable, the decay of patriotism, and a materialist attitude to life in general has created vacuum in some of the Western communities which the communists are turning to advantage by resorting to their usual lying propaganda.

A Totalitarian War

Moscow is making preparations to wage a totalitarian war. And for this reason any war waged on Moscow must not only be an economic and military one but also an ideological and political war.

a) The most successful and effective ideological weapon of the West against Communism is the opposition of the conception of nationalism and social justice against bolshevism, the militant anti-communist attitude of the Church, the combatting of national and social injustice, and the application of Christian principles in practice in social and national life.

b) In order to combat any future aggression on the part of Moscow it will be necessary for the political and military forces of the West to unite with the liberation movements of the Ukrainians and other subjugated nations. Such a union will, however, only be possible if the free world is willing to recognize the Ukrainian independent and united State and the splitting up of the realm of Greater Russia into nationally independent States, and is prepared to respect the sovereignty of the Ukrainian national policy and the revolutionary fight for freedom.

The ideological conception of the political and psychological war of the West on our front must be in harmony with

the ideological principles which have prompted the Ukrainian revolution and the revolutions of the other subjugated nations, otherwise, if this is not the case, there will be dissention on the anti-bolshevist front. Whilst nationalism is rallying and mobilizing thousands of persons, who will refuse to accept a compromise, in the fight against bolshevism, the hopes set on Titoism by the West run counter to the wish of the people, who regard him as the adherent of the Communist regime.

c) Communism has least supporters in Ukraine and among the other nations subjugated by Moscow in the U.S.S.R. The Western world can therefore have whole nations as its allies. The most deadly blow for the U.S.S.R. would be for it to be disintegrated from within, that is to say by the Western powers supporting the national liberation movement of the Ukrainian nation and the other nations. The West will be strengthened from the moral point of view to a far greater extent if it appreciates and supports the moral, ideological and political values of the fight for freedom of the Ukrainians and the other nations subjugated by Moscow, instead of resorting to material measures to mobilize forces which are incapable of waging war on bolshevism.

d) In order to turn the fact that the Ukrainians and other nations subjugated by Moscow can become allies of the West in a war waged against the U.S.S.R. to good account it is essential that their territories, in the final game of the future, be regarded as territories belonging to an ally. The political conception of the downfall of the realm of Greater Russia shall determine the purely military conception.

e) So far it is precisely the national revolutionary process which has deterred the U.S.S.R. from launching a direct military attack on the West. Moscow needs the pause that the West has allowed it in order to strengthen its position as ruler in the countries it has conquered and also to make the necessary preparations for the war.

The only guarantee for success is to rely on one's own strength

The Ukrainian nation and all the other nations in Europe and Asia which have either been subjugated by bolshevism or are threatened by it must above all rely on their own strength and their own battle if they wish to attain their justified aims and not shed their blood in vain;

a) the right to sovereignty and national unification on the part of those nations who have lost them as a result of the concession policy of the major powers towards insatiable bolshevism is not supported and defended by the major powers in question in keeping with the national interests of the nations concerned, but is treated by them from the point of view of their own current interests.

b) The liberation of those nations which have been subjugated by bolshevism and the defense of those nations in Europe and Asia which are threatened by bolshevism can only be achieved if they refuse to accept a compromise in their fight against bolshevism.

Although these nations do not constitute a block nor have they united to form a military alliance their principles in their fight against bolshevism, which exclude any agreement with the latter, differ from those of a Western block, which on the strength of a partition of the world into two or three parts is prepared to accept a compromise. In this respect the anti-bolshevist nations constitute an objective and *separate* factor in the political chess-match of the world.

c) These nations have allies in the implacable anti-bolshevist elements of every nation who recognize and support the ideology of national liberation, that is to say the independence of the anti-bolshevist nations.

The Ukrainian revolutionary fight for freedom and the creation of a Ukrainian Sovereign Independent State will guarantee a permanent world peace

a) The creation of a Ukrainian Sovereign Independent State will bring about a fundamental change in the international world order since its existence means the downfall of the Moscow Empire. In this respect therefore it would be of world-wide importance for the Ukrainian revolutionary fight for freedom, which is allied to similar processes in all those countries of the world which are ruled by bolshevism, to be supported by the West.

The Ukrainian fight for freedom and the Ukrainian conception and principles of freedom have become a guide for those countries of the world which are ruled by Russia that are striving to obtain independence. Any decision on the part of the Western world to genuinely support the idea of the Ukrainian Sovereign Independent State to the end would bring about a turning-point in the history of the world since an international constellation would result which would guarantee a permanent world peace if the Russian State were once more confined to its ethnical boundaries.

In the year 1917 the Moscow empire was one of the victors of the war but it was disintegrated internally by the Ukrainian revolution and by other national revolutions. The consequences which the Western powers should draw from this fact in the present anti-Russian struggle as regards the significance of the conception of nationalism and the fight for freedom are obvious.

c) Although the policy of the U.S.A. assesses the Ukrainian fight for freedom as a factor which will remain active in

any case it is striving to win over the Russians to its side at the expense of the Ukrainians and the other subjugated nations. The anti-bolshevist principles prompting the Ukrainian revolutionary fight for freedom are unalterable and there will be no re-orientation to agree with the principles of the Western major powers should the latter oppose and reject the aims of this struggle, which will be continued in accordance with Ukrainian anti-bolshevist principles. The confidence which the Ukrainians have placed in the Western powers has been shaken by the fact that there is at present a pro-Russian attitude on the part of certain Western circles in evidence in the psychological war.

A change of policy and the strategy connected with it is very difficult when once the war has already reached a critical stage and is hardly likely to remedy the damage which has already been done. The entire anti-bolshevist potential will be weakened if no political and practical assistance on the part of the Western powers is given to the national anti-bolshevist fight for freedom. Effective self-defense against an aggression by Russia, which is striving to conquer the world, is of the utmost importance for the vital interests of all nations since only in this way can the integrity of freedom be preserved.

c) By ignoring the aims of the Ukrainian revolutionary fight for freedom and supporting the idea of a united and indivisible realm of Greater Russia (only with a different regime) pro-Russian circles in the U.S.A. are endeavouring to force this latter attitude on the Ukrainian political forces, too. The present policy of the Western major powers erroneously underestimates the central importance of the Ukrainian revolutionary fight for freedom on the anti-bolshevist front.

The logical and all-round support on the part of the Western powers of the national fight for freedom in the U.S.S.R. would have made world ruin impossible, but the Western world must not use any support it may possibly give to the fight for freedom as a means of pressure to make peace with bolshevism or to gain its favour.

d) It is a political mistake on the part of the Western world to endeavour to reach an agreement with bolshevism during the present internal crisis which the U.S.S.R. is passing through and which is caused not only by internal revolutionary pressure but also by a struggle among the rivals for Stalin's position. Now is not the time for a truce, but for a decisive blow against the U.S.S.R. in order to render a Russian attack on the free world in the immediate future impossible.

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALIST

The Tenth Anniversary of the Third Special Congress of the Organization of Ukrainian nationalists

The recording of the events which happened between the 23rd and 27th of August in 1943, is undoubtedly one of the noblest tasks of Ukrainian historians and political writers. After thorough preparations had been made the Third Special Congress of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists was held from August 23rd to 27th in 1943. It was a special congress in as much as it was necessitated by the political and military situation at that time, and it was particularly important since it was the first congress of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists to be held in Ukraine, a fact which makes it all the more significant.

In the midst of the struggle in which the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists were engaged the Supreme Committee of the O.U.N. convened in order to discuss the political and social problems of Ukrainian nationalism in connection with World War II and its final issue and as regards the continuation of the struggle to attain Ukrainian national independence, and in order to define the policy to be pursued in the future.

It was characteristic of this congress that it was held in secret at a place where the National-Socialist and Russian-bolshevist occupation forces were fighting against the Ukrainian underground. A number of the delegates were also fighting in the ranks of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and had responsible positions. This fact added to the significance of the resolutions passed at the Congress, because the course of events later on was to prove that the principles defined there were correct.

One of the most important matters discussed was the clarification of organizational and structural problems pertaining to the O.U.N. In view of the fact that the Head of the Executive Committee of the O.U.N., *Stepan Bandera*, and other leading personalities of this organization had been arrested by the National-Socialist occupation forces it was now necessary for the Third Congress to solve the problem of who was to be in charge of the O.U.N. Members were elected for the Executive Committee of O.U.N. They were *R. Shukhevych Tur* (Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, General Taras Chuprynka), *Taras Majivsky* and *R. Woloshyn-Pavlenko*, who in

(Continued on Page 16)

L. P. BERIA'S CAREER AND DOWNFALL

A Ukrainian Viewpoint

The news from Moscow, Friday morning July 10th, 1953, of *L. P. Beria's* disgrace and removal from all his posts of might and power, hit the whole world as a formidable sensation.

This was *not* the case with many Ukrainians, since 35 years used and accustomed to the gloomy ways and habits of Russian bolshevism. It was not for the first time that in the interminable gang-warfare among the masters of Kremlin, a communist potentate was falling. This happened successively, let us remember, to *Trotsky*, to *Zinoviev*, to *Yagoda*, then *Bukharin*, to *Tukhachevsky*, to scores, then to hundreds, and then to thousands of "old bolsheviks", to party bosses, to ideologists and generals, to organizers, and marshals—and to untold millions of just plain people. There is sufficient evidence that *L. P. Beria* was arrested in his own office at Lubianka, Moscow, on June 27th, in the late afternoon; the whole elaborate M.V.D.-M.G.B. apparatus of his personal security was not able to save him. He became the victim of a very skillfully engineered plot between the Party (*Malenkov*, *Khrushchev*) and the Army (*Bulganin*, *Zhukov*). Some army tanks and armoured cars which rambled and rattled on that afternoon around the Lubianka region, sufficed thoroughly as to quench all possible idea of resistance.

There had been and there continues to be much speculation throughout the whole world as to the political background and the proper significance of *Beria's* downfall. The danger exists that under few most simple and obvious facts there would be substituted and underlied some "deeper meanings" and "ideas"—where there are none. Little by little, especially, there emerges in the Western world the conception of *Beria* as some sort by the most noble knight *Galahad* who fell the victim of Great Russians in his endeavours to undo the excessive dominance obtained by them within the Soviet Union and to give the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. greater freedom and more rights.

To prop and to buttress this conception such facts are cited: after the death of *Stalin*, using his influence as the second of the powerful triumvirs—*Malenkov*, *Beria*, *Molotov*—he exposed the falsity of the charges against the "doctor-murderers", in the Kremlin, most of whom were Jews and who allegedly had conspired against the health and lives of the outstanding Russian communist leaders. He demoted and removed highly placed Russians, the secret police leader *Rumin* and Communist Party Secretary *Symyon D. Ignatiev*, who tried to incite anti-Semitism

in the Soviet Union. Thus *Beria* is elevated to the heights of an enlightened "liberal" fighting the racial prejudices.

Another "proof" of his noble and equitable sentiments is seen in the changes *Mr. Beria* brought about in his native Soviet Republic of Georgia where he demoted a whole gang of Georgia-born, but corrupt and venal Russianizers and replaced them by another set of Georgians more close and sensible to the needs and wants of the plain Georgian people.

Yet the real show-piece of *Beria's* "liberal" and "sensible" policy was seen in his removal on June 13th, 1953 of *Mr. Leonid G. Melnikov*, the first Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, for "profound mistakes in the selection of personnel, the undue precipitation of the collectivization and the carrying out of national policy". *Mr. Melnikov* was the highest ranking Soviet official to be removed since *Stalin* died. As the leading secretary of the C. P. of Ukraine, *Mr. Melnikov* has headed the largest single branch of the Communist Party outside the All-Soviet party itself. His ouster was understood as an undirect blow at the party status and influence of his long-time protector, sponsor and personal friend *Nikita S. Khrushchev*, now first Secretary of the C. P. of the Soviet Union. *Mr. Melnikov* was charged that, especially, he had violated "Leninist-Stalinist national policy", particularly in the selection of personnel and in setting up in the Western Ukraine higher schools using excessively, and almost monopolously the Russian language. It was for the first time in the internal history of the Soviet Union that the existence of the policy of Russification in non-Russian countries of the U.S.S.R. was thus officially admitted and—condemned.

Some analogous moves had been also recorded in the Baltic States, in Azerbaijan, in the countries of the Turkistan and in the satellite States.

Yet the Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain, as those living in the free world, never became very "enthusiastic" about this "liberalism" of *Mr. L. P. Beria*, the Minister of the Interior of the U.S.S.R. and—the chief of the bolshevik police and the entire security system. They had all reasons to distrust the "idealism" and the "liberalism" of a bolshevik—policeman.

For the Ukrainians the first plain fact is that they perceive nothing of a struggle within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union between some two or more conceptions of Soviet policy, say, "liberalism" versus "totalism", "liberty of Soviet nations" versus "Great Russian chauvi-

nism", "democracy" versus "dictatorship", etc., etc. There are no two or more Communist Party factions in the U.S.S.R. represented by some strong personalities, fighting for the predominance of one of those theoretically possible trends. There exists *only one* possibility within the Communist Party, and that always is: singly and solely the *purely personal struggle between the party magnates* for the absolute dominance within the never changing pattern of totalitarianism, dictatorship and Russian chauvinism.

It is strange for a Ukrainian to read in a Western journal or a newspaper an interpretation of *M. Beria's* career and downfall as that of a fighter for the liberty of non-Russian nations. Because, by all means—who was *Beria*? An old bolshevik who started his political life in his native Georgia as a juvenile slaughterer of his own nation. He was a student at the University of Tbilisi (Tyflis), and started as a "Ch. K." informer who delivered his own Georgian native university comrades to the bolshevik execution chambers, then an officer of "Ch. K.", then a commissar, and then a diligent, cautious, extremely astute and extremely cold-blooded climber up the steeple and dangerous ladder of the "CheKist" career. He was a man who, after having inherited the murderous police powers of his bloody predecessors *Yagoda* and *Yezhov*, has turned the N.K.V.D., then M.V.D.-M.G.B., into the most ruthless and extensive police organization the world has ever known. He made the modern slave labour a science and a system. He exploited ruthlessly the prisoners in the interest of the State, in a system that engaged at last no less than some 15 million people. He set up an omnipresent and omniscient system of informers to embrace every institution, factory, farm, every building and even every family in the whole U.S.S.R. Everywhere he had his spies and the spies watched spies; he checked and rechecked everything twice and three times. He boasted before *Tito* in an icily cold, matter-of-fact manner that he killed during the "heroic years" of the Russian revolution more than three million people.

And he killed all of them: Georgians, Ukrainians, Balts and Azerbaijanians, Jews and Mongols, but sure—least of all Russians. As his boss, compatriot and the "great teacher" *Stalin*, also *Beria* knew only too well what he is due to the master-nation of the Union. *Stalin* could keep his dominant position in the U.S.S.R. only under the presumption of being thoroughly obedient to the interests of the Great Russian chauvinism and imperialism. Hence *Stalin's* famous eulogy in May 1945 of the "outstanding, manly, heroic virtues of the Great Russian people", its "sagacity, endurance, energy and the

talents of leadership shown during the World War II".

It is simply ludicrous to underly to the acts and deeds of this Mr. Beria some anti-Great Russian, anti-nationalistic and anti-imperialistic purposes and feelings. There is not a word, not a deed, not the slightest hint in all his past, showing even a trace of his "anti-Russian" and pro-minority bias". The national problem of the Soviet Union was not just *the* heart problem to him, but one of *many* problems to be dealt with—in the interests of the protection and the aggrandisement of his own personal power, and its preservation. Mr. Beria was neither a "Georgian", nor a "Russian", nor at all a national, but simply a bolshevik magnate, say, like the "Armenian" Mikoyan, or the "Jew" Mr. Kaganovich, bent solely upon his own career. He was towards the claims and aspirations of the various nations of the U.S.S.R., during 35 years of his life of a bolshevik, as he was towards the claims, aspirations and sufferings of those untold millions whom he spied upon, arrested, tried, executed and sent to his punitive labour camps. Mr. Beria—a "protector" and a "defender" of non-Russian nations—what an idea! . . .

So what is, then, the explanation of the "liberal" trend in his policy concerning the non-Russian nations shown immediately and somewhat abruptly after the death of Stalin?

There is only one explanation possible. As long as Stalin lived, Mr. Beria felt secure behind the broad back and in the shadow of his mighty compatriot. After his protector and benefactor "faded away", Mr. Beria had to stand in his own boots—and to keep the ground. In the future he had to find his position upon a power of his own. Mr. Beria was intelligent enough to know that the police force alone does not suffice to keep permanently one's position of power, and that this position must be supported and buttressed by some ideal, or better to say, some ideological elements. Behind Malenkov and Khrushchev there was a Party with its programme, its revolutionary aims, its fanaticism, its chiliastic promises, all powerful enough to mobilize and to organize not only materially, but also spiritually, untold millions. Behind Bulganin and Zhukov there was an Army with its Russian patriotic traditions, its spirit de corps, its nationalistic ambitions, its feeling of being protector, a sword and a shield of a vast country. In any case behind those Russians there worked a power based not only upon purely physical but in no lesser degree upon the spiritual elements, apt to show an enormous continuity and endurance.

But what was behind Mr. Beria? Only his police and security apparatus. It is an instrument, but no basis for the const-

ruktion of a permanent, enduring political power. Scarcely there is somebody in the world inclined to ascribe to the police forces, be they yet so formidable, enduring spiritual and ideological qualities.

Thus it came that Mr. Beria embraced the thought to *exploit the national idea* in the U.S.S.R. as quite a basis for the construction of his enduring political power. The motion quite obviously was to rally behind him the representatives of all non-Russian nations in all place of the formation of the Soviet public life: in the High Soviets and Governments of the national Republics, in both Supreme Soviets of the U.S.S.R. and in the central Government of the U.S.S.R. as to protect and to support the "nationals" everywhere in the Party, in the Army, in the corps diplomatique, in arts and sciences. The angle was to be put in the position as to throw in the councils of the State and public life the weighty argument: here is not only the Party, and not only the Army, and not only the Great Russians, here are also the other nations—and I am the man putting forward their legitimate desires and wishes. The speculation was to use the national idea as a weight to check and to balance the powers of Party, the Army and Great Russian nationalism.

But Mr. Beria miscalculated. Thoroughly irrefragable he counted that his firm hold of the police forces would last long enough as to put him in the position to build up in the meantime an adequate non-Russian political following. At first, the calculation seemed to strike the balance; he stroke even at such a potentate as Melnikov—and seemingly nothing happened. Basically Mr. Beria was insofar right, as controlling his vast and tightly meshed net of spies, he knew exactly what a tremendous force is steadily mounting in U.S.S.R. in the shape of a "rising tide of nations". But he overrated the possibilities of his police, and underrated the watchfulness and dexterity of his Great Russian counterpart. Mr. Beria was no idealist. Just the fact that he decided to enter upon the course of supporting the national liberty movements in the U.S.S.R. shows how highly he rated their powers and potentialities.

But the same did the Muscovites. Even the bare imitation that there is somebody bent and ready to use this force for his purposes had sufficient as to precipitate with a lightening speed Mr. Beria's downfall. The Party and the Army, dominated entirely by Great Russians, found themselves in a plot to destroy Beria, "the rebel", but in reality a mass-murderer who begot the idea to misuse the aspirations at liberty of non-Russian nations for his ambitious personal purposes. Yet the liberty of these nations never can be a work of such dirty hands, as his.

The speed and the thoroughness of the Russian anti-Beria plot shows how neu-

THE 30-YEAR JUBILEE OF THE UKRAINIAN CENTRAL STUDENT ORGANIZATION (C.E.S.U.S.)

The organized movement of Ukrainian students is most closely connected with the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation. Those who took part in the battles of liberation (1918-21) and the members of the Ukrainian army came largely from the ranks of the students. The failure of this struggle for independence forced many of them to flee abroad, where they again took up their studies, remembering that this constituted a peaceful form of the fight for independence.

Among these students and former members of the Ukrainian army who were living in Czechoslovakia, Austria and Poland, the wish gained expression of uniting Ukrainian students outside the borders of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. In June, 1922, there took place in Prague the pan-Ukrainian Student Congress where it was decided to create a Ukrainian central student organization. This was finally brought into being in January, 1923. The Central Union of Ukrainian Students (C.E.S.U.S.) united all Ukrainian student organizations in the emigration, as well as those in the West-Ukrainian districts occupied by Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia.

This same Central Union of Ukrainian Students is still in existence today and can look back on a many-sided work. And now a few facts to illustrate this work. The number of members has, at various periods, fluctuated between 4,800 and 700. The Central Organization has developed its activities in various European towns, such as Prague, Vienna, Munich and Paris, in the first two up to

(Continued on Page 16)

ralgic Moscow in everything is, what concerns the problem of the oppressed nations, in the U.S.S.R. The vehemence of Moscow's reaction shows not only Moscow's power, but also Moscow's deadly scare of this problem. Of course, L. P. Beria was not the man to succeed in such an endeavour. But the liquidation of him is by far not identical with the liquidation of the problem of non-Russian nationalities itself. The power and the fight for liberation of non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. exists and grows constantly; the day will come where no conspiracy of the Russian bolshevik Party and Army would be able to quench the general uprising. The Ukrainians would be among the first to reconquer their liberty, and this without the "help" and interference of criminals—as was Beria.

"ALL IS QUIET IN THE WEST"

Ukrainian resent the continued American and British policy of containment and appeasement with regard to the U.S.S.R.

By Antares

There is no use in concealing the deep disappointment prevailing among Ukrainians anti-communist political emigrée, concerning the present course of American foreign policy towards Moscow.

As to avoid all possible misconceptions and misunderstandings, it is to be stressed just at the outset that the emigré Ukrainians did not wish and do not expect that the Government of U.S.A. might start immediately an armed crusade against communism, as to liberate Ukraine from Russian domination. Such "wars of liberation", as, say, the last World War, are seldom an argument. They create much more problems than they solve. The Ukrainians know what a "war of liberation" looks like; they repeatedly had been "liberated". Now, the whole world had for three years an occasion to observe what the most modern war of liberation looks like in Korea. "The operation was successful, but the patient died". The free Ukrainian public opinion is thoroughly aware, that should the liberation of Ukraine be expected by means of war, the Ukrainians would have to face an atomic encounter—with all its terrible consequences. And nobody yearns for that.

It is not so much the receding "chance" of war that annoys and disquiets the Ukrainians. It is rather the present Western trend of politics that leads the Ukrainians to the conclusion that by the means and approaches, as applied at present by the Western powers, especially by the U.S.A. and Great Britain, the communists might continue their rule over more than 800 million peoples yet for decades—thoroughly unperturbed and unruffled.

Of course, it is first and foremost by the means of politics that the grip and reign of bolshevism could be challenged, and, if properly handled, also disrupted. Bolshevism is men-made and it lies in the hands of men to efface it. No outer war can destroy the bolshevism as long as the peoples conquered by it are not resolved themselves to dispose of it. But also vice-versa, the pertinent attitude and the decisions of the enslaved peoples depend decisively from the attitude of the outer world. The vast majority of the peoples from behind the Iron Curtain would wage an open war with their Russian slave-masters if they knew they would get all the outward support necessary for the success of such an enterprise. Nobody can go it in our times alone. The political war against bolshevism is not only a problem of courage,

but equally one of *encouragement*.

And here it is where the Ukrainian disappointments start. Not only from the natural desire for a change the vast majority of Ukrainians who were in the position to form freely their opinions, wished in 1952 the Eisenhower team a decisive electoral victory. The world was fed up with the sterile and barren Kennan policy of the "containment of bolshevism, because—1. bolshevism was not to be contained, 2. if even contained, this conception settled nothing. Years after the proclamation of this policy of containment the bolshevism has made its most resounding conquests (Czechoslovakia, China). It is no solution to put a viper in a cart-board as to "contain" it; you never can tell where the viper would find an outlet as to strike again.

Thus, the Ukrainians greeted most warmly the change in Washington. There was much propagandistic talk about the "new look" in Washington, the "dynamic approach", the "liberation policy". The world, especially the enslaved world, waited full of expectations and thoroughly ready for co-operation on what lines and patterns the new dynamic Eisenhower policy would take shape and materialize.

But, essentially, nothing happened. After some initial starts such as the "de-neutralization" of the Straits of Formosa, prospect of "relinquishing" China's nationalists, passing enlivenment of the E.D.C. efforts etc., etc., Washington returned to its old routine of—containment. The purpose was not to fight bolshevism but only to keep it at bay as best as possible. The main task was now—to finish the Korean war by all means and devices.

As most significant and decisive for the further course of the American world foreign policy the free Ukrainians came to regard the big, pattern-setting speech of *President Eisenhower*, held in April 16th, 1953, in Washington, at the rally of the "American Society of the Newspaper Editors". What the President said boils down to the following: there is no more question of containment or no containment. In the speech there clearly prevailed an undertone of some "wise resignation": the recognition that neither U.S.A. can overcome Moscow, nor Moscow can conquer the world. Hence the conclusion: it is time for a settlement. President Eisenhower proposed to meet the Russians "half-way", the underlying idea of the settlement being the application of the principle—50/50. By this President Eisenhower proposed to Mr. Malenkov, some

sort of the partition of the world, as if saying: you keep what you have, including China, but you correct your possessions in Europe approximately at the line of division between East and West in the year 1939. In Asia, Korea, Indochina and Malaya will have to return to Western block. This is what upon we can settle.

It is hard for Ukrainians to guess whether Washington is aware of this, or not, but this Presidential speech killed with one blow all possibilities of an efficient psychological warfare behind the Iron Curtain. All at once it became absolutely clear, even to the simplest kholkhos-peasant, that whatever are the slogans of American "liberation" propaganda, they are no more than only devices for the "softening-up" of the adversary to induce him to accept the American terms on the basis of 50/50. This speech was a clear proof that the U.S.A. is ready to "let Russia keep what is hers", and that U.S.A. is equally ready to stop at once all "dynamism" and "crusades" on behalf of the tortured peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The deadly seriousness of this American conception of "meeting each other half-way" was exemplified with exceptional bitterness in the case of the conditions of the Korean truce, leaving 50% of the Korean territory in the possession of the stooges of Moscow.

This is no policy of answering adequately the *courage* demanded of the resisting nations behind the Iron Curtain with the *encouragement* on the part of the West. The resisting nations are fully aware that it lies thoroughly in the hands of Moscow to make a deal with the West, or not, and hence, that they always have to face the possibility to be left alone by the West. This is how Mr. Syngman Rhee certainly felt after the final conditions of the truce in Korea had become known, and how the East-Berlin insurgents felt after their rebellion of June 17th was quenched—and no Western hand stirred this side of the Iron Curtain. "All is quiet in the West".

With equal distrust and resentment the analogous speech of conciliation (if not appeasement) was met, held on May 5th, 1953, by Sir Winston Churchill. The contents are known: Sir Winston proposed a new, decisive conference of the Bigs (Big Three, or Big Four, or even Big Five) should thresh out and settle by the ways of compromise all the acute world problems. "Let us sit down and talk it over"—was the almost imploratory tone of this speech,—as if there really was a possibility to settle by mere talks the differences of two worlds which never would be able to understand each other. Innumerable articles of the (not only Ukrainian) emigré press entitled and commented the speech of Sir Winston on a general

line: Sir Winston Churchill invites to a new Yalta.

What followed was, and is, a great expectation: would Moscow come, sit down and have *the* talk? All what would come next is no more a matter of principle but only of method, the principle being firmly established: "half way" and "50/50". The proposed, then cancelled Bermuda conference, then the Washington conference of the "Little Three" had no more sense than to whip up the Western partners to more profitable shape as to stand best in common the expected terrible pressures of the Russian counter-part.

For the nations behind the Iron Curtain there is no much hope for really an active, dynamic liberation policy on the side of the West, with inclusion of the Republican administration of Mr. Eisenhower. Let us repeat the main cognizance: what the West really wants is not the liberation but a *settlement*. Great Britain would go to any length to get a durable peace and the preservation of the British sphere of influence. The U.S.A. wants to have its boys home and the division of the World on equal terms, with the ensuing pact of non-aggression "for this generation" between both parts. All their Eastern Europe and Soviet policy is no more than shadow fight and continuous sparrings "to keep in form". But it is not a preparations for a real bout.

So if the Ukrainians wish no war, they also see at present no prospects to get freed by adequate *politics*. Their bitter resistance to bolshevism lacks a political counter-part on the West; it lacks the response of the free world. The Americans and the British should have recognized in the meantime that they can wreck bolshevism only by the politics of the most close co-operation with the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. But they avoid proper contacts with the peoples themselves and conform with the Moscow government. This creates in the last few months a feeling of a deep depression among the masses the other side of the Iron Curtain. This is the explanation why the Kremlin is able to quench even the slightest signs of a rebellion without creating even so much a ripple on the surface of the life of masses, as was the case with the downfall of Mr. Beria. Nobody cared really. The peoples of the U.S.S.R. know that the West would not respond.

"DEMAND" FOR MOSCOW NEWSPAPERS

"There are more than 100,000 copies of the local newspaper, *The Soviet Word* and thousands of other journals and magazines in stock at the storage depot of the newspaper-office of the *Union Press* in Drohobych. These periodicals which should reach the reading public via the sales-booths of the *Union Press* have been returned to the storage depot from the various districts. The Party and the Soviet Party organizations are not interested in the circulation of these newspapers and magazines by sale if they remain unsold at the sales-booths". (*Radyanska Ukraina* of June 30, 1953).

THAT HAPLESS „COMMITTEE" A LOT OF MONEY GONE, NO USEFUL WORK DONE

By P. Stepanenko

"American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism" faces the third anniversary of continuous bungling and frustration

In Munich, Germany, one of the largest spots of European post-war political emigré activities, there goes a jeering word around: "*efficient as A.C.L.B.*" And really, there seldom was a team more intent upon a laudable purpose, but applying more erroneous and inadequate means and expedient than this one.

The idea was after having formed an American Committee composed of "private organizations"—"to bring together in one Center emigrés from the many areas composing the Soviet Union with a view to enabling the Center thus formed to engage in propaganda activities designed to weaken the grip of bolshevism over the peoples of the Soviet Union and to be assisted and helpful at the process of their liberation".

This American Committee, first called "*American Committee for Freedom of the People of the U.S.S.R.*" came to a head in mid-1950, and was formally incorporated under the laws of Delaware on February 8th, 1951. This name was changed a few months later to "*American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia*", Inc". But this second name too, had soon to be changed again which came to pass on March 25th, 1953. The next name was then: "*American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, Inc.*" It was hard to say whether this is the last one and no more alterations will come.

Whatever the names, this same American Committee exists now for 3 years and it would be interesting to ask—what are the *results*? We do not know what the expenditures of the Committee in these 3 passed years exactly had been, but without doubts they go into millions. But three years later there exists no such *one* desired emigré Center, created with the help of assistance of the American Committee, which could boast it unites a really representable and responsible proportion of the nations and population of the Soviet Union. There are two, or three, or even more of such "Centres", all claiming that they are the sole and only "true" representatives of the Russian and non-Russian nations, and they are still multiplying. Concerning the anti-bolshevik propaganda three years later we know of no one book, or newspaper, or a pamphlet, or even a liflet worth mentioning, produced by one of the Russian or non-Russian organizations acknowledged, supported and financed by the American Committee. The gentlemen from these acknowledged and carefully hugged orga-

nizations have something much more important to do than to fight bolshevism: they fight with American help and money for the preservation of the Russian empire whatever its hue and colour: red, pink or white—what always means the continued enslavement of non-Russian peoples.

Already the above mentioned alterations in the denomination of the American Committee show pointedly all the precariousness and uncertainty which characterized the activities of the American Committee from the very outset. There is a popular Ukrainian proverb meaning that "who misses the first button-hole, would fail the last one". The trouble with the American Committee always was that at the very beginning of its activities it missed the first button-hole! The founders of the American Committee have not decided clearly and unequivocally what they are aiming at: the liberation of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., which is by itself identical with the dismemberment of the Russian Empire, or to preserve the existence of the Russian Empire, which by itself is identical with the preservation of the continued enslavement of the non-Russian nations. The founders of the American Committee entered upon a thoroughly erroneous and abstruse way of thinking that they can have both: the preservation of the Russian Empire *and* the liberty of non-Russian nations; to eat the cake, and to preserve it. For three years they have tried obstinately and even spasmodically to find a way out, to elaborate a compromise—where there can be no one. Three years later, and so many millions gone, they are exactly at the spot where they have started: nowhere. There is no emigré Center, and there is no anti-bolshevik propaganda.

The magic word by which the American Committee hoped to solve the problem and to untie the dilemma was: *democracy*. But what means democracy in even to the most ardent Russian democrat if democracy means that a non-Russian nation might take the chance and dissolve its ties with the empire? Such a Russian would gladly let democracy go as to keep the empire. For each genuine Russian the democracy stops exactly where the interest of the preservation of the empire begins.

And vice-versa. What means democracy to a non-Russian when he sees that it is tied up to the idea of the preservation of the Russian empire. This non-Russian has his bitter historical experiences and

knows only too well what the "brotherhood" of the "elder brother" means. Just the stubborn, convulsive sticking of every Russian to the idea of preservation of his empire makes every non-Russian doubt profoundly about the genuineness and the sincerity of their democratic assurances. If they are true democrats, those Russian "elder brothers", why do they refuse to acknowledge and to accept the formula that the non-Russian nations possess an unalienable right to secede from the empire?

To make the viewpoint of this journal more clear, we would suggest the gentlemen from the A.C.L.B. might imagine such a picture: 1789 there arises, say in France (at that time a very powerful nation), a "French Committee for the Liberation from Monarchical Tyranny". This French Committee fights the feudal abuses and crimes (as A.C.L.B. would like to fight bolshevik abuses and crimes) in the British Empire, propagates democracy—and French "non-predetermination" in the question of the preservation of the same British Empire. This French Committee would mean: "let us have democracy and not monarchical tyranny in the British Empire, then democracy would render the American separatism senseless. Under democracy all would live in the British Empire free and happy". Would the American Founding Fathers accept democracy as a substitute, an "ersatz" for their full national liberty? Of course, they would not. They would fight as they bravely did—in Philadelphia, Boston, Saratoga Springs, Yorktown, etc., etc. Democracy is no "ersatz" for liberty.

But this is exactly what the A.C.L.B. is suggesting in the case of Russia: the non-Russian nations might substitute their yearning for full liberty by the status of all-Russian democracy, provided the democracy in Russia is at all feasible. In consequence such is the everlasting "argument" of all American gentlemen from A.C.L.B., and of all their Russian "democratic" but empire-dizzy friends: "let us have democracy and not bolshevik tyranny in the Russian Empire, then democracy would render the Ukrainian separatism and all other national separatism senseless. Under democracy all would live in the Russian Empire free and happy".

The basic disease of the A.C.L.B., by which this organization sooner or later would inevitably die, is its lack of a clear-cut decision whom to make definitely the ally of Americans in U.S.S.R.: Russians or non-Russians. We would not tire to repeat and to prove this incessantly: America cannot have both of them. One day it will have to choose. And if the fight with bolshevism is for the U.S.A. a bitter earnest, then the day inevitably will come that U.S.A. will choose the non-Russian nations. The Russians would

as such never fight bolshevism seriously. They never did.

In one of the publications of the A.C.L.B. we find such a statement on the principles of this organization:

"In the Center the Committee would try to create, no group would be acceptable which was unwilling to agree that the political or geographical frame-work of a future Soviet Union can be decided only by the peoples of the Soviet Union themselves. No group of Great Russians which insisted upon the indivisibility of the present Soviet Union can be accepted into the Center, any more than could a group of non-Russian nationality emigrés who insisted as a condition of entering into the Center that the Center predetermines the independence of a particular area. In other words, the Committee is founded on the principle of equal assistance to, equal co-operation with, all emigré groups whether Great Russians or non-Russians who desire to carry on an active struggle against bolshevism and who recognize the unconditional right of all the peoples inhabiting the territory of the Soviet Union to determine their own fate on the basis of a democratic expression of the will of the peoples".

Fine as this statement sounds, particularly it makes no much sense. It is simply not applicable. By the above standards not one Russian group could be accepted into the Center because *all* of them insist upon the indivisibility of the Russian empire; absolutely all without exception. And vice versa, this applies also to all honest representatives of non-Russian nations: With exclusion of some Russian "federalistic" stooges, all of them insist on the independence "in their particular area". If it is true that A.C.L.B. insists that it recognized the unconditional right of all peoples of the U.S.S.R. to determine their own fate on the basis of the democratic expression of their will, then we cannot doubt about the clear will of both parties: the Great Russians will—their empire with all the other nations subjected, and the non-Russians will no Russian empire and no subjection to the will of the "elder brother".

This is the clear-cut decision made already by the peoples and this also is the solution of the "riddle" why the A.C.L.B., now for three years, is not in the position to form a common emigré Center worth mentioning. Thus it comes that the A.C.L.B., for months and years is tottering around, bungling from one "solution" to the other, always trying some "new" ways and approaches—and is coming to nothing. This involves a terrible waste of people. In these three years there already had been three bosses of the A.C.L.B. in U.S.A.: Messrs *Eugene Lyons*, *Adm. Alan G. Kirk*, and now

UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION

SERVICE (U.I.S.)

Published by

UKRAINIAN PUBLISHERS LTD.

237 Liverpool Road

London, N.1. Tel. NORTH 1828

Adm. Leslie C. Stevens. In Europe there is a whole row already of fallen or just teetering leaders of A.C.L.B. who had tried and failed: *Spencer Williams, Isaak Don Levine, Oatis P. Swift, Mr. Patch, William Cates, Manning H. Williams* etc., etc.

But there is more to that than only the failure of A.C.L.B. in creating one effective anti-bolshevik emigré Center. The appearance of the A.C.L.B. influenced disastrously the normal cause of the political life of many national emigrations. The Americans are convinced with their dollars they can achieve everything: buy people, remodel ideas, change historical conceptions. But more than often with their dollars they create confusion, disorder, moral depravation, even chaos and spiritual ruins. Before the appearance of the A.C.L.B., and before Ukrainians were needed for the "common front" with the Russians, the Ukrainian community abroad was a pretty well organized political entity, absolutely united in its common attitude and fight against bolshevism and Russian imperialism. A.C.L.B. with its dollars has created a number of Ukrainian political bastards in the form of some never heard of before "unions of federalists", and made the parties of U.N. Rada vacillate and totter in their formerly proper anti-imperialist anti-Russian position. Since the American "organization" of the "anti-bolshevik front" started, there is unrest, agitation and never-ending trouble in the internal Ukrainian emigré life, something the bolsheviks are the first to be glad of.

At last, there are signs that the A.C.L.B. is more and more openly taking the Russian imperialistic positions against the rightful aspirations of the non-Russian nations. Sorrowful as this in itself may be, a clear and open enmity is by far better and sounder than the life in the twilight of doubts and suspenses. The A.C.L.B. proposed to "help and assist" the political emigrants in their fight against bolshevism. Instead, the politics of the A.C.L.B. in the three years of its activities has only helped to disseminate and stimulate party and fractional hatreds, alienations, animosities, malices, strifes, conflicts and mutual discriminations. They say, they never intended? But they did.

That hapless Committee! . . .

Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn

THE HUMANE SCIENCES IN POST-WAR SOVIET UKRAINE

1. Archaeology and Pre-History

It certainly cannot be denied that, of all the humane sciences which have been tolerated at all in the Soviet Ukraine (Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic), in the thirty-five years of its nominal existence, archaeology, and especially that section of it which deals with pre-history (for the "historical" part of archaeology has had to share the fate of the actual science of history and the history of art) has suffered least of all under the bolshevist-Russian despotism. It was, on the one hand, a really *representative* science, closely connected with the West through numerous international and scientific congresses. One could not have simply let it lapse without considerably damaging one's own cultural reputation; and it was in the twenties that the Soviet Union was rather interested in its cultural reputation in Western Europe and America.

On the other hand, however,—and this was much more important—Soviet Marxism needed concrete pre-historical discoveries, in order to be able thereby to illustrate and make somewhat credible Engels' doctrinal theories, based on *Bachofen* and *McLennan*, his "Formations of Social Development"—thus primitive Communism, matriarchy, patriarchy, slave economy, and, to a degree, even ancient feudalism. So the entirely abstract nature of those "formations", and especially the marked deficiency in connection with tangible manifestations of material culture, was almost always dissimulated, and to every archaeological discovery was imputed any possible kind of "sociological" interpretation. That archaeological material, however, could not be furnished in the desired measure by actual Russian (Muscovite) archaeology, simply because of the very scanty number of pre-historical discoveries in Russia proper (Muscovy). The official Soviet-Marxism and, as one used to say, Leninism (although Lenin had never occupied himself at all with pre-history) were therefore forced to draw upon the concrete findings of Ukrainian archaeology and were thus greatly interested in its continued existence.

It is true that, during the thirties, these motives had lost much of significance and effectiveness against the powerfully aspiring Russian chauvinism. Yet even Russian chauvinism was considerably interested in a, if closely restricted, further development of Ukrainian archaeology and pre-historical research: the Ukrainian archaeological places of discovery could naturally not be transplanted to the North and, in order to examine them thoroughly, one required technically trained and scientifically highly qualified people, who

were, with a few exceptions, not to be found in Russia proper, and certainly could not have been themselves at all well trained there, on account of the scarcity of pre-historical discoveries which had been made in that land. Thus it was in the interests of the Moscow-directed Soviet science or, to be more accurate, of the Soviet-Russian bolshevist "culture politics", to treat Ukrainian archaeology differently from the other Ukrainian humane sciences and not completely to suppress or eradicate it, but to control it from Moscow and exploit for peculiarly Soviet-Russian ends.

That naturally does not mean that the Soviet-Russian despots made no reprisals on the Ukrainian archaeologists. As one example among many, one may here think of the prominent Kyiv archeologist, Prof. D. *Shcherbakivsky* (not to be confused with his brother, the pre-historian and ethnologist, Prof. Dr. *Valym Shcherbakivsky*, who has been doing scientific work in the emigration since 1919, and is at present in London) who, as early as the beginning of the thirties, was driven to suicide by systematic bolshevist persecution. Moreover, during the reign of terror of 1937-39 which was called after the notorious People's Commissar of the N.K.V.D., N. *Yezhov*, several Ukrainian archaeologists disappeared without a trace. They were not, however, persecuted primarily as archaeologists, but much more as prominent representatives of Ukrainian science, and their actual specialist work has little to do with their arrest, i. e. liquidation.

There were also instances of orthodox Marxists without special scientific training being imported into Ukraine from Moscow and Leningrad and set at the head of important archaeological institutions (like the infamous plagiarist, Prof. S. *Semenov-Zusser*, a former actor, in Kharkiv). Since, however, that kind of pseudo-scientist failed miserably at the actual excavations, their leading role was generally of short duration.

For it was upon these very excavations that Soviet "culture politics" specially relied, and it certainly cannot be disputed that, in their organization and technical execution, the Soviet regime in Ukraine showed, from the middle of the twenties, no lack of goodwill or remunerative financing. That sounds paradoxical, but is susceptible of a ready explanation. The excavations concerned were indeed carried out by Ukrainian scientists, but generally at the inducement of Russian specialists, and were thus made at the request of the Russian Academy of Science and, since the middle of the thirties, mainly accord-

ing to plans of work drawn up in Moscow. Even the scientific inspection of the finds were taken in hand "in common", and sometimes not even in Ukraine at all, but in Moscow. And, since the results of the researches concerned were published in Moscow and in Russian in a scientifically unobjectionable form (lest the Marxist terminology and phraseology were disregarded), Soviet-Russian science could not only boast of an illusory "scientific co-operation", but could also generally take the credit, before all the world, for these archaeological publications as "illustrious scientific achievements" of the Soviet-Russian archaeology. One may see that this parasitic attitude towards Ukrainian science has become, in the post-war period, more intensive than before by the fact that publications about the, territorially, purely Ukrainian neolithic Trypillia Culture (such as T. *Passek's* treatise: "The Problem of the Dating of the Trypillia Settlements", 1949) are now appearing predominantly in Russian.

Besides this, the Ukrainian Archaeological and pre-historical sciences have been forced to support with all their might, with their scientific material, the projection of Russian imperialism upon past ages, which idea has been especially flourishing since the war. Let us first take a concrete example:

The present Soviet pre-historical research is endeavouring particularly to "prove" that the original inhabitants of the Crimean Peninsula, the present Moldavian Soviet Republic and the Carpathian Mountains were not only Slavs, but "Eastern Slavs", and therefore the direct ancestors of the present-day Russians (and on no account, of the Ukrainians, or Byelorussians). This conception concerning the Crimea, which scientifically speaking, has been derived out of thin air, is being advocated with special emphasis, and that from quite transparent political reasons, in order to depict the Turko-Tartar population of the Crimea as a comparatively late intrusion and thus, to some extent, "historically" to justify the genocide which was committed in 1946 against these people by the Soviet government. In June, 1952, the Moscow Academy of Science held, purposely in Simferopol, capital of the Crimea, a conference expressly devoted to the subject of "the discovery of Crimea". The chairman was the official director of the Moscow Institute for Historical Research, Boris *Grekov*, and the purpose of the conference was to declare, impressively and "unanimously", East-Slav tribe to be the original inhabitants of the Crimea. Now it must be admitted that it is scientifically unobjectionable to state that the pre-historical population of the Crimea had no kind of Turko-Tartar constituents, but it is also highly probable that there

were no Slav, not to speak of any "East-Slav".

As far as *B. Grekov's* thesis on the pre-historical population of the Carpathians is concerned—that the history of the "Russian" state began, not as late as the 9th century, in Novgorod and Kyiv, but as early as the 6th century, in the Carpathian foothills, just as the empire of the Rurik dynasty is said to have been preceded by several national structures—this idea is nothing new: it was advanced two or three generations ago by renowned Ukrainian historians such as *M. Hrushevsky* in connection with a hypothetical pre-historical Slav realm in Volhynia. What, however, is new is that everything in primitive history which concerns the ancestors of the Ukrainians or the Byelorussians is simply claimed by Soviet-Russian chauvinism. This is done on the scientifically absurd pretext that it was not until the 13th and 14th centuries that these two nations had distinguished themselves ethnically from the "all-Russian" nation and naturally with the application of ridiculous sophism which are said to prove an allegedly closer connection of the pre-historical cultures in question with the ethnic Russians in the East.

Ukrainian archaeology must also take its place in the front line on behalf of the latest Soviet dating of "pan-Russian" history, since Soviet-Russian historical science has asserted that feudalism arose in "Russia" (i. e. including Ukraine) quite independently and certainly not later than in Western Europe. According to this statement, the beginning of feudalism in Russia can be assigned, no longer to the 10th-11th centuries, but to the 6th-7th. The "task of honour" of "substantiating" this nonsense archaeologically has fallen upon the Ukrainian historians, since it will, at the most, be a matter of those beginnings of feudalism which were already in existence in Western Europe at the time of the Romans. This is being done according to orders; and the zeal with which the Kyiv archaeologists, *Dovzheniuk* and *Briachevsky*, are defending the Soviet-Russian thesis is sufficient proof of their realisation that their heads are at stake.

Taken all in all, however, Ukrainian archaeology and pre-historical research is only one among the Ukrainian humane sciences which has not been deprived of its scientific workers and research methods under the Soviet-Russian yoke; and one may hope that, in the event of a collapse of Soviet-Russian domination in Ukraine, it will be able to shake free of the unworthy role of an "ancilla Marxismi Moscovitici" which has been forced upon it, and will immediately renew successfully its purely scientific and nationally important researches on a European scientific level.

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

HOW DO BOOKS GET INTO THE UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC?

"The Leningrad Book Distributing Centre sends literature to all districts of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. . . In this way 54 million Karbovanci's worth of books by Russian classical writers and Soviet authors have been dispatched since the end of the war. (*Radyanska Ukraina* of July 7, 1953).

The Moscow censors send books which they have compiled themselves to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and in this way rob the impoverished population of what little money it has. As we have already stressed on several occasions the Moscow "Culture" is now circulated openly in Ukraine and not as was formerly the case in its "Ukrainian Edition".

* * *

MOBILIZATION OF THE TOWN POPULATION FOR AGRICULTURAL WORK

"At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic it was ascertained that the first stage of the work of bringing in the harvest is catastrophic. On the Kolkhos farms in the Chernyiv district only 1 per cent of the hay was brought in by June 15th, according to the statement made at this meeting. "In the Sumsk district only 300 hectares of meadowland were utilized whilst the remaining 16,000 hectares available remained unmown. . . The heads of the agricultural organizations in the districts of Chernyiv and Sumsk have failed to draw the necessary conclusions from the serious mistakes made last year, when, as a result of delay and poor organization of labour, unmown hay was left on the meadows and the kolkhos farms could therefore not store sufficient fodder, which fact in its turn led to a considerable loss in cattle". . .

As can be seen from these statements there was a considerable loss in cattle in both these districts due to a shortage of fodder. Similar conditions existed in other districts, too, and for this reason it was necessary to point out to the heads of farms in the districts of Chernyiv, Shytomyrsk, Sumsk, Kirovograd, Dnipropetrovsk, Stanyslaviv and Tarnopil that "the work in connection with mowing the hay and storing fodder had been extremely inefficient". The decision was reached to employ all the kolkhos farmers able to work and labourers of the radhosp farms (Soviet farms) and, where necessary, the population of the towns, district towns and workers' settlements for this kind of work.

(*Radyanska Ukraina* of June 19, 1953).

* * *

"INSTRUCTIONAL PROPAGANDA DOES NOT STRESS THE NATIONALIST REMNANTS SUFFICIENTLY"

In a lengthy correspondence on the subject of instructional propaganda in the district of Chernivci the writer devotes his attention to the "inadequate exposure of those remnants of capitalism in connection with the national problem of which the people are most aware. . . Furthermore no mention is made of the socialist changes which have taken place in the province of Bucovina during the Soviet regime nor of the brotherly help accorded to the population of Bucovina by the Russians and by other peoples of the U.S.S.R.". (*Radyanska Ukraina* of June 20, 1953).

As can be seen from these statements the people of Bucovina are classed as "Russians", the word "Ukraine" is omitted, and the province of Bucovina is treated as a special district.

* * *

WHY ARE THERE SO FEW PICTURES IN THE SOVIET NEWSPAPERS?

In general very few photographs and pictures appear in the Moscow periodical press; if and when photographs and pictures appear in the newspapers then they usually depict machines, workshops and only few persons, if any. Or else they show mass scenes in which the faces of the individuals are blurred.

Photos of "leading and outstanding personalities" are also touched up in this way so that they depict not a person but a mask. There is seldom any deviation from this procedure, and the picture of a normal person is rarely shown in such a way as to enable one to gain a personal impression of him.

This type of picture which depicts persons appeared in the *Radyanska Ukraina* of June 28, 1953, with the following caption: "Mass meeting of workers and employees at the engineering works in Lviv in commemoration of events in Berlin on June 17th. In the foreground the foreman of the works, Volodymyr Savitzky". The picture shows about 150 to 200 persons, and those in the front are easily recognizable as for instance on a normal photograph printed on poor paper. The general impression one gains from the picture is that the persons on it are terrified of those who have called this meeting, and it is obvious that the workers and employees feel their fate to be the same as that of the victims of June 17th.

* * *

THE DUTY OF PHILOLOGY

The noble duty and responsibility of the learned and collective system of the language institutes and university faculties for the Ukrainian language is to set up a Marxist training course in the history of the Ukrainian language, which not only stresses the common origin of the Russian, Ukrainian, and part-Russian languages and the close connection between them, but also draws attention to the anti-scientific tendency of the bourgeois nationalistic misrepresentation of actual facts in the development of the Ukrainian language." (*Radyanska Ukraina* of June 26, 1953).

The same paper then mentions the successful results achieved so far and defines the task of the language institutes of the academies in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the future.

Truly "a noble duty and responsibility on the part of the language institutes and university departments in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic".

* * *

DWELLINGS FOR MINERS

"In the year 1952 to 1953 the miners (miners in the district of Voroshylovgrad) were given a total area of 133,000 square metres for the purpose of accommodation". . .

This Moscow phrase, expressed in millions and thousands of metres, when translated into normal everyday language, simply means that the 133,000 square metres for the purpose of accommodation really consist of 8 to 9,000 rooms that are none too large. What a "unique" state of affairs when 8 to 9,000 rooms are placed at the disposal of 450,000 to 500,000 workers. And if one examines this announcement more closely and compares conditions with those in England for instance, where 300,000 houses are built every year, then one will fully realize how much bluff there is in Communist propaganda about "the improvement in the standard of living of the miners" in Ukraine.

* * *

"VAST DEMONSTRATIONS"

"Vast demonstrations" are at present taking place all over the U.S.S.R. in connection with the dismissal of Beria. In the main cities of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in particular it is pointed out that Beria "by various crafty schemes sought to disseminate hostility among the peoples of our country. But the workers in the western districts of the Uk-

rainian Soviet Socialist Republic know that they owe their happiness and their freedom to the great Russian nation. . . And no crafty Beria will succeed in undermining the sacred friendship of our fraternal nations". (Pravda's comment on July 12, 1953 on a meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in the district of Lviv). "No enemies will ever succeed in undermining the sacred principles on which the national policy of our party is based or in weakening the long-standing and eternal friendship of the Russian, Ukrainian and other nations of our country"! (A resolution passed at a meeting in Kyiv, where the chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic gave an address). Of course no mention whatsoever is made of the Russian pressure exerted in the western provinces of the Ukraine, where Russian methods have been introduced in the Ukrainian schools and Russians have been appointed to be in charge of party positions.

* * *

THE "UKRAINIANS" SUPPORT THE KREMLIN

The Moscow newspapers often talk about the way in which the various individual national republics support the Kremlin. And here are a few examples of how the "Ukrainians" support Moscow's policy at meetings.

In Kyiv the supporter was a representative of the engineering works, "Bolshevyk", a man of the name of Malinin. In another Kyiv factory the supporters were the foreman of the casting department, Kuznetsov, and a "workwoman" of the name of Asentijeva. In Dnipropetrovsk the supporter was a representative of the Lenin works, called Araschimov, whilst in a metal works the supporter was a "workwoman" called Korolova. In Staino the district secretary of the Communist Party, Strujev, and the local woman-secretary of the Communist Party, Shuvalova, were the supporters. All of them attempted to convince others that Beria "stroved to activate bourgeois-national elements in Union republics and to disseminate hostility between the Russian and the Ukrainian nations".

* * *

THE "TRAITOR"

On July 10, 1953, a full meeting of the Communist Party of the district of Kyiv as well as meetings of other local party committees took place in Kyiv at which 1,200 persons were present. On this occasion the main subject was the case of the "traitor Beria". Speeches were made by the following persons: Kyrychenko, the secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Ukraine, Semenenko, the vice-president of the Academy of Science, and by Sokol, one of the secretaries of the Komsomol, who maintained that he was speaking "on behalf of 120,000 members of the Komsomol and the entire youth of the capital of Ukraine". In Lviv a similar meeting of the Communist Party of the district and of local groups also took place at which 1,100 party functionaries were present. At this meeting speeches were made by Serdiuk, the district secretary of the Communist Party in Ukraine, and by Shokalo, a member of the Academy of Science of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The "resolution" was passed at both meetings that Beria be dismissed, and he was reproached with having attempted to "separate the Ukrainian and the Russian nations". The fact that the speakers kept mentioning and stressing the "unbroken friendship" between the "fraternal and elder" Russian and Ukrainian nations proves that the Communist leaders in the Ukraine are intending to enter upon a new period of exerting Russian pressure. As has often been the case on previous occasions O. Kornijchuk was very much in evidence.

* * *

The high schools in Ukraine have been holding their final examinations. This year more than 40,000 students have completed their training at the universities and colleges. More than 55,000 students have passed the intermediate examinations at the technical schools and special vocational schools. These are the highest figures reached during the past two years.

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS.

(Continued from Page 8)

their turn then appointed other members of the Executive Committee. Since then all three have been killed in the course of the struggle against bolshevism. The Supreme Council of the O.U.N. was also elected, whereby the functions of the supreme judge and the central committee of the O.U.N. were transferred to this council, which also had a certain legislative power.

The revolutionary struggle in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was at that time at its height. The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army had thousands of members in their ranks and this necessitated political measures in the form of an all-Ukrainian representative body. It was at the Third Congress of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists that the idea of founding the Ukrainian Supreme Council (U.H.V.R.) originated.

External political factors were mainly determined by the events of the war, and this fact in its turn determined the foreign policy of the O.U.N. The leading personalities of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists assumed that the democratic Western hemisphere will never be able to reach a permanent agreement with Russian Communism and they therefore held the theory that these two worlds are bound to clash. The resolutions passed in August 1943 illustrate the attitude of the O.U.N. towards the forces of bolshevism and Nazism most clearly.

"... For this reason the O.U.N. is fighting against the U.S.S.R. and the 'New Europe' as advocated by the Germans".

"The O.U.N. most decidedly opposes all internationalist and fascist and national-socialist party programmes and political ideologies since they represent the means by which the imperialists aim to enforce their policy of world conquest.

For this reason we oppose Russian Communist bolshevism and German national-socialism".

Considerable attention was devoted to social problems because the O.U.N. realized that it was essential for it to draw up a social programme which would be in keeping with the needs and wishes of the Ukrainian masses. The resolutions passed at the Congress show that it opposed both the bolshevist economic system of exploitation and the capitalist system of economy, and advocated a social policy which would best serve the interests of the Ukrainian people.

Point 11a of these resolutions explains the attitude of the O.U.N. as regards the future Ukrainian political constitution, which is expressed as follows:

THE 30-YEAR JUBILEE OF THE UKRAINIAN CENTRAL STUDENT ORGANIZATION (C.E.S.U.S.)

(Continued from Page 10)

the outbreak of World War II, and in the last two after this war. The Central Union of Ukrainian Students (C.E.S.U.S.) was a member of the C.I.E. (Confédération Internationale des Etudiants) and of the I.S.S. (International Students' Service) until 1939 and, at the present time, is very actively co-operating with the C.O.S.E.C. (Co-ordinating Secretariate of Students' Unions). The participation of Ukrainian delegates in all important student assemblies and conferences may be regarded as one of the most important activities of the Ukrainian Central Student Organization.

In the Ukrainian sector, the C.E.S.U.S., occupied itself with the cultural and, until the year 1939, the material assistance of Ukrainian students. (Beginning with the year 1939, the latter task has been taken over by the Commission for the Assistance of Ukrainian Students (Ko. D.U.S.). Besides, it arranged meetings, conferences and high-school weeks. Emphasis was also laid on athletic training, and Ukrainian representatives took part in international functions.

This central organization today embraces 15 student organizations as legal members to which belong, in Europe, America and Australia, about 850 regular members. This year has been founded the Ukrainian Students' Organization of America, which unites 22 Ukrainian student organizations in the U.S.A.

To mark the occasion of its 30-year jubilee, the C.E.S.U.S. has published the jubilee postage-stamps and has prepared a jubilee calendar. The close of the jubilee festivities coincides with the 17th Congress of this organization, which took place in Paris on August 22nd and 23rd, 1953. In addition, a two-week high-school course was organized, the main theme of which was "The Ukrainian individual in the Soviet reality".

"Freedom of the press, of speech, of thought, opinion, faith and philosophy of life".

This point embraces all the principles of a democratic conception of the State and likewise became one of the guiding principles of the O.U.N.

It can be ascertained with the greatest satisfaction that the Third Congress of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists in the year 1943 did full justice to the claims and problems of the Ukrainian people.

Jaroslav Z. Pelenskyj



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 10—11

LONDON, OCTOBER—NOVEMBER 1933

Price 1 s

CONTENTS:

THE WEST AND BOLSHEVISM	1-2
W. M. KHRUSHCHOV'S AGRARIAN PROGRAMME	2-4
Z. Poray DIPLOMACY AROUND UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA	4-6
A Basic Test of American Political Integrity and Sincerity	
EUROPEAN DEFENCE COMMUNITY AND THE UKRAINIANS	6-8
Y. P. A.B.N.—A STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM	8
On the Occasion of the 10th Anniversary of the First Conference of the Enslaved Nations	
Yaroslav Z. Pelenskyj LIBERATING NATIONALISM	9-10
A few thoughts on the latest Soviet Interpretations of the National Problem in the U.S.S.R.	
V. D. THE NATIONALITY PROBLEM OF THE SOVIET UNION AND RUSSIAN COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM	10-11
V. D. NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE U.S.S.R.	11-12
John F. Stewart TORTURED UKRAINE	12-14
The 1933 Russian-Engineered Famine	
Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn THE HUMANE SCIENCES IN POST-WAR SOVIET UKRAINE	14-15
Science of History	
A. Kaminskyj MALENKOV'S "COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP"	15-16
UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN	16

THE WEST AND BOLSHEVISM

Since Stalin's death and the fall of the powerful M.V.D. chief Beria, the struggle for freedom of the peoples oppressed by Moscow has developed increasingly. The coming months and years will no doubt be of special importance for the free world. The attitude of the subjugated peoples will largely depend on the policy those powers are likely to pursue. There are clear indications of a looming crisis in the U.S.S.R., and in the satellite States as well. This situation is also, in part, due to the struggle for liberation of the oppressed nations and individuals. Neither terrorization nor national massacre was so far able to paralyse the active fight for liberation against national oppression, personal enslavement, and social exploitation, and the longing of men for freedom and justice.

The Political Struggle

The foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. has become mainly a function of the domestic policy, that is to say of pressure on the subjugated peoples. The fluctuations of Soviet foreign policy are due to the struggle for national and social liberation. It is obvious that those in power in the Kremlin want to prevent any co-operation of the representatives of the national underground movements with the free world, and in particular with the U.S.A. For this reason the indifference of the free world towards the political fate of the peoples oppressed by Russian-Bolshevist imperialism is very deplorable. This is not the time to revive a "policy of containment" or even an "appeasement policy", and to seek a kind of solution by means of compromise and peace offensive. There is only one way to secure a lasting success: active initiative, a concentric political offensive, and effective assistance in the struggle for freedom which is in progress at

present. It would certainly be to the detriment of the Western World if it disappointed the hopes of the subjugated peoples. And it would be in keeping with the wishes of the Kremlin if the Western World all too clearly showed that it was not in the least interested in the cause of those oppressed peoples.

The Soviets have in a masterly way used the general strike in France and the latent crisis in Italy to conceal their own weakness within the U.S.S.R., and, aided by their "fifth columns", have sought to demonstrate their undiminished strength to the free world. Precisely the fact that certain Western circles maintain continuous relations with White-Russian imperialists and former adherents of Bolshevism must inevitably lead to many negative results as far as the struggle for freedom is concerned. Russian imperialism will not be satisfied by surrendering them 10 or 12 peoples instead of 30. The present psychological warfare of the Western World, since it has such a low standard of political and intellectual efficiency, will neither morally nor politically prompt Russian imperialism to abandon its control over one third of the world, and to be content with the territory it controlled in 1939. After all, it makes no difference if one or twenty nations are subjugated to complete ruin.

The Sphere in Which the Struggle is Fought

Our epoch is doubtlessly characterized by the conflict between two entirely different worlds; it resembles the downfall of the moribund antique world which resulted in the rise of Christianity. Thus any fight, if it is to have a chance of success, must be fought on the basis of a total and not just a partial negation of Bolshevism. The battle is at present being fought

not only in the national and political spheres, but also in the intellectual and ideological sphere. The slogans hitherto used by the Western World were inadequate and insufficient for this struggle, and could therefore not be realized in practice. The initiative so far taken by the West, including the "American Committee for the Liberation from Bolshevism", "Free Europe", and the "Green International", were bound to fail because they were based on antiquated ideas. The war in China was lost for a similar reason, for no constructive and positive alternatives were offered in opposition to Communism.

In this era of intellectual revolution which could lead to the suppression of Bolshevism, it is essential that man should fight for the integrity of freedom and not merely profess himself an adherent of it.

The peoples in question must be able to have a clearly defined image of their future order in a national, social, and cultural respect. If no intellectual basis is established which stands for justice for all peoples and mankind in general, the Communist danger will continue to grow. Bolshevik nihilism pervades all spheres of human life, and thus results in the mass-mentality movement spreading even further. In the first place, Bolshevism must be overcome intellectually, its military defeat is only a secondary question. It must be opposed by a new intellectual principle, by a new positive idea, and the aim to restore the old Great-Russian empire must be abandoned. We are of the opinion that Bolshevism cannot be defeated with the same principles which prevailed before or during the revolution, for it was precisely those principles which caused the revolution. For the same reason a "restoration" is also out of the question.

The dissolution of the Soviet empire into national states must ensure political and individual freedom, social justice, and the exercising of power on behalf of higher cultural and ethical values.

At the same time it must be emphasized that the Bolshevik October Revolution was a national Russian revolution. Not only the Bolshevik Activists, but also a large number of new men succeeded in acquiring unrestricted power, and it will be extremely difficult to overthrow this clique. The Bolshevik Revolution was one more step towards materialism in the life of the Russian nation, for anyone who is acquainted with the Russian mentality knows that Bolshevism to a certain

KHRUSHCHOV'S AGRARIAN PROGRAMME

U.S.S.R. AGRICULTURE IN A SERIOUS SITUATION

The same Nikita S. Khrushchov who, three years ago, was the top executive of the Politbureau and the Soviet Government, and who thoroughly studied the plan of the "industrialization" of agriculture which in those days was new, that is to say the conception of "agro-towns", this same Khrushchov, who now holds the position of a Secretary General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, brought out a new plan in September this year, which may be considered by the Soviets as a means to remedy the alarming situation of agriculture in the U.S.S.R.

Khrushchov's speech which was published in the Soviet press on September

13, 1953, and the decisions of the Central Committee of the Party "on the measures for the future development of agriculture in the U.S.S.R." are rare and significant documents which may be of great importance for the future course of world policy. The reason is not only that there is a very close connection between politics and economy everywhere at the present time, and that the ties between these two main factors of the life of a nation are even closer in the U.S.S.R. than elsewhere, but also that the statements of Khrushchov and the Central Committee reveal most clearly that the present situation and the difficulties of

extent corresponds to this mentality. Bolshevism is based for the most part on the Russian nihilism of the 19th century (as the Russian philosopher Berdjajev points out in his book "The New Middle Ages"). The Russian never felt particularly strong personal ties to his property, his family, to law; or to the creative powers of tradition. It is imperative that the "sacral" character of Bolshevism be opposed by a new and liberal intellectual ideology and a national and political ideology. Bolshevism has destroyed all freedom and justice, but these must be revived and renewed by the revolution.

It would be entirely wrong to believe that the European era is past. But the word Europe must no longer be interpreted in the narrowest sense as was hitherto the case. Europe exists where European culture and its achievements are common values; such as the influence of Roman law, as a centre of culture, Christianity or western democracy.

The Right Way

Seldom has there been such an opportunity to undermine the Bolshevik regime from within as at the present time. It is a well established fact that subjugated peoples have a very fine sense of justice, for anybody who has to suffer under lawless conditions will, of course, have a much better understanding of national and social differentiation and injustice.

The subjugated peoples have a much greater longing for freedom and justice than the Western nations who enjoy freedom and justice, at least in the relative sense.

In conclusion the following facts must be stressed: if the Americans, and the Western powers in general, were to

understand the internal situation in the U.S.S.R. more clearly, if the American institutions were to cease to be advised by dubious Russia-experts, and if, finally, the ideas voiced by John Foster Dulles and Harold E. Stassen as regards the recovery of the Middle East and South East Asia which are now under British and French control, were applied in the case of the subjugated peoples under Soviet influence, then the political and psychological war waged against Bolshevism would soon be successful. The initiative hitherto taken by the Americans, which aimed to maintain the Russian empire in its entirety, must be rejected for the reason given above, and new methods must be sought. The restoration of the old Russian empire would mean a regression in the process of development towards freedom, and would, moreover, be entirely wrong for political reasons.

Therefore a radical and powerful offensive must be launched against Communist despotism and totalitarianism of every kind, against Leninist-Stalinist theories, against the suppression of religions, against colonial imperialism and the Russian type of federalism. The positive objectives should be: national independence, political and personal freedom, private property for the peasants, development of home industries, individual initiative within a pattern of social justice, and exercise of governmental power which aim at creation of positive intellectual and also religious values, and the attainment of liberty as a basis for further cultural development. If we bear these aims in mind we shall be successful in our fight against Bolshevism.

the Bolsheviks in this important field will not be without consequences for the development of foreign policy, at least in the near future.

The speech as well as the decisions of the Party establish in all frankness the following facts:

1. The production of wheat, vegetables, fruits, and other agricultural produce is very low.

2. Cattle-breeding does not meet present-day requirements of the national economy.

3. The industries connected with agriculture, that is to say medium and small food-producing industries, do not meet the demands of the population.

4. Something Khrushchov did not clearly mention, (but which is a logical consequence of his previous statement): *An alarming situation on the food market, a lack of consumer goods, and an excessively low standard of living of the population.*

In this respect Khrushchov refuted the boldly propagandized statements on the results of the first postwar Five-Year Plan. The same applies to the problems of price reduction which was announced several times, and to the abolition of the rationing system for consumer goods. In those days all these facts were meant to prove that the standard of living of the Soviet population had risen and that it had even surpassed that of bourgeois Europe. Soviet statistics which hitherto had demonstrated the "great success" of production on account of their obscure percentage scheme were unmasked by the highest Soviet official, the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Some Facts on Statistics

In his speech Khrushchov abandoned the Soviet tradition of misleading "percents" and quoted simple but significant figures. The statistics on domestic animals in the U.S.S.R. at present show, compared with figures of the time before the World War I and between the wars, a serious decrease of cattle, of cows and horses. Only the number of sheep and hogs increased to a certain extent. In his speech Khrushchov quoted the following figures (in millions):

	1916	1928	1941	1953
cattle	58.4	66.8	54.5	56.6
of these,				
cows	28.8	33.2	27.8	24.3
hogs	23.0	27.7	27.5	28.5
sheep and				
goats	96.3	114.6	91.6	109.9
horses	38.3	36.1	21.0	15.3

If we consider the increase of the population during the years of 1916 to 1953 in connection with the above table (from about 140 million to 210 million people),

then it becomes obvious that the number of animals per 100 persons is insufficient. The decrease in the number of draught-animals can be explained by the mechanization of agriculture. But the number of cattle, sheep, and hogs ought to have increased under normal circumstances, since these animals are used for consumption as in former times. As a consequence, the production of milk of course dropped too. The Ukrainian newspaper "Ukrainian Thought", in its issue of September 24, 1953, analysed these figures and arrived at the following conclusions:

"In the years 1926-27 the number of cows amounted to 28-29 million. At that time 30 million tons of milk were produced annually, of which Moscow consumed 4.3 million tons or 14.3 % of the total production. Since 1950 the number of cows has amounted to 24 million, which is equivalent to a production of 24 million tons of milk. Of this quantity Moscow claimed 13.2 million tons or 55 % of the total production, so that for the entire rural population—and that is more than 65 % of the total population—and for the feeding of calves, only 45 % are left".

In his latest speech to the Supreme Soviet, Malenkov announced that the butter production would amount to 400,000 tons in 1953. This indicates that previously the butter production was much lower. In comparing this figure with the number of the population we ascertain that only about 4 1/4 pounds of butter per person are available in the U.S.S.R. for the period of one year, i. e. one third of an ounce per day. It must, of course, be stated in this connection that not all citizens will get his third of an ounce, for the party hierarchy and the bureaucratic Bolshevik apparatus are entitled to much higher rations.

Livestock statistics for 1953, as outlined by Khrushchov, prove that the figures did not reach the target laid down in the first postwar Five-Year Plan. The proportional census of livestock in the Ukraine (proportional as compared to 1928, 1941 in the Ukrainian S.S.R. and 1953 in the U.S.S.R.) furnishes the following results for the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic.

	1941	1953	target of 5-Year Plan
in millions:			
cattle	11.2	11.5	12.2
hogs	9.1	9.4	9.6
sheep	6.7	6.7	6.8
horses	4.9	2.6	?

The "Big" Agrarian Programme

At first sight it might appear as if the programme announced by Khrushchov would be of greater importance for agriculture than the introduction of a new

Five-Year Plan. The crucial point of the programme is that agriculture is regaining a stronger position within the entire sphere of economic relations; moreover a reorganization of agricultural administration is being considered, and it might even be possible at the present time that agriculture will move up to the first place within Soviet economy. This may be the impression gained from an analysis of the said documents, if one does not bear in mind the concrete social and political realities in the U.S.S.R. The nature of these realities shall be examined later. At first we want to analyse some of the attempts made and some of the means proposed to remedy the situation of agriculture in the U.S.S.R.

The "Khrushchov Plan"—if we may call it so—includes all branches of agriculture and the industries connected with it: cattle-breeding, fodder, setting-up of cattle farms, production of potatoes, gardening, growing of fruits, mechanization of gardening, production of agricultural fertilizers, wheat production, organization of transport and communications, co-ordination of the activities of the M.T.S., the system of delivery to the state, the problem of wages, the organization of professional and political guidance, etc.

Serious insufficiencies, unsatisfactory conditions, and defects as regards the methods of organization were revealed in all these fields, and a considerable number of mistakes, embezzlements, and misrepresentations were discovered. A plan was presented laying down reorganization and the necessary reforms in each of the various fields mentioned, and, furthermore, a plan regulating the fulfilment of the delivery quotas for the next period of time. The main objective of all of these measures is *production*: more meat, more potatoes, bread, vegetables, and butter, in one word: more *foodstuffs*.

This plain and clear definition of the new agricultural plan may be attributed to the desire of the Soviet leaders to raise the standard of living of the famished Soviet citizen, whose dissatisfaction is developing into a dangerous threat to Moscow. But perhaps there is another, more likely reason for such clear statements and such rude self-criticism. In order to be able to realize the new agrarian plan in the U.S.S.R., the Kremlin clique is attempting to win over to its side the rural population or, to be more exact, the Kholchos peasants and the labourers of the Sovchoses on whose support this plan depends. It is aimed at arousing a positive attitude in the working-class masses, and to gain their support for this new experiment. Here we find the reason for all the concessions and all sorts of promises made to the Kholchos peasants: raises of wages in kind and money, main-

tenance and even increase of their private plots, in particular the permission to raise domestic animals and poultry, and to a certain extent also gardening. In addition, a reduction of the targets, a lowering of the delivery quotas of agricultural produce to the State, and an increased supply of tools and seeds are promised.

On account of all these facts many people might feel inclined to regard Khrushchov's plan as a second Soviet N.E.P. But this will not and cannot come true, because a possible N.E.P. would essentially require a fundamental reorganization of Soviet domestic and foreign policy.

In principle radical changes in the field of agriculture are hardly to be expected. They would be possible if the structure of Soviet economy would undergo a fundamental shift, that is to say, if agriculture and the industries with it were to replace heavy industry and armament industry. Neither Malenkov nor Khrushchov has given any indications of such a shift in Soviet industry, and they would not be in a position to mention such a thing, because, in such a game the very existence of the empire would be at stake. And indeed, the "great socialist building projects" and the heavy industry are being further developed. Maybe the intensity of such development will be reduced if the West seriously accepts this proof of "readiness for peace" which manifests itself in Khrushchov's plan. For Soviet agriculture, however, this could be of advantage only to a limited extent and for a short period of time.

In principle there will be no N.E.P.-changes, especially on the social level. Soviet economy will, in its fundamental structure, continue to remain the same as hitherto, characterized by one main feature: the *exploitation* of the peasants and the dreadful control by functionaries which originates in the collectivist principles of this economic system.

Hryhorij Machiw, former professor at Kharkov and leading Ukrainian economist, defined this system very strikingly: "Soviet economy is characterized by a maximum utilization of the manpower of the peasants without securing a minimum standard of living for them, and by an exploitation of the means of production, in this case equal to the soil. This economic system is of a deceptive kind, it inevitably leads to a decrease of the fertility of the soil, and there are no prospects of an increasing of productivity". (Ukrainian Encyclopedia "General Character of Agriculture of Ukraine", 1952.).

In our opinion these observations are absolutely correct, and Khrushchov's plans will not change the present state of affairs.

W. M.

Z. Poray

DIPLOMACY AROUND UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA

A Basic Test of American Political Integrity and Sincerity

"House Concurrent Resolution, 58"

One of the most important and clever moves in the American psychological warfare against Bolshevism and Soviet imperialism which promises to pay rich political dividends, is the proposal of Congressman Lawrence H. Smith (Rep.) of Wisconsin, U.S.A., to try to establish full diplomatic relations between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Republics of *Ukraine and Byelorussia*. On February 9, 1953 the Congressman introduced on the Floor of the House of Representatives the pertinent "House Concurrent Resolution 58", which became one of the most vividly and friendly debated topics among more than 2 million Ukrainians, Americans of Ukrainian descent, living in the free world on this side of the Iron Curtain. There is no doubt that not less interested in this matter are many more millions of Ukrainians and Byelorussians living and suffering *beyond* the Iron Curtain, who some way or other got news and knowledge of this proposal.

The Reasons

The motives and reasons of Repr. Lawrence H. Smith had been presented very clearly and convincingly in his prefatory remarks to the "H. Con. Res. 58". The Resolution "aims to express the sense of this Congress that our Government should seek to establish full diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia; we must strive to free these peoples from the steel chains that bind them to Communist Russia against their will".

"The Kremlin—Repr. L. H. Smith continues—has maintained the fiction that Ukraine and Byelorussia are free and independent republics, and if one were free to believe what one can read it would appear that they are. But I assure you that it is only a pretence.

"Historically, the record shows that as early as 1921 Ukraine joined in the Treaty of Riga with Poland and Russia. This seems to indicate that Ukraine enjoyed a separate status. Also, when the Union of Socialist Republics was organized in 1923, Ukraine and Byelorussia were each considered a separate nation, and each reserved the right freely to withdraw from the Union...

"It is also true... that this constitutional guarantee of autonomy finds support in the distinctive national banners and emblems of the states and are presumed to symbolize independent sovereignty of Ukraine and Byelorussia.

"And further... the Kremlin insisted that the so-called Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia were entitled to have a separate and independent status in the United Nations. Delegates from these countries sit today in the U.N. and their right to do so has never been challenged.

"Why then... does the United States fail to establish full diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia? No logical excuse exists for this not being done.

"... Our new President has charted a new course in a foreign policy. He has charted it with firmness and with a determination to carry it through. In his great speech to us a week ago he said: "Our policy, dedicated to make the free world secure, will envision all peaceful methods and devices except breaking faith with our friends. We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves'.

"... "Adoption of my 'Resolution' is only one of the devices that can be used to beat Communism on the propaganda front. Let us start by extending full diplomatic relations with Ukraine and Byelorussia. The time to start is now".

The Profits and Advantages

The well known American Commentator *Bob Considine*, perhaps most clearly saw at once the advantages for the policy of the U.S.A. of the acceptance of this "Resolution" as he wrote on April 27th, 1953 in *New York Journal American* in the article "Encouragement for Slaves" as follows:

"... It would demonstrate American interest in perhaps the most unstable and restless national areas in the Soviet empire. It would put Russia on the spot in a variety of ways. The Kremlin likes to boast that Ukraine and Byelorussia are independent republics, and swung separate seats for them in the U. N. *If Russia won't let the independent republics accept ambassadors from the United States, their slavery will be illuminated for all the world to see and all anti-communist factions inside the countries to feed upon*".

From another angle saw the advantages of the adoption of the "H. Con. Res. 58" the American commentator Mr. *Felix Morley*, as he wrote on April 13, 1953 in *Barron's* in the article "Three envoys to Russia":

"A glance at the map of Russia shows certain advantages for us of having separate diplomatic representation in Minsk, Kiev and Moscow. The two provincial capitals, which themselves lie about 300 miles apart, are each nearly 500 miles from Moscow. Intelligent observers, thus, would in concert have a very good idea of everything transpiring in Western Russia. Moreover, an American Embassy in Minsk would be close to the borders of Poland. One in Kiev would be within earshot of Rumania and the Balkan satellites. So the development could more than triple our present information as to what gives behind the Iron Curtain. . ."

Most warmly and insistently "H. Con. Res. 58" had been recommended and supported by the "Ukrainian Congress Committee of America" (U. C. C. A.), a leading and representative mass organization uniting some 1,500,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent. The U. C. C. A. is headed by Professor *Lev E. Dobriansky* from the Georgetown University. "The Ukrainian Bulletin", No. 11-12 of June 1953, the official organ of U. C. C. A., which appears semi-monthly in New York, N. Y., sums up the advantages of the "Resolution 58" from the American vantage point in the following manner:

"The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America in full recognition of the importance of the Smith Resolution is pressing for immediate passage of the measure in Congress. Its advantages to America are many:

1. Our proposed Embassies in Kyiv and Minsk would cause serious concern in Moscow over U. S. interest in Ukraine and Byelorussia, the most dangerously exposed non-Russian republics in the U. S. S. R.;

2. Our step would greatly advance our propaganda war against the Soviet Union;

3. The fraudulent Russian claims as to the "independence" of these two republics would be exposed;

4. The move would strengthen the bonds of alliance between the American people and the traditionally friendly peoples of Ukraine and Byelorussia,

5. The step would create embarrassment for the puppet delegation of these two countries, now falsely representing Ukraine and Byelorussia in U. N.;

6. The measure would be a valid test of the sincerity of the Malenkov group's vaunted desire for peace;

7. Our Embassies in Kiev and Minsk, if established, would provide additional listening posts behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in the strategically important areas of Ukraine

and Byelorussia;

8. The Embassies would create new possibilities of contact with active anti-Soviet leaders of the non-Russian peoples of the U. S. S. R."

First Congressional Hearing on "H. Con. Res. 58"

Though introduced on February 9, 1953, the first Congressional hearing on "H. Con. Res. 58" only found place on July 15, 1953, very shortly before the adjournment of the 1st Session of the 83d Congress of the U. S. A. On that day a *Special Sub-committee on House Concurrent Resolution 58* convened in Washington, D. C., United States Capital, at 10 a. m., Room 6-3, the Sub-committee (under the chairmanship of Hon. *Francis P. Boiton*) being an *ad hoc* organ of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Other members of the Sub-committee were: *Lawrence H. Smith*, Wisconsin; *Thomas E. Morgan*, Pennsylvania; *James G. Fulton*, Pennsylvania and *Omar Burleson*, Texas.

Witnesses and experts on the question had been invited and testified, making their statement on behalf of the Resolution—*Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky*, Professor of the Georgetown University and President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; *Michael A. Feighan*, Representative from Ohio; *Dr. Alexander Granovsky*, Professor of the Columbia University, New York, N. Y.; *Adm. George F. Mentz*, Front Royal, Va.; *Dr. Roman Smal-Stocky*, Professor of the Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.; *Michael Papy*, Professor of the Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.; *Dr. John S. Reshetar Jr.*, of the Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; *Dr. Louis Scors*, President of the Byelorussian Congress Committee of America and President of the Prometheus Club, New York, N. Y. and *Rev. William J. Gibbons*, S. J., of New York City.

Of the 29 members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, several members were present at the hearing of the Sub-committee and listened intently to the arguments in favour of the Smith Resolution presented by those who testified. Thus many pertinent questions were put by Representatives—*Alvin M. Bentley* of Michigan, *E. Ross Adair* of Indiana and *Albert P. Morano* of Connecticut.

Documentation

The main body of the testimony had been presented to the Sub-committee by *Prof. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky* of Georgetown University. He supported his statement by very extensive documentation, all of which had been accepted and included in the record of the proceedings. Amongst other remarks submitted for the record were those of Hon. *Everet McKin-*

ley Dirksen of Illinois, made in the Senate of the U. S. A., March 25, 1953 about the "Russian Iron Curtain in the U. S. A.", the remarks of Senator *George A. Smathers* of Florida in the Senate of the U. S. A. on October 17, 1951, in connection with the address by *Hon. Edward M. O'Connor* about the "Tragedy of the Ukrainian Nation"; the article from the New York Times, October 4, 1951—"Soviet Intensifies its Russianizing"; the article from the New York Times, February 11, 1951—"Soviet sees growth of Russian Language"; the article by *Harry Schwartz* from the New York Times, March 18, 1951—"Russification Seen in Soviet Tongues"; the article from the New York Times, February 29, 1952—"Rationalizing Imperialism"; the article by *Harry Schwartz* from the New York Times—"Soviet Continues Minorities Purge"; the article from the New York Times of June 14, 1953—"Trouble Behind the Iron Curtain" introduced by *Hon. Lawrence H. Smith* on June 17, 1953, into the Congressional Record; the Address "The Spirit of Independence; America and Ukraine" by the Secretary of the Interior *Oscar L. Chapniak* at the Fifth Triennial Meeting of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in Hotel Stalter, New York, N. Y., July 5, 1952; the book "Massacre in Vinnitsa", edited by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, New York, N. Y., 1953; remarks of Senator *H. Alexander Smith* of New Jersey on the Article of *Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky* in "Ukrainian Bulletin", January 1, 1951—"Tactics, Not Strategy, of Freedom", introduced into the Congressional Record, January 17, 1951; the address of Senator *H. Alexander Smith* of New Jersey at the Rally of the Ukrainian Central Committee of Newark, N. J., in the Mosque Theatre, March 30, 1952; the article of the New York Times, March 6, 1953 "Text of Soviet Unity Call in Stalin Crisis", the speeches of *Mr. Malenkov*, *Mr. Beria* and *Mr. Molotov* at Stalin's funeral; the article by *Harrison E. Salisbury*—"Soviet Tells People Beria Plotted To Sow Hate Among Nationalities" in New York Times, July 13, 1953; the article by *Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky*: "House Concurrent Resolution 58—A Solid Text of American Initiative in the Cold War", in The Ukrainian Quarterly, Vol. IX, No 2 1953; the article by *Bob Considine*: "Encouragement for Slaves" from the New York Journal American, April 27, 1953; the article by *Felix Morley*: "Three envoys to Russia" from *Baron's*, April 13, 1953; the letter of *Hon. Jack K. McFall*, Assistant Secretary in the U. S. A. Department of State to Senator *H. Alexander Smith*, of June 26, 1952; the letter of *Hon. Thruston B. Morton*, Assistant Secretary in the U. S. A. Depart-

ment of State, of March 13, 1953, to *Senator H. Alexander Smith*; Memorandum in Reply to State Department Opinion by *Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky*, prepared for the use of the House Special Sub-committee on Resolution 58; two letters of the International Relations Club at Georgetown University to *Prof. A. M. Baranovsky*, Chief Delegate of the Ukrainian S.S.R. at the United Nations, and to *Hon. K. V. Kiselyov*, Chief Delegate of the Byelorussian S.S.R. at the United Nations, New York City.

Basic Statement of Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky

Before the hearing on the Smith Resolution, *Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky* released a basic statement in which he pointed out the main merits of the proposed move. He said:

"As a medium of the American peace offensive against the Soviet peace defensive, this Resolution calls for the extension of U.S. diplomatic relations with the Soviet Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia. Both nations are members of the United Nations, and are legally recognised by our Government in the framework of this international body

"However, in striking contrast to all other U.N. capitals, Kiev and Minsk, the capitals of Ukraine and Byelorussia respectively, are inaccessible to any foreign representation. Indeed, steel curtains surround these two countries behind the European Iron Curtain. The Resolution, as a forceful expression of America's peace offensive, is aimed at the penetration of these steel curtains and at making contact with these two most restive and strategic areas in the Soviet Empire.

"Considerations of this 'unique' Resolution comes at a most significant moment. One of the chief charges lodged against Beria, a non-Russian Georgian, is that he attempted to 'sow enmity between the peoples of the U.S.S.R.' and to encourage nationalist tendencies in the individual Soviet republics, at the expense of all-Soviet unity. Purges of the Malencov's Russian communist satraps in such non-Russian Republics as Ukraine, Georgia, etc. might well be attributed to him.

"The reality of the multi-national tension and cleavage in the artificial Soviet Union is the foremost factor of weakness in the structure of the Soviet Russian Empire. The Smith Resolution is skilfully adopted for us to capitalize immeasurably on this weakness.

"It is an open secret that we were pitifully asleep on the East German outbreak. Let us now prepare for a symphony of unrest and dissension throughout the entire Soviet Empire,

EUROPEAN DEFENCE COMMUNITY AND THE UKRAINIANS

THEY HOPE THAT E.D.C. WOULD GROW SO AS TO EMBRACE ALL EUROPEAN NATIONS, WITH THE INCLUSION OF UKRAINE

E.D.C. gets going

The amazing sweeping electoral victory of the West German "Iron Chancellor No. 2"—*Dr. Konrad Adenauer* at the polls for the Bundestag in Bonn, on Sept. 6th, 1953, inspired a new and vigorous life in the till now "liveliest corpse on the European horizon"—the *European Defence Community* (E.D.C.). Now it can be expected reasonably that, before long, the previous restrained and delaying attitude, and even the recalcitrance of France concerning the participation of France in the E. D. C., will be overcome and the E. D. C. Treaty would be ratified by the French Parliament, maybe, even before the end of 1953. Incidentally, the E. D. C. was originally a French idea, and the Free World expects France to stand by it. By the fears, doubts and hesitations of France in the face of German rearmament, however serious and well founded they might

be, are not nearly so imminent and threatening as the menace of Russian bolshevism for the same France—and the rest of the world. The French anxieties concerning the E.D.C. are, in our opinion, alleviated by the more or less direct participation and guarantees offered by the U.S.A. and Great Britain. The rest of the World would not understand, if France should break up the E.D.C. which brings her powerful alliances and security.

Unflinching Ukrainian Resistance

What is the attitude of free Ukrainians towards these developments? By "free Ukrainians" we mean the 2 million Europeans, most of whom are already naturalized Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian descent, who are living this side of Iron Curtain. In spite of their party divisions and internal political and ideological differences, there are some basic ideas and

especially at the closest proximity to its base of imperialistic power—the non-Russian nations held captive in the Soviet Union. The Smith Resolution is a solid step in this winning direction".

The Opposition of the State Department

According to the AP news of July 21, 1953—"(the House Foreign Affairs Special Sub-committee *unanimously approved* on that day the Smith Resolution calling for immediate diplomatic recognition of Ukraine and Byelorussia. The Resolution which now goes to the full Foreign Affairs Committee calls for the establishment of diplomatic relations with these two States of the Soviet Union as a means of carrying out the policy of liberation. If finally adopted by Congress, the Resolution would have no legal effect, but would express the legislators' opinion. The Sponsor, Representative *Lawrence H. Smith*, Republican, of Wisconsin, said that the two States were the only members of the United Nations with which the United States did not have diplomatic relations".

The Smith Resolution was not adopted by the full House Foreign Affairs Committee at the 1st Session of the 83d Congress, because of the opposition of some circles of the State Department. These circles insisted that their opinion ought to be heard before such an earnest measure should be adopted. Obviously the opposition stems from the "Russian-first" followers in the State Department, supporting the Kennan policy of containment and appeasement. In the middle of July

1953, it was already too late to force the adoption of the Resolution by the full House Foreign Affairs Committee and the further procedure on that matter had to be postponed until January 1954.

A Test of Sincerity

It is hard to say whether the Smith Resolution still wouldn't be dashed to pieces by the opposition, or better to say, by the obstruction of the above-mentioned circles of the State Department. This wouldn't change the basic fact that the nationalist resistance of the non-Russian nations behind the Iron Curtain to the regime of Russian bolshevism and imperialism, *is and remains the main revolutionary power able and willing to resist, to fight and to overcome the Soviet tyranny.* It's up to the leaders of the U.S.A. to use or to repulse this power. The adoption of the Smith Resolution would be one of the best ways to win the sympathy and the political affection of literally millions of Ukrainians. The rejection of this Resolution would be a clear proof that the U.S.A. is practically disinterested in the lot of the nations subjugated by Russia and that they need not expect American aid and assistance in their fight for national liberation. This would, at least, create quite clear political fronts. The further destiny of the Smith Resolution would be for many millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain one of the clearest tests of American political integrity and sincerity, with reference to the pretended American policy of freedom and liberation.

postulates which are commonly shared by all of them. One of such basic postulates is the unfaltering Ukrainian resistance to bolshevism and Russian imperialism. The free Ukrainians support everything that opposes communism and the Russian drive for world domination. This applies to E.D.C. The Ukrainians could never understand the easy-going attitude of the West, towards Moscow and its manifest universal aims at domination, especially in the years 1941-1948, i. e. during and immediately after World War II. The Ukrainians know bolshevism and Russian imperialism only too well by their own century-long experience. They are aware that, sooner or later, the Russians will assail the West, on their bloody road to world domination. The Ukrainians greeted every sign of awakening of the West towards the peril of Russian-bolshevist imperialism. Hence, the Ukrainians followed the every origins and slow—alas, too slow—development of the E.D.C. with very warm sympathies and understanding. At last there was an idea and a scheme to stop bolshevism and the relentless way of Moscow to more and more conquests.

"Little", "Greater", "Greatest" Europe

Nevertheless the Ukrainians were, and remain, deeply disquieted about the incipient narrowness of the present E.D.C. scheme. They assume it was born on the basis of the concept of the so-called "policy of containment". The initial idea was really *defensive* not fight but only to stop bolshevism. E. D. C. embraces only the Schuman plan countries: France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg. This is the so-called "Little Europe". It does not even include the nine remaining countries of the *Council of Europe*, or the so-called "Greater Europe" (Great Britain, Ireland, Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Greece, Turkey and the Saar). Yet beyond the organization of the "Council of Europe" there still remain more of the undoubtedly European states and nations, members of the "*Great Europe*": Switzerland, Austria, Spain, Portugal—and those behind the Iron Curtain: Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania—Byelorussia and *Ukraine*.

Thorough egoism

The creation of the "Little" or preferably, of the "Littlest Europe" would be understandable and acceptable if this organization would be conceived as the nucleus, the hard core of a planned larger structure—to be grown and developed later. The disquietude of the Ukrainians stems from the apprehension that the "Littlest Europe", as well as the "*Coun-*

cil of Europe" show until now all signs of a thoroughly egoistic seclusion and self-sufficiency. The prevailing idea among the proposed present members of the E. D. C., is to get peace from bolshevism and Russia—at any cost. Referring to this the E. D. C. is really only a *defence* community, first of all intent on saving their own skin. The infamous agreement of Potsdam 1945 was reached with Moscow by sacrificing 11 nations and some 100 million peoples all of them true and genuine Europeans, to the domination of Russia. The present leaders of the "Littlest Europe" are fit and ready to ratify and to petrify the Potsdam agreement as a price for guaranteed further Russian non-aggression. In other words: the defensiveness of the E.D.C. is so thorough that they are ready to sacrifice half of Europe so as to get peace from Moscow.

Western guarantees for Moscow

The most astounding confirmation of this Western defeatist attitude was given on Sept. 25, 1953 on the forum of the United Nations, when France proposed through her U. N. delegate *Maurice Schumann* the so-called "Western guarantees of the present Europe's borders". Following the report of the "New York Times" of Sept. 26, 1953 France told the Soviet Union on that day that the E. D. C. countries, and practically the whole West—maybe with the exception of the U. S. A.—were willing to consider plans for guaranteeing Europe's present borders as an "extra measure of guarding against the rebirth of militarism on the Continent". The indication, "militarism" applies evidently to Moscow's fears of the rearmament of Western Germany. Mr. Maurice Schumann made it plain, that the price of working out a system of border guarantees, would be the dropping by the Soviet Union of its hard fight against Western Europe's plans for setting up a defence community. France was trying to sell Moscow the idea that the E. D. C. was in itself assurance that none of its members could prepare a war of conquest. The contention was that one day Moscow would realize that, by fighting the creation of the European Defence Community, it would be fighting a plan that would make for stabilization of the post-war order as settled in Yalta and Potsdam. In other words: the West was asking Moscow for permission and acquiescence to arm and defend itself.

Mr. Maurice Schumann of France spoke obviously with the consent of his Premier *Joseph Laniel* and the French Foreign Minister *George Bidault*. But not only France took all possible pains to appease Moscow on this point. The idea that E. D. C. was no threat, but an assurance of the stabilization of Moscow's power, was underlined in recent

speeches before the 1953 General Assembly of U. N. by the U. S. A. Secretary of State *John Foster Dulles* and Great Britain's Minister of State *Selwyn Lloyd*. It is worth remembering that on May 11, 1953 *Sir Winston Churchill* suggested the conclusion of some sort of "Eastern Locrano", guaranteeing Russia her present territorial status and the unassailability of her borders. Similar assurances that the partners of the E. D. C. and the U. S. A. were not associating for aggressive purposes were also stressed by Belgium's Foreign Minister—*Paul van Zeeland*.

There is no Price

There is no price not even the guaranteed, ratified and petrified delivery to Moscow's digestion of half Europe, by which the West can buy and ensure Russo-bolshevik non-aggression and acquiescence. The resistance to bolshevism and Russian imperialism can only be efficient if it is conceived in the spirit of the liberation of all states and nations suppressed and exploited beyond the Iron Curtain, and not by the scheme of the egoistic self-preservation of the Western few. "Littlest Europe" whatever it's internal technical and cultural intensity and mutuality, if left alone is too small to withstand the terrific pressure of bolshevism which will never cease. The single opportunity for Europe to survive is to build up the "Greater Europe" with inclusion of all really European Eastern nations, inclusively Byelorussia and Ukraine. So long as Moscow, or more accurately, *the Russians*, are not pushed back into their ethnographic territory, none of the European states, or the 6 States of the E. D. C.—would ever obtain real peace and security.

* * *

The Ukrainians hope already that the better Western insight into the true nature of bolshevism and Russian imperialism will one day prevail, and present mental and moral, thoroughly egoistical narrowness of the E. D. C. will be overcome. The Ukrainians belong culturally, racially, spiritually and morally to *Greater Europe*; their minds and faces are turned to the West. But they will fight along with the Western powers against bolshevism and Russian imperialism only so long as they can have a hope that the West will not stop at building up the "Little Europe" but will start the drive for the liberation and unification of the *Greater Europe, the whole of Europe*. The Western powers cannot expect the Eastern European nations to oppose bolshevism continuously in the face of a Western attitude by which the present borders and the internal regime of bolshevism should be internationally guaranteed and certified; no one beyond the Iron Curtain would sacrifice himself for the peace and security

A. B. N.—A STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

ON THE OCCASION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST
CONFERENCE OF THE ENSLAVED NATIONS

The laying of the foundation stone of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (A.B.N.) took place, on the 21st-22nd. of November 1943, ten years ago, near Zhytomir (Ukraine), when there met together, as this First Conference of the Subjugated peoples, the representatives of 13 nations. The guarding of the meeting-place by fighting units of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.) and direct skirmishes with a Gestapo detachment stamped this political deed from the very beginning with a revolutionary character. The participants in this conference were mostly members of national underground movements who were actively engaged in the national liberation struggle. The initiator of this meeting, the C. in. C. of the U.P.A., Gen. *Taras Chuprynka*, and the president of the conference, *Rostyslav Voloshyn-Pavlenko*, member of the Executive Bureau of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.) expressed the solidarity of the conference, with the war being waged against Bolshevism and Nazism, which was now to be co-ordinated and waged in common. The political aim of a common fight of the oppressed nations against Russian-bolshevist imperialism was thus no product of an abstract political theory, but arose from out of the facts that already existed:

a) The common awareness of the necessity of continuing the antibolshevist struggle.

b) The struggle of the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe and Asia for their own independent national status.

c) The striving of the individual towards personal freedom, which can only be assured in his own national state.

The conference of the oppressed nations of Eastern Europe and Asia and the consequent rise of the A.B.N. had, moreover, been carried out on a concrete ba-

sis, i. e., in the midst of the political and revolutionary struggle for independence being waged by the subjugated peoples.

of the West—without reciprocity. Speeches such as that of Mr. Maurice Schuman, and all conceptions like that of "Eastern Locarno", are the best destroyers of all hopes of Eastern European nations ever to get a Western helping hand in their fight for liberation. Such moves are the best possible devices to reconcile the Eastern nations with Moscow. The positive Ukrainian attitude towards the European Defence Community is based solely upon the hope that this scheme would grow and broaden, and would embrace at last all really European nations—with inclusion of Ukraine.

sis, i. e., in the midst of the political and revolutionary struggle for independence being waged by the subjugated peoples.

How inadequate, without any real political foundation and without any kind of contact with reality, in comparison with this, are those structures, the C.C.A.B.F. and the "Committee for a Free Europe", who are trying, from the emigration, to exert a political influence on the people in question.

The alliance of the subjugated peoples in a common fight against Russian Bolshevism and Nazi Germany took place at the moment when the imperialistic war between these two Powers had reached its climax. The first two points of the resolution which refer to the political situation best throw light on the attitude of the conference to these problems:

1. The present war between German National Socialism and Russian Bolshevism is a typical imperialistic and aggressive war, waged for the mastery of the world, for a new distribution of the earth's wealth, for new sources of raw materials and new markets, and finally for manpower which entails the enslavement and exploitation of man.

2. Both warring imperialisms deny the right of a nation to political and cultural development within a national state, bringing political, social and cultural slavery to the conquered peoples in the form of the Nazi "New Europe" or the Bolshevik "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".

The oppressed peoples, particularly Ukraine, were at that time waging a two-front war against the once more advancing Russian Bolshevik and the National-Socialist adversary who was trying to replace them. At this time, the former was a close and trusted ally of the West; the latter was also an enemy of the Free World. Although the conference and, with it, the oppressed peoples declared their solidarity with the fight against Nazi Imperialism, they have, to this day, received no suitable acknowledgement from the West.

1. The First Conference of Enslaved Nations of Eastern Europe and Asia greets the heroic struggle of the Nations of Western and Central Europe against the Nazi Imperialist and proclaims its complete solidarity with them.

2. The conference deems it necessary to acquaint the Nations of West-

ern and Central Europe with the struggle, of the Nations of Eastern Europe and Soviet-controlled Asia, and the aims for which it is waged.

The ruthless and uncompromising struggle against the two Imperialisms could only be waged when the single independence-movements had a firmly outlined political programme at their disposal which was also acceptable to the other nations.

The Second Congress of the O.U.N., which took place in 1941, had already passed resolutions on the general political demands, "Liberty for Nations! Liberty for Individuals!" The Third Extraordinary Congress of the O.U.N. was also held in the same spirit. It was the Conference of the Enslaved Nations that introduced this general demand into the programme of the A.B.N. The realization of the national independence of the individual nations of Eastern Europe and Asia and the assurance of personal liberty for the human individual have grown up into a political aim which has received full confirmation in the 10 years of the A.B.N.'s successful existence. The co-operation of the oppressed nations in the A.B.N. has received much appreciation in many publications of the Ukrainian national underground, which bears testimony to the constructive conception of this organization.

These conceptions could be upheld because they:

1) Were conceived in the midst of battle and in their native territory,

2) Are uncompromisingly opposed to imperialism,

3) Are on the side of a positive ideal and that is the *ideal of liberty*.

A preliminary condition, which was laid down by the conference and which was the starting-point of the A.B.N. for the realisation of these last demands is: "A single common front of the freedom-aspiring nations is necessary to achieve victory for national revolutions."

Y. P.

"UKRAINIAN OBSERVER"

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

published by

Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,

237, Liverpool Rd.,

London, N.1. Tel. NORTH 1828.

LIBERATING NATIONALISM

A FEW THOUGHTS ON THE LATEST SOVIET INTERPRETATIONS OF THE NATIONAL PROBLEM IN THE U.S.S.R.

Editors note: In connection with this article we wish to refer the reader to two further book-reviews appearing in this number of our journal which deal with the nationality problem in the Soviet Union and whose authors are well-known Ukrainian writers:

Oleh R. Martovych: "National Problems in the U.S.S.R." and Roman Smal-Stocki: "The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian Communist Imperialism".

These two books, which have been published in English, should provide the Western reader with an objective picture of the nationality problem in the U.S.S.R. and contribute to a clarification of the confusion created by Russian imperialistic propaganda. Our book-reviews give an introduction to the fundamental aspects of the national problems in the U.S.S.R.

The recent appearance in the Soviet Press of a whole series of articles devoted to national policy and national problems demands a searching discussion of the "thesis" and "guiding principles" recapitulated there. "The Friendship Among the Nations—the Ultimate Basis of the Multi-national Soviet State" by *A. Azizyan*, *Radyanska Ukraina*, Aug. 25th, 1953, Nr. 200 (9715); "A Potent Means of Cultivating the Feeling of Friendship Among the Nations", written for the 15th anniversary of the Kyiv branch of the Lenin Museum, by *O. Chabło*, *Radyanska Ukraina*, Aug. 29th, 1953, No. 204 (9719), and "The National Pride of the Russian Nation", by *Radyanski Ukraina*, Sept. 9th, 1953, No. 213 (9728), are among the articles.

Outwardly "Pro-National"

"One of the most important tasks of the internal policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a further strengthening of the unity and the friendship of nations of our country, the Soviet multi-national state. The ideal of equality and national friendship finds its expression in the foreign policy of permanent peace among the nations and the strengthening of the democratic camp . . ." (*Radyanska Ukraina*, Aug. 25th, 1953).

The Russian Bolsheviks know the value of the national ideal both in the internal as well as in the foreign policy. They employ it to gain the sympathies of the colonial peoples who are striving to achieve their national liberty. "In it the oppressed peoples of the world see a powerful moral weapon to be used in their struggle into one revolutionary family has been

for liberty and national independence; for democracy and socialism; for permanent peace among nations". This and many other similar declarations are, without doubt, extraordinarily attractive to many peoples of Asia and Africa who, by reason of the unrealistic French and English nationality-policy in the colonies have, in one form or another, an indifferent or even sympathetic attitude towards Bolshevism. The Bolsheviks, for their part, maintain that the Communist Party always advocates the national sovereignty of nations and has always worked for the realization of national independence for all peoples. They contend that "the policy of national discrimination and oppression is a source of weakness of the bourgeois state".

Without agreeing with the fundamentally false Communist interpretation of the social and political conditions, as, for example, the assertion of the existence of constant warfare in all bourgeois countries between "proletarian internationalism" and "bourgeois nationalism", it must yet be stated that this propaganda of the ideal of national independence and sovereignty just by the Russian Bolsheviks constitutes one of the most dangerous attacks of Russian-Bolshevik imperialism. The political incapacity of the colonial peoples in question, as well as the aggressive colonial imperialism of the white ruling nations, leads in fact to an intensification of the conflict in the non-communist world and thus weakens the integrity of the freedom which is propagated by the free nations of the western world and is, in part, being realised, especially by the U.S.A. The West has not yet worked out a constructive anti-bolshevik nationality policy and is thus weakening its own position.

Chauvinistic Internal Policy

There is quite a different aspect assumed when one considers the nationalities problem from the internal political viewpoint. The Bolshevik Press is always seeking to prove what "happy" lives are led by the peoples of the individual Soviet Republics, who, "thanks to socialistic production methods" and "the building-up of national culture", have at last been able to raise themselves to the present position.

After the short interlude of the "liberalising nationalities policy", which very soon met its expected end, the Soviet journalists have devoted themselves to lauding the "first-rate" position of the Russian nation. "The primary role in the unification of all the nations of our land

played by the Russian working-class", which has been leading, not only the Republics of the Soviet Union but also all the oppressed peoples of the world. In another place it is stated that, "in the post-war years, all the nations of the U.S.S.R., and our elder brother—the great Russian nation—in particular, have helped the workers of Soviet Ukraine to heal the wounds inflicted by the war, to improve the economy of the Republic, and to develop Ukrainian culture, national in form and socialistic in its content". (*Radyanska Ukraina*, of Aug. 29th, 1953).

At the present time, however, Russian imperialism finds expression in a different form. Normally the Bolsheviks used to speak of a categorically inferior class with regard to the Russian element and, at the same time, they railed against "the bourgeois nationalists—the base minions of foreign capital".

Now they are trying to prove the backwardness of nationalism, in political, social and cultural respects. "Despite the facts that, with us, the exploiting classes have been liquidated and, for this reason, there is no foundation for nationalism, there still exists a nationalistic residue. They take their appearance in literature, art, history and other branches of knowledge. Common to all these manifestations of nationalism is the idealisation of the past, seclusion in their own national state, and an insufficient valuation of the importance of the socialist reformation and friendship among the nations of the U.S.S.R.".

Even these attempts are, at bottom, no novelty and have been practised by the Bolsheviks before. For example, one such article which appeared in the "*Radyanska Ukraina*" in 1946 gave the Ukrainian underground publicist, *P. Poltava*, the idea of writing a basically publicistic work demonstrating the progressive part played by liberating nationalism and the correctness of its theoretical foundation. ("The Ideal of an Independent Ukraine and Basic Tendencies of the Political Development of the Present-day World").

The constant Bolshevik agitation in connection with national problems is a further indirect proof of the impossibility of liquidating this political tendency. For the purpose of further concealing the aspirations of Russian imperialism, the author of the article on the "Friendship among the Nations", already quoted by us, has made the attempt to produce historical evidence that "the bourgeois nationalists want to separate the individual nations and to develop anti-Russian tendencies. In unmasking the bourgeois nationalists, the Party points out the great progressive part that the Russian culture of the nation has played with regard to a further cementing of the friendship among the nations".

From all that has hitherto been said it is obvious that there are certain fundamental national differences existing within the Soviet Union. The constant search for the "historical culprits" is endless. The Bolsheviks impute the guilt to nationalism as such, and to Ukrainian nationalism in particular; they conceal the core of Russian imperialism, which is the real cause of the national differences and has brought the Russian nation into its present position of oppressor, making however, no fundamental objections to this imperialism. The cause of national hatred and intolerance is never a freedom-seeking nationalism; but the imperialism of the ruling nation, which arouses resistance in the oppressed.

The Russian Aspect of the National Question

Every appeal to the past; to national history; or every emphasis on linguistic distinctness is interpreted in the case of the non-Russian, and particularly the Ukrainian element, as "bourgeois nationalism", "backwardness" and, last but not least, as "unfounded narrow-minded patriotism". It is, however, quite another matter when it is a question of Russian history, literature, etc.

In this case, the patriotic attitude is praised, and the Russian Tzarist ambitions in political fields are regarded as completely justified, and as serving Russian national interest. The Soviet Press never attacks Russian nationalism but, on the contrary, the glorification of the Russian Army and its Generals. The great Russian writers are stressed at every opportunity, even in the press of the Soviet Republics.

Thus, the "Radyanska Ukraina" of Sept. 9th, 1953 devotes a whole front page to the 125th anniversary of the birthday of L. M. Tolstoy. This is no place to go into the literary activities of L. Tolstoy or to discredit his artistic ability, as is so often practised in the Russian-communist and emigré press with regard to Ukrainian culture and its representatives. This case is only to serve as an example of the Russian conception of the national problem. In his leading article, which was written for this very occasion, W. Voitusenko made the following statement:—"Tolstoy's works are a protest against the wars of conquest which are being waged by the imperialists; they are a weapon for all fighters for liberty. One may detect in them a passionate sympathy for the colonial peoples and dependent countries oppressed by imperialism. There lives in them a flaming patriotism; a great national pride in the greatness and tremendous power of the Russian nation".

This interpretation is an obvious distortion of Tolstoy's mental attitude. He was certainly a Russian patriot but never

THE NATIONALITY PROBLEM OF THE SOVIET UNION AND RUSSIAN COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM

By Roman Smal-Stocki, Marquette University, with a preface by Lev E. Dobriansky, Georgetown University (Published 1952 by The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee)

It is to be regretted that the title of this comprehensive and almost 500-page treatise only partly fits its contents. Apart from the first three chapters, which provide a thoroughly indispensable introduction for the Anglo-Saxon reader, and Chapter 9 ("The Present Predicament of the Non-Russian Nationalities"), the author, a prominent Ukrainian etymologist and political emigré, deals almost exclusively with the *language problems* in the Soviet Union and the history of the Soviet language-policy. Other aspects of the national cultural life, such as literature, drama, fine arts, and others, are only occasionally considered; and social policy and economics, although obviously just as significant for every national problem, are not touched upon at all.

The author has, nevertheless, succeeded in achieving something great within the bound of his limited subject. His extraordinarily thorough and no less shrewd presentation and weighing-up of Moscow's genocidal linguistic-national policy (as well as the scandalous indifference, or even favour, with which most academic circles in the West, especially in the U.S.A., regard that policy, when they are not seeking directly to justify it) may with good cause be valued as a real standard work on the linguistic-national crime of Soviet-communist Russia. The book in question is an indispensable basis, and a collection of sources for every future explanation regarding the question. The author has rendered special service, by dealing with the Soviet-Russian oppression and Russification of the non-Slav nations and peoples in the U.S.S.R., about which so little is known in the West.

As in most of his writings, the author shows himself to be a lively performer and a passionate controversialist, which lends to the whole work animation and stimulus. This, however, has its dark side. It is to be welcomed that American Slavists and philologists in general hear bitter hometruths about their pro-Soviet and

pro-Russian attitude. It seems, however, that out of enthusiasm for the dispute, the author either presents matters in too biased a light or is clinging so firmly to to a risky premise. A faulty inference, which in itself would be of no great importance, has a very detrimental effect upon the whole broader presentation. This last, occurs only once in the book, but in a very important case. The author sees in the so-called "Japhetic Theory" of N. Marr (later called "the New Teaching about language") "the instrument of the Russification of all non-Russian languages", the *Soviet Linguistic Theory* which is supposed to be the basis of the entire Soviet language-policy from 1920 to 1950: "thousands of linguists, philologists and teachers paid with their lives or with years of slave-labour-camp imprisonment for their opposition against this monstrosity of Marr's theory". That is completely wrong. Although the Japhetic Theory did a great deal of harm to Soviet etymology by rendering any kind of research into every language (including the Russian) impossible for decades, its actual *political* importance was very small. In Ukraine, for example, it was, until the end of 1931, possible in academic instruction, and occasionally even in the press, to be critical or sceptical of "Marrism". It is only since the etymological conference in Kharkiv in December, 1931, that an official, (purely formal), longer agreement with the Japhetic Theory has been obligatory for all etymologists and language-teachers. The systematic extirpation of the nationally-conscious non-Russian etymologists and language-teachers in the entire Soviet Union (which had already begun in Ukraine in 1927) resulted almost *exclusively* in the impeachment, on pretext or suspicion, of the "bourgeois-nationalist ideology". For that the "Party and Government" did not in truth need Marr's abstruse "Japhetology"! As a purely academic matter, "Marrism" had nothing at all to do with the practical language-policy. Although Marr had babbled so much nonsense about the "artificial means in order to accelerate the language-forming process", his only practical suggestion was the motion, published in 1920, that the *Georgian* language should be raised to the rank of a common means of communication among all the Caucasian nations and tribes. Characteristically his "analytical alphabet", even before the

a friend of the oppressed and, with his idea of the special mission of the Russian nation, he created the ideological foundation for Russian imperialism. As in this case, so also in all others; Russian imperialism is boosted and the non-Russian peoples, especially the Ukrainians, are made the object of national oppression.

Yaroslav Z. Pelenskyj

Revolution, based almost entirely on Caucasian phonetics and was, moreover, made up almost exclusively of Roman letters. Marr was neither a "fanatical Communist", a Russifier, nor even a Russophile. It is pure arbitrariness when the author asserts that Marr, with his doctrine of the progressive "unification of languages", aimed at the hegemony of the *Russian* language in the U.S.S.R. Such a thing did not occur to Marr. He was a scientifically-educated psychopath. A really revolting specimen of the well-known "mania etymologica", to whose lot it fell to trace back all the words of all the languages of the earth, by means of those fantastic "four original elements", to something Georgian. In order to help these foolish machinations to victory over the hated comparative etymology, he named his "method" dialectic-materialist and simulated an approach to Marxism which, however, remained basically merely phraseological. "Party and Government" let him have a free hand, as they needed someone to combat thoroughly the "capitalist-imperialistic etymology of Western Europe". They had otherwise very little interest in his fancies. According to this, the recent condemnation of Marrism in no way represents "a pure propaganda in the ideological preparations for World War III and therefore a sham retreat, as the author wishes, but a decisive victory of Russian nationalism, to which the "Japhetites" have always been a thorn in the eye and an abomination. This in no way entirely on account of the thousands of indecent and crazy etymologies, such as *solnce* (the sun) i. e., *svinya* (the swine)—over the clearly internationalistic tendencies in Marrism which the author has unfortunately overlooked. He ignores both the pre-revolutionary idealistic "nucleus" and purely linguistic composition of "Japhetidology" as well as its close connection with Caucasian philology. The rather numerous cases in which the author merely presents things in a too biased light are naturally of less importance. One case is this detailed treatment of the activities of the "Promethean League" (1925-1929), a movement which, in spite of its excellent intentions, was actually unsuccessful. Another, is his fundamental apology of the so-called "purism" (i. e. the replacement of loan-words by native terminology)—one needs to be no purist in this sense to condemn the Soviet language-policy in the sphere of the terminology of the non-Russian languages. Still another is his very detailed polemic against the Russian etymologist. R. Jakobson, which is actually of interest only to etymologists. For the laity, a few quotations from Jakobson's writings are enough to prove that here we have a Soviet-Russian fellow-traveller, who, strange to say, still repre-

NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN THE U. S. S. R.

by Oleh R. Martovych, with Ethnographical Map of the Soviet Union
by Dr. Mykola Kulycky, Introduction by John F. Stewart. Foreword by Major-General J. F. C. Fuller, C. B., C. B. E., D. S. O.,
Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1953, X x 58 pp.

Oleh R. Martovych, who is already sufficiently well-known in Anglo-Saxon anti-bolshevik literature by his, comparatively successful, book, *"The Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times"*, has this time attacked a far more comprehensive and complicated subject and with considerable success. For years—even for centuries—we have been waiting for a book of this kind. It is reserved and "dispassionate" in everything which concerns the author's own political views. It teems with facts and figures, and is an authentic reference book which will be welcomed by many an East-European who has escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. At the beginning of the booklet there may be found, for the benefit of the lay reader (and there are still many such in the West), hints and explanation in the form of two forewords. One by John F. Stewart, who is the Chairman of the lofty and uncompromising anti-Moscow "Scottish League for European Freedom". He has served the cause of liberty and independence of the nations oppressed by Soviet Russia extremely well. The other, is by the well-known British military expert, General J. F. C. Fuller, who has very strongly emphasised that "the U.S.S.R. is the greatest prison

sents the fifth column at Harvad University. In his uncommonly violent polemic against Hans Kohn's ideologically, though very unpleasant book, "Nationalism in the Soviet Union" (1933!), it would have been much more advantageous for the author's attitude if, instead of showering Professor H. Kohn with sarcasm, he had pointed out that the latter had already completely altered his opinion of the Soviet-Russian national policy. Professor Kohn, for example, in his treatise, "Pan-Slavism and World War II", "The American Political Science Review", Vol. 46, No. 3, September, 1952) frankly admits that the present Pan-Slavism has nothing to do with the liberal Pan-Slavism of the Western Slavs of 1848. It can actually be described as Pan-Russianism.

There is certainly no sense in emphasising that these partial misconceptions and ineptitudes, on the part of the author, are not able to detract from the great positive value of the publication as a whole. The book remains a significant and fruitful political event.

V. D.

in the world; it is a gigantic psychological bomb, which, if detonated, will blow the Soviet imperium into a thousands fragments".

In his concluding chapter, "The Political Reconstruction of the U.S.S.R.", the author very clearly shows that a blasting of the Soviet-Russian despotism from within will lead, not to a Balkanised fragment-complex, but to a restoration of ethnically-conditioned and cultural-historically founded, vital national states.

He looks, it is true, too much on the bright side in categorically advocating projects which today one cannot really know will meet with the approval of the nations and peoples in question. It was, for instance, in Table 5: "New World on the ruins of the U.S.S.R.", rash to place a "Karelia" among the future "independent states", especially as the author himself admits on p. 33 that "the peoples of the Finno-Karelian S.S.R. have to be assured of their right of self-determination of their political status. It may be full national sovereignty or union with Finland". Now there are only two peoples in the present Karelian-Finnish S.S.R.—Finns and Russians. The Karelians, an East-Finnish people, are no more a nationally distinct people than the Moldavians are from the Rumanians or the Carpatho-Ukrainians from the remaining Ukrainians. As regards the Russians, they form exclusively—one naturally does not count the contracted workers, forced-labourers and their guards who were not brought into the land until Soviet times—a quite compact semi-enclave in the neighbourhood of the Lake of Onega which was cunningly incorporated into the Finno-Karelian S.S.R. only for the purpose of ensuring an actual preponderance for the Russian element there and of outwardly breaking-up the markedly Finnish character of the native population. To arrange, even in prospect, for a structure like this, which has been artificially created for the sake of Russification, a "sovereign" continuation, even after the future collapse of the Soviet domination, is simply nonsense. The Karelian Finns will, at the first opportunity, join their brother nationals in Finland. As the Russian settlers around the Lake of Onega, have already been there for five hundreds years, they cannot be "repatriated" and will naturally prefer to share the fate of the other

ethnically north-west Russian area between the Baltic and the White Sea. No demand from the Allied Powers and no theoretically hammered-out projects will be able, in the long run, to alter that.

From this one example it may be clearly recognised how little, in the definition and delimitation of genuine national boundaries within the Soviet Union, one may rely upon the official divisions into Soviet Republics, Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Areas, etc. Yet other sources, even anti-Soviet ones must also be employed with caution sometimes, as they also contain many a politically-biased misrepresentation of the ethnic-national facts. When, say, the author submits that the "peoples of Idel-Ural", among others, should conclude a "union with Turkestan on the basis of common Moslem culture", he is quite obviously forgetting that the Ugro-Finnish elements of the Idel-Ural complex—the Komians (formerly Zyryanians), Udmurts (formerly Votyakians), Marians, Mordvinians and also the Turkish-speaking Chuvashians—are not Moslems (and, with a few exceptions, never have been) but Christians. Naturally they feel more drawn, both ethnically and culturally, to the western bulwark and centre of the Ugro-Finnish culture i. e., to Finland. This, unfortunately, is what the ideologists of the Idel-Ural scheme habitually overlook.

A similar case is met with in Turkestan. It is well-known, the Turkestanian patriots regard the Tadzik S.S.R. as a puppet-creation which has been just as artificially torn out and fenced-off from the unity of the Turkestanian National State by the Soviets as all the rest of the Turkish Soviet and Autonomous Republics and Areas of the so-called "Central Asia". It is called that in Soviet-Russian in order to avoid the term "Turkestan", even in a purely geographical sense. That is also the opinion of the author, in that he mentions on p. 11 that "the Tadzikis, who speak a dialect related to Persian, are of Turkish origin". But that is quite wrong. It is historically quite incredible that a Turkish tribe in the Middle Ages should, while retaining their Turkish customs, adopt an Iranian language. The Tadzikis, on the other hand, represent the remainder of an Iranian, and therefore pre-Turkish, aboriginal population of Turkestan, who have been intensively Turkicised, but have still retained their Iranian mother-tongue. For the *political* attitude of Tadzikis towards the unity and independence ideals, that is not necessarily decisive; but simply to describe them as Turks is not possible, and least of all in a reference work has appeared in Great Britain, where the national-ethnic circumstances in Turkestan are well-known to quite a large number who have explored

TORTURED UKRAINE

THE 1933 RUSSIAN-ENGINEERED FAMINE

by John F. Stewart

Chairman, Scottish League for European Freedom

In the early 1930s, my lawful occasions, otherwise my professional business, took me again to Eastern Europe. There I knocked up against my good friend W. He was a German who had accompanied me during a great part of my travels (also professional) in Soviet Russia, some time earlier. The Germans were then in high favour with the Soviet Government, and W. was apparently an important person much favoured by the German Embassy in Moscow, and *persona gratissima* with the Kremlin himself. At least, I could not help noticing that wherever he wished to go in the U.S.S.R. he seemed to have no difficulty in going there. He opened to me many a door in Russia, both official and unofficial, that otherwise would have remained closed to me. He was ever my very good friend and I have always been grateful to him.

During dinner we had a long talk about our former travels and about the general situation in the U.S.S.R. In the course of our talk he referred to "the terrible famine in Ukraine in 1932-33". I told him he must have been the victim of somebody's lying political propaganda.

Famine in Ukraine! It was inconceivable. We used to call the smiling land "the granary of Europe." It owned the famous black soil, the richest corn growing country in the world. The people were all skilled farmers, hard-working, capable, and devoted to the production of the food for which their rich country was famed. There was no dearth of labour, and the women were skilled and hard-working as the men.

My friend's quiet rejoinder was, "I am not giving you any second-hand information, I am telling you what I saw with my own eyes. As you have seen for yourself when we were together before, I have not found any difficulty in going where I wished, and, during the so-called famine time I happened to be travelling over a large part of Ukraine".

"But," I said, "I happen to have had sent to me the statistics showing the yields of grain in the U.S.S.R. covering those periods, and there was no suggestion of a drought, floods, or any other convulsion of Nature to cause such a disaster as a famine anywhere, much less in so rich a country as Ukraine."

or travelled in the Middle East. One should not proceed too systematically in such questions. Moreover, it makes not the slightest difference, from the A.B.N. standpoint, whether the Tadzikis, once they are free from the Soviet-Russian yoke, want to attach themselves to Turkestan or to Afganistan the country which is allied to them by speech and race. That must be decided only by the Tadzikis themselves.

These few critical observations are naturally in no way intended to deny the high positive value of the work as a whole, least of all that of the extraordinarily comprehensive survey, complete with a series of reliable statistical tables, of the nations and peoples oppressed by Moscow, their past history, their present position and their national rights and aspirations, which is contained in the chief chapter, "Different Nationalities — the Achilles' Heel of the Soviet Union". The Bolsheviks cunningly-devised myth about the alleged one hundred and thirty odd "peoples" that belong to the U.S.S.R. (who therefore are said to need, on account of their own disunity, the guiding hand of an "elder brother") dissolves into nothingness in the face of these indisputable facts and figures. It is made clear to the

most unfavourably prejudiced reader that the number of nations within the U.S.S.R. who are striving for liberty and independence in no way exceeds that of the present Soviet Republics, and that the A.B.N. conception does not mean a "Balkanised" Eurasia, but a *just restoration of normal correlations between national culture, national state and religion in that area.*

The ethnographical map of the Soviet Union which is appended to the booklet—with an explanatory text which is well worth reading—is, it is true, not free from isolated mistakes. It seems to us unfortunate, that the spreading of the former military-settlements of the Cossacks from the Black to the Yellow Sea is shown with the same brown matching, as any contact between the Cossacks of the Far East, those of West Siberia, with those of the Kuban, Don, and Terek areas can only be purely political. It will nevertheless be of the greatest benefit to every reader, as it makes much that is abstract become concrete and graphic. It is to be hoped that this map will often be reproduced. How many anti-Moscow publications have we already seen that urgently require a map of this kind!

V. D.

"Well," said I, "what happened? What became of the food that was actually grown in those years?" "Every grain of it," said my friend, "was carted away by orders from Moscow. Why? For more than one reason. One was that the Chinese Communists were then being supported by Stalin and needed food, so Stalin saw that they got it from—Ukraine, leaving the Ukrainians to go without. Another reason was that" (I knew this myself) "the Soviet Government badly needed foreign currency, and dumped the grain at any price on the European markets. And much went to the new great industrial towns created east of the Urals to feed the new immense populations who were all engaged in making—what? War equipment for the coming attack on the West!"

But my friend told me that the main object of creating this famine was from a political motive, to strike a deadly blow at the Ukrainian nation and increase terrorisation.

The Ukrainians, a nation of 45 millions in South-eastern Europe, have been long under Moscow domination, imposed with consistent cruelty.

While I could trace no existence of famine in any other part of the U.S.S.R. in 1932-33, it would appear that the *Manchester Guardian* had a special representative who reported that in Russia so far from there being a shortage, people flocked there to buy food.

At this same time, Russian ships which put into Belgian and Dutch ports, invited all and sundry to dances, banquets and other free entertainments to show how bursting with food the U.S.S.R. was, and what a happy land was this. Could anything be more brutal more cynical? At the very moment when the Soviet authorities were knowingly murdering millions through the theft of their food, they were flaunting their abundance in the eyes of Western Europe and pouring it out for nothing.

My friend described the ghastly scenes he saw, and he was not a particularly humane German. He had been through the war as a spy as well as a soldier, and the sight of thousands of dead did not mean a great deal to him.

But he told of the dead he saw, thousands of bodies, or rather skeletons. What affected him most, was the sight of thousands of unrecognisable little children, with swollen bellies and matchsticks for arms and legs, some with little life, others dead. Men and women, also hardly recognisable as human, crawling about the streets, emaciated, with swollen feet and bodies, begging a crust or scraping in garbage dumps for filthy, rotten scraps. My friend told me he thoughtlessly threw away a cucumber

skin, and hundreds of demented wrecks fought for it.

The political aim was, as well as mere annihilation of a few millions more or less of the Ukrainians the Russians were determined to destroy, to force collectivization on an unwilling people. The people were farmers and peasants, and like farmers and peasants all over the world, passionately devoted to their own little bit of soil. They resented collectivization, which meant the seizure of their own loved land and their own equally loved animal stock, giving it up to the unholy State and being tied to what was their own property as slaves. They resisted, and the famine was the punishment.

Actually, the 1932 harvest had been good and there was plenty of food for years. But, suddenly, the great vehicles of the Kremlin rolled in day by day and scraped every grain from the people, leaving them *nothing*. This went on day after day, in circumstances of the greatest brutality, and, horrible as it is even to think of, these fine people were driven to cannibalism, eating their own loved children. Just think of it, you mothers of the West! These women were not African savages, with whom, rightly or wrongly, we have been accustomed to associate cannibalism. They were of the same stock as those who brought Christianity from the East, and for centuries their nation formed a great rampart defending the West from the inroads of the savage hordes of the East.

Even now, the Ukrainians are a most devout, religious nation, and nothing has affected them more than the attacks on their religion and their devoted priesthood. "For God and Country! For Freedom for the Peoples and the Nations" truly describes their true aims.

For many centuries the Ukrainians have fought for their freedom against the hordes of Moscow, again and again they seemed doomed. But again and again they re-appeared, as determined as ever to throw off the yoke of the detested invader, whether Tsarist, Communist, Socialist or any other; to them the yoke does not belong to any particular political body, they desire their release from their oppressor through the centuries—Russia.

At the moment they have their own Underground Resistance, with a well organized army which is able to cause much anxiety in the Kremlin. And behind this Resistance and behind this army stands the Ukrainian Nation. Surely such a people can never be crushed!

To return to the famine which was no famine, but the theft on a gigantic scale of the food of the people to whom it belonged, the fact was concealed from the West with the skill with which the Kremlin can prevent other people from know-

ing what is going on the other side of the Iron Curtain. But there are occasional cracks in the curtain and a little news does seep through—I have been enabled to make use of some myself. Newspaper correspondents had been shut out of Ukraine during the period of the thieving, but, later in the year 1933, W. H. Chamberlin was in Ukraine to pick up what he could of the ghastly events which had taken place, and about which scraps had reached him. Mr. Chamberlin is one of the most reputable of all American correspondents, and, possibly, the most informed on Russian and Eastern European affairs. Here is what he says:—

"Early in 1933 Ukraine was declared 'out of bounds', for foreign correspondents, so that there could be no widely circulated accounts of the great human tragedy. What had happened was not hardship, or privation, or distress, or food shortage, to mention the deceptively euphemistic words that were allowed to pass the Soviet censorship, but stark, outright famine, with its victims counted in millions. No one will probably ever know the exact toll of death, because the Soviet-Russian Government preserved the strictest secrecy about the whole matter, officially denied that there was any famine, and rebuffed all attempts to organize relief abroad.

"Walking through the dusty streets of the villages in Ukraine, one was impressed by the sense of death and desertion. House after house seemed to be abandoned, with window panes fallen in and corn growing mixed with the weeds in gardens which had been abandoned by their owners. Nearly in every village the death rate was not less than ten per cent. "There has perhaps been no disaster of comparable magnitude that received so little international attention. The Soviet-Russian method of stifling direct reporting of the famine, by refusing permission to correspondents to visit the stricken regions until a new crop had been harvested, and the outward signs of the mass mortality had been largely eliminated proved very effective. Officially Moscow continued to deny brazenly that there had been any starvation. Few correspondents were inclined to risk difficulties with the censorship by sending the story of events which had occurred some months in the past."

And, while the Soviet vehicles rolled through the streets of Ukrainian towns and the country roads, stealing every grain that could be scraped up in spite of the appeals of the hunger-stricken, other vehicles paraded the streets and roads picking up the skeletons of the dead with which Ukraine was strewn.

Prof. Volodymyr Derzhavyn

THE HUMANE SCIENCE IN THE POST-WAR SOVIET UKRAINE

II. SCIENCE OF HISTORY

In order to some extent to understand the present deplorably low level of the Science of History in Soviet Ukraine, one must remember that it was this Science which, after having flourished magnificently in the twenties, both in Soviet Ukraine and, especially, in Polish-occupied Western Ukraine and among the Ukrainian national-political emigration, was, during the thirties, systematically extirpated in Soviet Ukraine. No wonder that the few Ukrainian historians who had survived the mass and individual proceedings, especially directed against Ukrainian national intellectual life, which were instituted by the "proletarian class-justice" of 1930-36, itself completely governed by Soviet-Russian chauvinism, and also the mass-persecution of the Yezhovshchina-terror of 1937-39, so called after the notorious leader of the N.K.V.D., the half-crazy sadist, Nikolai Yezhov, were not at all willing, at the beginning of the German-Soviet war, to allow themselves to be "evacuated" by the Soviets from Ukraine to Central-Ural districts (Ufa). Instead they remained under the German occupation in Ukraine and later preferred, despite all anti-Ukrainian repressive, disqualificatory and starving-out measures on the part of the German Nazis, to avoid the unheard-of bloody terror of the Soviet-Russian re-occupation of Ukraine, in 1943-44, by a dangerous flight to the West that was attended by every privation. Thus did the main part of Ukraine, which even before 1939 had languished under the totalitarian despotism of the alien Soviet-communist occupants, lose the last remnants of its, more or less, trained academical historical cadre.

The result of this is naturally that the Science of History among the present Ukrainian national-political emigration is one of the best represented and most zealously cultivated. This is testified to by the names, and the works published among the emigration, of such prominent historians as **B. Krupnytsky**, **O. Ohloblyn**, **D. Doroshenko**

And so the greatest massacre of all time was committed, and over six million people died.

To the Muscovite, human life is nothing. These are the people, whom the insanity or worse of the West, brought into the heart of Christian Europe during the Second World War.

(died in Munich, 1951), **N. Vasylenko-Polonska**, **M. Chubatyj**, **J. Borshchak**, and many others. Most of the above-named historians belong, it is true, to the "older generation" of Ukrainian emigrés, but it is characteristic that, between the latter and those of 1943-45 emigration, there are no divergencies worth mentioning regarding aims, fundamental principles, and methods of historical research—which is greatly to the advantage of Ukrainian Science in the emigration.

For the History of Science in Soviet Ukraine, however, the direct consequences of the war and the post-war period were catastrophic. Her scientifically qualified cadre shrunk even more because among those historians who had let themselves be evacuated to the East in 1941, the shrewdest, such as the highly-talented historian of the Ukrainian Cossacks, **Mykola Horban**, had warily chosen to remain in Siberia, where the "Party and Government" took less notice of the non-Russian nationality of a historian than in the ethnically Ukrainian countries.

Thus weakened and disorganised, the historical cadre in Soviet Ukraine was not able to derive only benefit from the superficially more liberal national policy of the "Party and Government" during the Second World War, as were the Ukrainian historians of literature, of art, and the archaeologists. Between 1941-46, there were published no important works in the realm of Ukrainian history, only a few text-books for intermediate and high-schools which, it must be admitted, were less inimically inclined towards the nation and less Moscow-phile than the corresponding production in 1935-40. At the close of the "liberal" era in 1946, these books were of course promptly confiscated as the work of "bourgeois-nationalist vermin"; there had been, in practice, no real change of policy.

In the West Ukrainian districts, which had been newly seized by Soviet Russia, the situation promised to be somewhat more favourable, especially in Galicia, where a number of prominent historians had remained behind in 1944, in the hope of a comparatively tolerant attitude towards their purely scientific activities on the part of the Soviets. Even the minimum tolerance towards all non-Marxist historians, who therefore required what the Soviets phrased "a political morato-

rium" in order to achieve a proletarian class-consciousness, proved to be of short duration. As early as 1946 began arrests, banishments and other repressive measures, a few of the proscribed historians, such as Professor **Ivan Krypyakevych**, Senior Professor of Ukrainian History at Lviv University, were afterwards pardoned, but there can be no thought of their continuing with their scientific work. Just like the other non-Russian historians in the Soviet Union, they may say and write only that which the "Party and Government" declare desirable.

Yet another thing must be taken into consideration, and that is that those West-Ukrainian historians suffer under a threefold Soviet-Russian control: as Ukrainians on the whole, as West-Ukrainians, i. e. as persons whose entire activities before 1944 took place in a "capitalistic" setting, and finally as representatives of a tendency in Ukrainian historical research which is specially odious to the Soviet-Russians (and, one may say, to the White Russian emigrés as well)—the so-called political school which, founded outside the Soviet domains in the twenties by a number of famous historians (**V. Lypynsky**, **S. Tomashivsky**, **D. Doroshenko**, etc.), prefers to study the state-building factors and precedents in Ukrainian national history and, in contrast to other schools of Ukrainian historians, knows how to value the historic role played by single prominent personalities. Since this tendency in Soviet Ukraine was never allowed into print, eventual co-operation between Ukrainian historians and those of Central—and East-Ukraine is out of the question: there is a sad lack of mutual understanding between them.

This all the more, since, of the three schools which represented in the Ukrainian science of history in Soviet Ukraine in the twenties, and so at a comparatively tolerable period of the Soviet Russian national and cultural policy, there is nowadays only one, which is called, owing to its sphere of interests, the **regionalistic** or **ethnographic** school. It is the oldest of all, as it was the only one which could be fostered, within certain limits, even under the Tsars. This school, it is true, also lost its most talented representatives, such as the scholar, **D. Yavornytsky**, through the Soviet terror (another important representative of the same school, the scholar, **D. Bahaliy**, fortunately died in 1931, just before the beginning of a systematic persecution), yet it was not completely eliminated, on account of the fact that it preferred to direct its interests on scientific

details: the Soviets did not consider it particularly dangerous, although it must be admitted that this school also produced several prominent champions of Ukrainian national political sovereignty.

Many more, however, were produced by the so-called national schools of history, which, founded in West-Ukraine at the end of the last century by the great Ukrainian historian, **Mykhaylo Hrushevsky**, took rapid root in Central and East-Ukraine after the revolution of 1905, and was the most predominant in Soviet Ukraine during the twenties. Although this tendency of Ukrainian national historian research was based upon the theory of an "organic" spontaneous development of the Ukrainian nation and thus underestimated to a certain extent the historical value of purely political trends and movements as was, moreover, somewhat inclined to socialism, its contribution to the formation of the Ukrainian national political feeling was extraordinarily great, as it proved, clearly and indisputably, the continuity of Ukrainian national history and its independence of Muscovite Russiandom, and that in an unobjectionable scientific manner. And since this school uncompromisingly upheld the principle of an original and organic independence of the Ukrainian national culture, it was, without exception, sacrificed to the Russification lust of the Moscow despots in Ukraine. The consequence of this was that, as early as the middle thirties, this school had no representatives at all within the Soviet sphere of domination.

The very same fate befell, several years later, that school of historical research which one may aptly describe as **national-communistic**. Although loyal to Marxism and Leninism and in this connection in opposition towards the national liberation struggle, it nevertheless sought to demonstrate the line of development of the revolutionary forces and industrial proletariat in Ukraine as being divergent from the Russian. This was naturally closely connected with the nationally-coloured efforts of the Ukrainian Communists to get rid of Moscow centralization, while retaining the Soviet system and a communistic Party-dictatorship. The Soviets diligently exploited this group for the combatting of all the other historical schools and, after the liquidation of the latter, exterminated it just as completely as them—naturally on the same pretext of "bourgeois-nationalism". The actual scientific achievement of this group, by the way, including the treatise of its chief representative,

MALENKOV'S "COLLECTIVE LEADERSHIP"

by A. Kaminskyj

The Riddle of the Ministries

In many places in the Western World the reshuffling of the Soviet government after Stalin's death, by which the number of Ministries was reduced from more than 50 to 24, was explained as a new trend towards an increased centralism on the part of the new masters in the Kremlin. And when, after Beria's fall, five new Ministries were established recently, the same circles logically came to the conclusion that this now indicated a decentralization. This was affirmed by the "wave" of collective replacements of leaders on all levels of the party apparatus and the state, and the considerable upheaval about it. It is considered to be a new political line not only in the U.S.S.R. itself, but also in the Satellites ever since. This interpretation seemed to be all the more probable in view of the so-called new course in its entirety.

In both cases, however, the guesses were completely wrong, for the deeper political and sociological factors were not considered at all, and the entire problem was dealt with in a simplified arithmetical method.

The large number of Ministries in the era before Stalin's death set a model example of a so-called "decentralisation into departments" which, in reality, is a kind of centralization, that is to say just the opposite of what its name indicates, and of the so-called "organic decentralization". It is based on the principle that all major fields are divided up into single departments which are competent within clearly defined limits and strictly submitted to one central authority. This authority can thus exercise an extraordinary control over the entire field. This was the structure of the Soviet system as a whole when in recent times Stalin, with some of his associates of the Politbureau, was the Head of State and held it together by his personal Secretariat.

the West-Ukrainian Communist, **Matviy Yavorsky**, was very small.

The Science of History in Soviet Ukraine at present can therefore, at the most, occupy itself with details of an archival or ethnographical nature; the scanty remnants of the regional historical schools are not capable of anything more important. A fundamental rejuvenation of the science of history is to be hoped for from those scientists who are now active in the national-political emigration in the West.

Beria's Intentions

The reduction of the number of Ministries therefore meant a decentralization entrusting the single Ministries, not only with a wider field of responsibility, but also increasing their powers, authority, and their independence. This was a logical consequence of the conditions prevailing in the Kremlin in those days before Beria's dismissal, for it was still a collective government then. Beria's wish and intention was to apply this practice also to the Republics and to combine it with a "new" nationality-policy. As Chief of the entire police organisation for many years he not only studied the problem of nationalities in the U.S.S.R. very thoroughly, he also judged it correctly. His "new" nationality-policy had a dual purpose: On the one hand he wanted to find an outlet for the ever increasing anti-Russian sentiments among the non-Russian peoples (mainly the Ukrainians and Georgians), on the other hand, he aimed at strengthening his own position for the future struggle for power with Malenkov and his Russian adherents by conferring more powers on the Quisling-governments in Kyiv and the capitals of other Soviet Republics.

Who Worked Against "Collective Leadership"?

The accusations raised against Beria that he had violated the principle of "collective leadership" were a mere propaganda trick, for it was precisely Malenkov who has now abolished the "collective leadership" in the Kremlin. Incidentally, this is not the first time in the history of Russian Communism that one who survived the political struggle for power misrepresented the doctrines and ideas of his ousted enemies, in order to reproduce them later as his own, and, accused others of his own or merely imaginative misdeeds while later doing the same for which others had to pay with their lives. A typical example is the relationship between Trotsky and Stalin.

Of course, this does not mean that Beria would not in the future have removed a rival whom he feared. As long as he did not feel himself strong enough he was interested in maintaining the "collective leadership" in the Kremlin. The ousting of Beria therefore marks the beginning of a new development which, by the strengthening of Malenkov's position, will lead to a one-man dictatorship in the Kremlin. This is the aim of Malenkov himself. The obvious obstrusiveness he has displayed in recent times, his appearing everywhere—sometimes even de-

putizing for Foreign Minister Molotov on the occasion of foreign political speeches and some receptions—is very different from his silence in Beria's days, and, in addition to the appointment of men like Khrushchov, Kruglov, Kabanov, and Zotov, and also certain other indications, clearly give proof of his intentions.

"Collective Leadership"—a Means of Oppression

But at the same time, and with much propaganda, the system of "collective leadership" was maintained in the republics and in all other spheres of political life in the U.S.S.R. However, in consequence of the various reorganizations and replacements, the intention of which was mainly to remove Beria's friends, this system no longer purported to serve decentralization but centralization. The characteristic feature of Malenkov's collective leadership manifests itself in the establishment of groups of associated leaders who, owing to their structure and to the scope of their responsibilities, are subject to strict control and constant interference of a central authority. At the same time the danger that certain strong personalities in the Kremlin and elsewhere might become all-powerful is eliminated.

This applies in particular to the non-Russian Soviet Republics and the Satellites. Take Tito as an example for such an accession to power. Spellbound by the Russian mania for power and also in dread of the nationality-problem, Malenkov, at least for the time being, tries—in contrast to the policy of Beria—to overcome the acute internal problems which threaten to undermine the Soviet "penitentiary of nations", by social and economic measures and by "collective leadership". This is the reason for the "new" agrarian policy, for the promises as regards an intensified development of light industry and an increased production of consumer goods, the building of new hospitals and schools, etc.

Malenkov's Economic Worries

All this is not only a result of the apparent failure of Moscow's past social and economic policy, but, on the one hand, it is a means to appease the dissatisfaction of the population, and on the other hand it is to guarantee the supply of Soviet economy which has to face the eventuality of a new war in all seriousness. It is probably not a mere coincidence that special consideration is attached to wheat production and cattle-breeding, especially if one knows that the preference hitherto given to heavy industry has resulted in a catastrophic situation in precisely these economic fields. The new masters in the Kremlin must seriously take into account the fact that in a future

war there will be no American tanks and guns, nor American tinned food. Only those who have studied the supply problems of the Soviet army during World War II, are aware of the difficulties which confronted the Russians in this respect, although they are unbelievably modest in their wants. Incidentally, the expansion of trade with the West is intended to serve the same aim.

In view of these facts the setting-up of new Ministries has a centralist and political as well as an economic reason. Whether Malenkov will, however, by means of social and economic measures and with the aim of his system of "collective leadership", succeed in delaying an outburst of these latent nationalist tensions in the Soviet Union for a longer period of time, is difficult to predict. One thing, at any rate, is certain: much will depend on the policy of the Western Powers, that is to say, on the question of whether they are willing to use the internal difficulties in the U.S.S.R. in time to the advantage of the Free World.

Historical Comparisons

Historically Malenkov's "collective leadership" is not a novelty to the non-Russian peoples in the Soviet Union and the Satellites. After the defeat of the Ukrainian Hetman Mazepa and the Swedish King Charles XII in the battle of Poltava in 1709, the Russians, shortly before the death of Mazepa's successor, Hetman J. Skoropadskij, formed a "collective leadership"—an Executive Committee which was responsible for the Ukraine, and which was even competent for taxation. In 1764 the office of the Hetman was abolished in the Ukraine and replaced by the "Second Executive Committee". Headed by the Russian General Rumjancev, this Committee was composed of four representatives of the Russian Government and four representatives of the upper Ukrainian nobility. The top positions in the Ukrainian Soviet Republic are to-day again held by Tychyna, Kornijchuk, and Stefanyk, together with people like Karavajev, Selifanov, Valujev, and others, in the same way as Rokossovskij keeps an eye on Bjerut in Poland.

UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

The Budget of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic

On Sept. 10th, 1953, a session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S. S. R. to deal with the question of administration of revenue for the year 1953 (?) took place in Kyiv. The budget of the U.S.S.R. was settled on August 8th, 1953, and now the Ukrainian S.S.R. had to "order its finances". The chairman of the meeting was *Pavlo Tychyna* and the deputy Minister of Finance, *I. O. Tolkunov*, was present as reviewer of financial questions. The budget of the Ukrainian S.S.R. amounts to 17,990,7 million

roubles and, in comparison with the total Soviet budget (544,264.7 million roubles) constitutes 3.3 per cent of the whole. The economic position of Ukraine in the complex of the U.S.S.R. is clearly displayed by this budget, which serves, at the same time, as a testimony to the exploitation of the Ukrainian economy.

In the budget of the Ukrainian S.S.R., 16,072 million is set aside for social-cultural expenditure. This "social-cultural" expenditure is quite out of proportion to the trade, industry and military affairs, and one can tell at first glance that the independence of "socialistic" Ukraine is mostly preserved in this respect. When one, however, considers the "social-cultural" expenditure further and once again examines the total Soviet budget, in which 129,762.4 million roubles are set aside for this purpose, it is obvious that, in this respect, the budget of the Ukrainian S.S.R. amounts to only 12.3 per cent of whole, which again is not in proportion to the number of the population, which constitutes 25 per cent of that of the Soviet Union.

At this session, the services rendered by the Russian nation in raising the level of the Ukrainian economy and the living-standards of the population, were, of course, "suitably" referred to. If we look once again at the nationalities of the following people: *Hryhoriv, Minister for Building Materials, Kulbejkin, Minister for Forestry and Paper Industry, Karavajev, Minister for State Control, Valujev, Minister for Fuel, Tretjakov, Minister for Local Affairs, Selivanov, Chairman for the National Planning Commission, Tolkunov*, the above-mentioned deputy Minister of Finance (exclusively Russians), the composition of the budget becomes more comprehensible and its purposes obvious.

* * *

Delivery of the Fruit Quota

According to an announcement in the "Radyanska Ukraina" of Sept. 5th, 1953, the quota for delivery of fruit to Leningrad and Moscow has been fulfilled with 215.6 per cent. In the Rivne district, for instance, the quota for fruit-delivery had been fulfilled with 112.9 per cent by Sept. 1st. The delivery of cucumbers at this point amounted to 122.4 per cent. Thus, twice as much fruit as in the previous year has been brought into the state planning centres.

Similar conditions prevail in the Stanislaviv district, where the delivery is two and a half times as much as in the previous year.

* * *

At a session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S.S.R., under the chairmanship of *M. S. Hrechukha*, the president of the Kyiv district executive committee of the Communist Party; *Staryichuk*, gave a report on the statements and grievances of Ukrainian workers in this district. It was shown that bureaucracy and ineffective treatment of the wishes of the working population is to be met with everywhere. It was, however, not ascertained how this evil could be cured.

* * *

This year, 83 million books were delivered to Soviet Ukraine. They were, of course, mostly the works of communist bolshevik writers. At the present moment, million editions of the works of Marks, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and the ordinances of the 19th Party Congress of the C.P.S.U. are being printed.

L. M. Tolstoi's "War and Peace" and *A. N. Tolstoi's "Peter I"* are being published in Ukraine for the first time. Moreover, the works printed are mostly those by Russian poets and writers and very few Ukrainian authors are represented.

* * *

From Sept. 21st to 27th there was held in Kyiv a republican training course for composers, poets, painters and sculptors. The participants occupied themselves with questions of up-to-date literature, drama and similar things. The greater part of the programme was again taken up with Soviet propaganda.

* * *



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 12

LONDON, DECEMBER 1953

Price 1 s

CONTENTS:

SOVIET POLITICS 1-2

Z. Poray

UKRAINE—"THE LAND OF
MILK AND HONEY" 2-4

Prefers Rather to go Hungry than
to Work for Moscow

P. Stepanenko

N.T.S. PREPARES FOR THE
NEXT RUSSIAN EMPIRE ... 4-6

Russian political emigres are try-
ing to win over the sympathies and
the support for their plans of the
West-German Government and
Society

A CONSISTENT ATTITUDE 6

THE AGRICULTURAL SITU-
ATION IN THE U.S.S.R. ... 7

MOSCOW'S EDUCATIONAL
POLICY 7

Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn
THE HUMANE SCIENCES IN
POST-WAR SOVIET UKRA-
INE 8-9

V. D.

The Journey for our Times
THE JOURNAL OF THE
MARQUIS DE CUSTINE ... 9-10

TWO BRILLIANT UKRA-
INIAN DATES 10-11

The Seventh Centenary of the Co-
ronation of King Danylo Roma-
novych and the Foundation of the
City of Lviv

UKRAINE BEHIND THE
IRON CURTAIN 11

AN AMERICAN WOMAN IN
UKRAINE 11

SOVIET POLITICS

THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE BOLSHEVIST SPHERE OF POWER

The events of 17th June, 1953, have proved to the Western World that an active mass-revolt on the part of a suppressed nation is possible even under conditions of totalitarian terrorism. We, the representatives of the suppressed nations, were already aware of this, since our peoples have been waging a similar war—in part armed—for years. Some years ago armed units of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army made a systematic propaganda raid into the West. At the same time and even before, raids were made by other units into Poland, Slovakia, East Prussia, Lithuania and White Ruthenia. One battalion, under Commander Lys, even went into Caucasasia.

In view of the circumstances the fight for freedom assumed the nature of an underground movement, whereby armed units formed small groups. These groups are more concerned with propaganda than with military activity. The main object is to intensify and spread the revolutionary fight in all spheres of life—in the fields of industry, culture, and administration—and particularly among the members of the Soviet Army. As Bolshevism, has become the external form of expression of Russian imperialism, so this psychological revolution thus evoked becomes a national and political fight which includes every sphere of life.

The Soviet policy to extend Russian influence is constantly being intensified and increased in the U.S.S.R. as well as in the Satellite States. At the same time, however, the resistance of all the non-Russian peoples is steadily increasing accordingly, and the internal pressure exerted by the national independence movements is constantly growing. This has resulted in a crisis in the

U.S.S.R. and the Satellite States. Recent events in the Ukraine, in Hungary, Bohemia, Slovakia, Poland, Georgia, Eastern Germany, and in other countries have revealed the internal weakness of Bolshevism. The crisis which has arisen in the economic, national, political and military fields, as well as the struggle for power among Stalin's successors, presents a favourable opportunity for the Western World to take the initiative and actively intervene in the affairs of the U.S.S.R. The Western World had and still has the possibility of effecting a liberation policy, and conquering the U.S.S.R. and Bolshevism from within. Malenkov, considerably perturbed by this eventuality has started to play a hazardous game, which he has partly won. Adopting Lenin's zigzag policy, which saved Bolshevism on several occasions, he has promised concessions in certain fields. Such as holdings of land for town-dwellers; privately owned stocks of cattle for farmers on collective farms; a fictitious reduction of prices; the expansion of light industries (that is to say better provision for the mass-consumer), and an alleged cut in the Budget for military purposes, in favour of mass-consumption, etc. Beria, too, —allegedly without Malenkov's permission—is said to have made fictitious concessions in favour of the non-Russian elements of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (a fact which was not denied after Beria's fall). Malenkov achieved his greatest success, however, by his apparently conciliatory attitude towards the Western World. The latter fell into the trap. Guarantees regarding the status quo, projects for an Eastern Locarno as well as various non-aggression pacts, the postponement of the

liberation resolution in the American Congress, statements to the effect that the Western Powers would be willing to desist from every kind of liberation policy,—all these factors, commented upon at length in the Soviet press, were a serious blow as far as the suppressed nations were concerned, for they now realized that, instead of supporting their fight for freedom the Western Powers intended to refrain from intervening on their behalf. And the suppressed nations thus saw themselves degraded to objects of barter. In this way internal revolutionary tendencies in the U.S.S.R., which might possibly lead to national insurrections, were, to a certain extent, paralysed.

History, however, proves that the possibility of defeating Russia is to be found in the **national** problem of Russia. It is an historic fact that Russia was always defeated whenever it was internally divided by national revolutionary movements. This was the case in the Crimean War, in the Russo-Japanese war, as well as in the years 1917 to 1918, although Russia at that time belonged to the coalition of victors. The more concessions the Western Powers make to Soviet Russia because they dread her atomic and hydrogen bombs, the more they guarantee the status quo, the more will they promote Russian aggression. **Russia will only yield to force.** Every indication of weakness on the part of the Western World paralyses the will of the suppressed nations to fight for freedom as it obviously corroborates Bolshevik propaganda about the decline and fall of the Western World, which is predestined to ruin. Every attempt on the part of the Western World to bring about a compromise is detrimental, for the compromise is not likely to materialize since Russia is not aiming to achieve peace, but world supremacy. Instead of using the internal crisis in the U.S.S.R. to advantage by establishing political and friendly relations with the nations suppressed by the U.S.S.R., the Western Powers intend to make a pact with the suppressor, by offering the U.S.S.R. a guarantee. A guarantee, not against an attack by the Western Powers,—such an attack, incidentally, has never been intended—but a guarantee against the possible pressure brought to bear on the U.S.S.R., by a fight for freedom on the part of the suppressed nations. The Kremlin is thus able to deal with the suppressed nations as it sees fit, for it is these nations that Soviet Russia fears, and not the Western Powers!

However, the following problems still continue to exist and make

Ukraine—"The Land of Milk and Honey"

PREFERS RATHER TO GO HUNGRY THAN TO WORK FOR MOSCOW

By Z. Poray

A disagreeable plenary session

Ukraine once was known as the granary of Europe. Before the First World War and the Revolution, huge quantities of grain cereals, butter, lard, pork, poultry, eggs and other agricultural products made up, year after year, for the food deficit of the central Russian provinces and also had been exported to the industrial areas of Western Europe. The Ukrainians were inclined to regard their homeland as "God's own country"; they were proud to see their vast steppes undulating with wheat, maize and sunflowers.

Today, Ukraine is a devastated, drained and exhausted land, utterly neglected in look and substance, and reduced to extreme poverty. A population of 45 million live upon one of the richest soils of the earth, and they are now covered in rags, hungry and destitute. This is the direct consequence of Russian colonial occupation of this country and of 36 years of Bolshevik mismanagement.

Comrade O. Kirichenko, the Secretary General of the Communist Party of Ukraine, was compelled recently to come to this conclusion at the plenary session of the *Central Committee of the C.P. of Ukraine* on Oct. 14th, 1953, in Kyiv, in a general review of the present economic and social situation in the Ukraine.

themselves felt. The serious agricultural crisis in the U.S.S.R. which has even been admitted by Khrushchov himself; the intensification of the national antagonism between Russians and non-Russians; the obvious contradiction directed against the Western Powers, between the slogan of a national liberation and effort to remedy the social and economic distress of those peoples on the one hand and the unbearable conditions, of national suppression, social exploitation, and famine in the U.S.S.R., on the other hand. In the Soviet army, itself, national and social differences are making themselves felt to an ever-increasing degree owing to the preferential position of the national Russian elements and the national Russian officers' caste. Six million of the seven million Party members in the U.S.S.R. are Russians, and out of 1,316 members of the Supreme Soviet Committee, 629 are employers and intellectuals, 269 are farmers and only 418 are workers. It is obvious from these statistics that

Comrade Kirichenko started his report with an untruth, by stating that the Ukraine had as usual made "allegedly gigantic advances" in recent years under the Soviet rule. This, of course, being due to the "brotherly help of the great Russian nation" and the wise guidance of the solicitous Communist Party. This was the usual string of hackneyed phrases, a sort of Tibetan prayer-mill in bolshevist setting, a kowtow before the gods and the demigods of the Kremlin.

Painful truths

Then came the statement of painful truths, revealed and admitted because there was no possible way to hide them. For the first time *Comrade Kirichenko* quoted figures, instead of "per cents".

He started with stock-farming and cattle-breeding. Here is the picture showing by comparison, the year 1941 (before the outbreak of the war with Germany), to 1953:

	1941	1945	1953
Cattle	10,751,000	7,011,000	11,717,000
Pigs	9,059,000	1,804,000	9,030,000
Sheep and Goats	6,364,000	2,770,000	8,343,000
Horses	4,573,000	1,768,000	2,469,000

The war losses, as the above index shows, indeed had been terrible. But in the eight years since the end of the war

a dictatorship composed of a clique of leading Party members, who by a very considerable majority consist of Russian Party intellectuals, in a social respect opposes the masses of the peoples suppressed by Russia, as well. Furthermore, the state of confusion existing among the dictators themselves, is revealed by Malenkov's zigzag political course as regards the suppressed nations.

The opportunity would therefore be extremely favourable for the Western Powers to adopt an active policy. It would likewise be a favourable opportunity to launch a political offensive rather than to carry on negotiations regarding a settlement or guarantee promises. Indeed, all Malenkov's political manoeuvres prompted by this same necessity. Moreover, the internal situation in the U.S.S.R. is stabilized by Malenkov's success in the Western World since the Western Powers, to their own disadvantage, have recently begun to betray the cause of the suppressed nations.

this branch of economy, under normal standards should have recovered more quickly and intensively. In 1953 Ukraine had 814,000 cows and 2,104,000 horses less than 1941. Kirichenko admitted that "especially in Eastern areas of the Republic we have not yet reached the number of cows and sheep we had in the Ukraine in 1918". He avoided to quote the figures. The Ukrainian peasants and farmers slaughtered almost all their live stock, in 1928 to oppose the total collectivization of Ukrainian agriculture. It became known as the year of the "big slaughter". In the meantime the population of Ukrainian towns had increased by at least 2½ million. As they were the main consumers of meat, the supply had accordingly to be reduced.

No butter, no milk

Also the quality of the milch-cattle proves to be much worse. In the kolkhozes of Ukraine the average yield per cow in 1950 was 1,221 kilograms; in 1951—1,215 kg; 1952—1,117 kg. By comparison, for 1951, the yield per cow in Belgium was 3,400 kg; in Denmark—3,300 kg; in Holland—3,700 kg; in Switzerland—2,950 kg; in Sweden—2,900 kg; in England—2,800 kg and in France—1,950 kg. This is the testimony of the "efficiency" of the "most progressive socialist techniques and economy". The productivity of the Soviet cows lies far below the French and English yields. The milk productivity in some districts of Ukraine is low beyond comprehension. In the district of Ternopil a cow yields on average—812 kg; in Zhitomir—825 kg; in Volhynia—858 kg; in Chernihiv—899 kg; in Kamianetz Podolsk—1,043 kg, and in Subcarpathia—not even 600 kg. The highest yields were reached in the district of Kherson—1,413 kg, the lowest averages in the district of Rivne—611 kg.

"Take it easy"

Comrade Kirichenko complains that the different yields in milk, dairy products and meat in various districts had been caused by the "breach of the principle of uniformity concerning the per hectare delivery". The state demands had not been uniform, and this was wrong. For instance one kolkhoz had to deliver to the state in 1952 per hectare of soil resp. of pasture, 43 kg., of milk, another kolkhoz—only 28 kg., according to the effective amount of the tended cattle. The less the amount of the kolkhoz cattle, the less the demanded delivery—the more you work, the more you'll have to give away. Hence—"take it easy"!

The percentage of milk producing cows in a herd has been abnormally low in the last years. In a cattle herd of 100, only 26 are milk producing cows, the rest being bulls, oxen, calves, and

heifers. In some districts this ratio drops to 21, or even—19.

Very few cattle are in the private possession of the kolkhoz peasants. Theoretically, according to the basic kolkhoz statute, each peasant is legally entitled to manage his own small plot, and to keep some cows, pigs and poultry. In the last few years the existing privately owned live stock has fallen. During 1952 the privately owned live stock fell by 176,000 cows, and at the beginning of 1953, 51 per cent of the kolkhoz peasants possessed no cows at all. The reason being that the state demanded from the private owners such large quantities of meat and dairy deliveries, that the peasants preferred not to tend their live stock at all.

High death rates

In 1952—100 cows bore only 69 calves; 100 sheep only 86 lambs, 1 sow littered only 8 sucking pigs. The death rate of live stock is disproportionately high. During the first 8 months of 1953, every 8th and 6th calf died in the districts of Chernihiv and Voroshylivgrad respectively. In the district of Mykolaiv every 10th pig died.

"The yields of forage, fodders, meadows, natural pastures and grasslands are very low" lamented *Comrade Kirichenko*. "In the course of the last 3 years the kolkhozes of Ukraine harvested per hectare less than 12 centners (hundredweight) of hay and 100 centners of fodder-turnips.

"In many kolkhozes the yield of potatoes is so low that it scarcely compensates for the used seed. In 1952 the potato crop in the districts of Zaporozhe and Voroshylivgrad were no more than 24-29 centners, whereas the used seed amounted to 23 centners". The seeding of potatoes was mechanized only by 14%, the harvesting by 1%.

What Moscow demands

"Intensify the yields of hothouses to avert catastrophic developments", *Comrade Kirichenko* advised the kolkhoz peasants of Ukraine. In 1952 there were 15 per cent less than in 1940. This urge is quite understandable, as Moscow according to its 5-year Plan, demands from the Ukraine for the year 1954 140 centners of potatoes (and not 24 as was the yield in 1952); 170 centners of cabbages; 120 centners of cucumbers; 135 centners of tomatoes; 82 centners of onions and 130 centners of white turnips per hectare.

The situation in sugar-beet cultivation and the sugar industry is also most unfavourable. In 1950 the kolkhozes delivered to the factories 166 centners of beets per hectare; in 1951—187 centners; in 1952—172 centners. In 1952 there had been 794 kolkhozes in Ukraine (10 % of total) which did not reach even 100 centners of sugar-beet per hectare. And

now one more comparison with the corresponding yields in the "corrupted West". In 1952 Belgium harvested 410 centners of sugar-beet per hectare, Holland—453 centners; Denmark—370 centners; France—291 centners; Italy—257 centners.

"The level of the mechanization of agriculture of Ukraine now harvests 100 or more puds (1 pud - 16,36 kilogramm) of grains per hectare"—boasted *Comrade Kirichenko*. That makes 16 centner per hectare on the famous black soil of the Ukraine. Yet in the "foul West" Belgium harvests 35 centners per hectare, Denmark and Holland—34 ctn., Switzerland—35 ctn., and even stony Norway—22,8 ctn.

The Communist Drivers

All this is bad enough—but what is to be done? *Comrade Kirichenko* sees one of the main ways to improve the situation is to raise the yield of the crops by the "revised personal policy". He stated that "at the present time there are living in Ukraine 72,000 agricultural specialists, but only 5,015 are employed directly in the kolkhozes and 10,808 in the sovkhoses (state farms). In the meantime we have directed to the farms 6,762 agriculturists and 3,836 zoo-technicians (breeders), and another 26,000 will soon follow." There are 63,000 live stock farms in Ukraine "but only 13,000 communists are working there in responsible positions. Yet at least 130,000 communists would be needed"—declared the harassed Kirichenko.

Why is this? They are needed "to fight laziness, indolence and inertia, and to combat bureaucracy and red-tape, chaos and muddling". The practices of the Ministry of Chemical Industry of U.S.S.R. in connection with the corresponding practices of the Ministry of Agriculture of Ukraine had been severely criticized. The distribution of fertilizers and artificial measures were more often than not "irresponsibly faulty". The phosphate needed for the cultivation of sugar-beet in Vynnytsia and which is produced there, is sent to Latvia, and the phosphate produced in Latvia is sent to Vynnytsia. This autumn some 10,000 hectare of deep sugar-beet ploughing was made without fertilizing whatsoever. The cultivation of maize in the last 3 years deteriorated in Ukraine "simply to criminal limits". No due attention is paid to the proper education of the agricultural specialists and "to the propaganda of the most outstanding achievements of the Soviet agricultural science". Agricultural literature is often sent to wrong districts. For instance, books and manuals concerning the cultivation of cotton had been sent to the district of Lviv and Ternopil, books dealing with the prob-

N. T. S. Prepares for the Next Russian Empire

RUSSIAN POLITICAL EMIGRES ARE TRYING TO WIN OVER THE SYMPATHIES AND THE SUPPORT OF THE WEST-GERMAN GOVERNMENT AND SOCIETY

By P. Stepanenko

One more Russian "peace offensive"

One of the most interesting traits in the development of Russian political emigration during the last four years is visible in their almost frantic and obstinate endeavours to gain very close contacts and co-operation with influential German governmental and social circles. This applies to *all* the Russian emigre political parties, including the cultural and scientific associations and social bodies, from the extreme Monarchist and Fascist Right to the extreme Democratic Left. It would appear as if the Russian emigres were acting in accordance with some pre-designed unanimous plan. A kind of Russian general psychological "peace offensive" is operating with the obvious aim of gaining the sympathies of Western German Society on behalf of far flung Russian aims.

It is symptomatic that this Russian propaganda offensive is met on the German side with remarkably feeble opposition, in fact on the contrary, it meets with a considerable favour. Two centres, especially, in Western Germany can boast of substantial pertinent gains. They are "*The Freedom Society for*

lem of Polissia marshes to Voroshylovgrad and the kolkhozes of Chernihiv had to read books about the breeding of Danubian fish".

They repent and promise

The Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the C.P. of Ukraine accepted the severe criticism of *Comrade Kirichenko* with due submission, applause, repentance and repeated promises of betterment. Here, as always, the party was found to be "absolutely right". But whatever the reasons given for the present catastrophic state of agriculture in the Ukraine, the main reason was not given. The source of all evil lies in the Russian occupation of Ukraine and in the "socialist economy of Marx, Lenin and Stalin", which is hated and despised by the Ukrainians to the deepest cores of their hearts. The Ukrainian people simply refuse to work for the Russian parasites; but work only enough to keep body and soul together. Moscow simply doesn't get the much-needed and demanded bread, butter and meat from Ukraine. And no Plenary Sessions of the communists will ever fundamentally change this situation. Ukraine will again bloom and prosper only after the Russians are gone.

German-Russian Friendship" ("Freiheitsbund für Deutsch-Russische Freundschaft"), and the "National Labour Union" "*Nationalno-Trudovyj Ssoyuz*" known in Russia as "N.T.S.". The two Societies are closely linked in material and organizational respects and the same personnel are often in leading positions in both of them. Although the "Freiheitsbund" stresses rather the German basis of its membership, the general conviction exists that the Russian N.T.S. is the real driving power behind the activities of "Freiheitsbud".

These activities are quite substantial. For instance, the first half-year report of the "Freiheitsbund" for 1953 enumerates 50 public lectures in conjunction with "akin organizations", 5 meetings of "Members and Friends", 28 gatherings of "Study Groups", 4 Press Conferences, 3 "Special Meetings with Foreign Guests", and 31 radio broadcasts. Some of the Press Conferences were particularly interesting, as they were before the Members of the Swedish Parliament in Stockholm, and another in Copenhagen, Denmark.

The "Freiheitsbund"

The "Freiheitsbund", created in Berlin in 1949, is centreing its attention on lecture work. During the first six months it had an audience of over 15,000 listeners. But the "Freiheitsbund" concentrates on influencing small and select audiences rather than appealing to huge gatherings. The themes mostly preferred have been on Central Europe, Germany, the Satellite Nations and in particular the interrelations between Russia and Germany and the scheme of United Europe, as well as the understandable interest in the problems of Russia and the Soviet regime.

For publicity the "Freiheitsbund" found its propaganda media in such German or Russian-German journals as the "Frankfurter Heffe", "Neues Abendland", "Fortschritt", "Freies Wort" and the "Deutsch-Russische Stossrichtung". Many commentaries had been broadcast by the "Nord-West-Deutscher Rundfunk" (N.W.D.R.) and the "Radio RIAS". During the same half-year the "Freiheitsbund" distributed 64,500 copies of books, pamphlets and leaflets. Out of four new local groups of the society created in the area of Nordrhein-Westphalia, the most noted one was in Bonn, the present capital of West-Germany, on the 17th August, 1953. The constituent gathering of the

group in Bonn was remarkably well attended, and gained the adherence of some notable Germans. It was also reported on favourably by the leading German press.

The late Professor Dr. Ernst Reuter, the well known popular mayor of Berlin, by his adherence and active work, made the "Freiheitsbund" representative of serious German political thinking. He was elected the Honorary President of the Society. The unexpected death of Professor Reuter on the 29th September 1953 was a severe blow, not only for the besieged Berlin, but also for the "Freiheitsbund" which lost in him its most influential propagator and protector.

The background of N.T.S.

It would take too much time to enumerate the outstanding German personages who are members of the "Freiheitsbund". At the moment Herr O. E. H. Becker and a Dr. A. Trushnovich, are the elected acting presidents of the Society, for the German and Russian parts respectively. Their headquarters are in Berlin-Nikolassee, am Schlachtensee 136.

The Russian N.T.S. which was created in Yugoslavia in 1930 is, as an organization, much older than the "Freiheitsbund". The hard core of the organization consisted of the "younger generation" of the 1917-1921 Russian emigrés. This younger generation tried to disjoin itself from the outmoded, mostly reactionary beliefs and patterns of their parents, especially their notions of the Theocratic Monarchism and feudal social order. In *Socialism* and *Nationalism* they saw the main driving powers of the modern world, and made an attempt to form a doctrine of *Russian national-socialism* by trying to weld both trends together. This led them to the ideological camp of Italian Fascism and German Nazism. During World War II. they made influential connection with Hitlerites and found many powerful protectors close to the Führer. Long before the famed General *Andrey Vlassov* declared himself as a friend of Hitlerite Germany and started to form a Russian army on the side of the Axis Powers, the N.T.S. leaders had tried to form various Russian armed units at the side of Hitler, with its first objective to start an anti-bolshevik propaganda warfare. Many Russian armed and propaganda units sponsored and created by N.T.S. had already been in action. But the N.T.S.—Hitlerite friendship did not last very long. In 1944 the Gestapo dealt a severe blow to the whole fabric of N.T.S. It appeared that the Organization had many bolshevik agents and the whole N.T.S. seemed to be a huge bolshevik agency, more or less skilfully masked. Nearly 400 leaders of the N.T.S. were arrested in 1944 and more than a 100 instantly shot. The

arrested were particularly suspected of espionage for the U.S.S.R. and were sentenced to German concentration camps. Dr. Victor Baydalakov, an old emigré of 1920 the president of N.T.S. and also Dr. Vladimir Poremskij the deputy president were among the arrested suspects.

Yet this particular political chronicle scandaleuse did not end with this German purge. At this present time West-European population can see its somewhat dramatic and ludicrous continuation. Recently the German newspapers, widely reported, that a Georgi Vladimirovich Horunshi, alias Georg Müller, was arrested on September 1, 1953, by the American Security Agents in Frankfurt and charged in the American Occupation Court of espionage and agent's work for the Soviets. Horunshi alias Müller is one of the most outstanding leaders of N.T.S., having trained its chosen members in revolutionary, subversive and propaganda anti-Soviet work. He had also sent small sabotage and espionage units behind the Iron Curtain and warned simultaneously the Soviet Security Authorities of their arrival. Georgi Horunshi alias Müller—the German newspapers further report—gained the confidence of the highest American Security Officers, and was acknowledged by them to be an outstanding Russian expert in psychological antibolshevik warfare. As he was in such close contact with Baydalakov and Poremskij in the Russian emigré world, he was in the position to report everything accurately and promptly to the Soviets. It would appear that Horunshi-Müller will soon have a place in the annals of world history revolutionary and underground movements as being one of the most intelligent and dangerous agents-provocateurs ever known.

The "Plan P"

The untimely death of Mayor Dr. Ernst Reuter, and even more the arrest and terrible scandal concerning Horunshi-Müller, dealt a severe blow to the wide-spread plan of the Russian emigrés and their German friends in Western Germany. We are now in the position to give some details concerning the German political centres and leading members who are particularly active in this field of Russian-German relations. One of the most interesting plans recently evolved seems to us to be the so-called "Plan P" which envisages the creation in Germany of a Russian "Democratic Exile Government".

Apparently since 1950 some American "private circles" were trying to create a unanimous front of the "Peoples of Russia" so as to centralize and intensify the psychological and propaganda warfare against Communism. Accordingly an "American Committee for the Liberation

of the Peoples of Russia", was created in New York which was later renamed the "American Committee for the Liberation from Bolshevism"—A.C.L.B. For three years intensive American endeavours were made to create an organization uniting Russians and non-Russians, as a non-American counterpart to the "American Committee". The members were bona-fide representatives of the nations of U.S.S.R., and in whose name this warfare should have been formally sponsored. At last a "Co-ordinating Centre of Anti-bolshevik Struggle", the so-called K.C.A.B. was created, but soon split up, forming two different "centres"—the Right-wing "K.C.A.B." and the Left-wing "M.A.K.C.". The split was the result of the separation of Mr. R. Nikolaevsky's Socialist party from the Vlassovite "SBORN" led by Messrs. Krylov, Milovanov and Kruzhin. The Americans unwilling to show preference chose to withdraw their support from both. The N.T.S.-people at this point decided to play the German card.

The people of the N.T.S.—now saw the right moment to capture what remained of the K.C.A.B., and to transform it to their own domain. Very soon such old Russian emigre leaders as Messrs. A. F. Kerenskij, S. P. Melgunov, A. J. Mikhaylovskij and A. K. Kurganov had to yield under the pressure of the "dynamic policy" of the Fascist-trained N.T.S.-men. The N.T.S. delegated some of their ablest men to K.C.A.B. Very soon they became the real leaders of this "co-ordination", especially Messrs. V. D. Poremskij and R. Budanov. Together with Messrs. Artemov and Romanov they are the top inspirers and executors of "Plan P".

For the preservation of the Stalinist Empire

The political background of this "master-plan" is no less interesting. Western Europe in general, and Russian emigrés particularly, are under the firm impression that the U.S.A. are developing the "Adenauer-Germany" into their main political agent, and their first ally, or as the Russians used to say—their chief "armed hand" in Europe. The Russians are convinced that the U.S.A. will leave the actual lead, and the decisive word in Eastern European affairs to the Germans. In other words, after the downfall of bolshevism, Germany will have to settle "in peace and justice" all fundamental Eastern European problems. Such as the new arrangement of frontiers, the rebirth, the size, and the constitution of the post-bolshevik Eastern European states. The Russian emigrés anticipate that nothing in Eastern Europe would happen in the future without the consent and the participation of Germany. The U.S.A. allegedly are ready to pay these privileges to

Germany, as the price of their fidelity and alliance.

From this rises the concern of the Russian emigrés to secure the sympathies and support of the growing power of Western Germany at the proper time. Also the great psychological offensive directed towards Bonn and the leading circles of German society. The main idea, of course, is to put over the N.T.S. conception of the future construction of the post-bolshevik Eastern Europe to the Germans—and through them, to the Americans. The political and social contents of this idea are not very difficult to fathom. At the bottom of everything, lies the idea to preserve at any cost the existence of the Russian empire, if possible, within the boundaries as reached by Stalin. The N.T.S.-people are using the same string of phrases, such as the "self-determination of nations", "plebiscites", "free votes", etc., as the Bolsheviks. They fear most the emancipation movement of the satellite and non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. in their development towards the creation of their own sovereign national ethnographical states. They see the solution of the most vital nationalities problem of Eastern Europe in the same kind of "federations" and "confederations", as already achieved by the bolsheviks. Actually, those emigrés are, without exception, ardent nationalist and chauvinist Russians. Sworn to keep the preponderance and the dominance of the U.S.S.R. as the "master-nation". In other words the Muscovites, over all other non-Russian nations.

The traditions of German Russophily

The Russian emigrés, led and directed by the N.T.S., are trying to win over the Western German sympathies and understanding only for the idea of the unity and the indivisibility of the Russian empire. Their propaganda drive is helped enormously by deeply rooted political traditions of a very old pattern and historical practice with many Germans. Their main consideration is that as long as there existed two powerful empires, Germany and Russia, mutually keeping the peace, or alternatively, "as long as their backs were mutually secured" and the famous German "Drang nach Russland" was never strained, both empires had free hands for their mutual expansion: Russia towards the East, Germany towards the colonies and the West. This is the policy, the emigré Russians argue, which was successfully practised for centuries by Prussian Kings. This policy reached its peak at the unforgettable time of Bismarck. Russia and Germany could divide all the nations living inside the belt between the Baltic and Black Sea, between themselves. Hitler would never have been beaten had he kept his alliance with

A CONSISTENT ATTITUDE

A Press Conference of the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations (A.B.N.), was held on October 21st, 1953, in Bonn, Germany. Exactly one month before the tenth anniversary of the founding of this organization. As far as an explanation of the attitude of the suppressed nations towards the present political situation is concerned, it represented a valuable contribution.

The subjects dealt with at the Press Conference of the A.B.N. were three fundamental aspects of present-day politics.

1) The present situation behind the Iron Curtain,

2) Malenkov's policy and its motives,

3) The policy of the Western World, and suppressed nations.

The representatives of those suppressed nations that are members of the A.B.N. discussed the present situation behind the Iron Curtain, explaining the significance of the national fight for freedom and the relations between themselves and the Soviet regime and Russian imperialism. These relations which have resulted in considerable tension, have to some extent influenced the foreign policy of Soviet Union. "The foreign policy of Russia reflects to the highest degree the attitude of the nations that have been suppressed by Russia. As a result of the activity of the resistance and fight for freedom by the suppressed nations, the pressure exerted on Moscow's despotism

Stalin. Therefore, the N.T.S.-people argue, it is most essential for the reborn Germany to return to these old and glorious traditions. And they find many willing German ears.

Nothing can be won by that

It remains to be seen how friendly and seriously Western Germany will accept these Russian emigré political advances. The friendliness and readiness of many outstanding Western Germans to join the "Freiheitsbund", and to listen to the whispering and innuendos of N.T.S., portend ill for the nations occupied and oppressed by Russia. Apart from the powerful bolshevik infiltrations working inside N.T.S., as well as inside all other Russian political emigré organizations, it should not be forgotten that *all Russian* politics, bolshevik as well as emigrés, are always *imperialistic* and *chauvinistic Russian* politics. Lastly, nobody, as yet, prospered by an alliance with Russia however enticing. If observed carefully, one third of Germany is still occupied and kept firmly not by *bolsheviks* *prima facie*, but by the *Russian* imperialists. The liberty and unity of Germany will never come as a result of German alliances with Russian imperialism.

regime is being increased, and correspondingly the danger of Russian plans to conquer the world is thus automatically reduced. If the Western World supports the fight for freedom by the suppressed nations, then there would be much more chance of localizing a World-War, provoked by Russia".

After Stalin's death a struggle for power began in the Soviet system which resulted in Beria's fall. National differences came to the fore more than ever, and a serious economic crisis made it impossible for the Soviets to continue to carry on a large-scale cold war or resort to armed intervention. For these reasons Malenkov was obliged to use skilful and deceptive manoeuvres in order to safeguard the territories captured so far and suppress the individual nations even more. Added to this, there is the indefinable attitude of the Western World, which seeks to check Russian imperialism by means of guarantee treaties, security agreements, and "East Locarno". Such an attitude is advantageous for the Soviets, who are thus able to exploit the Western Nations' genuine desire for peace, for their own psychological offensive.

The Kremlin aims to discredit the Western World. In the eyes of the suppressed nations, by stressing their willingness to establish the status quo permanently by guaranteeing the present frontiers, and thereby crushing the hopes, and powers of resistance, of the suppressed nations, for the support of the Western World.

The Russians are not interested in reaching an understanding with the Western World. They want them to capitulate to their imperialist plans, and to acknowledge and sanction the conquest made so far by the Russians.

The Western Nations must continue to prepare themselves in order to defend their freedom, and not rely on an illusory permanent peace, by the grace of Moscow.

The Western World has failed to use to advantage the Soviets' inner political crisis and has, moreover, in no way supported the demands of the suppressed nations. This inner political crisis would have given the Western World opportunity to attack the Soviets and drive them into a corner.

The unsuccessful experiment with a new political course has in the meantime had serious effect on the psychological attitude of the suppressed nations. For instance, the announcement that the regime would in future become less rigid and that living conditions would improve was indirectly a serious admission by those in power in Soviet Russia. A decree

to this effect, for the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic indirectly revealed the terrible living conditions of the population. It also showed that their regime of terrorism is untenable, and, made the people of the suppressed nations become even more aware of their wretched living conditions.

Despite the fact that events in Eastern Germany on June 17th, 1953, and in other satellite states have led to further tension, and were clear proof of the ever-increasing anti-Communist movement, no way has been found to co-ordinate the policies of the Western Powers with those of the suppressed nations.

The events of June 17th in the Eastern Zone of Germany have shaken the Soviet regime to its very foundations. This mass revolt can undoubtedly be explained by the fact, that the eighteen million suppressed Germans in this zone, have always been given to understand that there could be no doubt about the question of their liberation and the reunion of Germany. These two issues are also the immediate aim of Western policy.

If the Western Powers were to declare such a firm and clear attitude towards our people as well, then a flare-up would be inevitable throughout the entire sphere under Soviet Power. Moscow's endeavours to uphold the status quo by non-aggression pacts and security guarantees is chiefly to prevent such a flare-up from occurring, and also to make the 180 million enslaved peoples resigned to their fate."

It is clear that there is a revival of the old Containment Policy in the West and it is to be feared that attempts may even be made to resort to the completely erroneous Appeasement Theory. This would only result in the further subjugation of the suppressed nations and the enslavement of other nations, which are at present endangered. Bearing in mind results of the last A.B.N. Press Conference, we are bound to arrive at one clear conclusion, which is, that this was a consistent attitude at the right time.

"UKRAINIAN OBSERVER"

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

published by

Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,

237, Liverpool Rd.,
London, N.1. Tel. NORTH 1828.

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN THE U.S.S.R.

The present agricultural situation in the U.S.S.R. can well be described as hopeless, inasmuch as Moscow has, to an ever-increasing degree exhausted the supplies of agricultural products, and is no longer in a position to provide its industries with larger quantities of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials. There are definite indications that Moscow has during the past two years, as a result of the serious crisis in agriculture in general, received less foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials than was previously the case. This, for instance, is indicated by the fact that all farmers under the collective system who up to June 15, 1953, possessed no cattle of their own, have been exempted from the usual compulsory delivery of meat. In addition all compulsory deliveries in arrears, of livestock and poultry products (meat, milk, eggs, etc.), for the past year have been cancelled. Khrushchov's statement to the effect that there has been a general decrease in the harvest and in the potato and vegetable crop is likewise clear proof of an agricultural crisis.

The decisions of the Central Committee of the Party (September 7, 1953) in this respect are, however, of a purely administrative nature. The increase of production in agriculture which they aim to achieve is made to depend entirely on the increase in number and strength of the administrative authorities and the pressure they exert on the agrarian population. There is no mention whatsoever in these decisions of any economically independent activity on the part of the farmers under the collective system. The entire system of decisive measures is based solely on the administrative activity of the Soviet and Party authorities and on the technique of their executive powers. These measures reveal Khrushchov's principles, who, as is well-known, already advocated the idea of drawing up agriculture on a factory basis in former times.

By adopting the above-mentioned measures it is planned to increase the livestock in 1954 (in million heads) as follows:

	1953	1954
Cattle:	56.6	65.9
of these, cows: ..	24.3	29.2
Hogs:	28.5	34.5
Sheep and goats: ...	109.9	144.4

In a corresponding manner the "supplies" (that is to say, deliveries) of livestock for the year 1954 are also to be in-

creased, namely, as compared to 1952, 1.1 million tons more of meat, 4.3 million tons more of milk, 1.7 billion more eggs, and 48,000 tons more of wool.

Fundamentally, as Khrushchov, too, has pointed out, the increase of "collective" livestock is the chief means of solving the livestock problem. On the other hand, however, the Central Committee of the local Party, Soviet and Agrarian Organization decrees "that the harmful practice of restricting the interest of the Kolkhoz farmers in the livestock in their personal possession should be brought to an end; and that the fact should be taken into consideration that the presence of a certain number of prolific cattle in the personal possession of a collective farm is an important prerequisite, both for the material prosperity of the farming class, as well as for an increase in the supplies of livestock products in our country". In order to avoid any impression being gained that this is a "new economic policy" Khrushchov has said that, "The presence of a certain number of prolific cattle, as determined by the collective system statute, in the personal possession of a collective farm in no way represents a danger to the socialist order of society. Furthermore, it is time the biased idea were overcome, that it is not fitting for a worker or an employee to possess cattle of his own."

The above-mentioned resolutions also decree that certain measures should be introduced in order to increase the acreage of arable land, also the yield of the cereal, potato and vegetable crops. The main factor, however, is the obligation of the competent Ministries and the Executive Committees of the various districts to transfer thousands of agriculturists and veterinary experts from Soviet Party departments to the collective farms. All tractor drivers, teamsters, and other farming technicians, who have taken up employment in industrial concerns, are likewise "advised" to return to the machine and tractor plants in the rural areas. Two hundred and fifty factory and vocational training schools are to be turned into training centres for agrarian mechanics, and in the course of the next three years a further three hundred training centres of this type are to be founded. Party control of agriculture

MOSCOW'S EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Since the death of Stalin, one can rightly maintain that there has been no change whatsoever in the educational policy of the U.S.S.R. as far as its non-Russian nations are concerned. It is possible that Beria, before his downfall, might have had the intention, for certain tactical reasons, to reduce inner national tension and, above all, Russian pressure and influence in the various national territories and republics, but we have no actual proof. In any case, his closest supporters, whom he entrusted with certain key-positions in the above-mentioned territories, found no time to introduce any positive and concrete measures. It is of no little significance that the Soviet press, during the months of May to July 1953, played down the glorification of the "elder brother" as it has been supplanted by a new terminology.

The true character of the Bolshevik "educational policy" in all the national republics is revealed in the statistics of the State Budget of the Supreme Council of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Ukraine for the year 1953 (!), as announced on September 10, 1953. According to these statistics, the Soviet Socialist Republic of Ukraine has a population which is 25% of the total population of the Soviet Union. But it is to receive only 12.3% of the total money to be provided for Social and Cultural measures under the Union Budget (16,072 million roubles of a total sum of 129,762.4 million roubles). In view of the number of its population this is less than half of what it would be entitled to receive, in spite of the fact that the Soviet Socialist Republic of Ukraine enjoys the prestige of ranking second in the entire Soviet Union as regards its culture.

What is the explanation for such an allocation of funds in the Union Budget? The main reason is that in the entire sphere of culture, Moscow controls all the key-positions in the most important political and economic colleges and research institutes. They are financed and administered directly by the Kremlin and are therefore in no way controlled by the Ukrainian Soviet Government. It is obvious that such measures enable the Russians to extend their influence as far as possible.

As in Stalin's time, only the most primitive ethnographical forms of national culture are permitted in all the National Republics and Territories. Where they are permitted they are only inadequately fostered under the strict control of the State Police and Party. In this way every non-Russian is rapidly persuaded that

Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn

The Humane Sciences in the Post-War Soviet Ukraine

III. Linguistics

The systematic extermination of philology and philologists in the Soviet Socialist Republic of the Ukraine, which lasted for twelve years (1926-1938), had such far-reaching consequences that even today there is still little indication of any adequate scientific activity in this sphere. It brought the rapid and excellent development, during the twenties, of Ukrainian philology which had been determined by national and cultural factors, to a tragic end. Even now the "Party and Government" are only interested in the revival of such an activity, to a very limited degree. It is Moscow's policy as regards the Ukraine to extend Russian influence, and to endeavour to force its national language and culture down to the level of a Regional "folklore". This will serve as a kind of national foil to "all-Russian" imperial "Soviet culture", Ukrainian philology is a thorn in the flesh, as of all the "Humane Sciences" it is the one which is regarded politically as the most dangerous and is rigidly controlled. Its official existence is only permitted on conditions that it confines itself strictly to the rules as laid down by Soviet policy, which is to extend Russian influence. Also no attempt is to be made to overstep the instructions it receives, in connection with scientific theories or the limitations of concrete research subjects. The Ministry for Education in the Soviet Socialist Republic of the Ukraine is not even officially allowed to busy itself with such questions, needless to say.

The Years of the War

It is true that Russian pressure and national suppression abated slightly in the Soviet Ukraine at the end of 1939 because of the national attitude of the West Ukrainian territories which had recently been incorporated in the Soviet Union and had previously been occupied by Poland and Roumania. It is equally true that this relaxation of pressure during the war years and at the beginning of the post-war period, until the Spring of 1947, was noticeably stressed for obvious national and political motives. A fact, which to a limited degree, proved advantageous

his own national culture is extremely primitive and provincial, as compared to that of Soviet Russia.

As a symbol, they have built the magnificent new Moscow University, to assert that they have the exclusive authority on higher culture, throughout the entire U.S.S.R.

for Ukrainian literature and the science of literature. But all this did little to foster Ukrainian philology. As a result of the ruthless terrorism of the infamous N.K.V.D. leader, N. Yezhov, philology experts became so rare that by 1939 there were only very few in the Soviet Ukraine. They naturally did not trust this temporary trend of liberal educational policy, and refrained from achieving more in a scientific sphere than was demanded by the Government, which might have proved dangerous. Actually most of them, like the majority of philologists in the West Ukrainian territories, preferred to seize the opportunity to enjoy personal and scientific freedom offered them during the final years of the war, and joined the National and Political Ukrainian movement of emigration. With reference to the so-called "younger generation of scholars", the majority of these are not even of Ukrainian birth, but have been promoted to scientific positions, because of their Party ambitions. Most of them are Soviet Russians who know only the Ukraine. They have managed to carve quite a profitable career for themselves, by constantly seeking to suppress alleged "manifestations of bourgeois nationalism" in Ukrainian philology. It is obvious that these professional informers are often at loggerheads with each other, owing to their rivalry and over-zealousness.

Stalin versus Marr

Under such circumstances it is hardly surprising that the booklet entitled "Marxism and Philological Problems", which was published under Stalin's name in the summer of 1950, brought about no vital changes whatsoever in the Ukraine, in spite of the very considerable and obligatory homage paid to the booklet and its alleged author by philologists. It abruptly eliminated the hitherto predominating influence in Soviet learning, of the notorious "Japhetic theory" of the Russian scholar, Nikolay Marr, who died fifteen years ago. Although the application of Marr's "Japhetic theory" was compulsory for all Soviet philologists, including even the most unpretentious teacher of grammar or foreign languages, it was never really used in academic circles in the Ukraine. This doctrine which is mostly "pan-Caucasian" with its fantastic, farcical and erroneous assertions was, incidentally, accepted for a time by Soviet Russian educational policy, as a useful substitute for the non-existent Marxist-

Leninist theory of grammar, which could not even be constructed. In the Ukraine, however, the question at issue was not Marxism or Leninism but a *national struggle*. Particularly as far as Human Sciences were concerned and the Soviet police measures and terrorism adopted to suppress them. For this reason Ukrainian philologists were not dismissed from their positions because they rejected the Japhetic theory, as was sometimes the case actually in Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, but they were put into Siberian concentration camps or executed on the political pretext that they were, allegedly, members of the Ukrainian movement of "bourgeois nationalism". Marr's "Japhetic theory" was used by Bolsheviks mostly as a camouflage for their policy of extending Russian influence, particularly, as far as the Caucasian and Turkish peoples were concerned. In the Ukraine, on the other hand from the middle twenties onwards, measures were not even camouflaged for the extermination of Ukrainian national culture and learning. The question as to whether Marr was a theoretical "fellow-traveller" of Marxism and Leninism or a philological maniac was of little significance for Ukrainian learning and its suppression. By the abolition of the "Japhetic theory", many nonsensical ideas with regard to the original and peculiar principles of this theory, were eliminated. Marr, not only maintained that all languages in the world had a common origin, but also that they were, in essence, identical, and that all words were derived from four original syllables, namely "sar", "ber", "yon", "rosh". Marr claimed to have "discovered" this from the Caucasian languages and affirmed that they were the original names of Caucasian tribes! According to Marr's theories, which, had no scientific basis, the Caucasian languages were therefore a very special "original" formation of human speech. This was the reason why every word spoken anywhere in the world, could be found in Caucasia. His etymological theories can best be illustrated by an example: the Ukrainian (and Russian) word, *balyk* (cured sturgeon,—obviously borrowed from the Turkic-Tartarian) is supposed to be exactly the same as the word, *ryba*, (fish) found in all Slav languages; according to Marr, inversion of the syllables has taken place, *r* has become *l* according to etymological rules, and the final *k* is "an ancient Japhetic (that is to say Caucasian) plural form"!

The fact that Soviet language-teachers are no longer officially compelled to apply such nonsensical theories can be regarded as a certain progress in the field of learning, and will also be advantageous in the study of languages, both in Soviet Ukra-

ine and throughout the entire Soviet Union. Moreover, it is gratifying to know that the grammar of Slav languages has been taught since 1950 under its own traditional name and not in some camouflaged form, although as far as we know, *L. Bulakhovsky* is now the only Slav language expert left in the Soviet Ukraine. The publication of the booklet against Marr, however, had another and much greater significance for Ukrainian philology.

Actual consequences

In order to extend Russian influence, return to the police methods of the thirties are now based on "ideological" permission from the highest authority (a permission which is hardly necessary, as the ruthless terrorism of the thirties proved). Practically all the reports we hear from the other side of the Iron Curtain, regarding philological activity in the Soviet Union, correspond exactly to conditions in the thirties. Public denunciation and the removal of political suspects are conducted with the same monotony and regularity as twenty years ago, as is noticed by the stereotyped nature of the accusations. Whether it is the leading article in the "Radyanska Ukraina" of June 29, 1952 which attacks the Philological Faculty of Kyiv University, or the article by *I. Hreysiutenko* in the same paper of February 13, 1953, or the annual report of the Institute of Philology of the Academy of Science of the U.S.S.R. (published in the journal, "Voprosy yazykoznavaniya", 1952, No. 4)—the accusations always deal with the same subject. Namely, "not enough antagonism and opposition to lapses into Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism"; not enough emphasis on the close ties and historical affinity between the Ukrainian and Russian languages"; "disregard of the beneficial cultural and linguistic influence of the mighty Russian nation on the Ukrainian people". The accusations are all concerned with the alleged slowing up of the process of extending Russian influence, a process which must be speeded up at all costs. These stereotyped accusations must not be taken too seriously. We do not know of course whether they refer to actual cases of passive resistance or not. It is quite possible that they do not and are all untrue. These accusations will be repeated regularly, and irrespective of the actual situation, as long as the Ukraine is occupied by the Russians and a policy to extend Russian influence is pursued. For the simple reason that they are preventive measures, and the Soviets' urge to extend Russian influence is unlimited, and they will never be satisfied with the situation, whatever it may be.

For this reason new Ukrainian and Russian-Ukrainian dictionaries are now

JOURNEY FOR OUR TIMES

The Journals of the Marquis de Custine

Edited and translated by *Phyllis Penn Kohler*.

Introduction by Lieut.-General *Walter Bedell Smith*.

Arthur Barker, Ltd., London, 1953, 240 pp.

Actually, it is not to be wondered that an American Ambassador in Moscow between 1946 and 1949, after reading the famous book of a French aristocrat and traveller, which described Russia as it appeared in the year 1839, declared the description to be very accurate and appropriate to the present conditions of the Russian Empire. A century ago very little was known in Western Europe and America of the "empire of two continents", and people nowadays think that they know something definite about it,—taking mis-statements for actual fact. The Tsars' and the Soviet Government, the revolutionaries, and those emigrés who have fled before the Revolution, have often attacked each other in their propaganda, yet their "all-Russian" imperialism is common and much more in evidence than their social and political diversities of opinion. It follows therefore that, after about a century of this mendacious propaganda, West-Europeans and Americans suddenly feel compelled to "discover" Russia once more. The fact, however, that they are not past such things as this essay, which, although decidedly intellectual and conscientious, is fundamentally very old fashioned, is rather shameful.

The aristocratic globetrotter of 1839 admits: "I went to Russia in search of arguments against representative government. I returned from Russia a partisan of constitutions". He spent only *three*

being hastily compiled, as those which appeared during the early post-war years, obviously cannot keep pace with the speed and extend to which Russian influence is being extended. It is hardly necessary to comment on the fact that all research projects of the Ukrainian Institute for Philology are censored (quite officially) by the appropriate Russian Institute in Moscow.

The only hopeful sign is a certain revival in the sphere of dialect research. As the authorities in Moscow are compiling a large-scale atlas, showing the different Russian dialects, it is now planned to compile a corresponding one in Kyiv on the same lines as the Russian one and according to instructions from Moscow. Whether this work will ever materialize is another matter!

months in Russia, almost exclusively in St. Petersburg and Moscow.

Admittedly, the Marquis de Custine was an extraordinarily clear-sighted psychologist and observer of human nature, and an intelligent political thinker, which is shown by his gloomy misgivings concerning future Russian invasions of Europe.

"When our cosmopolitan democracy, bearing its last fruits, will have made war universally odious; when the so-called, nations the most civilized on earth, will have succeeded in enervating themselves by their political debauches and step by step will have fallen into slumber within their own boundaries and into contempt for the outside world—all alliance being recognized as impossible with these societies, senseless in egoism—the floodgates of the North will again be raised upon us. Then we will undergo a last invasion, no longer of ignorant barbarians but of masters—cunning and canny, more canny than we for they will have learned from our own excesses how one can and should govern us".

Also he has given a striking characterisation of Russian political methods, when one considers present-day conditions.

"Russia sees Europe as a prey, which will sooner or later deliver itself up to her by our dissensions. She fomented anarchy amongst us, in the hope of profiting by the corruption she has promoted".

Had de Custine not wasted so much time on publicism, belles-letters and essays, he might have become a sociologist of the same standing as Alexis de Tocqueville or Ernest Renan. For instance, the following brilliant utterance is an example. "In France, revolutionary tyranny is an evil of transition; in Russia, the Tyranny of despotism is a permanent revolution".

At the same time, it cannot be denied that de Custine was actually astonishingly ill-informed concerning the social and national problems of the Russian Empire. Russian history, he only knew from fragments of Karamin's pompous historical work and from court gossip. It is no wonder therefore, that he remarks rather opportunely, concerning the Russian social order. "The merchants, who would form a middle class, are so few in number that they cannot count in the State; furthermore, nearly all of them are foreigners" (a true tourist's mistake). With regard to the nationality problem, he misses the mark altogether. He knows,

it is true, that there are some Finnish and Turkish people in the Russian Empire and has naturally heard something of the Cossacks on the Don and in the Urals, but nothing of the Ukrainians. (To the old Kyiv grand-ducal state he acknowledges a certain refinement of taste and "love of the arts"—"due to the relations maintained by the rulers of Kyiv with Constantinople"—that is until the Mongol invasion). Nevertheless, he only speaks of the Russians ("the Russian nation") and therefore believes—like most of the American diplomats and publicists of today—that one can reduce all the nations in the Russian prison of nations to a common denominator. Furthermore, incredibly, from time to time he actually identifies the "Russians" with the "Slavs"! Although he knows the Poles and shows great sympathy for them, apparently he does not consider them to be Slavs, but "Sarmatians", or something similar.

He should have allowed himself to believe what is supposed to have been said to him quite openly in front of two witnesses by Tsar Nikolas I.: "Submission, in Russia makes you think there is uniformity; don't believe it. Nowhere is there a country in which there is such diversity of races, customs, religion, or mentality as in Russia. The differences are basic; the uniformity superficial, and unity is only apparent".

De Custine, however, believed another very important utterance of the Tsar: "Despotism still exists in Russia, since it is the essence of my government; but it is in keeping with the character of the nation".—De Custine's present American translators and commentators think, on the other hand, that they know the "character of the Russian nation" better. They prate continually of a would-be "development of a Russian nation that will play a constructive rather than a destructive rôle", and that "the change must come primarily through the efforts of the Russian people themselves, when their eyes have been opened and they demand their heritage—the right to live as a free people" (from the "introduction" by the former American Ambassador in Moscow, Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith). When one is determined, to preserve these illusions, in spite of everything, one is lagging more than a century behind the sharp-witted Marquis, who considered a political and social revolution within the Russian Empire as possible, but not any changes in the basically hostile attitude of the Russian (i. e. Muscovite) nation towards the West. We can now see that he was completely right. But whoever is unwilling to contemplate reality with his own eyes and without prejudice—the shrewd warnings of the past are not of the slightest use.

V. D.

Two Brilliant Ukrainian Dates

THE SEVENTH CENTENARY OF THE CORONATION OF KING
DANYLO ROMANOVYCH AND THE FOUNDATION
OF THE CITY OF LVIV

Two very important national and historical anniversaries are celebrated by the Ukrainian community in the free world in December 1953. The first is the Seventh Centenary of the crowning of the Ruthenian Prince *Danylo Romanovych* as King of the State of Galicia-Volhynia. The second is also the Seventh Centenary of the foundation of Lviv, the large Galician town, by Crown Prince Lev Danylovych son of King Danylo. *Lviv*, in Latin medieval chronicles was known as *Leopol*, in German times as *Lemberg*, and later became the capital of Galicia-Volhynia.

The Ukrainians have special reasons to commemorate both dates solemnly. These are proud dates of national prominence. Both events occurred in times of deep national distress and show the invincibility and indestructibility of the Christian and Western spirit of Ukraine.

The present time for Ukraine is in many respects similar to those far off days. As an example of the way in which King Danylo Romanovych, and later his son, saved the very essence of their people from the ordeals of those days, so now the present-day Ukrainians are able to hope, with confidence, to overcome their own sore trials.

Seven hundred years ago King Danylo Romanovych lived in the times when the Mongolian hordes had overrun the principalities of ancient Russ, known in Western history as the medieval *Kievan Empire*. The term "Russ" is not identical with that what is understood by "Russia" today; "Russ" covered practically the territory of the present Ukraine. In the years 1240-41 the Kievan Empire fell under the terrible blows of the Mongolian "Golden Horde", led by the famous *Khan Batu*, the grandson of *Dshengis-Khan*. Kyiv the beautiful capital amongst many other ancient Ukrainian towns and principalities were sacked and left in ruins. The Mongolian, or more accurately, the Tartar invasion became a veritable "Scourge of God", as in the shortest possible time the whole nation was almost exterminated. Seven centuries later this invasion is repeated—this time by the Bolshevik scourge.

Only the principalities of *Galicia/Volhynia* managed somehow to avoid the Tartar occupation. The outstanding achievement of Prince Danylo Romanovych, was his uniting these principalities into one well organized, disciplined and strongly armed state, by his ability, his never tiring energy and his assiduous work. His task was not easy, as he had to overcome innumerable dy-

nastic difficulties. There were never ceasing family and court intrigues, combined with the claims and demands of many princely competitors and pretenders, coming from inside as well as from abroad.

He faced the ever looming Mongolian danger in the East almost alone. His country stood on solitary guard at the "Iron Curtain" of those times, receiving no help or assistance from the Western Powers.

Only *Pope Innocent IV* understood the impending danger. Twice, the Pope offered him the crown, and elevation of his state to a Kingdom, to bolster up the position of the valiant prince. On the first occasion, in 1249, when under the terrible pressure of the Tartars, Prince Danylo refused, by answering the Pope—"Give me, together with the crown, the substantial help of the Western Christian Nations". On the second occasion, in 1253, the Pope promised a crusade—which Prince Danylo accepted. But no Western help came. All appeals and demands of the Pope to the Western World proved to be of no avail. In spite of this King Danylo defended his territory. In two wars he repulsed the repeated assaults of the Mongolian forces led by the Tartar Commanders *Kuremsa* and *Burun day*, as best he could. Even in those days, the Ukrainians bled themselves to death and utter ruin opposing the assaults of Eastern Barbary, whilst the protected Western Nations had time and leisure to build up their cultures and prosperity. This ancient history repeats itself in our own times. The Western Nations again underestimate the power and merits of the continued resistance which the Eastern European Nations, and primarily Ukraine, are putting up against the pressure of Bolshevism and Russian imperialism.

The main accomplishment of King Danylo, in the history of Ukraine, is his preservation intact of the Kingdom of Galicia-Volhynia. He created, as it were, a sort of an asylum, or reservation, where the substance of Ukrainian political and cultural life was spared and protected. From here, the Ukrainian national rebirth could make a new start after the Tartar menace was slowly abating. This rebirth was helped enormously by King Danylo in the foundation of Lviv. This has always been the most Western town of Ukraine, and from where the influence of the West has emanated. Since its foundation, the city has been under many foreign rulers, namely Poles, Austrians, Russians, and now Bolsheviks. But fun-

Ukraine behind the Iron Curtain

A Republican Exhibition of the Free Artistic Professions is to be held in Kyiv in December. Similar exhibitions are to be held in the districts of Chernyiv, Drohobych, and Rivno during the next few months. At present there are more than 90,000 amateur artistic companies in the Ukraine. They have been entrusted chiefly with the task of performing Russian operas and plays.

At present there are more than 600 choirs, ballets, orchestras, and other artists' societies in Kyiv.

The Opera Ballet Theatre in Kyiv opened the season in October with a new version of the opera, "Bohdan Khmelnytsky". This opera has often been criticized by the official Soviet Press as a work with "bourgeois and nationalist tendencies". On this occasion the Moscow newspaper, "Izvestia", on October 21, 1953, reported that, "The populace of Kyiv hailed the performance of this opera very warmly, as it reveals famous aspects of Ukrainian history and also depicts the fight against foreign conquerors in order to bring about a union between brothers,—namely with the mighty Russian nation". (!) Other plays by Soviet Russian authors will also be performed in the course of the season.

In order to prepare the Ukrainian population for the October festival, more than two and a half times the normal amount of meat and butter have been supplied recently to villages in the Ukraine. In addition, oil and sugar supplies have been increased by fifty per cent and the supplies of herrings by sixty-eight per cent.

Various supplies of fish products have been allocated to the markets in Kyiv, Kharkiv, Stalino, and Dnepropetrovsk. The Soviet Press also states that allocations of many other everyday commodities will be issued. The price of meat in the markets at Kyiv, Lviv, and Odessa is said to have dropped by four to six roubles. Meat prices must be extremely high to account for this large drop.

Many new buildings are reported to have been erected in Dnepropetrovsk recently. Amongst them are 10 High Schools, 125 other schools, 23 cultural buildings and clubs, 3 theatres, and 200 shops.

There is a shortage of books at the Higher Agricultural Training Centres. Owing to the Socialist reconstruction of agriculture all economic and technical problems and organization have been solved, by the "ingenious" pocket-solution theories of Marx and Stalin, which very often are in direct contrast to the laws of Nature. In an article entitled "The Immediate Task of Training Centres", in "Pravda" dated October 6, 1953, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the U.S.S.R. sums up all these defects as follows: "It is an untenable state of affairs that in certain important fields of learning there is a complete lack of books and instructive material. So far there are no books of instruction on the cultivation of land, the

organization of Socialist agrarian concerns, and other similar subjects..."

"The combination of common and private interests in the Kolchosos.

In our comments on the subject of an increase in agricultural production we have often stressed the fact that very little attention is given to the Kolchos farmers, who are responsible for this production. A lengthy article was published on October 5th, 1953 in "Pravda" on the subject of the combination of interests, in which it was affirmed that "as a result of the lying assertions spread by bourgeois ideologists to the effect that the working classes are being exploited, the impression might be gained that such things really could happen in the land of Socialism".

A true impression of the prevailing conditions can best be gained from official statements made during recent Party conferences, and from the speeches of Khrushchov, Kyrychenko, and other Soviet Party leaders.

For the 8th session of the General Assembly of the U. N. the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has composed the following delegation: the Foreign Secretary of the Ukrainian S.S.R., A. M. Baranovskiy, and the members of the delegation—L. F. Palamarchuk, P. W. Klyuen, E.W. Chochol, and I. S. Shokalo.

In the latest resolution of the C.P.S.U. in connection with the "new agrarian policy", it was stated that the tractor-drivers and other technical workers were to be guaranteed their bread-ration from national stocks. From this it may be seen that even the skilled workers in the kolkhozes, who have always held a privileged position there, are not sufficiently sure of their bread ration. The starvation norm of kolkhoz workers is leading to depopulation of the villages, which is even admitted by the Soviet press. The leader of the "Radyanska Ukraina" of Sept. 25th made the following statements: "There are difficulties among the kolkhoze-cadre in various districts. These difficulties are the result of the serious losses which we suffered in the war. In the post-war period, a great number of the most well-trained and—educated kolkhoze farmers are going to work in industry".

In the Ukrainian S.S.R., at the present moment are 19 agricultural colleges, which are attended by 22,000 students. Beside this, 3,000 people take part in various courses. This year, the colleges in the districts of Kharkiv, Lviv and Odessa accepted 5,000 new students.

On Oct. 1st, the new academical year began in the art colleges and academies in Kyiv and Kharkiv. The schools of these two cities produce every year more than a hundred highly-qualified specialists—further artists such as painters, sculptors, architects, scenery-painters and pencil-artists.

famed University and Academy of Arts, together with its theatres and entertainments. The heraldic lion that watches over the city, bears on his shield the motto, "LEOPOLIS SEMPER FIDELIS". This means that the city is always true to its basic principles, of the *Christian faith* and Western culture, conceived at its creation. This spiritual heritage of its founders, the Ukrainian Kings, Danylo and Lev, will always be faithfully kept by this city.

AN AMERICAN WOMAN IN UKRAINE

The statements made by representatives of the Movement for a Free Ukraine with regard to national difference and the suppression of these in the territories of the present U.S.S.R., have always been received in the West with a certain amount of cool reserve and, indeed, sometimes even with open hostility. This attitude was based on the theory that all the nations of the U.S.S.R. have to submit to the same suppression and suffer in the same manner under the Communist regime. The prerequisite for such reasoning, in addition to many other factors, as for instance Russian infiltration into American high schools and political institutions, was the well-trying, and to a considerable extent positive principle of democracy, which fundamentally rejects the idea of discrimination of whole nations or men. Russian unperialists, by resorting to every form of hypocrisy and cunning imagination, used this principle in order to cover up their imperialist aspirations to power.

Furthermore, this attitude on the part of the Western World was encouraged by several people who visited Russia and became the victims of optical illusions. From time to time, however, there have been people in the Western World who clearly realized the true state of affairs in the Soviet Empire and discovered its obvious faults. Undoubtedly, *Perle Mesta*, the former American Minister to Luxembourg, who recently undertook a trip to the U.S.S.R., is one of them. Upon her return from the Soviet paradise she published her impressions gained during her trip, in a series of articles in the "New York Herald Tribune" under the title of "Perle Mesta in Russia". In the fifth of these articles, which appeared on September 19th, she described in particular, her stay in Kyiv and Kharkiv in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The subtitle of her article, "Ukrainians Resent Being Taken for Russians But Prove to Be More Friendly and Talkative", is a clear indication of the general attitude of the Ukrainian population.

"In Kharkiv and later in Kyiv, two metropolitan centres of the Ukraine, I learnt that there is no greater offence than to mistake an Ukrainian for a Russian. They reacted as if I had slapped them in the face and replied angrily: 'Russian? Russian? No! No! Ukrainian! Ukrainian!'"

Pursuing the objective remarks of this American writer, who, incidentally, reveals considerable powers of perception, we are not surprised to read sentences such as the following which deal with matters of a fundamental nature.

"I knew Ukrainians cherished their own nationality, but I did not realise they

damentally it has always remained Ukrainian. It was always very conscious and proud of its "royal association" and historical traditions. After the downfall of the Austrian Empire, which had ruled over Galicia, quite naturally Lviv was ready to proclaim instantaneously on November 1, 1918, the rebirth of the Ukrainian State and Government. Lviv, today is a city of some 500,000 inhabitants, and has diligently created, in the course of the past centuries, its trades and industries, cultural and scientific institutions, its

would consider it an insult to be taken for Russian—as if that were the last thing they would care to be mistaken for. Their reaction sheds some light on why the Kremlin continues to be troubled about the Ukraine, the second-largest republic in the Soviet Union, and the source of much of its food, coal and iron ore”.

From conversations with various Ukrainians, Perle Mesta reports that it is obvious that the latter unanimously expressed their anti-Communist and anti-Russian attitude. All of them—a taxi-driver who gave her information, a cinema-goer during an anti-American film, a woman who happened to be sitting on a bench in a park, to mention only a few she conversed with, in some way or other expressed their attitude in this respect. The taxi-driver in Kharkiv, for instance, talked to her quite candidly and voiced his criticism of the regime.

In her article, Perle Mesta states that it was with considerable surprise that she never found a Russian who would tell her the population of Moscow, as if this was a deep, military secret, but her Ukrainian driver replied without hesitation, “We have about 1,000,000 people in Kharkiv—roughly one-third Russians, one-third Ukrainians and one-third Jews.” She then goes on to relate an experience she had in a cinema. “I was terrified by what happened a few hours later, while sitting in a movie theatre, after dinner. The film introduced a scene about ‘The Voice of America’, and went into a vicious attack on the United States. An Ukrainian man, having heard me speaking English, kept leaning over to say; ‘Lies! All lies!’”

She was no less surprised to observe the Russians, travelling first-class, to stress their role as rulers of the Ukraine.

Of all the town and cities in the U.S.S.R. that she visited, this American woman diplomat was undoubtedly most impressed by Kyiv, the capital of the Ukraine, which she liked best. “The people of Kyiv, as a whole, were as cordial as those I had met in Kharkiv, and their city was even more beautiful—the most impressive city I visited in the Soviet Union. They seemed particularly pleased when they discovered I was an American—one of the first they had seen since Moscow lifted its ban prohibiting foreigners from travelling to Kyiv, the capital of an ostensibly independent country and a member of the United Nations”.

American Russophil political leaders are particularly recommended to read this objective and candid report of her journey to Russia, which Perle Mesta has written with a sincere warmth of feeling. They will gain the necessary knowledge of conditions and a better insight into the Ukraine and U.S.S.R. in general.

THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN THE U.S.S.R.

Continued from Page 7

rests with the District Executive Committees. It is the duty of the Regional Executive Committees of the Party “to transfer the most efficient Party functionaries of the Regional, District and Republic organizations to the rural areas”. Khrushchov, incidentally, mentioned the mobilization of fifty thousand Party functionaries.

Stalin's successors are thus availing themselves of the Stalin system of supplying the Moscow “proletariat” with foodstuffs, but the economic sources of agriculture of the country have been exhausted to the utmost. From the economic point of view the farmers, under the collective system, can hardly be counted upon as being in a position to supply more products. The fact that they have been exempted from making the usual compulsory deliveries, proves that they have descended to such a level of poverty that all attempts to restrict their activity or to exert pressure on them are no longer of any avail.

Khrushchov has been entrusted, with the aid of the Stalin system of the Party and the collective economy measures, with the vitally important task of supplying the Moscow “proletariat” with foodstuffs and the Soviet industries with agricultural raw materials. Apparently Khrushchov is keeping unerringly to the “Stalin course”, in its most orthodox and primitive methods. Under Stalin's rule practically all personal possession of cattle by the farmers under the collective system was abolished. They were deprived of holdings and vegetable plots belonging to the farms, and in many cases farm-buildings were pulled down. All these measures considerably restricted the activity and undermined the vitality of the rural population. This is the sorry state of affairs which confronts Stalin's successors. In view of this situation it is highly probable that within the next two or three years, they will be forced to admit their final defeat. This will no doubt be their last attempt to bring a “radical improvement in the economic status of the working-classes” (as they call it) according to Stalin's methods.

“National Problems in the U.S.S.R.”

by Oleh R. Martovych

Author of “Ukrainian Liberation Movement”

with

Ethnographical Map of the Soviet Union

by Dr. Mykola Kulyckyj

Co-Author of “Atlas of Ukraine”

Introduction by John F. Stewart

Foreword by

Maj.-General J. F. C. Fuller, C.B., C.B.E., D.S.O.

Price: Great Britain — 5/-

U.S.A. and Canada — \$ 1.25

In other countries at price to correspond.

Orders to be sent to:

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION SERVICE,
28, Minster Road,
London, N.W. 2.



DAS UKRAINISCHE LWIV

Illustrated Publication (in German)
describing the beauty of the Capital of
Western Ukraine

THE CITY OF LVIV

Price: \$ 2.

Orders to be sent to:

Verlag Ukraine,
München, Rumsfordstr. 19,
Germany.



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 1—2

LONDON, JANUARY—FEBRUARY 1953

Price 1 sh

THE RIGHT OF UKRAINE TO INDEPENDENCE

LEADING THOUGHTS OF THE ENCYCLIC BY POPE PIUS XII.

On 30th Dec. 1952 the Pope Pius XII published an Encyclic to the Clergy of Oriental Churches, in which he stressed religious persecution behind the Iron Curtain, and most of all—sufferings of the Church in the Ukraine.

As French Press and Radio point out (the Commentator of 'Radio Paris', during his 10 minutes review of the Pope's message on 2nd Jan. 1953 drew attention to the references to the Ukraine in the Encyclic), it is the first time the Pope had in a solemn address defined in such detail the position of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

The Encyclic, addressed to Catholic Bishops of Eastern Rite, refers to the problems of the Catholic Church in the Ukraine, Bulgaria and Rumania. The basic part of this document, according to French Press, is devoted to the analysis of the situation in the Ukraine. Talking about 6 millions of Ukrainian Catholics of Peremyshl, Stanyslaviv, Uzhhorod and in the archdiocese of Lviv the Pope describes their fate under Soviet occupation. Ukrainian nation was first to become a martyr for the sake of her faith. The trial of Ukrainian bishops in Kiev resulted in their condemnation; the Bishops of Peremyshl and Stanyslaviv died in prison; the bishop of Uzhhorod was murdered. The Archbishop-Metropolitan of Lviv condemned in 1945 to 8 years imprisonment, serves in a hard labour camp. In 1953 the termin of his imprisonment comes to end. 3,000 Catholic priests are deported or deprived of all rights. Almost all of them were replaced by the emisaries of Moscow.

In the Encyclic the Ukrainians are treated as a separate national community with a marked spiritual distinction, which has claim to the same rights, as other nations.

Continued on Page 16

FULL INDEPENDENCE ONLY

UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PARTIES REFUSE TO JOIN THE CO-ORDINATING CENTER OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA AND DEMAND THOROUGH SEPARATION FROM RUSSIANS

THE TASK OF U.C.C.A. IN EUROPE

In the middle of December 1952, a Delegation of the "Ukrainian Congress Committee of America" (U.C.C.A.) arrived in Europe for a series of conferences with Ukrainian political emigree groups. The aim of the Delegation was to convince Ukrainian political organizations in Europe of the advisability of Ukrainian participation in the "Co-ordinating Center of Anti-bolshevik Campaign" (C.C.A.S.) in Munich, sponsored by the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" (ACLPR).

In the course of almost four weeks, the Delegation of U.C.C.A. visited successively the Ukrainian political centres in Germany (Munich), Italy, Spain, France, and Great Britain. The main talks, however, were held in Munich where the leaderships, Central Committees and Executives of the decisive Ukrainian emigree political organisations and parties reside. The essential public meetings took place in Munich on 19, 20 and 22nd of December, all being also attended by the representatives of the free Ukrainian press and prominent Ukrainian individuals.

The "Ukrainian Congress Committee of America" is a super-structure uniting far above sixty social, cultural, charitable, political etc. organizations of Americans of Ukrainian descent, practically the U.C.C.A. represents the whole bulk of the old as well as the new Ukrainian emigration in the USA.

The American conferees were: 1. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Associate Professor of Economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and the President of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America; 2. Mr. Dmytro Halychyn, Executive Vice-President of the U.C.C.A. and President of the Ukrainian National Association; 3. Mr. Walter Dushnyck, mem-

ber of the political policy board of the U.C.C.A. and editor of Ukrainian Bulletin, and 4. Mr. Stephen S Jarema, Executive Director of U.C.C.A., a former member of the New-York State Assembly and a practising attorney in New York City.

UKRAINIAN POLITICAL PARTIES

The Delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America had to deal with following Ukrainian free political centers, organisations and parties:

1. Executive Organ of Ukrainian National Council;
2. Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council;
3. Units Abroad of the Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists-Revolutionaries (O.U.N.-R.);
4. Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Solidarists (O.U.N.);
5. Union of Ukrainian Hetman-Adherents (monarchists);
6. Union of the Lands of United Ukraine;
7. Union of the Creative Forces of Ukraine;
8. Ukrainian Revolutionary-Democratic Party;
9. Ukrainian Socialist Party;
10. Ukrainian National-Democratic Association;
11. Ukrainian National State Union.

This is practically—with exception of Communists—a broad-fan of all Ukrainian parties and political organizations who, from the extreme right to the radicals, met in common session the Delegation of U.C.C.A., and after prolonged deliberations between themselves, in answer to the proposals of the Delegation, presented in a "Declaration" their united and unanimous view-point. (We publish this "Declaration" on page 8 of this issue of "Ukrainian Observer").

UKRAINIAN NON-CO-OPERATION

Ukrainians have long remained aloof, and as the "Declaration" of the parties show, continue to stay aloof from the "American Committee for the Liberation

Continued on Page 2

of the Peoples of Russia". This Ukrainian attitude was thoroughly justified by a number of important reasons. First of all, A.C.L.P.R. was dominated from its very beginnings by the forces and individuals who, though anti-communist, proposed a perpetuation of the Russian imperialist system and ignored the rights of the non-Russian nations within U.S.S.R. to determine their future existence as independent, sovereign states in accordance with their acts of self-determination in 1917-1919. For the Ukrainians who have long struggled for a Ukraine thoroughly free of Russians and other foreign occupants, policies of A.C.L.P.R. made co-operation simply impossible.

WITHOUT UKRAINIANS NO ANTI-BOLSHEVIK FRONT

Yet, the A.C.L.P.R. was and remains fully aware that the creation of a common anti-bolshevik front without the participation of Ukrainians makes no sense at all and is simply unpracticable. This is plainly admitted in a press-release of A.C.L.P.R. of December 24, 1952, issued on occasion of the trip of the Delegation of U.C.C.A. to Europe. We read:

"From the time of its inception, the American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia paid much attention to the necessity of obtaining participation of the Ukrainians in the united anti-bolshevik action of the emigration. The forty million Ukrainian people are numerically second among the peoples of the Soviet Union. Their large and well-organized segment of the emigration includes in its ranks major political, cultural and intellectual elements which would be of notable help to the front of the anti-bolshevik struggle. . . It is our aim to assist all those forces in the emigration which are willing and able to lead a really active struggle against the communist tyrants for uniting and co-ordinating their efforts. Here the role of the Ukrainian emigration could be very significant. For this reason the leaders of the Committee and its European representatives have engaged in the last two years in numerous talks with the representatives of various Ukrainian groups concerning their participation in the common emigree action. Now, these negotiations have brought their first positive results: Professor *Lev Dobriansky* and three other leaders of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America have gone to Western Germany for conferences with the European groups of the Ukrainian emigration".

UKRAINIAN DEMANDS

The above press-release states further that the mentioned group of the leaders of the Ukrainian Congress Committee,

during their recent talks with the chief of the A.C.L.P.R., Admiral Stevens, "put several conditions and demands concerning, their collaboration"; it contends by implication that these conditions and demands had been now basically satisfied.

This implication is the proper background of the visit of the Delegation of U.C.C.A. in Europe and its talks with the representatives of the Ukrainian political parties. In its own press-release of December 18, 1952 the Delegation of U.C.C. states as follows:

"Recently, however, important policy changes have been made (in A.C.L.P.R.) which respect Ukrainian interests and have smoothed the way for Ukrainian membership (in Co-ordinating Center). . . The task now remains for American delegation to convince the emigree leaders that Ukrainian independence will not be compromised by their co-operation and that Russians, who barely comprise one-half of the total population of the U.S.S.R., will not dominate the Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-bolshevik Struggle which is located in Munich".

PARTIES DENY CHANGES

The Delegation of U.C.C.A. has been received in Europe by the Ukrainian centers in five countries with remarkable pleasure and cordiality; the Ukrainian political emigrees were very glad to meet personally the leaders of the dominant and effective organization of the Americans of Ukrainian descent. The existence and the work of U.C.C.A. proved to be in the hard post-war years for the mass of Ukrainian refugees in Europe of great help and assistance.

However, the emigree Ukrainian political parties in Europe came to the opinion that the leaders of U.C.C.A. were wrong in assuming that, indeed, such important policy changes had been made in A.C.L.P.R. and its structure with respect to Ukrainian interests, as really and unequivocally to "smooth the way for Ukrainian membership in the Co-ordinating Center".

On the contrary, the Ukrainian political parties reached the conclusion that the possibility of their participation in A.C.L.P.R., resp. in Co-ordinating Center has been rendered by now even more difficult than ever. They have tried to make their American guests understand and agree that no satisfactory preconditions for the participation of Ukrainians in the Co-ordinating Center had been fulfilled. The parties stressed and tried to prove that in reality basically nothing has changed at all. Neither the name nor the statutes of the A.C.L.P.R., resp. the Co-ordinating Center had been altered.

RUSSIAN PREPONDERANCE

The Ukrainian emigree political press as the mouthpiece of the above enu-

rated parties plucked to pieces, point by point, the untenability of the contentions of A.C.L.P.R. that the allegedly revised and improved statutes of Co-ordinating Center now warrants the Ukrainians the just break and equal chances with the Russians.

The Ukrainian public opinion maintains that now as before there exists the situation of a clear Russian preponderance in the whole "revised" scheme. Already the bare fact that against their manifest will and desire the Ukrainians are deliberately inserted into one and indivisible organization together with the Russians, constitutes an act of clear pre-determination favouring openly the Russians and harming gravely the liberation chances of Ukrainians. What cogent reasons justify the necessity to build up a liberating organization like A.C.L.P.R., resp. the Co-ordinating Center strictly on geographical, political and imperial lines of the present constitutional structure of the Soviet Union? The Ukrainians do not find a satisfactory answer, except the quite evident deduction that A.C.L.P.R. is bound to preserve the existence of this empire also for the future.

NO "COMMUNITY OF FATE"

By this scheme the entire world is taught and is being made accustomed to see the lot of Ukrainians inseparably fettered to the future of the Russians. Thus, a *community of fate* is artificially created for the Ukrainians in unwanted fellowship with the Russians; something the Ukrainians are frantically striving to avoid. This creates the world-wide psychological feeling and political understanding that the Ukrainians belong "naturally" to the Russian sphere of life; the implying contention is that *both* causes, the Ukrainian *and* the Russian, stand and fall together. The inevitable further implication is that *both* nations are equally responsible for the existence and the outrages of bolshevism and Russian imperialism, and in the case of a new world armageddon both nations will have to endure the consequences. Now, the Ukrainians have never been the originators nor the disseminators of bolshevism; the communist regime has been imposed upon Ukraine by the means of the most rude and implacable Russian terror. No other nation in the world paid a higher tribute in resisting bolshevism than the Ukrainians; nearly ten million Ukrainian peasants alone were exterminated by this imperialistic regime. The Ukrainians simply refuse to be put on a par with the Russians; they refuse eventually to be A-bombed for sins and trespasses never committed.

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The Delegation of U.C.C.A. was said that the Ukrainian parties do not understand why the freedom-loving Americans ab-

olutely insist in keeping the Ukrainians within an organization quite clearly dominated by the Russians; why the Ukrainians are forced by that to endure further this fatal "community of fate" with the Russians; and why the Ukrainians are not free to be dealt with, say, within the frame of the "Committee for Free Europe"? The answers the Delegation gave to all these question were felt by the audience as evasive, and in any case, not satisfactory enough.

UKRAINIANS WERE WILLING—IF..

Still, notwithstanding of all doubts and apprehensions, the Ukrainian independent parties—and there exist no others which really count—left no doubts that they *are* willing and able to join and to co-operate with America-led front of suppressed and endangered nations in their common anti-bolshevik struggle. This willingness and readiness is shown without any doubts in the Paragraph 1. of the "Declaration":

"The co-operation of Ukrainian political powers with various American groupings in the common front of anti-bolshevik struggle, based on an adequate political platform, is equally necessary for the Ukrainian liberation fight as well as the anti-communist struggle in general. Hence, the enumerated Observer. Gal. 26.

Ukrainian political institutions and organizations declare herewith their readiness to carry on their fight against bolshevism and Russian imperialism commonly with American anti-communist groupings, provided the accordant preconditions would be fulfilled".

A.B.N. AS NUCLEUS

By this the Ukrainian parties agree that the creation of the common front of the nations oppressed and endangered by the bolshevism and Russian imperialism is of paramount importance and are ready to join such a front.

For instance, the "Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-Revolutionaries" (O.U.N.-R.), known also as the "Bandera-movement", as can be seen from their special party statement (which we publish in this issue of *Ukrainian Observer* on page 9) proposes that the existing well-known "*Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations*" (A.B.N.) might be taken as a nucleus of such a common organization. But all Ukrainian parties stress with indubitable clearness that they would be ready to join only under the main preconditions that their cause would be treated politically and organizationally in a clear and effective separation from the Russians.

The main point, however, remains the frankly declared willingness and readiness of the Ukrainians to join such a common front. The Paragraph 1. of the 'Positions' should be understood and accepted by

THE UKRAINIANS AND THE ELECTION OF GENERAL EISENHOWER

BY ZENON PELENSKY

In common with the rest of the world, the Ukrainian political emigres in the four continents have followed the course of the American presidential elections with the closest attention. It is self-evident that the interest of the Ukrainians was prompted by considerations of whether this election, and the eventual instalment of a new president in the White House, would have a deleterious or favourable effect upon the liberation struggle of Ukraine against the Russian bolshevist domination.

Like all other national communities in the free world, the Ukrainians are divided into various parties and groups. The attitude of the Ukrainians towards the presidential campaign was therefore not quite unanimous. The great representative organisations, however, mostly refrained from voicing an official opinion.

This was the case, for example, with the leading union of Ukrainians, that of Americans of Ukrainian origin in the U.S.A., the "Ukrainian Congress Committee". This organisation gave its hundred-thousand-odd supporters a completely free hand. There arose in the U.S.A. Ukrainian committees for the support of the democratic, as well as the republican, candidates.

The alert interest of the Ukrainians in no way developed into passion, or into a bitter campaign on behalf of Gen. Eisenhower or Gov. Stevenson. Moreover, it did not prevent the Ukrainians, especially those outside the U.S.A.,

what it really and loyally means. Of course, this would necessitate many new difficult deliberation, substantial statutory changes, and personal shifts on the side of A.C.L.P.R. and its sub-structures as to satisfy fairly the just and well-founded Ukrainian demands.

UKRAINIANS HOPE TO BE UNDERSTOOD

The propositions of the Ukrainian parties as expressed in their "Positions" are now at hand. They are felt by the whole Ukrainian exiled community as just and fair, and thoroughly acceptable also for all really democratic and freedom-loving Russians. The Ukrainians feel keenly that such their attitude corresponds thoroughly with the innermost wishes and longings of the whole Ukrainian nation. In consequence, the Ukrainians in exile, as the natural and legal spokesmen of their enslaved home-country, hope ardently that their attitude, as taken by the Ukrainian political parties, would be understood and appreciated properly and sympathetically by the decisive and judicious men of A.C.L.P.R. and all other competent American circles.

from making a good many reservations and even preserving a certain scepticism with regard to both contesting parties. The reason for the Ukrainian reservation was that the Ukrainian liberation problem did not seem to exist within the personal intellectual horizon of either of two candidates, nor was it included in the electioneering political programmes of either party. Whoever won the election, the Ukrainians were quite certain that the issue would scarer by better their precarious position, wether behind the Iron Curtain, or in exile.

Nevertheless, the symphaties of Ukrainians everywhere in the free world inclined towards Gen. Eisenhower and the Republican Party. We believe that most of the American Ukrainians voted for Gen. Eisenhower. The deciding factor may well have been that the Democrats and their policy are very well known, and experience of this party holds forth no promise for the Ukrainian liberation problem. The Republicans, on the contrary, promised nothing, but at the same time did not commit themselves; consequently they at least opened up the possibility of a chance.

In the minds of most Ukrainians, the Democratic Party in the U.S.A. is connected with *two* indelibly bitter experiences. Firstly, the Democratic Government of President Woodrow Wilson refused, in the years 1918-1921, to apply the principle of self-determination for the nations to the liberation movement of Ukraine. Wilson's Foreign Minister, *Robert Lansing*, would not play the part of "partitioner of Russia", and refused Ukraine the status even, of an independent nation. One part of Ukraine (Galicia and Volhynia), comprising 8 million people, was even granted by the American Democratic Government, in the framework of a wider Entente-policy, to Poland—and thus delivered them up to inhumane political oppression and national persecution, lasting nearly 20 years.

Secondly, the Ukrainians could not forget that it was again a Democratic Government in the U.S.A. which, under *F. D. Roosevelt*, formally acknowledged and, especially during the Second World War, cultivated friendly relations with the bolshevist government of the U.S.S.R., which finally degenerated into the present peril of all mankind. As before, this government denied the national independence of Ukraine, and professed itself for the long out-of-date and frail "Unity" of Russia.

A later offspring of this russophile policy of the Democratic Party was perceived by the free Ukrainians in the crea-

tion of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" in the time of President Truman's government. In spite of numerous, firm, and mostly bloody, manifestations of political independence and desire for freedom on the part of the Ukrainians, this "American Committee" insisted upon the preservation of the fiction of the "Unity of Russia". As a logical consequence, the practical "work of liberation" of this committee was placed in the hands of the ardent Russian chauvinists and new kinds of imperialists. And there was nothing, nothing at all, in the behaviour of President Truman's Democratic Government at the end to admit of any inference that this American Democratic policy would ever alter. The Ukrainians could not promise themselves anything new or better from the Democratic Party's remaining in power.

Naturally that does not mean that, with the Republican's accession to power, everything will change overnight. The only encouraging word of the new elected President Eisenhower during the electioneering-campaign with regard to this problem consisted of his utterance that "the U.S.A. would never have an easy conscience as long as the nations occupied by the Soviets remained enslaved". Yet from the formulation of a principle to its practical realisation is a very, very long way. President Eisenhower did not mention the Ukrainians as being among these enslaved peoples. It will necessitate a stupendous and protracted task on the part of the Ukrainians to make the Republican administration of the U.S.A. well-disposed towards the Ukrainian ideal of independence.

Nevertheless, as already stated, the Republicans have, up till now, at least not said "No". This party has, in its history, not been tainted by any anti-Ukrainian decisions and attitudes. There exists, therefore, the inducement to regard the government of President Eisenhower with every sympathetic expectation, and at the same time the Ukrainians' obligation to explain and to prove to the new government their standpoint and their aim of liberty. Certainly it would make an indelible impression on the national memory of the Ukrainians, should they regain their freedom and national-political independence during the government of, and with the help of, the Republicans.

* * *

DANGEROUS FILM TITLES

Three films are now being shown in Kiev: "Far from Moscow", "In our free Ukraine" and "I want to live in joy". The man putting up posters stuck them in such order that passers-by looked round terrified while reading them. On the advertisements' board was to be read: "I want to live in joy"—"far from Moscow"—"in our free Ukraine."

MOSCOW'S DARK CLOUD OVER UKRAINE

THE UKRAINIANS IN EXILE FEAR THE RUSSO-BOLSHEVIK MASS-ACTION AGAINST THE UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUAL "BOURGEOIS NATIONALISTS" AFTER THE FASHION OF THE RECENT MONSTRE TRIAL IN PRAGUE

BY PETRO STEPANENKO

UKRAINIAN 'BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM'

On the grounds of an attentive study of the recent press and radio, the Ukrainian community in exile expects with an ever-increasing fear that Moscow is quite obviously creating the "proper" psychological atmosphere and prepares once more widespread extermination measures against Ukrainians.

Especially it is commonly feared that, in the wake of the show-trials and purges which, in the course of the last two years, have taken place in the satellite states, there is being prepared a similar Monstre action in Kyiv and Lviv, the two capitals of Ukraine, against the Ukrainian 'bourgeois nationalists' which will be followed by mass-exterminations.

It is not yet definitely known in Ukrainian exile circles how many, or which, Ukrainian personalities have already been chosen by the M.G.B. for this next public court exhibition and for annihilation at the wall or on the gallows. Nevertheless, it is possible today to make quite probable guesses, because the names of a quite definite circle of people are being mentioned more and more often in the press and on the radio, and accusations are being levelled against them.

CAMPAIGN AGAINST UKRAINIAN INTELLECTUALS

The recent notorious Slansky trial in Prague, which ended with the hanging of the 11 defendants, had primarily an economical background. There had to be scapegoats found for the catastrophic failure of the Soviet economic system in Czechoslovakia. In Ukraine, Moscow's weakness is on another level. There are reasons to fear that Moscow's next blow will be directed, not so much at the economists, as at the intellectuals; against writers, poets, journalists, scientists, artists, etc.

It is a remarkable thing with the "Marx-Lenin-Stalinist theory of consciousness". According to the learning in their 'Dialectics of Materialism', the consciousness of mankind is built up on the current economical foundations, and that is reflected in their minds. Since, according to Stalin, socialism has been prevalent in the Soviet Union since 1929 (the First Five-Year Plan, collectivisation of agriculture, etc.), the general socialist consciousness should, in the more than twenty years which have now elapsed, have long ago gained ground, and established itself firmly on this socialist material foundation. How, then, has it come about

that there exists such widespread "bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism", to which the Russian Soviet power has lately been compelled to devote so much time and attention? And, in particular, whence does it come into the consciousness of quite young people, who already were born in the Soviet time, who could have no proper, living picture of the old, civic, pre-war times, and knew nothing different from the socialist, communal order—and have nevertheless 'somehow' achieved an ardent Ukrainian national consciousness?

MOSCOW DOES NOT TAKE ROOT

One well remembers how, in the early summer of 1951, Moscow's comprehensive ideological, political, and national-administrative campaign against the 'bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism' was started with the sharp attack of the Moscow "Pravda" on the poem of the Ukrainian poet Volodymyr Sossyura—"Love Ukraine" (written 1942), and whose author was threatened with serious consequences. Since that time, Moscow's intellectual pressure on Ukraine has not abated for one moment; in the contrary, it has increased from month to month.

It is almost impossible to enumerate all the reproaches and occasions which Moscow has since poured upon the most notable exponents of the Ukrainian intellectual life. There is also not one Ukrainian intellectual, writer or artist who has not in meanwhile publicly admitted and bitterly rued his ideological 'defections' and 'mistakes'. There is not one Ukrainian town in which mass-expositions of 'public criticism' i. e. expositions of mass-self criticism by these accused and suspected, have not taken place. All the Soviet newspapers in Ukraine and in Moscow are always full of them.

The main accusation which is made concerning all these 'defections', 'errors', and 'mistakes' is always the same—the reproach that, in Ukraine, there is too little admission and acknowledgement of Moscow's leadership. There is too little internal and external Russianisation apparent. There is in this country still too much consciousness of national differentness, of national peculiarities and of a right to independence and liberty.

VANISHED FIGURES

Since the summer of 1951, the experts on Ukrainian Soviet literature have sought in vain for such names as the once well-known Ukrainian Soviet writers: I. Stebun, O. Kylymnyk, Y. Kotsiubynsky, P. Kozlanyuk, P. Panch, I. Vilde, Y. Vyh-

ren, P. Usenko, A. Trostyanivsky, K. Storchak, etc. Vanished from the literary field are more and more well-known Ukrainian literary critics, such as L. Novychenko, H. Omelyanenko, M. Novykov, O. Bashkyn, A. Trypilsky, A. Kurylenko and several others. No-one hears anything more of the Ukrainian professors of the University of Lviv: S. Tsybko, N. Aladkyn, G. Herbytsky, K. Hladkivsky, and S. Ossechnivsky, who were publicly denounced, in the Moscow "Pravda" of July 1951, in a 'critical letter' signed by the well-known Moscow literary hacks in Ukraine — L. Kizin, L. Korneychuk, and K. Stetsiuk.

MOSCOW DOES NOT TRUST THE UKRAINIAN COMMUNISTS

Now the Moscow central organ "Communists of U.S.S.R." has sharply attacked the "Communist of Ukraine" in its 20th number of November, 1952. It attacked not only some articles or one number, but all the editions of this monthly journal in Kyiv in the years 1951 and 1952. The publication of this criticism immediately after close of the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. is, without doubt, a harbinger of an imminent severe purge.

We learn that the "Communists of Ukraine" carried out its duty 'extremely unsatisfactorily', is conducted on a 'miserably low ideological and doctrinal level', is 'not up-to-date', and 'does not sufficiently regard or value the practice of the construction of the communist society. The editorial staff of what is, according to the Party, the most responsible journal of Ukraine 'possesses no courage for initiative', 'does not pay enough attention to the ideological work, does not cultivate the necessary relations with the party organizations'.

EVERYTHING GOOD COMES ONLY FROM MOSCOW

And now the journal's deadly sin: "In the pages of the journal, the necessary bitter campaign is not carried on against the increasing spread of the nationalist bourgeois ideology". The editorial staff takes no trouble "to interrupt and to bring home the blessings of the Lenin-Stalinist nationality policy" to the members of the party and to the masses. The problems of 'the development of the socialist nations' are not suitably worked out. And, above all, there is no adequate propaganda made for the principle of 'the Stalinist friendship of the nations and, particularly, of the friendship of the great, leading Russian nation'.

And now come the names. The Ukrainian literary critics, H. Omelyanenko and M. Novykov, for example, are guilty, that in an article, on the Motives of the Ukrainian October-Revolution, published in 1950, they designated the Ukrainian writers, Ivan Franko and Mykhaylo Ko-

tsiubynsky the "forefathers of proletarian literature in Ukraine". That was wrong. The forefather of all the proletarian literature in the world can and may only be a Russian, and that Maksym Gorky; everyone else can only have learned from him. The contention of the two attacked critics, that the Ukrainians could have produced proletarian literature by themselves and without any connections with Gorky 'leads obviously to national isolationism and to the enstrangement of the development of the Ukrainian democratic literature from that of Russian proletarian literature'. The ultimate consequence is 'the despicable, extremely pernicious Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism' which inevitably leads to betrayal of the Soviet fatherland and to the enslavement of the nation 'in the chains of American imperialism'.

Thus close the net of Moscow's evidence. These accusations go in columns. More and more new names are indicated. The critics, Omelyanenko and Novykov had 'formed schools'; in their footsteps went, in a "completely wrong direction", the critics and writers Y. Zaruba, H. Mulykh, A. Kronyk, and V. Gott. The writer A. Ishchuk had written a quite objectionable, basically 'nationalist Ukrainian review' on the greatest poets of Ukraine, Lesya Ukrainka, which was 'teeming with ideological faults'. Just as bad, objectionable and nationalistic was a recently published book of Y. D. Dmytrenko on 'The social-political and philosophical views of Taras Shevchenko.'

MOSCOW MAKES PREPARATIONS FOR WAR

Thus, dozens and dozens of 'disreputable' Ukrainian names, with which one could fill, not one but very many and very large docks, have lately been published in the Stalin-controlled Russian press. On this side of the Iron Curtain it is not yet known, if it should come to the supposed deterring action in Ukraine, who of the many attacked would be specially selected for the 'representative' trial, and who even still lives. Yet the ever-mounting intensity of the Russian-bolshevik campaign of hate against the 'bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists' makes one justified in expecting and fearing the worst. In the Prague Slansky trial it was the Jews, the Zionists, who were regarded, and attacked, as the threat to the Muscovite domination of Stalin. Moscow sees in Zionism the 'American fifth column', which supposedly attacks the bolshevik rule in U.S.S.R. from within. It would be only too logical if, in consequence of the Russian policy of terrorisation, the 'Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists' were the next to come into the Russian dock, as successors of Slansky and Co. Moscow knows that, in the event of any serious international armed dispute, it is the resistance and fight for liberation of Ukra-

THE CASE OF ROMAN AND WOLODYMYR SWITENKO

In a letter of the 13th January, 1953, the Extradition Commission of the United States High Commissioner for Germany informed the General Secretariat of the Central Co-ordinating Committee of Ukrainian Welfare Organizations that the District Court in Warsaw had sentenced Roman and Wolodymyr Switenko to death. Following an appeal Roman Switenko's sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life. Wolodymyr Switenko's appeal was dismissed, and he was executed at Warsaw on the 29th October, 1952.

Roman Switenko and his son Wolodymyr were arrested in Munich in June 1948 on a denunciation by Ishak Mandel, a Jew who accused them of having taken part in the persecution of Jews in Horodok in the Ukraine, during the German occupation in the years 1941 to 1943.

The U.S. Authorities referred the matter to the German Courts for preliminary investigation. This was carried out by the Chief District Attorney, Dr. Hafer, who took the evidence of some 50 witnesses. Two other Jews supported Mandel's charges, but were by no means clear in their statements. Over 40 witnesses, who were personally acquainted with the accused, gave evidence in their favour and emphasised that during the German occupation a number of Jews owed their lives to the Switenkos who, regardless of their own danger, had helped them to hide from the Germans.

Notwithstanding this evidence, the efforts of the lawyers for the defence and the protests and petitions of Ukrainians and of people of standing, including the Apostolic Visitor, Bishop Ivan Buchko, the U.S. Authorities decided to accede to a demand by the Polish Government to hand over the Switenkos for trial in Poland. An attempt however by Wolodymyr Switenko, in the presence of American Prison Authorities and Polish Representatives, to cut his arteries to avoid extradition, caused a postponement.

During the night 19/20th January, 1950, however the Switenkos, who were in the German prison of München-Stadelheim, were there unexpectedly and secretly handed over to Representatives, dressed in civilian clothes, of the Polish Military Mission in Berlin. Of the U.S. Authorities the Chief Adviser to the Land Commissioner for Bavaria, Mr. Leonard Hanze, and a Representative of the Prisons Department, Mr. Saul Moskovitz, were present. The lawyers for the defence had not been informed that their clients were to be handed over.

We are aware that the General Secretariat of the Central Co-ordinating Committee of Ukrainian Welfare Organizations had earlier petitioned the United States High Commissioner in Germany against the extradition of the Switenkos. In reply to this petition the U.S. Extradition Board explained that they had been handed over on evidence supplied by the Polish Authorities and on the condition that, in the event of their being found not guilty, or after completing any but a death sentence, they would be returned to the U.S. Zone of Germany.

The sentence has now been disclosed. We see that the result of the extradition, which we anticipated and of which the U.S. Authorities were warned has come to pass. A sentence which we cannot believe to have been just has been passed and carried out.

The sufferers are two men for whom the entire community of Ukrainian Refugees interceded, not indeed shield them from punishment if they were guilty, but to ensure a fair trial for them in a Court of the Free West.

This was denied to them.

(Extract from No. 5, Vol. IX, of the "Ukrainian Thought" of the 29th January, 1953)

ine which is most to be feared. Consequently, the free Ukrainians in exile stare, as if under a spell, at the menacing, black Muscovite cloud which has lately been gathering from the north and brooding thicker and deeper over Ukraine.

MORALE AND POLICY IN THE U.S.S.R.

(Based on the article published in the "Ukrainian Thought" No. 5, Vol. IX of the 29th January, 1953).

The experience of the late war have brought about profound changes in the morale and outlook of people within the U.S.S.R., and Soviet internal policy and propaganda have had to be adjusted to the altered political climate.

Before World War II the basis of all political indoctrination and of the ideological education of the many different peoples of the Soviet Union were the fact and the meaning of the 1917 October Revolution, the onward march of victorious Marxism and the "Communist Paradise" which, it was claimed, had already been at least partly realised.

The experiences of the war and of the years following the war have shown the premises on which this indoctrination and education were based to have been false. Masses of the inhabitants of the U.S.S.R. served in the Soviet Armed Forces, saw living conditions in the "liberated" countries and became aware of the realities of both the outside world and of their own situation. A new approach to the problem of raising the morale of the population, a new starting point for their political re-education had to be found.

This was the more important as a new generation had grown up, to whom the conditions and events of the October Revolution meant little and the stories of the proceeding period of despotic Tsarist rule meant less. Much of what had been taught before the war had been discredited by what they had seen themselves. The invincibility of the U.S.S.R. had proved a delusion. The myth, which had contrasted the prosperity and well-being of the Workers of the Soviet "Socialist Paradise" with the terrible sufferings and distress of workers leading a wretched existence under the "Capitalist yoke", was exploded in the eyes of men of this and a slightly older generation who, in the Soviet Armies, for the first time had an opportunity of seeing the world and of contrasting standards of living in "the Capitalist Hell", with their own miserable condition. Stalin's "Solidarity for the people" appeared a mockery when millions were treated as expendable material in war and millions more were deported to terrible suffering in the Forced Labour Camps.

Realisation of the truth may have been incomplete and, in the main, confined to those who had seen life in the outer world for themselves. But the traditional propaganda claptrap, based on the blessings of the October Revolution and the thirty years and more of beneficent Soviet construction that were supposed to have given the Workers of the U.S.S.R. a new heaven and a new earth, had lost its power to attract and to convince. As even in Eastern Europe vast populations can-

not be ruled and kept at work or criticism stifled by terror alone, a new approach had to be found.

Thought had received a new stimulus by contact with the outside world. The new perspective gained by men who had acquired first-hand knowledge affected the mental atmosphere within the U.S.S.R. and the armies of internal propaganda had to take account of it.

The late war gave the oppressed nations within the Soviet Empire an opportunity to attack their Russian masters from within. While the struggle for the abolition of the Collective Farm system ("kol-khosis") and for the restoration of the Churches was universal, armed National Resistance Forces fought against the Russian Fighting Forces on their Lines of Communication, whilst at the same time fighting against the German invaders. On the other hand many men of the enslaved peoples deserted and fought against Russia with the German armies.

These developments destroyed the pretence of Russia leading a Union of free peoples within the U.S.S.R. to a common goal on the road of Socialist reconstruction. The real situation inside the vast Soviet Empire, with its conglomeration of nationalities dominated by a ruthless Soviet Russian imperialism, became apparent. The Moscow Government dropped the mask of Socialist Brotherhood and appealed to Russian nationalism. Soviet Russian imperialism proceeded from the "liberation", conquest and enslavement of its formerly oppressed nations to the conquest and enslavement of many new countries and nationalities.

In spite of the victories in the late war, however, and of its conquest since, Moscow has lost ground outside the "Iron Curtain". The membership and enthusiasm of foreign Communist Parties and of the network of organisations inspired or influenced by them has fallen off, and there have been confusion and division in their ranks. More and more Moscow has to rely on its own paid agents abroad.

In the U.S.S.R. as well disillusionment has spread. Popular apathy or hostility force "the Boss" (khazyain), as Stalin is unofficially referred to in governing circles, and the clique of the Kremlin to rely on their own men, the M.V.D. (the former "O.G.P.U."), the Communist Party and the Political Educational Apparatus of "politruki".

The division between a sullenly indifferent or hostile population and the agencies of government is most marked in the territories where armed resistance in the fight for national independence during the late war was most active and most formidable. Whilst in Russia herself the population has, since the war, settled down, docile if not content, to the routine

of the Collective Farm and of a communal social life, the evidence of the Soviet Press clearly shows that in the "Outlying Regions", and most of all in the Ukraine, better opposition to the system of Collective Farming continues. Correspondingly, the Soviet Press throughout the U.S.S.R. daily inveighs against the "bourgeois nationalism of the Outlying Regions".

Never has there been such a spate of propaganda literature, never have so many pamphlets been published concerning Ukrainian national aspiration, as during the past year. To judge by a careful analysis of the Soviet Press, however, the campaign does not appear to meet with much success.

The propaganda would seem to be ineffective because the population turns a deaf ear to it. The people do not frequent the clubs, the reading rooms and the "Homes of Culture", they do not read the pamphlets and the papers showered upon them. To overcome their sullen negative attitude a vast machinery of "Agitation and Propaganda" ("Agitprop") has been set up. Some of its aspects approach the ludicrous. In one administrative district in the Ukraine, containing less than 30 villages and population slightly below 30,000, between 800 to 1,000 agitators and propagandists are employed. We read that in one Collective Farm village every family is a subscriber to one or two newspapers and periodicals, that, as the villagers do not visit the Village Hall on their own, they are summoned to meetings in the fields in the lunch hour and in the evenings, when the same newspapers are read aloud to them, to prevent any escape from the wireless which they will not go to listen to at the Village Hall.

The main purpose of these broadcasts is to eradicate "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism", to urge close attachment to the "Big Elder Brother", the Russian people, and to praise the benefits bestowed on the Ukraine by Collective Farming.

During and after the war the armed Resistance Movement was suppressed with the utmost severity. It was either completely crushed, or driven underground as in the Ukraine, where its continued existence encourages the people in their hope for eventual delivery from Russian domination and stiffens their determination passively to resist the Soviet system, while the Kremlin is baffled in its attempts to defeat a popular and nation-wide ideology..

In this fight against such oppression Moscow is handicapped by the fact that many of its formerly reliable supporters have become uncertain and lukewarm, and by a definite decadence in both the Communist Party and Government organs in the U.S.S.R. Both are, to an extent, results of the late war.

During the war and after its successful conclusion the lower ranks of the Soviet Armed Forces could not fail to observe

that none robbed and plundered the population of the "liberated" countries and of Eastern Germany so shamelessly or treated them with such brutal violence as the Officers of the Red Army, as the Soviet War Minister brought out in his report to the 19th All-Russian Communist Party Congress.

During the war the Party lost many of its most reliable members. Its ranks were much diluted by further recruitment as well as the replacement of losses, particularly in the second half of the war. Numbers in the Party Machine continued to grow, and the quality of the men so employed steadily deteriorated. In addition to demoralisation consequent on contact with the outside world and the opportunities of conquest, corruption and inefficiency spread throughout the Party in every part of the Soviet Empire. They assumed such alarming proportions that they were a problem absorbing the attention of the 19th Congress of the All-Russian Communist Party, the first it had been found necessary to convene after many years. Members of the Party were heavily criticised, corruption, demoralisation and lack of discipline were stated to be widespread, and severe purging was stated to be necessary. Resolutions were passed and the Statutes of the Party were altered. It was found necessary to include a declaration that it is the duty of a Communist "to be honest and frank with the Party."

The Soviet Press complains that deceit on the part of Party Officials by the supply of untrue and misleading informations is one of the graver offences, but by no means the only one. Among a wealth of criticism an extract from the "*Soviet Ukraine*", a newspaper published by the Soviet authorities in the Ukrainian language, of the 9th January, 1953, gives this typical example of abuses in the Snihuriw District of the Nikolaev region in the Southern Ukraine:

"... the Chairman of the Collective Farm, Comrade Avramenko, runs his farm on the same lines as Comrade Zoloty *). When leaving his office he often gives instructions to "say that I am on leave or ill if anyone asks for me."

"This was the answer given to a caller on the 30th December 1952. In fact, however, Avramenko was carousing with his nephew, Fedir Plakusha. The day before he had been drinking with his son-in-law's father, and the day before that with his brother. And that's how it is every day.

"The wife of one of the foreman, Melanya Remez, only worked 1.4 day during the whole of 1952. The Chairman's wife did not even do as much as that"

When this is how the local representatives of the Communist Party behave one can imagine their relations with the people, and the feelings of the Collective Farm

*) The Chairman of a neighbouring Collective Farm (Ed.)

workers, all of whom, as well as their wives and adolescent children, must put in a minimum of 180 to 240 full working days in the year before they can think of doing any work on the ground allotted for their personal use.

In the demoralisation following the war the restoration of discipline in the ranks of the Party has been the most serious preoccupation of the Soviet Government, which has tried to improve matters by continual "purges" and the suspension of further admissions to the Party. The fact that it was eventually found necessary to convene a Party Congress, the first since before the war, to tackle the problem on an Empire-wide basis, publicly to castigate the misdemeanours of members and to decide on a programme to improve matters indicates the gravity of the situation and the anxiety felt in the Kremlin.

Against a background of general malaise and dissatisfaction varying from apathy to bitter hostility, a new tone has for now about a year crept into Soviet publications, particularly those published for consumption in the Ukraine. This new tone has an antisemitic edge. The literature has now for a considerable time and with increasing directness and violence aimed at working up indignation and racial hatred against the Jews.

"It's really the Jews who are to blame!" For everything. There always were a certain number of officials of the old "Okhranka", the Secret Police of Tsarist days, in the ranks of the O.G.P.U., and those who survive in the M.V.D. will remember the cry "beat up the Jews and save Russia", cunningly inspired by agents of the Tsarist Government. Particularly in the Ukraine the cry was a favourite expedient to divert active hostility to Russian domination and to direct it against the unfortunate Jews. When popular suspicion and indignation had been whipped up to the required pitch, a "pogrom" would be unleashed. Jewish shops would be plundered and destroyed, a number of Jews would get hurt and a few might get killed. Some hours later the Police would start intervene and arrest looters and "disorderly elements". They made sure that the latter included prominent Ukrainian Nationalists, whether they had anything to do with the pogrom or not. Evidence against them could always be produced.

Now the things are not quite so simple because the number of Jews in the Ukraine were greatly diminished by massacres and deportations during the German occupation, and the proportion of Jews in appointments of authority and influence, which had been very great, has been greatly reduced, their places in the Ukraine mainly being taken by Russians. Still there are enough left to blame for the shortcomings of the regime and its administration, for the lack of everything essential to a satis-

factory standard of living and for the misdemeanours of Russian officials.

The technique is as follows:

Grave offences or neglect of duty which Russian officials have been guilty, or possibly simple failure, are fictitiously represented as being crimes committed by a Jewish official, who may have been appointed to a particular post for that very purpose, or by several Jews acting in concert. If a crime which it is intended to attribute to a Jew has been committed by a Russian, neither his guilt nor his punishment will be allowed to become known. A Ukrainian may become involved as well, but preferably as an innocent fool who has been hoodwinked by the cunning rascally Jew. If a Russian official cannot be kept out of the affair he will be represented as the Chief whose generous trust has been betrayed.

Anger against the Jews as the pretended authors of shortages and suffering caused in the Ukraine by Soviet Russian misrule and its abuses is artificially worked up. A favourable atmosphere for a launching of a pogrom is thus to be created. A scapegoat for the failure of the regime was urgently needed. The foundation for the campaign against the Jews were laid long ago. Its latest development is the propaganda that the Ukraine has to go short of food and clothing owing to a Jewish conspiracy, while Moscow, and indeed in the Kremlin itself, the very heart of the U.S.S.R., the Jewish doctors, as the agents of American Capitalism and in order to prevent the world-wide liberation of the Workers, have destroyed and are seeking to destroy the leaders of the Ukrainians' Big Brothers, the Russians, by poison.

These attempts to turn the hostility to Russia of the oppressed nations against the Jewish scapegoat may or may not end in attempts to bring about pogroms in the Ukraine (such as Odessa and Kishinev) which would be represented as "explosions of the wrath of the Working Masses." It would certainly be confidently expected that the strident clamour of the anti-Jewish propaganda campaign would divert attention from the purge of perhaps some hundreds of thousands of members of the Communist Party, mainly Russians, by which the Kremlin is trying to restore its creaking administrative machinery to working order, and from the real cause of the failures of the Soviet Russian regime and its consequence of suffering.

Present official propaganda among the oppressed nationalities, and particularly in the Ukraine, can be summarized in these slogans: "Enslaved younger sons, join in a close and lasting union with your elder brother, Moscow, to defeat the Jews and to serve the U.S.S.R.. Fight uncompromisingly against bourgeois nationalism. Strengthen the Collective Farm System!"

A. O.

WHY DO THE UKRAINIANS NOT JOIN IN?

THE UKRAINIANS OPPOSE THE POLICY OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE PEOPLES OF RUSSIA", AND HAVE NOT JOINED THE "CO-ORDINATING CENTER" IN EUROPE

THE SEARCH FOR A "REPRESENTATIVE BODY"

As has been repeatedly reported in our journal, the *American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia* (A.C.L.P.R.) has already been trying for nearly 2 years to form a combined representative body from the political emigrees from the U.S.S.R.

The task of this body would be to represent before the world the entire free, non-bolshevist "Russia" and to wage a propaganda-campaign against the bolshevist domination, both inside and outside the borders of what, in the U.S.A., is understood by the term "Russia". Such a body would be one of the most effective weapons of the free world in the cold war; it would become a kind of *Anti-Cominform*.

It is, however, remarkable that, although the Americans have spared no expense and have appointed some of their best brains as leaders of the A.C.L.P.R., no real success has yet resulted from these actions.

WHAT IS K.C.A.B.?

If one is to believe the Russian emigre press and a statement of the A.C.L.P.R., such a representative body is supposed to have finally been formed in Munich on October 16th, 1952. From out of 4 Russian and 5 non-Russian splitter groups there rose into being a "*Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-Bolshevist Campaign*" (C.C.A.C.), better known among the emigrees by the Russian abbreviation, K.C.A.B. Strangely enough, this Russian abbreviation is phonetically identical with the word "*katsab*", which has for centuries been a popular term among non-Russians for bearded, tight-fisted, covetous and greedy Muscovite. This "K.C.A.B." was instantaneously understood and interpreted as a "nomen-omen", an involuntary tell-tale of what this "representative centre" was meant to be: one more instrument of the unceasing Russian imperialism.

The K.C.A.B. has been joined by such Russian exile parties as: (1) The League of the Struggle for Peoples' Freedom (Russian abbrev.—L.B.N.S.); (2) Russian People's Movement (R.O.N.D.); (3) Union of the Struggle for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia (S.B.O.N.R.); (4) Union of Fighters for the Liberty of Russia (S.B.S.R.). All these parties pretend to be purely democratic in design and purpose, but they all insist most emphatically on the preservation of the territorial and constitutional unity of the Russian empire and fanatically refuse the idea of the separation from the empire of even a single non-Russian nation.

The non-Russian partners of K.C.A.B. are: (1) *Georgian National Council*; (2) The Committee for *Azerbaijani National Unity*; (3) The Union of the *Armenian Fighters for Liberty*; (4) *North-Caucasian National Union*; (5) The *Turkestanian Committee for Liberation* ("Turkely"). It should be noted from the beginning that the non-Russian organisations and committees enumerated can in no way count as really representative bodies of the corresponding nationalities. They are organisations representing only one aspect of the national feeling and have joined the K.C.A.B. only under deep protest from their other national unions. They represent, as in the case of the Turkestanian "Turkely", scarcely a fraction of the freedom-loving Turkestanian population.

WHEREIN THE UKRAINIANS WILL NEVER YIELD

Here, however, we are particularly interested in the position of the Ukrainians, in whose name this journal speaks to the world. We have already presented in these pages so many times the reasons for the recalcitrant attitude of the Ukrainians that it is superfluous to revert to them in detail once again. The Ukrainians want their full national-political sovereignty and complete and unconditional separation from Russia. They will never surrender this standpoint of theirs, nor alter it. Every Ukrainian who thinks and behaves otherwise will be regarded, instinctively and automatically, by the free Ukrainian community, as a traitor to his country, and will be treated accordingly.

Well could, and should, a common anti-bolshevist front be formed, composed of peoples from behind the Iron Curtain, and not excluding the Russians, provided that the Americans and the Russians unconditionally recognise the right of the nations of the Soviet Union to form their sovereign national states on an ethnographical basis, and separate from Russia.

"NON-PREDECISION"

But that is exactly what the "democratic" Russian parties of the K.C.A.B., as well as their present American patrons in New York and Munich, do not want to grant to the Ukrainians and the other nations of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the entire political programme and the organisation statute of the K.C.A.B. has, from the first, been so drawn up and ordered as to consolidate and guarantee the unity of the Russian empire for ever.

One of the principles of this "programme" asserts that the A.C.L.P.R., as well as the K.C.A.B., works on the basis of non-predecision which were made by the

nations before the bolshevist-Russian aggression are no longer valid. In other words, all national decisions, votings, etc. will be made again after the fall of bolshevism. Thus, for example, in the case of the Ukrainians, it now counts for nothing that, on Jan. 22nd, 1918 in the case of the East Ukraine, and on Nov. 1st, 1918 in the case of West Ukraine, they announced and established their national independence, and that on Jan. 22nd, 1919, the solemn union of the two parts of Ukraine was proclaimed by their legally elected parliament. Three of the proudest pages of Ukrainian history have been simply torn out. This is a demand as unreasonable as if one were to suggest to the Americans to expunge from their history with their own hands the Declaration of Independence of July 4th, 1776 and to declare it invalid.

A STUPID JOKE

On the other hand—with reference to the political programme—the following ought to be noted. The nations of the Soviet Union might perform an act of self-determination in some, unspecified, form, but not before bolshevism has been destroyed in all the territory of the present Soviet Union and a new democratic order has been established everywhere. If we now conjure up a picture of the materialisation of a new great war or of a revolution in the U.S.S.R. we must not imagine that the individual nations of the U.S.S.R. will be allowed to perform an act of self-determination as soon as their territories are freed from bolshevism. No, they must wait until all have become free; that is, in the first place, until the 90 million actual Russians (Muscovites) have become free and have established their political power and set themselves firmly in the saddle. Only then might the Ukrainians, the Byelorussians, the Georgians, the Caucasians, the Turkestanians proceed with their acts of self-determination and their liberation. What such a "liberation" looks like in practice, when a strong Russian government is sitting in Moscow or St. Petersburg, the non-Russian peoples know from bitter, centuries-long experience. And if the Muscovites swear to their democracy, their liberalism and their 'fraternal feeling' a thousand times over, no-one will ever believe them.

In this connection, the circumstance that the "programme" does not mention by a word that, in this act of self-determination, the United Nations or perhaps some other international court of arbitration will be invoked is very characteristic. To quote from the programme: "The creation of the Co-ordination Centre signifies the victory of the principle that, with the final liquidation of the communist dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., all questions of the future of the peoples who live today in the territories of the Soviet Union will be settled by the peoples

themselves, according to their wishes and *without any interference from outside*". That means: first comes the destruction of bolshevism, then the creation of a Russian government and *then* the "liberation" of the non-Russian nations, but in such way that no-one from outside can interfere.

In Russian this is called—"Democracy". After the announcement of this "political programme", the American gentlemen of A.C.L.P.R. in New York thought it proper heartily to congratulate the leaders of the K.C.A.B. on this "noteworthy achievement" of theirs in the direction of the "liberating of the peoples of Russia". Tens of thousands of Ukrainians, however, and their free press in 4 continents have received and interpreted this distorted and insidious proclamation as one of the stupidest political jokes of recent times.

But this is not all. The liberal spirit of Russian "democracy" shines forth even more brightly from the lines of the resolutions of the *organisation statute* of the K.C.A.B. This statute lays down that the, so to say, sovereign and, in certain sense, legislative supreme council of the Co-ordination Centre shall consist of 30 Russians and the remaining 30 places shall be distributed among the non-Russian "minorities". Since, according to the plan, about 10 non-Russian nations are to be represented in the K.C.A.B. and every "minority" nation will, rightly, receive the same number of votes as the others, each non-Russian nation will be allotted exactly 3 votes. Consequently 3 votes of the whole 60 fall to the share of the Ukrainians as well. Is that not a wonderful calculation for the Russians? It suffices only for them to draw one or two "minorities", such as the Armenians (population 1,000,000) or the North-Caucasians (population 1,100,000) on to their side to obtain, in a wholly democratic manner, an absolute majority, and to grind all others into the dust. Ukraine, incidentally, represents 20 p. c. of the entire population and more than 50 p. c. of the economic resources of the whole Soviet Union (including 73 p. c. of the sugar production, 62 p. c. of the manganese, 53 p. c. of the wheat, and 61 p. c. of the anthracite, etc.). The extreme cynicism of this "democratic" calculation is shown also in the fact that the Russians splitter groups, such as the "League of the Struggle for the Peoples Freedom" (L.B.N.S.), of whose existence in the Soviet Union hardly anyone has the faintest notion (and God knows how many "hangers-on", with their political programmes, may be counted in the "representative body" of the K.C.A.B.), have, by reason of the method of distribution, received more than 5 places, compared with only 3 for the 45 million strong Ukrainian nation. Is it any wonder, that, after the publication of the "inspired"

UKRAINIANS IN COMMON FRONT

DECLARATION

BY THE UKRAINIAN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONCERNING THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK ACTIVITY OF VARIOUS AMERICAN CIRCLES

Authorized delegates of all Ukrainian political institutions and organizations in Europe have discussed the affair of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" on December 27, 1952, based on information from the delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (U.C.C.A.) on the 19th—20th Dec., 1952. At this meeting, specially convoked for this purpose, the delegates unanimously resolved in the name of the institutions and organizations represented, that the following declaration shall be regarded as obligatory directive for the Ukrainian policy as to the said affair:

1) Co-operation between the Ukrainian political forces and various American circles in the field of anti-bolshevik campaign and on appropriate political basis is necessary for the Ukrainian struggle for liberation, as well as for the common fight against bolshevism. Therefore the undersigned Ukrainian political institutions and organizations are willing to fight against bolshevism and Russian imperialism in common with the said circles, under certain conditions.

2) The delegates are of unanimous opinion that the political conception and the structure of so-called "Co-ordination Center of the Anti-bolshevik Campaign" (C.C.A.C.), which was constituted with considerable assistance from the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia", renders co-operation with American circles impossible. The C.C.A.C. repudiates the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations and the equal rights of nations; it allows representatives of those Russian parties to join and prevail, which, in practice, is based on Russian imperialism and deny the right of the Ukrainian and the other subjugated peoples to restore their independent and democratic states. This conception impairs in its principles our struggle for deliverance and common fight against bolshevism, as

a) it is for maintaining the Russian empire at the cost of the subjugation of Ukraine, and the other non-Russian peoples;

construction of the K.C.A.B., all the free Ukrainian journals on this side of the Iron Curtain and also the overwhelmingly greater part of non-Russian public opinion were full of derision and contempt for such a "liberation-scheme"? Is it any wonder that the Ukrainians have decisively rejected even the suggestion that they should sit at the conference-table with such "statesmen"?

b) it tends to weaken morally and politically the most powerful and active factor of the anti-bolshevik fight within the Observer. Gal. 31.

U.S.S.R., namely the national movements for liberation and national independence of the non-Russian peoples;

c) it diverts the policy of the United States of America to supporting Russian imperialism and renders the co-operation between the national movements for liberation and American anti-bolshevik activity impossible;

d) it abuses the American aid and funds by combatting the antibolshevik movements for the independence of the nations subjugated by Moscow.

Those principles upon which the C.C.A.C. is based render impossible such reform of it that would allow the Ukrainians to join. Therefore any attempts in the direction of reform are in vain. Only the complete rejection of the said conception would render the organization of a common and expedient fight against bolshevism possible.

3) Ukrainian political organizations are willing to participate in the activities of the various anti-bolshevik American circles, provided that the following premises have been realized:

a) Affirmative attitude towards the fight of Ukraine and the other subjugated peoples for their national independence;

All national representations joining the anti-bolshevik front bind themselves to respect the struggle of all nations for their independent democratic states, within their ethnographical boundaries and not to work against their fight. Only Russian anti-bolshevik forces, which will respect the principles mentioned and will observe them in their activities, are allowed to join the common front;

b) Each national representation keeps its independence in all domains of a liberation policy. International co-operation is to be achieved in co-ordination and not in one-sided leadership;

c) Co-operation is exercised through equal delegations of each national group (equal votes to each people, as in the United Nations);

d) Each national group is represented by authorized delegates of the political emigration of their respective people;

4) On the basis of these premises the American circles have the possibility to endorse the common anti-bolshevik front and to warrant simultaneously the realization of the premises mentioned above by appropriate political conception.

Thus natural possibilities are at the same time given for a successful func-

tioning of the common front of all subjugated peoples fighting for liberation, including all peoples within the U.S.S.R. as well as the so-called satellites subjugated now.

The Executive Committee of the Ukrainian National Council (V.O.U.N.R.);

Foreign Representation of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (Z.P.U.H.V.R.);

Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Z.CH.O.U.N.);

Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Solidarists) (O.U.N.S.);

Union of Ukrainian Monarchists (S.H.D.);

Ukrainian Peasant Party (S.Z.S.U.);

Ukrainian Democratic Revolutionary Party (U.R.D.P.);

Ukrainian Socialist Party (U.S.P.);

Ukrainian National Democratic Association (U.N.D.O.);

December 27, 1952.

STATEMENT

BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS (O.U.N.) ON THE QUESTION OF CO-OPERATION WITH AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS, THEIR CONCEPTIONS AND MEASURES CONCERNING THE SETTING-UP OF A COMMON ANTI-BOLSHEVIK FRONT

The Executive Committee of the O.U.N. Units Abroad having approved of the united "Declaration" taken up by Ukrainian political institutions and organizations of December 27, 1952, formulated and drawn up with the active participation of our representatives, and also having approved of joint *Declaration of the national political centres and the national liberty organizations of the peoples subjugated by Moscow*, of December 14, 1952, this Committee issues following addendum and expositions:

1) The only basis for co-operation between the Ukrainian and American institutions in the anti-bolshevik campaign is the recognition of the idea of the whole of Ukraine as a sovereign state and the dismemberment of the Russian empire into national states, the support of said nations in their national fight for freedom against bolshevism and all other forms of Russian imperialism.

2) The American Committee for Liberation of the Peoples of Russia perseveres in its insistence on the opposite platform, namely on the preservation of a united and indivisible Russian empire. That platform makes any co-operation impossible for us.

Beside the Russians, there are no "peoples of Russia", but there are *peoples enslaved by Russia*. The anti-bolshevik fight for freedom waged by the peoples subjugated by Moscow has nothing in common with the action of the Russian imperialists working against the bolshevik regime as such. The subjected peoples are fighting for their detachment from Russia without regard to its political constitution, while the Russian imperialists of every trend are aiming at retaining those peoples within the Russian Empire.

The menace to the freedom-loving world is to be found in imperialist Russia. As long as that empire exists there will be no liberty and no freedom from fear in the world. The pro-Russian action in the A.C.L.P.R. (American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia), particularly the founding of the C.C.A.C.

(Co-ordination Center of the Anti-Bolshevik Campaign) has sown suspicion among the peoples enslaved by Moscow, who are friendly towards the western world, and want it as an ally in the anti-bolshevik campaign.

The so-called C.C.A.C. is an obstacle in the way of that campaign and the participation of non-Russians in it is equivalent to treason.

3) Those Russians who do not approve of the subjection of other peoples, and who are prepared to fight against Bolshevism for their own national state within its ethnic borders, may join the common front of the oppressed peoples.

The Executive Committee of Units Abroad of the O.U.N., declares that, up to now, not one Russian political group has come forward in favour of breaking up the Russian dungeon of nations and the building up of national states in their ethnographical borders.

On the contrary, the project of the American institutions to form a common anti-bolshevik front by setting their hope upon the participation of the Russians and casting them for the principal part has no proper foundations. That idea, and all steps taken in that direction, tend to bring America's anti-bolshevik policy and action to a standstill and weaken the active anti-bolshevik front, as that is directed against any and every kind of Russian imperialism.

4) For successful joint action the West should set the subjected peoples in the centre of interest, not the Russians, who are intent on imperialist aims and will thus bring dissension into the common front.

The recognition by the American factors of the idea of sovereign, democratic states within their own ethnographical borders, instead of the decayed U.S.S.R., would make firm ground upon which all participants in the common front might build their co-operation with America for the future, as well as to-day.

If the object of the American "psychological warfare" consists in mobilizing

the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in order to stimulate an active anti-bolshevik campaign, it can only be accomplished by the proper support of the idea of state independence for those nations.

The co-operation of American circles with a common front must not be just seizing a favourable opportunity, nor a means for political pressure on the Kremlin, in order to come then to an agreement at the expense of the enslaved peoples.

5) The still free, but menaced peoples, as well as the subjugated peoples, must fight shoulder to shoulder in a united front against bolshevism, the foe of the whole freedom-loving world.

The guarantee of victory over the common enemy is the consolidation of the anti-bolshevik campaign of the west bloc and the revolutionary national struggle of the peoples under bolshevist oppression.

Only to combat the U.S.S.R. from outside, without the co-operation of the allied revolutionary forces, can bring no decisive success, and the co-operation of the latter depends on the recognition and support of their struggle for liberty.

The role of the subjugated peoples in the anti-bolshevik world front bases on their own all-round revolutionary, and especially armed, political fight against occupation.

Special significance should be given to the Ukrainian Liberation Movement, — O.U.N. and U.P.A. (Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army) which have without interruption directed and organized the armed political campaign for the whole of Ukraine; the Ukrainian people, however, to be the main force in the total anti-bolshevik revolutionary proceedings within the U.S.S.R., which will conclude with the general uprising.

The whole action outside the U.S.S.R. — the Ukrainian as well as that of the West, — in the common front must take its bearings from the ideal, political position of the revolutionary struggle in Ukraine, with due regard to its requirements, so that it is afforded the necessary all-round, moral, political and technical support.

6) The idea of a common front for the revolutionary anti-bolshevik fight for freedom is anchored in the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (A.B.N.), the co-ordination centre of that fight. The A.B.N. was formed in the fire of the underground campaign against two fronts, against Hitlerism and bolshevism, on the initiative and with the participation of the O.U.N., U.P.A., Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Georgian, Idel-Uralian, North Caucasian, Turkastanian, Byelorussian and other National revolutionaries.

A.B.N., built up on the principle of equal rights, is a union of national free-

dom organizations of the peoples long subjected by Moscow and those recently enslaved, who are all fighting for the destruction of bolshevism and the dissolution of the U.S.S.R., and for their own independent national states, in their own ethnographical borders, as well as for the return of their expelled or deported countrymen.

The fundamental conception of the A.B.N. bases on the nations' own forces, their national struggle for freedom and their collaboration in a joint front. A.B.N., organized and maintained by its own resources, without outside aid, is the expression of the aims of the peoples in their fight for freedom, and is their decisive role of an individual and independent force in the world struggle against bolshevism.

The A.B.N. and its idea must not be underestimated where it is a question of the serious treatment of the problem of a common front against bolshevism.

7) The interests of that front require that America gives up its pro-Russian policy and evinces a favourable attitude towards the fight for liberty and independence being waged everywhere, in the spirit of the noble ideas for which Washington's America once took up arms.

For the victory of the freedom-loving world, a positive attitude on the part of the Western Powers towards the Ukrainian anti-bolshevist liberation movement, its principles and struggle in Ukraine itself, and the joint stand of the political organizations in emigration of December 27, 1952, as well as the analogous stand taken by the other peoples in the thraldom of Moscow, and the idea and action of the A.B.N., is indispensable.

8) The Executive Committee of the Units Abroad of the O.U.N. hopes that the U.C.C.A. (the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America) will distance itself from any measures and efforts to get Ukrainians to join the C.C.A.C., or similar formations, and calls upon the U.C.C.A. to share the united attitude of all the Ukrainian political powers and defend the position of the Ukrainian independence policy.

All Ukrainians abroad and all western anti-bolshevik circles should remember the words of the appeal made by belligerent Ukraine, October 1949, "...the only salvation for the world lies in the immediate and complete destruction of Russian imperialistic bolshevism in its present starting point. That can only be accomplished by the organized power of a uniform front of all peoples subjected, or threatened by Russian bolshevist imperialism".

December, 30, 1952

*The Executive Committee
of the Units Abroad of Organization of
Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.)*

DECLARATION

THE NATIONAL-POLITICAL CENTRES AND NATIONAL LIBERATION-MOVEMENTS OF THE NON-RUSSIAN PEOPLES IN THE U.S.S.R. MAKE THE FOLLOWING DECLARATION OF THE STANDPOINT OF THEIR ANTI-BOLSHEVIST, NATIONAL FIGHT FOR LIBERATION!

I

1. Bolshevism, which has already crushed so many nations and is preparing to conquer the entire world, is a mixture of Russian imperialism and communism. These two elements, of different origin, have, in the process of history, grown together into an indivisible unity, and are working in one direction. They are held together by their common aim, by their effects on various spheres, and by reciprocal reinforcement. Both strive for the mastery of the whole world, which follows the creation of a single world-empire, accompanied by the supremacy of communism in all spheres of life and the domination of Russia. Their common path is characterised by internal decomposition, conquest and domination of more and more nations, the abolition of their independence, their right to self-determination and their national character. Their aim is the extermination of religion and of all cultural, political, social and economic order which are anti-communist. Added to this is the liquidation of all hostile elements, and the suppression of nation and human beings and all signs of life under this ruthless, terrorising dictatorship.

Russian imperialism and communism can regard each other as the strongest mutual support and guarantee of their mastery. The uniting of these two elements, their aims and their working is the main characteristic of bolshevism.

2. The enemy of all liberty-loving people is not solely the bolshevist amalgamation of Russian imperialism and communism, but also each of these two elements independently. Russian imperialism and communism retain their inimical traits in whatever form they manifest themselves, be they separated from each other, or hostile to one another, or even if they appear to be opposed to the regime of Stalin. Their opposition to the Kremlin or any other element does not divest them of their noxiousness or make them enemies of bolshevism, for each of them, in its own particular sphere, speaks the same language as the Kremlin and prepares for the latter's expansion. That applies also to the anti-communist variations of Russian imperialism among the emigres and to anti-Stalinist communism, such as Trotskyism and Titoism.

3. Our peoples were the first victims of the bolshevist raids when, at the end of the World War I, they freed themselves from the domination of Tsarist Russia and restored their independent national States. Then, without any division on

account of their mutual enmity, bolshevism and the anti-communist Russian imperialistic forces began a common military aggression of our national States, with the aim of destroying them once more enslaving our peoples within the bounds of the Russian Empire. In this conquest of the independent non-Russian nations they were aided by the so-called White-Russian anti-communist forces, who were themselves subsequently annihilated by the bolsheviks.

This hostile attitude towards our nations' fight for freedom still exists in the Russian anti-communist emigree circles and guides their political action towards the establishment of a Russian Empire, which is also the be-all and end-all of bolshevism.

4. Although our countries were conquered by armed force and occupied by Russian bolsheviks, our people have not given up the struggle. This struggle is directed equally against Russian imperialism and against the communist regime of force. The ultimate goal of our fight for freedom is this:—the complete elimination from our countries of these two elements of bolshevist oppression, our unconditional liberation from every subservience to Moscow, and the restoration of our national, independent States on the democratic lines, with the safeguarding of all liberties, with social justice, the free development of religion and culture and the well-being of all citizens.

Our nations' struggle against bolshevism embraces all spheres of life. It consists of frustrating the anti-social plans and actions of bolshevism, of preserving and developing all forms of our national heritage, the strengthening in our people of every kind of resistance against bolshevism and Russian imperialism, and their preparation for the national revolutions which will destroy Russian bolshevist domination and communism. It has many forms, ranging from passive resistance and silent sabotage to the political-military revolutionary dealings of the organized underground movements.

5. The chief plans of the world-wide campaign against bolshevism—not only that of the nations already subjugated, but also of those now menaced—must be carried out with the aim of destroying completely both its constituents, i. e. Russian imperialism and communism.

That conception of the anti-bolshevist campaign which is based only on the fight against the bolshevist regime and the communist system, or only against the intended aggressions of the Russian-bol-

shevist imperialism, is quite wrong, as it carries with it a tolerance towards the other element of the same adversary.

Still more misguided and dangerous, however, are the attempts to form a plan of campaign against bolshevism on the assumption that it is possible to turn the Russian imperialism and communism into mutual enemies and, for this purpose, to regard certain of their variations as allies, and thus, in order to win these over to sacrifice the reliable, anti-bolshevist national forces of the non-Russian nations, and their cause. These attempts repel all those who will not work either with Russian imperialism or communism. This plan cannot bring liberty, peace and security to the freedom-loving peoples, any more than it has been achieved by the victory over Hitler in alliance with the U.S.S.R.

II

1. The so-called "Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-Bolshevist Campaign" which has been brought into being by the lavish help of certain American political circles, must, in its composition and by its programme—as may be seen from its statutes and other official publications—be regarded as an attempt:

a) to incorporate in the anti-bolshevist front the disrupting Russian imperialist forces, particularly when they are opposed to the regime;

b) to grant to them decisive influence over the anti-bolshevist revolutionary campaign within the bounds of the U.S.S.R.;

c) to sacrifice the liberation campaign of the non-Russian peoples subjugated in Soviet Union, in favour of the Russian imperialism;

d) to direct American policy, which plays a very important part in the free world's fight against bolshevism, on to the "broad path" of support of Russian imperialism;

2. The so-called "Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-Bolshevist Campaign" is working for the continued existence of the pressure of the liberation movements of the present-day U.S.S.R. This aim is to be realised by denying the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. the right to separation from the Russian Empire. Their revolt against bolshevism is to be carried on under the slogans of the unity of the present empire. This aim is clearly reflected in the programme and the structure of the "Co-ordinating Center". Above all, the "Co-ordinating Center" denies the legality of the restoration of the national States of the non-Russian peoples in the style of the national revolutions of the years 1917/18; the free expression of the wills of the peoples in our democratic States is not recognized.

These viewpoints are clearly emphasized in the statutes of the "Co-ordinating Center". In Point 3, admittedly, the fundamental right of the above-mentioned peoples to self-determination by means of a

democratic plebiscite is acknowledged. But, at the same time, it is strictly limited by the statement that his right can only be exercised after the destruction of the bolshevist regime in all the territories of the Soviet Union. This means that the non-Russian peoples are denied the right of determining their own fate by the help of national revolution.

It is further maintained in Point 3, that this democratic expression of will may be made only by means of a plebiscite or by the vote of the national assemblies or of the "All-Russian" Assembly. Thus the Russians will be given the right of regarding only the decision of the "All-Russian" Assembly as binding on themselves. Point 2 of the political programme refers to the February Revolution of 1917 as the basis of the nations' democratic expression of will. We maintain that the national policy of our peoples is not to be dated from the February Revolution, but has been determined and exemplified by the centuries-old history of our nations. This revolution, incidentally, as seen from the standpoint of the non-Russian peoples, is a denial, on the part of Russia, of the genuine democratic fundamentals, because she refused to recognize the natural right of the people to order their individual lives. The "Co-ordinating Center's" conception of liberation is, therefore, only to destroy the present regime, and nothing more.

In the statutes and in the Communiqué of the directing-body of the Conference of the C.C.A.C. from 10th till 18th October 1952 a clear distinction was made between the full powers of, on the one hand, the Russian representative and, on the other, of the representative of non-Russian peoples. The national organizations are considered to be the representatives of the individual nations. The Russian organizations, on the other hand, speak not only on behalf of the Russian nation, but also in the name of all the nations of the U.S.S.R. They appear to be champions of the liberty of the "peoples of Russia", and not of the Russian nation alone. This arrangement pursues the aim of securing for them the role of overlord of all the other peoples of the Soviet Union. This arrangement, by the way, is reminiscent of a method which the bolsheviks use also: in the U.S.S.R. there exist Communist Parties of every nation, except the Russian themselves—in Russian territory exists only the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

3. The programme of the "Co-ordinating Center" is, in the sphere of national problems, more reactionary than that of the bolsheviks, as set out in the Soviet Constitution (1936). The bolsheviks do recognize, at least on the paper, the right of every nation to self-determination and the secession from the U.S.S.R. Under the pressure of the liberation movements of these nations, the "Unions" and "Au-

tonomous States" of the Soviet Union were formed. The "Co-ordinating Center" and all Russian emigre circles are not willing even to put similar formal rights in writing.

4. The attempt of the American-founded "Co-ordinating Center" to deny to the liberation-movements of the non-Russian nations the right to political liberation is of great significance, as it is calculated to weaken the liberation campaign and the entire anti-bolshevist front.

5. The participation in the "Co-ordinating Center" of five insignificant non-Russian splitter-groups of the Armenian, Azerbaijanian, Georgian, North-Caucasian and Turkestanian emigres is nothing else than a complete denial, on their part, of the liberation-campaign of their people, who will never cease from fighting for their national independence. They would never have come into being if the Americans had not been involved, as the Russian are no longer in the position by their own power to attract anyone to co-operate with them. It runs completely counter to the wishes and the attitude of these nations as manifested by the formation of their independent status in the years 1917/18. In their long struggle against the Russian oppressors, these nations clearly showed their fundamental attitude towards the question of their own political life. The fact that the above-mentioned political sects have attached themselves to the "Co-ordinating Center" divests them of the right to be regarded as spokesmen for their nations.

Against this political background we may justly affirm that the "Co-ordinating Center" does not truly represent the above-mentioned nations and their liberation-movements, but the imperialist interests of the Russian emigre organizations.

6. The co-operation of American political circles in the founding of the "Co-ordinating Center" reveals that their political understanding is incorrect. This is clearly shown by their support of Russian imperialist tendencies and in their mistrust of the liberation movements of the non-Russian peoples. Such an American policy renders impossible any co-operation between the American anti-bolshevist forces and the liberation-movements of the non-Russian peoples.

7. Our attitude towards the "Co-ordinating Center" is completely negative. We condemn and combat its attempts to divert our liberation campaign from its true course or to pass itself off as representing this campaign.

8. We declare: we will carry on our struggle against bolshevism, and every other kind of imperialism, regardless of all obstacles that may confront us on the way.

9. We summon the non-Russian groups who have joined the "Co-ordinating Center" to sever their connection with the Russian imperialists and to tread the path of real liberation for their nations.

10. We appeal to American political circles to give up their policy of supporting Russian imperialist tendencies and, instead, to turn to the advancement of the national liberation-movements of the nations subjugated by Moscow.

We wish to express our earnest hope that the fundamentals of freedom, independence and equality, which have played such a prominent part in the history of the American nation, will not be denied to our people and that, in their struggle for human liberty and an independent political life, they will be accorded the full support of the entire free world.

(*M. E. Resulzade*)

President of the Azerbaijanian National Center

(*A. Wanicki*)

for the Presidency of the Byelorussian National Center

(*R. Gabashwili*)

President of the Georgian National Political Center Abroad

(*E. Pataridze*)

Chairman of the Georgian National Democratic Party

(*Prince Niko Nakaschidze*)

for the Presidency of the Georgian Political Organization

(*Veli Kajum Khan*)

President of the National Turkestanian Unity Committee

(*Garip Sultan*)

for the Presidency of the New Union of Fighters for the Independence of Idel-Ural

(*A. Magoma*)

President of the North-Caucasian National Committee

(*W. Glaskow*)

President of the Supreme Cossack Representation

(*Yaroslav Stetzko*)

Chairman of the Units Abroad of the Organization of

Ukrainian Nationalists

(*A. Kmeta*)

for the Presidency of the Union of Ukrainian Monarchists

December 14th, 1952

The Byelorussian Central Council declares herewith its solidarity with the Declaration of the national-political centres and national-liberation movements of the peoples subjugated in the U.S.S.R. of December 14th, 1952 and undersigns it. February 1st, 1953

(*R. Ostrousky*)

President of the Byelorussian Central Council

"PARAMOUNT AND MOST IMPORTANT TASK OF SOVIET PRESS" runs the heading of the editorial in the "Soviet Ukraine" of 14. 1. 1953, which thus defines this task:

"Newspapers must denounce without mercy the reactionary, antinational nature of bourgeois ideology, Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, zionism, and cosmopolitanism, insidious actions of warmongers driving to new war, in particular American imperialism, the gendarme of the world, strangling freedom and independence of peoples".

PLENARY SESSION OF THE EXECUTIVE OF THE ANTIBOLSHEVIK BLOCK OF NATIONS (A.B.N.)

A common session of the Council of Nations and of the *Central Committee of the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations (A.B.N.)* was held on 25th Jan. 1953 in Munich—where important political and organizational problems were discussed. The Session was opened by the acting President of the Council of Nations, *Veli Kajum Khan*, President of the National Turkestanian Unity Committee, who also acted as Chairman. In his speech the Chairman stressed the importance of the political moment, in which the Session takes place, pointed out the successes of the A.B.N. so far and drew attention to the A.B.N.-activities amongst the Moslem peoples in particular amongst whom the A.B.N. struggle against Russian bolshevik Empire found great sympathy.

The main speech was addressed by Mr. *J. Stetzko*, President of the Central Committee, former head of the Government of the renewed Ukrainian State in 1941, and the head of the Executive of Units Abroad of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. The speaker summed up the result of 10 years activities of the A.B.N. and outlined a practical constructive programme for work in the future. He stated in his speech that aims of the A.B.N. find in world opinion more and more recognition and sympathies. Then followed reports by the Secretary General of the A.B.N.'s Central Committee, Dr. *Ctibor Pokorny*, Vice-president of the Slovak Liberation Committee, by the head of the A.B.N. Military Commission, Col. General *Ferenz Farkash de Kisbarnak*, President of the Hungarian Liberation Movement, by the head of Commission for International Law problems and international relations, Prof. Dr. *Ferdinand*

Diurchansky, former Minister for foreign affairs of the Slovak Republic and present President of the Slovak Liberation Committee, by the director of the A.B.N. information and propaganda service, Dr *D. Balkansky*, former Bulgarian Secretary of State and present member of the Presidium of the National Bulgarian Front, by the head of the Statutory Commission, Prof. Dr *Rudolf Virer*, member of the Presidium of the Czech Democrats, and by the director of Finance Department, *Yaroslav Roman*, member of the Ukrainian Delegation to the A.B.N. In the discussion of the reports and programme of activity took part all present national delegations, among others ing. *W. Glaskow*, President of the Supreme Cossack Representation, Dr. *S. Buch*, representing the Presidium of Croat National Committee, *Prince Niko Nakaschidze*, representing the Presidium of the Georgian Political Organization, Prof. Dr. *Wilhelm Szepesvarlyay-Hendel*, representing the Presidium of Hungarian Liberation Movement, editor *Y. Gintis*, representing the Presidium of the Lithuanian Regeneration Movement, Prof. *A. B.*, representing the Presidium of Byelorussian National Center.

All reports were unanimously accepted as well as all important points of the new programme. All taking part in discussion stressed that the A.B.N. with its ideology, representation and strength, surpassed by far similar enterprises and that co-operation with the A.B.N. of all anti-communist forces in present world struggle is inevitable. Certain resolutions concerning consolidation of A.B.N. organization were also passed with unanimity. They eliminated certain doubts in respect of the interpretation of A.B.N. status and organization structure.

CONVENTION OF THE A.B.N. YOUTH IN GREAT BRITAIN

The constituent Congress of the Youth Organisation of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations in Great Britain (ABN Youth in Great Britain) took place at the Caxton Hall, Westminster on Saturday, 17th January 1953.

The Representatives of the following national organisations took part:

Association of Ukrainian Youth in Great Britain,
Cossack ABN Group,
Czech National Council,
Hungarian Liberty Movement,
Latvian National Guard,
Polish ABN Group,
Slovak Liberation Committee.

The Congress elected Count Denys Halka-Ledochowskyj President of the Council and Mr. Melchior Kiss Chairman of the Executive Committee, and other Officers.

The ABN Youth in Great Britain aims at organising and preparing young refugees from the countries behind the Iron Curtain for the liberating struggle against Russian imperialism and Communist oppression in closest co-operation with the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN).

The work of the ABN Youth in Great Britain will be carried out with the assistance of three commissions: Political, Cultural and Physical cultural.

A periodical will be published in English language.

RESOLUTIONS

We, young representatives of Anti-Bolshevik movements of refugees from various countries enslaved by Communist Russian imperialism: Byelorussians, Cossacks, Czechs, Hungarians, Latvians, Poles, Slovaks and Ukrainians, assembled this 17th day of January 1953 at the Caxton

Hall in London for the purpose of holding the 1st Congress of the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations Youth in Great Britain, state our firm conviction that:

1. To-day's world tension is a result of the expansion of the traditional Russian imperialism which in Bolshevism has reached the peak of aggression;
2. During the last thirty-five years our nations have been brutally and deceitfully enslaved by Moscow and deprived of their sacred rights to national and personal freedom;
3. The final aim of Russian Bolshevism is world domination;
4. To paralyse the defence of the free world the Bolsheviks deceive and incite people with the false slogans of the Marxism-Leninism, build up subversive communist parties and infiltrate with their Fifth Columns into vital organs of every nation;
5. As long as the Russian imperialism dominates the nations of Eastern Europe and Asia no true peace can exist in the World.

OUR AIMS

Recognising the great importance of the young generation in the liberation struggle against Communism and Russian imperialism, as well as in the future task of establishing a just order in the countries now oppressed by Moscow, we decided to form the ABN Youth Organisation in Great Britain which we hope will enable us to give an effective support in spreading and realising the ideas of the ABN.

WE DEMAND

1. The abolition of Communist regime in the countries enslaved by Russia;
2. A complete dissolution of the Russian Imperium into national sovereign states. Among them will be the independent states of: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Cossackia, Czechia, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Caucasia, Poland, Rumania, Slovakia, Turkestan, Ukraina;
3. The application of the ethnic principle in defining the borders between states.

To help our nations to achieve these aims **WE RESOLVE:**

1. To do our best to unite all Anti-Bolshevik refugee Youth in Great Britain for the work assisting our nations in the struggle against the Muscovite enslavers;
2. To work hard to gain support of the British Youth and public opinion for the just ideas of the ABN.
3. To organise and prepare our ranks morally, ideologically and physically for the great task of liberation.
4. To support directly the unrelenting struggle of our nations for freedom and independence, whenever possible.

We, who are assembled at the Congress, take the liberty of expressing our gratitude to Her Majesty's Government and the British people for the hospitality and

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

PERSECUTION AND PURGE CONTINUES

The Kievan "Truth of the Ukraine" and its echo the "Soviet Ukraine" in their issues of 16th. Jan. 1953 start baiting in their article "Socialist property is sacred and inviolable" a whole number of "Ukrainian" ministers because "in commercial, export and co-operative organizations and industrial enterprises of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic infiltrated adventures, cheats, thieves"...

"Former (already purged) secretary of Kiev District Party Committee, Comrade Hrysha overlooked harmful activities of thieves and speculators, ... and former secretary of the same Committee even protected criminals". "Associated with cheats and thieves also former secretary of Podolian area Party Committee, Nehoda, and the Chairman of the Area Executive Committee, Bora".

"Ukrainian Council of Tradeunions local Trade Union officers neglected control in general; the officers of militia (police), State Attorney, Court do not act, do not apply the laws in their whole extent in respect of these enemies of the people".

"Especially extensive malpractices were discovered in a number of enterprises of light-, food, timber, local, meat, and milk industries, in the building organizations and in consumers' and industrial co-operatives in Kiev, Charkiv, Odessa, Chernivtsi, Voroshylovhrad, Stalino, and Zhytomyr districts".

This plundering became possible because the Minister of Trade, Comrade Zaporozhets, the Chairman of the Ukrainian Co-operative Federation Comrade Maliukov, the Minister of Food industry Comrade Hryshuk, the Minister of Meat and dairy industry, Comrade Butenko, the Minister of light industry, Comrade Yesypenko and others do not wage yet a war against plunderers, cheats and those who waste Soviet property...

"Such leaders ought to be reminded of Comrade Stalin's words that a thief, stealing property of the people, is a spy and traitor, if not something worse", threatens the "Soviet Ukraine".

* * *

PLENARY MEETING OF C. P. OF UKRAINE

According to the report of the "Radysanska Ukraina" of December 27th, 1952 (No. 305 (9512), the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of Communist Party of Ukraine was held from the 23rd to the 26th of December, 1952. The following questions were the subject of discussions:

1) The course of the propagation of the resolutions of the 19th Congress of the C.P.S.U., of the inspired work of Comrade J. W. Stalin, 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.', and of the efforts towards improving the ideological work of the party organizations in Ukraine".

2) "The settlement of the agricultural undertakings, the preparation of the kolkhos farms, of the M.T.S. and of the collective organizations, with the purpose of obtaining greater yields in all spheres of agriculture in the year 1953, and of ensuring the realisation of the development schemes of collective cattle-breeding, and of the raising of the increased yields connected with it".

3) "The intensification of the struggle for the preservation of the national and communal property and the improvement of the selection, education and training of the lower party officials for the trade and cooperative organizations".

protection extended to us in the spirit of the most noble traditions of the land of Magna Carta which has always defied tyranny.

Young refugees — join the ranks of ABN Youth!

Courage liberates — cowardice enslaves! Freedom-loving Youth of all nations—support the Anti-Bolshevik liberation struggle!

The fundamental comments on the first problem were put forward by the secretary of the C.C. of the C. P. of Ukraine, L. H. Melnykov, who also made the closing speech. The aspects of the second question were dealt with in detail by the first deputy of the chairman of the Ukrainian Cabinet, Comrade H. T. Kalchenko. The third group of problems were dealt with in a speech by the secretary of the C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine, O. J. Kyrychenko.

All the leading functionaries of the Communist Party of Ukraine took part in this plenary meeting. Without doubt the most important were: H. E. Hryshko—secretary for the Kyiv district of the C. P. of Ukraine; M. V. Podhorny—secretary for the Charkiv district; V. Palladin—president of the Academy of Science of the Ukrainian S.S.R.; I. D. Nazarenko—secretary of the C. C. of the C. P. of Ukraine; H. H. Shevel—secretary of the Komsomol of the Ukraine; H. P. Pinchuk—Minister for Cultural Relations of the Ukrainian S.S.R.; A. Hrytsenko—the commanding officer of the Kyiv military area; V. P. Zaporozhets—Minister of Trade of the Ukrainian S.S.R.; P. P. Hrytsenko—Minister for Industry of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and, not least, M. S. Hrechukha—the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the Ukrainian S.S.R.. They all took an "active" part in the debates and made "spacious resolutions" concerning the questions under notice.

Apparently neither the resolutions of the 19th Congress of the C.P.S.U. nor the "inspired work of Comrade Stalin on 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.' have created the desired impression on the Ukrainian population or on the Communist Party leaders. The party leaders, therefore, are obliged to use radical means in order to achieve this goal.

The economic exploitation and social pressure in the Ukraine is to be increased, in order to supply Soviet-Russian imperialism with the reserves and the means for wider policy of conquest.

Finally, a suitable rising generation of helpers must be moulded, who will assist the Russian oppressors in accomplishing the complete subjugation of their country.

* * *

THE ABSENCE OF COMMUNIST TRAINING IN CARPATHO-UKRAINE

In the "Radysanska Ukraina" of Dec. 26th, 1952 No 304 (9511), I. Wash, the secretary for the Carpatho-Ukrainian realm of the Communist Party of Ukraine devoted a detailed letter, under the heading "More Attention to the Matter of the Education of the Workers", to the economic and political problems of Carpatho-Ukraine.

Like every Soviet publicist, he begins with an enumeration of the "significant" resolutions of the 19th Party Congress, a broad description of the merits of the Lenin-Stalin party, and a quotation from Malenkov's speech. He also declares that, in this region of the Ukrainian S.S.R. there are 300 new enterprises existing, 805 secondary and elementary schools are functioning, and that more than 15,000 kolkhos-workers are attending suitable three-year courses of instruction in agricultural colleges.

There exist, however, also in this region "inadequacies and deviations" which are not sufficiently combatted and expunged by the party organizations. "An unimaginably important place in the ideological work in Carpatho-Ukraine is taken up by the fight against manifestations of bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism". In order to do away with this evil, the party organizations must use various means. "The workers of Carpatho-Ukraine have recently been enabled to hear more lectures on the Stalinistic friendship of nations in the U.S.S.R., Soviet patriotism, and the achievements of the Soviet lands in the fields of economy, culture, and science".

He also refers to the fact that the Communist Party and, naturally, the "great Russian nation" have very greatly helped the Ukrainians in this respect. It is self-evident that the Carpatho-Ukrainians must learn something from their "Russian elder brother". The

workers of this region are arming themselves with the splendid knowledge of the communist organization of their Russian brothers". Apparently all the non-Russians are not in a position to achieve anything without the help of their "elder brother".

The writers of this district, I. Hryda and M. Tomshany, and many others, write more about mountains, woods, flowers and clouds than about the Soviet people and their labour for the welfare of the country. Naturally, they are not in touch with the existing party organizations, which, in common with the "Union of Soviet Writers of Ukraine", exercise no control. The Russian-communist comprehension of artist and his works is no less than startling for the uninitiated. And qualy naturally, the official word of the party organization should be exclusively authoritative for him, and not any "bourgeois endeavours".

But J. Wash appears to have discovered one more evil in Carpatho-Ukraine. It would be better to say an "old evil", but one which is not treated so much today by Soviet publicists, and that is: religion. "With reference to the conditions in the Carpatho-Ukraine, the fight against the remnants of bourgeois ideology as, e. g. the religious superstition, is of special significance." It should here be noted that religious feelings have always been very strongly marked in Carpatho-Ukraine. Therefore many systematic lectures on popular and scientific subjects have been given, for the purpose of eliminating these religious leanings. The strength of the religious faith which the Ukrainians have always revealed in their bitterest hours has always been a thorn in the side of the Russian oppressor.

"One of the most serious inadequacies in the activities of the various local party organizations is the fact that they do not conduct the ideological education of the workers in the suitable manner". Even the communist leaders of this Ukrainian province are anything but excellent. Their functions are always modified by the occasion.

The resistance of Carpatho-Ukraine is unbreakable!

MORE ATTENTION TO YOUNG ACTORS

Under this heading the "Radyanska Ukraina" of Dec. 24th, 1952 No. 302 (9509), published a detailed article, which deals with the problem of the rising generation in the Ukrainian theatre and refers to the importance of this sphere in the cultural life. "The young actors need profound and careful assistance from the masters of the drama and continuous support from the party and Komsomol organizations".

A general investigation of the standard of young actors was recently held in the Ukrainian Soviet republic. "About 800 young actors, working in 64 theatres of the republic, took part in this examination. It was thereby ascertained that by far the greater part were developing and improving".

After enumerating a few positive signs and naming a few young actors who had specially distinguished themselves, the critic, Mr. Yakubenko, leader of the propaganda department of the Central Committee of the Komsomol, proceeded to an exhaustive criticism. In addition, the fact that only 245 participants out of 800 had, in this examination, gained the right to appear on the stage, serves as a warning.

"The organizers of the investigation have already shown that the training of young actors does not have enough attention paid to it in the republic. The following incidents are characteristic: in the theatre of Lviv, the examination days have never once been made known beforehand. The town commission applied itself irresponsible to this business and therefore a part of the performances of young actors could not be attended by individual members of the commission".

Many deficiencies and failures can be traced back particularly to the "lack of systematical ideological educational work and genuine creativeness in the collective-concerns" and must therefore be speedily eliminated. "The party organizational departments and the present Komsomol officials show far too little interest in the development of the budding actors and are therefore equally guilty in such cases". Moreover, the attitude of the critics was subjected to an unfavourable verdict, who "bestowed too little attention upon the activities of the young actors in respect of their work".

This article is at first seemingly meaningless to the casual observer; upon closer observation, however, it shows by many characteristic signs the general Soviet cultural policy. The young Ukrainian actors receive very little opportunity to cultivate their art. This shows the discrepancy between the number of young actors who appear and the number who have passed the test. In place of the lack of instruction—the true cause—the reason for the deficiency is given as the lack of "systematical ideological work" in the sense of the Communist Party. The declaration of the adequacy of the party seems ridiculous when it is known that the artistic vocation does not tolerate cramping by party-political connections, and young artists, above all, need the maximum of liberty in which to develop their abilities and the necessary specialised knowledge and thus to develop their art adequately.

Therefore it can certainly be maintained that such Soviet culture policy will bring the Ukrainian theatre, which possesses a great tradition and can look back with pride upon a free theatrical development, to the brink of destruction, unless the requirements of free creativeness and activity are allowed to survive in the Ukrainian world of art.

THE FALSEHOODS CONCERNING THE LIBERATION OF WEST-UKRAINE

Formerly before the "elections" of local deputy councils the Soviet Press was always accustomed to give an account of developments in the republic, or district of the same, in question, and to give instructions for the future. This year also, shortly before the elections of the local-deputies in the West-Ukraine, the "Radyanska Ukraina" of Dec. 28th, 1952, No. 306 (9513) published a detailed leading, under the heading "The Tremendous Transformations in the Liberated Areas", which dealt with the general situation in the West-Ukrainian provinces, and attempted to give advice for the future.

Right at the beginning it is especially emphasized that the "Ukrainian Socialist Republic" was an inseparable part of the mighty Soviet Union, i.e. of Russia, and had the latter to thank for everything very much "The Ukrainian people know well that only by the help of the peoples of all countries, and especially the great Russian nation, and only on the basis of the wise leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party, has the Soviet Ukraine been transformed into republic with a great socialist industry, a developed collective agriculture, and a high socialist culture". In the opinion of the author I. Sobko, West-Ukraine was not until now in the position to raise itself up. "A low standard of living and political outlawry were the results of severe national oppression". The entire life of the West-Ukrainian people was "mere misery", and exposed to exploitation on the part of the ruling classes. Under the compulsion of want, and the impossibility of acquiring any foothold in the land, many Ukrainians had left their homeland and sought a living in various European and trans-pontine lands.

All this was changed, however, by the "liberation" of West-Ukraine. The inhabitants of these provinces are now "extraordinary happy" and enjoying their existence under "the sun of Stalin". But not only the ruling classes were to blame for the misery of the Ukrainian people; they had yet another foe. "The most terrible antagonists of our nations—the bourgeois Ukrainian nationalists, who justly conceal their counter-revolutionary intentions under their national banner, have served with loyalty and faith the Polish, German, French, Anglo-American, and other foreign oppressors, and have helped them in their dark designs of enslaving the workers of West-Ukraine".

Thus the "Radyanska Ukraina". To all this is only the following to be said: the West-Ukraine and its population have never striven after an alliance with the Soviet Union; its chief attention has been centred upon union with the other Ukrainian provinces only. For the rest, it is pure nonsense to maintain that Ukraine has ever received anything from Russia or her successor, the Soviet Union, or is in any way indebted to her. Further, the much abused existence of Ukrainian nationalism serves as a solemn warning.

UKRAINIANS ABROAD

ADMIRABLE RELIGIOUS MANIFESTATION. In conclusion of the "Week of the Union of Churches" and because of publication of the encyclic "Ecclesias Orientales" Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Mission in Paris arranged on 1. 2. 1953 a magnificent religious manifestation.

On the same day at 10 a. m. Vicar General of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in France Very Rev. Van de Male assisted by Father Bachynsky and Dr. Vivcharuk, celebrated a solemn Mass at St. Volodymyr's the Great.

At the service were present: Monseigneur Rupp, Vicar General for Foreigners in France, representing His Eminence Cardinal Felin, who was unable to take part because of other arrangement, two representatives of the Apostolic Nunciatura in Paris, representatives of foreign Missions in Paris, of religious orders, clergy, and many French theology students.

After the Service Mons. Rupp preached a sermon in French for large Congregation, pointing out the importance of common prayers for unity of all Christians.

At 12 a. m. the next part of manifestation took place in the small hall of the Geographic Society. The Vicar General told in few words the assembled foreign guests and Ukrainians about the purpose of the celebration and read the letter-telegram to the Pope, in which the Ukrainians in France assure of their determination to adhere to the faith of their ancestors and thank Holy Father for his warm words in the last encyclic.

Few songs by the choir under Mr. Dratvinsky and an address by Dr. Markus completed the programme.

UKRAINIANS AT THE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' CONFERENCE IN COPENHAGEN. The 3rd International Students' Conference in which representatives of Central Students' Organizations of 44 nations of the free world took part, was held from 12. 1. 1953 to 17. 1. 1953, in Copenhagen.

The delegates of the Central Union of Ukrainian Students who attended the Conference, were Boris Makarenko of Louvain, Yuriy Borys of Stockholm and Vsevolod Murdak of Paris. The Ukrainian Delegation succeeded in achieving legalization of the Status of the Central Union of Ukrainian Students, admission of its delegates as representatives with full rights to speak at the plenary session and committees and to collaborate in all activities when problems of practical students activities are discussed.

The Ukrainian delegates aroused interest of Danish Press and other student delegates gaining new friends and their sympathies.

A CONFERENCE OF SCOUTS' ORGANIZATIONS IN EXILE was held on 7. 12. 1952 in New York. The Scouts' organizations in exile of Byelorussian, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Poles, Russians, Ukrainians and Yugoslavs, were represented at the Conference.

The need for such Conference arose from the fact that the International Scouts' Organization in London does not recognise the Scouts Organizations in Exile and does not admit them to membership, adhering to the principle of State Organizations. The Conference sent a memorandum to the International Scouts' Conference in London, demanding the admission of the Scouts' Organizations in Exile to membership in the International Scouts' Conference.

from the Ukrainian Scouts two years ago. At this Conference Ukrainian Scouts acted as hosts. The de-

The initiative to organize such Conference came legates of the Ukrainian Scouts were: A. Milanych, K. Korchynsky, and R. Rohosha.

It is the standard-bearer of the Ukrainian national ideal and, as an uncompromising champion of Ukrainian independence, and has abundantly proved that it can best represent the interests of those very Ukrainian workers and can defend their political and social interests.

The Ukrainian nation will therefore never accept the bolshevist lies about the alleged "liberation" even of a single Ukrainian district: it continues to strive militantly towards the goal of an independent state.

BOOKS REVIEW

PAN-SLAVISM AND WORLD WAR II

by Hans Kohn

(*The American Political Science Review*)
Vol. XLVI September, 1952 No. 3

This study on "Pan-Slavism and World War II" by Prof. Hans Kohn, who is a recognised authority on the problems of nationalism and East-European history, testifies to the author's deep understanding of the aspects of Pan-Slavism and its trends in recent history.

Right at the beginning, this survey accurately estimates the political and intellectual situation of the Pan-Slavic ideal on the threshold of the Second World War. "In spite of later claims that it had been the leader of the anti-fascist camp and of the Slav world from the beginning of World War II, the Soviet Union followed a strictly Russian policy, neither anti-fascist nor Pan-Slav, from August, 1939 to June 1941" (p. 699). The development and single phases of Pan-Slavism are handled, with the necessary care and scientific detachment, out of a deep factual and literary knowledge.

Prof. Hans Kohn rightly refers to the fact that the re-awakened Pan-Slavism became more and more a variety of Russian nationalism. The enthusiasm for the imperialist expansion of Tsarist Russia, the glorification of the Russian army (Alexander Nevsky, Dmitri Donskoi, Alexander Suvorov, Mikhail Kutuzov), the sudden "justification" of the tsarist policy of conquests, the degradation and disparagement of those heroes of the liberty-campaign, Shamil and Kenesary Kasyrov, who heroically opposed the Russian imperialist endeavours, the Soviet historical writings are by milestones on the road to the resurgent Great-Russian chauvinism, which today takes the lead in the Soviet Union. "It was only natural that in such an atmosphere the ghost of Pan-Slavism rose again — not the liberal Pan-Slavism of the Western Slavs of 1848, but the Pan-Slavism of Moscow and of the Pan-Slav Congress of 1867; a Pan-Slavism which preached the liberation of the other Slavs from alien influences by the Russian people, a Pan-Slavism, which was Pan-Russianism" (p. 704).

It is very true that during World War II the Russians were very cautious to disclose their actual plans in connection with the Pan-Slavism idea. They had to exercise a little caution in order not to push the other Slavonic nations of the Soviet Union (primarily the Ukrainian and the Byelorussian) to another side. After the end of the World War, however, the situation changed completely. Even during the war, the symptoms appeared of the replacement of the Pan-Slavonic idea by the Great-Russian chauvinistic interests. "As it was, Stalin apparently became convinced that he could count only upon

the support of the Great-Russians, to whose emotions the annexation of the years 1939-1941 had appealed, and among whom some began to look upon him as the leader who would bring about the Pan-Slav and Pan-Asian expansionism of extreme Russian nationalists and the Utopia of universal social justice of Slavophile messianists". (p. 703). While these questions were debated with extreme caution and reserve at the meetings of the Pan-Slav Committee on August 10th, 1941 and April 4th, 1942, at the Third Pan-Slav Congress in Belgrade on Dec. 8th, 1946 the Russian-chauvinist line became quite apparent. "The Pan-Slavism of the war years, promising the equality of all Slav peoples, was openly replaced after 1947 by a Pan-Russianism which imposed Russian predominance on the Slav peoples first, but also on Magyars and Rumanians, Uzbeks and Caucasians" (p. 711).

After the war, victorious for the Soviet Union, the Russianized Pan-Slavism was able to sow its wild oats. But this also hid the germ of the decline and gradual replacement of this ideal. "Altogether the period of Pan-Slavism in its third, communist, Pan-Russian form came to its end. But even in its heyday it had been unable to solve, in spite of all totalitarian pressure and conformity, the old problems disputed among the Slav peoples: the control of Teschen contested by Czechs and Poles, the allegiance of Macedonia to Yugoslavia or Bulgaria, and the desire of the Ukrainian people for independence from the Great-Russians". (p. 711)

Although one cannot agree with all the author's statements and interpretations, as, e. g. his doubt of the "justified" inclusion of the western Ukrainian districts (occupied by the Poles until 1939) to the main part of Ukraine, or even his concept of the whole Pan-Slavonic problem — one must grant him sincerity and a honest desire to elucidate this difficult phenomenon. We represent the view that Pan-Slavism should be regarded only as a historical phenomenon, and could never, in a modern world, defend its significance as a political reality. For it is fundamentally a racist theory, which would never withstand a thorough analysis.

Nevertheless one can quite agree with Prof. Hans Kohn's final remarks as having been proved. They run: "Yet there are signs — in Titoism, in the ever repeated official accusations by Moscow against Polish, Ukrainian, Uzbek, and Caucasian writers and historians — that the non-Russian peoples, Slavs as well as non-Slavs, do not sufficiently appreciate being constantly reminded of the deep gratitude which they owe to the "great" Russian people and of immutable dependence upon the leadership of the Russian people. It is not impossible that an enforced conformity and loyalty driven to such length, may prove a weakening factor in the vast

UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE

(U.I.S.)

Chief editor: Zenon Pelensky

Published by

UKRAINIAN PUBLISHERS LTD.

237 Liverpool Road

London, N.I. Tel. NORTH 1828

THE RIGHT OF UKRAINE TO INDEPENDENCE

Continued from Page 1

Solemnly declaring the greatest solidarity of the entire Church with the Eastern Churches, united with Rome, and with the Church in the Ukraine in particular, Holy Father appeals to all faithful to pray for those who suffer persecutions.

Some newspapers, e. g. French daily "France Soir", of 1st Jan. 1953, give such comments:

"No doubt, the Encyclical will be one of the fundamental basis, to which will refer the Ukrainian independents. The main content of this Pope's document will not be known in the Ukraine immediately; it will leak out there through chinks, it will be diffused in secret and will have a very great influence.

And on this side of the Iron Curtain it will be used by all movements to prepare the break-up of Russian Empire and downfall of Stalin's regime.

In the opinion of the French Press, Holy Father, although quite realizing that the Encyclical will attract to him Stalin's hatred, published it with a triple object in mind:

- 1) *to draw attention of the world to the problem of hard situation of the small Catholic island in the Eastern Ocean of bolshevism*
- 2) *to encourage the faithful whom his voice will reach, in their fidelity and endurance*
- 3) *to recognize, in a manner as little complicated as possible, the right of the Ukraine to independence.*

Moscow empire and may help one day to restore the principles of liberty, equality, and diversity on which the Pan-Slav movement insisted in 1848, when it rejected categorically Moscow's leadership and looked to the West for guidance and inspiration." (p. 722)

Y.Z.P.



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. V No. 3

LONDON, MARCH 1953

Price 1 sh

*Stalin's death does not
solve the main problem:*

THE SCOURGE OF RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

Stalin's passing on March 5th, 1953 made the whole world to hold its breath. An area for wide speculation was thrown open: what would happen next? Now that Stalin is gone, is there a chance for the harassed world to come with the rulers of Russia to some reasonable terms? Does Stalin's death mean that the main obstacle to the world peace was removed? Or does Malenkov's accession to power rather mean the stiffening of communist abstinacy and hostility? Is this a chance for war or peace? Or, maybe, a permanent congelation of the present world status will ensue, an interminable hovering between war and peace?

We are of the opinion that the world's anxious looking, at the lips of Malenkov, or Beria, what he might or might not say, now or in the future, is not the right attitude. We are no preachers of historic determinism; there is no denying of the tremendous importance of the human individuality on the course of the world history. But we maintain that there still exist basic trends and tendencies in the development of single nations which come into existence independently of the will of individuals. Single leaders may sometimes greatly advance and increase, or weaken or reduce such basic trends, but they cannot nullify or cancel them. This or that way they do, always come at last into being.

This is the case with the national, in-born, perpetual Russian imperialism. It is a continuous historical phenomenon. It never ceases. Some Russian leaders may have enhanced, or lessened the impact and the pressure of it, but they always stuck to it.

The peculiarity of Stalin's historical appearance lies in the fact that he pushed the conquest of Russian imperialism as nobody did before him to monstrous di-

Continued on Page 16

THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY

*THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF THE C-in-C OF U.P.A.
GENERAL TARAS CHUPRYNKA*

The division of the world into two camps, which display specific qualities and whose difference manifests itself in all spheres of life more and more comprehensively, had, sooner or later, to lead to a sharper delimitation and even conflict in the form of the "cold war" and actual fighting on the periphery.

The West, led on by the U.S.A., represents the principles of free development in politics, commerce and science. Even the cultural intellectual action of the human race are confined within this framework of the free world. One proceeds from the preliminary condition that the free individual has a right to a free life as a citizen of a State, threatened by no-one, and living the life that is most suited to him. Every nation, as an organic, natural union of such individuals possesses the right to the creation of such a form of life which best suits its structure, provided that their neighbour nations and mankind at large are not thereby exposed to any danger.

All these things compose the conception of liberty.

On the other side, and as representative of a completely contrasting system, stands Russian bolshevism. This bitterly combats every appearance of liberty and strives for the domination of the world. It recognizes no free development in the life of the individual and nation and denies the peaceful co-operation of all countries. Its goal is the absolute world-domination of an imperialistic system, which has, and never will, tolerate a free impulse.

The opposition between the two camps rests upon their differing attitudes towards freedom, which are not to be reconciled.

The Ukrainian nation has already, for a long time occupied a place in the camp of freedom. She has defended, with all her power and possibilities, this stretch of the front of freedom; she was the first to fall a victim to Russian imperialism,

and the blame for this lies mostly upon her own camp, in this case, the West.

It was *Taras Chuprynka*, who, as Commander in Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.), fell on March 5th, 1950, and the third anniversary of whose death fell this year, knew very well of this deep and never to be bridged chasm between the West and bolshevism. He often made it clear that this union of the Western Allies with the Soviet Russian regime, which in its very nature was completely hostile, was quite misguided, as the principles and structure of these two worlds could not be reconciled. He knew only too well that one day there would come an end to this unnatural relationship and that the fronts would then again be sharply limited and opposed to one another. On account of this accurate knowledge and in the consciousness that a conflict would one day be inevitable, he remained at his post and defended the principles of freedom.

His personal sacrifice, combined with a deep insight into the necessity for a final abolition of the Russian-bolshevist system, are not only an individual phenomenon. Their significance can only be properly and sufficiently estimated when one realises that he was a personification of the long and bitter struggle for liberty which the Ukrainian nation, in the front line, has borne on its shoulders for 35 years.

His personality, the foresight that there must come a conflict which would lead to a clarification of these relationships, i.e. which one of the two systems would gain the mastery in the world, should make him a symbol of freedom, not only for the Ukrainian nation, but also for the whole free world.

It is not given to all who fight for freedom and give all their talents and their lives to this cause, to realise its final

Continued on Page 2

LIGHTS AND SHADOWS OF AMERICAN REPUDIATION OF YALTA

UKRAINIANS SUPPORT REVOCATION ON MORAL GROUNDS BUT
UPHOLD THE JUSTNESS OF MOST OF ITS SETTLEMENTS

(U.N.)—On February 20th, 1953, President Eisenhower sent to the Congress of the U.S.A. a draft of the resolution denouncing the U.S.S.R. for its violation of the wartime Allied agreements. A joint declaration by Congress and the President was demanded by which it should have been known that the United States "rejects any interpretations or applications of World War II agreements that have resulted in Russian subjugation of free peoples".

By this, of course, the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam were clearly meant. Although the Presidential draft does not mention both these historical places, in his first press conference in his quality as the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles indicated that the target of the resolution are the "secret understandings" reached at those conferences.

The announcement of the impending repudiation of Yalta and Potsdam resulted in a world stir and commotion. A wide field for speculations was thrown open. The main question was: how far President Eisenhower really intends to go? Would this be a total repudiation, including also the proclamation of the desired reversal of the territorial settlements reached in Yalta?

TWO WASHINGTON TRENDS

There are two trends of thinking in Washington concerning this problem. One camp, composed mainly of the rather conservative wing of the Republican party, supports the idea of the total repudiation, limbs and body. The other camp which includes substantial numbers of liberal Republicans, and almost all Democrats, is inclined to proceed reservedly

and cautiously as not to commit U.S.A. to promises and pledges which, maybe, should prove thoroughly unobtainable.

The wording of the Presidential draft is shaped in pretty general terms. It includes no specified, and in particular no territorial, nor structural commitments. In this form it satisfies pretty thoroughly the aims and intents of liberal Republicans, and the bulk of Democrats. Up till now the opposition of the right-wing Republicans which found the Presidential draft not being "hard" and "substantial" enough, failed to materialise decisively. Thus, it is very probable that the draft would be accepted by the Congress in Presidential wording unanimously.

CORE OF THE DRAFT

The core of the Presidential draft has following wording:

"The Senate and the House concerning—

"Join with the President in declaring that the United States rejects any interpretations or applications of any international agreements or understandings, made during the course of World War II, which have been perverted to bring about the subjugation of free peoples, and further—

"Join in proclaiming the hope that the people who have been subjected to the captivity of Soviet despotism shall again enjoy the right of self-determination within the framework which will sustain the peace, that they shall again have the right to choose the form of government under which they will live, and that sovereign rights of self-government shall be restored to them in accordance with the pledge of the Atlantic Charter".

UKRAINIANS ENDORSE THE DRAFT

The Yalta agreements concern most vitally Ukraine; no Ukrainian can remain indifferent to the attitude which President Eisenhower and the present Congress of the U.S.A. takes towards it. Generally the Ukrainian anti-communist, democratic, national, public opinion, as expressed by the voices of the free Ukrainian press, accepts thoroughly the above wording of the Presidential draft and finds it as being just and appropriate. Especially, the Ukrainian public opinion opposes most seriously and sternly all suggestions and manoeuvres which might be inclined to question the justness of the majority of the territorial settlements

reached in Yalta, and later corroborated in Potsdam.

The Ukrainian public opinion maintains that not *everything* was wrong and condemnable which had been voiced and settled in Yalta. If anywhere, just in this case there can be applied the famous words of Mephisto in Goethe's 'Faust': "Ich bin ein Teil von jener Kraft, die stets Böse will und stets das Gute schafft" — "I am a part of that power which always wishes the wrong, and still creates the right".

INSTEAD OF LIBERATION— ENSLAVEMENT

Whenever and wherever the Ukrainians condemn unequivocally and oppose bitterly the Yalta agreements, it happens first of all on moral grounds. The basic wrong of Yalta agreements is not their territorial settlements. Most of them were just and desirable. The basic wrong of Yalta was the conscious and purposeful delivery on the side of the main Western powers of so many nations—almost 100 million Europeans—to the rule and domination of Moscow. Yalta should have been an act of liberation. Instead, it became an act of bitter enslavement. Yalta agreements should have been the principal implementation of the general principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Basic Declaration of the then newly founded United Nations. Here is the substantial quotation from the text of the pertaining Yalta declaration:

"The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice. This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter—the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those people who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations".

Now, the reality was that in spite of the above fine words, the "Big Three" assumed in Yalta the boldness to speak, to decide and to enter upon pledges and commitments in the name and for innumerable peoples never bothering to collect and to meet the opinions and the wishes of the peoples concerned. Nobody has been asked. Nobody has been consulted. Nobody has got a chance to say what he does or what he does not like. "They had been married without being asked"—as a Ukrainian proverb goes.

THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN

The contention was, of course, that once the genuinely democratic principles would be applied, the peoples concerned would get a chance to express their opi-

THE STRUGGLE FOR LIBERTY

(Continued from Page 1)

victory. Among these is numbered General Taras Chuprynka.

The motive of his work lies in the conception of the division of the Soviet Empire and the construction of a new order in Eastern Europe on the basis of a free national development of the individual nations and an ordered and peaceful co-operation among them.

When, however, the West achieves the insight to see that liberty cannot be distributed and that every nation has a right to it in the framework of an independent National State, then the testament of this Ukrainian statesman would receive the necessary regard, and benefit would ensue to the struggle of the Ukrainian nation for the re-attainment of her national liberty.

nions freely and to settle their impending territorial and constitutional problems among themselves.

But accepting such a platform, Messrs. *Franklin Roosevelt* and *Winston Churchill* on the one side, and the jolly, old "Uncle Joe" Stalin on the other side, had been talking about thoroughly different things. As *Aune O'Hare McCormick* of the *New York Times* (January 21, 1953) puts it. "In reality there was no understanding at these meetings. The tragic mistake was not in the effort to reach accord with Moscow, or in the form of the agreements, but in the failure to comprehend that when Stalin spoke of self-government, free elections, democratic processes, joint action and the like he not only gave his own meaning to these phrases but had no idea of what they meant in our language".

Well, the Ukrainian opinion endorses thoroughly the above statement of *Aune O'Hare McCormick*—except the last words. Stalin knew very well what the West undertood under the words democracy, free elections, self-determination, and the like. The trouble is—and remains—that using these Western weapons allegedly in Western sense, he beat *Roosevelt* and *Churchill* upon their own grounds. Out of this quid pro quo arise all present Western, also American, attempts to "excuse" the Crimean deals with Stalin by maintaining that "Yalta was all right but Stalin has not kept his word".

The main, the terrible, the never softening reproach of all nations and 100 million European people, who had been hard omitted and prostrated by Yalta agreements is: *the Western Powers, Roosevelt and Churchill, should have known by foresight not by hindsight, what in concurrence with Stalin they are driving the peoples into.*

IT WAS NOT DIFFICULT TO SEE

Stalin was no novice by then, and bolshevism was no new device. At that time Stalin and bolshevism had a standing record of more than 30 years, and what a record! This was a record of most implacable terrorism, constraint, treachery, lies, broken words, falsehoods, aggression, robberies, thieveries, blackmails—and the never abating lust for power.

Was it so difficult to foresee how Stalin would treat peoples entrusted to his sphere of influence? Was it enough for the freedom and security of 100 million Europeans to rely upon a "hunch" of President *Roosevelt* that he "knows" that by then "the present bolshevism is no more the real old bolshevism", that the present "Russia is in deep transformation towards restricted, purely national interests", that "Russia wants only security", that once she gets "security" her imperialistic drive will abate, hence—for the sake of the "world peace" and Russia's "security" the peoples in question can be

entrusted to Moscow's care and protection.

More and more the thoroughly different explanation of the mild and complaisant attitude of the Western powers towards the Russian demands in Yalta engraved itself deeply in the minds of the peoples in question. It was not so much the Western concern about the "security" of Russia which directed at that time the steps and the decisions of the Western powers. It was rather the anxiety of their own Western security which was predominant in Yalta. This was the policy of appeasement at its height: the feeding up of Russia, the throwing every thing into her insatiable tract as to get and secure one's own peace—"for one hundred years at least". For just so long was foreseen the digestion of the sumptuously devoured pray.

The peoples thus betrayed and sold over never can and never will accept some other excuse of that kind of the Western powers, i. e., that the complaints of the peoples involved are of no avail because "anyway", Stalin by all means would have taken what he virtually has taken; he simply had the power". But there is a difference whether somebody takes something by its own, onesided, arbitrary action and power, or whether he takes it by the consent and the written and signed international agreement.

"HOPE AND INSPIRATION"—WHAT FOR?

It was, therefore, the highest time to make a serious attempt, at least on the side of the U.S.A., to repudiate morally an international agreement which became the legalized arrangement for the enslavement of 11 nations and 100 million of people. The proposed joint resolution can at least make attempt to void and to eradicate the moral devastation in the hearts and minds of millions created by the deals and political barterings manufactured in Yalta.

But, of course, the American verbal revocation of Yalta and Potsdam cannot undo the effective material consequences of the Allied Crimean understandings. The difference between the former conclusion and the present repudiation of Yalta is that the conclusion was backed and implemented concurrently by the force of scores of American divisions which in February 1945 invaded Europe. But the present repudiation is backed by nothing: no divisions, no powerful pressures, no sanctions. The Russians remain solidly entrenched in their new possessions and apparently accept all this with pretty leisure. The present effects of the repudiation avail to no more than to a situation in which somebody who got a terrible scull hit by a baseball bat, now gets an excuse: "so sorry sir, this wasn't intended!" But already the admission of the perpetrated wrong makes a difference.

How much difference? A Republican senator in a high-policy making position meant nowadays that aim of the repudiation consists "*in kindling hope and inspiration in the hearts of the enslaved peoples and in dismaying the Communist oppressor*". If there no policy of hard pressures and effective sanctions against the Soviet regime is planned and envisioned, there remain "hopes and inspirations"—what for? That the Soviet rulers one day would change their mind and become propitious? That a revolution in U.S.S.R. would break out? That the communist regime would miraculously fade away? Or—that what happen else? The presidential draft gives no answers.

UNITY OF UKRAINE

But in case that one day there really "something" may happen in Eastern Europe, the communist congealment may break up and a new flow of historic events may ensue, it is of utmost importance that this bit of involuntary justice which was involved in Yalta agreements might be preserved.

FIRST, this applies to the assemblage and the unification of all Ukrainian ethnographical territories, torn apart in the course of history between many neighbours, into *one* Ukrainian National State. The repudiation of Yalta should never be identical with the restoration of the territorial status of Eastern Europe of 1939. This status was with regard to Ukraine an act of open defiance, a slap in the face of the principle of self-determination. In clear violence of this principle large parts of Ukrainian national ethnographical territories had been attached after the World War I to the States of Poland, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, then Hungary. The largest chunk—8 million Ukrainians—had been forcibly attached to Poland.

The Ukrainian problem was very well known to the British policy-makers of that time. It is no accident that just the British Foreign Secretary *George Curson* drew 1919 his famous "line" separating the Ukrainian and Polish national territories. Already at that time the British policy was compelled by facts to acknowledge that the territories in question—Galicia and Volhynia—are nationally and ethnographically undoubtedly Ukrainian. On the western side of the "Curson line" are still some ethnically Ukrainian territories.

In the meantime vast population shifts and ethnographical adjustments have taken place in that regions. There are no Poles now in Western Ukraine as almost all of them—nearly 3 million—had been shifted to the West. One of the positive traits of Yalta was that at last, after 6 centuries of wars and bloody strifes, a to a certain extent just Ukrainian-Polish border had been established, with clear separation of both national populations.

In any case, no mixed Ukrainian-Polish population shall again live in the same place because such a "solution" inevitably will again create, as was the case between the two World Wars, unendurable claims for national mastery, a state of incessant mutual struggles, tensions and hatreds.

Or shall again, as between two World Wars, 700,000 Ukrainians go under the Czech, resp. Hungarian rule, and another 900,000 Ukrainians under the Roumanian domination?

All such "ideas" are for the Ukrainians plainly intolerable and in case of the attempts, their forcible implementation would provoke the Ukrainians to most embittered, bloody resistance. After centuries of separations the Ukrainians at last obtained their national unity, and they will keep it—whatever price this may cost.

Thus it was wisely and thoroughly justified that President Eisenhower attached no revisionistic and restitutional territorial strings to his project of the repudiation of Yalta. As the agreements of Yalta constituted in its many parts a glaring injustice the restoration of the status of 1939 would be a still more glaring injustice. President Eisenhower was right to drop that hot iron. Whatever comes, the Western frontiers of Ukraine would in any case remain at least what they presently are, despite of the fact that they do not constitute a just ethnographic solution.

UKRAINE AND UNITED NATIONS

SECOND—the total repudiation of Yalta would also mean the expulsion of Ukraine and Byelorussia from the United Nations. How such eviction should be engineered in view of the fact that 59 nations have recognized the membership of Ukraine in this body—is anybody's guess.

By the means of Ukrainian membership in U.N. the status of the existence of a formally independent Ukrainian State had been at last internationally recognized. As the unification of all Ukrainian territories, also the international recognition of the Ukrainian statehood is one of the involuntary justnesses which Yalta had created.

The problem at hand is not to repudiate Yalta as to evict Ukraine and Byelorussia from United Nations but to look to it that the Russian-bolshevik stooge which at present "represents" Ukraine in the United Nations be replaced by a genuine representative of Ukraine, freely elected resp. appointed to this international post by the free will of Ukrainian nation.

The total repudiation of Yalta which programmatically would necessarily involve the territorial restitution to the status of 1939 would inevitably awake anew the imperialistic appetites of Poles, Czechs, Hungarians and Roumanians—and equally inevitably would chill the

THEIR ANOTHER BIG LIE

THEIR FIGHT AGAINST THE INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE
RUSSIAN EMIGREE IMPERIALISTS ARE MISUSING THE A.C.L.P.R. IN

By Petro Stepanenko

A COLLECTIVE TRAIT

That Russians understand to lie, and to lie greatly, is very well known everywhere throughout the world. Gorky wrote a whole treatise expounding the sociology of the Russian lie. It suffice to read one single page of Dostoevsky's works to see at once how well, how perfectly, how masterly they know the business of lying. The heroes of the Russian literature relish in lies. You can be dead sure that 95 p. c. of all plots, complications and suspensions in Russian novels are

sympathetic feelings of the oppressed nations under the power of Moscow towards America and the democratic world in general.

So again it was reasonable that the Presidential draft avoids the international structural and constitutional commitments of any kind. In consequence, the repudiation of Yalta remains in a purely moral sphere, voicing just principles but avoiding all hints with regard to possible practical implementations. The Ukrainians can readily accept exactly such formulations and wordings.

GREAT CHARTER OF LIBERTIES

But the repudiation of Yalta, if seen properly, is in itself still only a *negative* device, a proclamation—what the U.S.A. wants *not*. Yet the time ripens where the U.S.A. would be obliged to declare to the whole world, and especially to the peoples of Eastern Europe in unmistakable terms and propositions what it aims at *positively*. The time is ripening to proclaim a Great Charter of Liberties for all the peoples enslaved by Moscow, and not only those who became the victims of Russia in and after World War II, what the position of U.S.A. is, what the peoples in question can reckon with, what awaits them and for what they have to struggle against the Kremlin.

As the present Republican government of the U.S.A. rejects the former policies of the *appeasement* and the *containment*, and enters boldly upon the policy of *Liberation*, it is necessary to clarify what by the word "liberation" is exactly meant?

Only such positive clarification will at long last undermine the strength of Kremlin and set America in the eyes of the peoples oppressed by Moscow as their true friend and liberator. In final account, the Ukrainian public opinion evaluates the moral repudiation of Yalta by President Eisenhower and the Congress of the U.S.A. only as the *first* step in proper direction. But there is still a very long way to go.

based on lies and develop from lies. There are innumerable hues, tints, shades, colors, tones and keys in their cultivation of all sorts of untruths,—in all their falsehoods, fabrications, forgeries, inventions, misstatements, dissimulations, shams, pretenses, impositions, bluffs, trickeries, colorings, fictions, tales, conards, yarns, moonshines, subterfuges, evasions, feigns,—no, decidedly, the English language is *too* poor to raise an idea of the abundant welth of all sorts of untruths known in the Russian language. And the language undoubtedly is the mirror of a man's soul.

The Russian bolshevism reached the peak in the "subtle" art of lying—reversing everything, making black white, good bad, liberty slavery, and so on. It took George Orwell's frightful description of "1984" to implant all humanity an idea what the Big Lie may develop to. The biggest Russian Lie the Americans have up till now experienced was manufactured in Yalta. The "Big Brother" has kept literally not one word of all his most solemn promises and pledges. Here it was that the U.S.A. had to learn that the same word can have two and more thoroughly different meanings.

A STRANGE STATEMENT

Thus, when the Russians do distort and lie—the world takes it almost for granted. But the strange thing is that the Americans allow the Russians to deceive them once more, no more in Yalta, but this time in the midst of New York, 6 East 45th Street, in the premises of the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia". Obviously, quite involuntarily, the Americans concur in one of the biggest Russian political lies ever devised. We have in mind the strange Press release of A.C.L.P.R., issued on December 24th, 1952, concerning the participation of Ukrainians in the "Co-ordinating Center of Antibolshevik Struggle", set up shortly in Munich, Germany. We quote the word for word:

"The Committee (i. e. A.C.L.P.R.) is well aware that the Ukrainian emigration is composed not only of various groups, but is subdivided into two major political trends: one for defending the complete independence of Ukraine; the other standing for federation with Russia. The opinion of the Committee is that both of these major trends should be represented in the future political center and that neither one of them can benefit at the expense of the other. And the Committee does not see any reason why the representatives of these two major trends of the Ukrainian emigration cannot take their

places around the same table with their colleagues from the Russian and National emigree organizations and to discuss jointly the proper means and forms of their mutual collaboration in the struggle against the common enemy".

Apparently the author, or the authors, of the above statement started from the principle so profitably formulated by the late Super-Master of Lies, *Adolf Hitler*, who stressed that a lie must only be big enough to be accepted and believed. The bigger the lie, the more chances has it to be accepted. The plain, average people simply cannot perceive that somebody could and would lie so terribly, hence—the people infer—"there must be some truth in it". The Russians influencing the A.C.L.P.R. again landed a "big stroke" inducing the unsuspecting Americans to believe, to sign and to publish the above declaration based thoroughly upon a most brazen lie. The idea was that the people would infer that there really "must be some truth in it". But there is none.

WHERE THEY FOUND UKRAINIAN FEDERALISTS?

The Russian lie implied in the quoted statement lies in the contention that the "Ukrainian emigration is... subdivided into two major political trends: one defending the complete independence of the Ukraine; the other standing for the federation with Russia". To put it shortly, there are among Ukrainians *independents* on one hand, and the federalists on the other hand. And both constitute "major trends".

Reading this statement the Ukrainians throughout the whole free world are at a loss trying to find out and to understand: where of all places the A.C.L.P.R., and especially its Chairman, Admiral *Leslie Stevens*, has taken the "major trend" of Ukrainian "federalists" from? The Ukrainian public opinion knows nothing of the existence of such a political Ukrainian group to be counted seriously with, nor of its dimensions which would allow it to define it as a "serious trend". In reality no such group exists. Here we undertake to prove this.

What is a major political trend? We think that if a political trend is really *major*, it ought to have its principal manifestations, for instance its written founded *programme*, its popularly known *leaders*, its ideological *press*, its tangible *organization* embodied in its circles, cells, committees, membership, caucuses, offices, elections etc.

We flatter ourselves to know exactly what the picture of the Ukrainian political life in the home-country and in the exile looks like. Thus, we know of the existence in exile of some 12 Ukrainian non-federalist, independent political groups, organizations and parties. On demand we would be able to say all essentials

about their lives and activities. The Ukrainian public opinion knows their leaders, who they are, where they live, how they live, what from they live, what gifts and capacities, what weaknesses and failures they possess. They are liked or disliked—but they are *known*. The Ukrainians know the programmes of these parties, their ideological and tactical differences. And they know their material embodiments: the composition of their central committees, their internal oppositions, their Press, even their incomes. The Ukrainians know the real strength of these groups and parties, i. e. which is entitled to count upon the support of hundreds of thousands, and which is limited to the tiny amount of some dozens of followers.

A CHALLENGE TO A.C.L.P.R.

But what about the "federalist" movement? And especially: what about its "size"? Is there somewhere one Ukrainian federalist party? Or does there exist more of them? Who knows? And here is our challenge: if A.C.L.P.R. knows something substantial about that, we would be extremely grateful to be taught accordingly and properly enlightened.

But we are afraid, the A.C.L.P.R. would disappoint us: it would not be in the position to divulge the pertaining data, simply because there exist no such data. You cannot state something about nothing. What about federalist *programme*? What about the leaders, Press, organization, membership, committees, caucuses etc.? Make an experiment and ask an average Ukrainian, anywhere, everywhere, what he or she does know about the organization, the leaders, the programme of the Ukrainian "federalist" movement? You will be surprised: an average Ukrainian would give you a dozen and more names of Ukrainian political leaders, but none of them would be a "federalist".

THE WITNESS

One might think that first of all, a "major political trend" should have a sizable Press at its disposal. What about the Ukrainian "federalist" Press? The *Ukrainian Observer* has published in its April number 1952 a huge photograph of the assembled titles of the Ukrainian emigree Press from all free continents. Exactly 99 items were exhibited: dailies, semiweeklies, weeklies, monthlies, and all sorts of political, cultural, scientific and religious journals. None of them ever propagated federation with Russia. All of them always supported, and continue to support, staunchly the full independence of Ukraine.

And now, the federalist "counterpart": how many papers have they? We know of none. Of course, we know that the Russians publish, since a year, two papers in Ukrainian language propagating the submergence of Ukraine in a "Greater Russia". One of them is the *Skhidniak*

(*The Easterner*); many people wonder what this name properly means? It is published in New York, as the supplement of *Novoye Russkoye Slovo* (*New Russian Word*). The second is the *Bulletin*; it appears in Munich. At first it was substantially financed by Mr. *Isaac Don Levine* of the A.C.L.P.R. Now it is financed thoroughly by the Russians. This must be stressed with all clarity: it is the *Russians* who, being interested in Ukrainian "federation", publish and finance these two papers, and not the other way round: the *Ukrainians* who are honestly convinced in the national salvation through federation.

NO GROUND IN UKRAINIAN SOCIETY

This has a much deeper meaning than it seems at first. How it comes that the Ukrainian independents are able to publish 99 periodicals, many of them at the highest Western standards, without ever enjoying any outer supports and subventions? All this is done by their own means and devices. The answer is simple: this happens because this independent Press enjoys the support of the entire mass of the Ukrainian emigrees, and because this population is independent; it likes the ideas, the conceptions and the guidance of its free Press.

On the other side; how does it come that there exist no Ukrainian "federalist" press worth to be mentioned? How it is that just the Russians are obliged to finance their pitifully scanty *Easterner* and *Bulletin*? Were it not the Russians, not a single number of these both splendid publications would ever see the light of day. Again the explanation is only too evident: because the mass of Ukrainian population strictly and uncompromisingly refuses to accept and to support its preposterous ideas. There is no ground among Ukrainians for such Press. This Press analysis constitutes an absolutely unmistakable proof that there exists no federalist "major political trend" among the Ukrainians.

THE RUSSIAN CONCEPT OF "LIBERATION"

It is unknown to us by what "arguments", manoeuvrings and practices the Russians convinced Admiral *Leslie Stevens* and the A.C.L.P.R. that among Ukrainians there exists this mysterious federalist "major political trend". We are absolutely convinced that the American leadership of A.C.L.P.R. accepted this contention bona fide. But instead, the more obvious are to Ukrainians the Russian reasons *why* they are trying, and that by all means and devices, to convince the Americans of the existence of that faked "major movement".

The Russians, *all* Russians, or better to say, all Muscovites, of every political hue and slant, see the Russian empire in a mortal peril. They know that the Russo-

bolshevik imperialism aroused at last the resistance and the reaction throughout the whole imperilled world. They know that the periods of *appeasement* and *containment*, these gratis insurance policies for the preservation of the Russian empire, are swiftly running out, and that a policy of *liberation* is in making. The anti-bolshevik Russian concept of liberation, shared by all Russian so-called democratic parties, is to liberate *them* after the downfall of bolshevism for *their* succession in power, but never to liberate "the dung of the empire"—the non-Russian nations. Consequently, the Russian idea is to pervert, to frustrate, to compromise, to prostrate and to render impotent all national liberation movements.

How better to paralyze the Ukrainian liberation movement than by splitting it into two parts, nullifying by that the efficiency of both of them? This is an old Russian device, applied one thousand times in Ukraine, and now repeated with remarkable assistance of Americans—in New York. If there are no Ukrainian federalists, they must be invented. If they cannot be invented, they must be created. Moscow was always able and particularly deft in finding and in using widely *political stooges*, even in the U.S.A.; see, the communist party of the U.S.A. It was not difficult to find its stooges, too, among Ukrainians.

MUSHROOMING of "FEDERALISTS"

We would be obliged to respect a Ukrainian federalist movement if it had some really independent standing, say, if somebody would have preached and advocated the Ukrainian federation with Russia already 20, or 10 years ago, and if he would have been ready and willing to fight for it and to suffer for it. But no one such ideology, nor movement, was in the past 30 years ever forthcoming. There were no federalist ideologies, nor parties.

The most remarkable and astounding thing is that the Ukrainian "federalists" and their "parties" mushroomed spectacularly into existence only *after* the A.C.L.P.R. was created. It was obvious that sooner or later the Ukrainians, too, would have to come into the picture. The Russians know the power, the organization, the intentness, the devotion of the Ukrainian national liberation movement. The Russians know that the Ukrainians are the natural leader, the mainstay of all other non-Russian national liberation struggles within the U.S.S.R. Consequently, the main task was, by splitting the Ukrainian representation into "independents" and "federalists", to emasculate the Ukrainian participation in the A.C.L.P.R., and to render it impotent at the very beginnings.

This is the proper explanation why all at once, and thoroughly unexpectedly, a "federalist" movement came into "being". All at once frantic Russian attempts had

been made to build-up some outstanding Ukrainian "federalist" personalities: "General" Gulay's, "Dr". Bogatyrychuk, and the like. The Ukrainian society asked in amazement and bewilderment, and even in some fascination: *who* are they? Where do they come from? Who knows something about them? It is quite understandable that the Ukrainian society simply refused to recognize them.

TRUTH WILL PREVAIL

But the most amazing feature is that the Americans are lending a helping hand to all these Russian imperialistic schemes and devices. The above mentioned Press release of the A.C.L.P.R. asks innocently—why then the Ukrainian independents cannot sit at the same round table with Ukrainian "federalists", and discuss the common plans against the common enemy? The answer is: The Ukrainians cannot do this, first, because there are no "Ukrainian federalists", and, second, because the people who pretend to be "federalists" are simply and evidently the Russian imperialist stooges. Each such "federalist" is in reality nothing else than one member and one voice more of the Russian delegation in the "Co-ordinating Center". To let *two* Ukrainian delegations represent the Ukraine in one centre, is to make the Russian a referee and master of both of them. This is in what the true Ukrainian parties would never acquiesce. The Ukrainians refuse to concede to the Russian the role of the "Big Brother",

at that in an American sponsored organization.

The Russian "Big Lie" about the existence of a Ukrainian "federalist" movement is too preposterous to have a very long standing. It would not be very difficult to expose it. The whole mankind learns more and more how to treat and to accept assertions, contentions and allegations which come from the Russians. Thus, in this particular case, too, the truth at last will prevail. There is a Russian proverb saying that you can reach the farthest corner of the world using the lies, but you will never be able to come back. It is only once that the Russians are able to hoax the Americans with the "existence" of Ukrainian "federalist" movement; the second time it would not work.

In Paul M. Angle's fine edition of "*New Letters and Papers of Abraham Lincoln*" (Boston; Floughton and Mifflin, 1930, p. 81) we find a very fine word of the Great ABC which gives us an assurance that the A.C.L.P.R. will at last dispose of the Russian Big Lie, discussed in this article. The word of Lincoln goes: "It is the right of any people, sufficiently numerous for national independence, to throw off, to revolutionize, their existing form of government, and establish such other in its stead as they may choose". The Ukrainians, *all* of them, are choosing sovereignty, no federation. They know nothing about federation, and refuse even to listen. That is all.

THE UNITED FRONT CLOSES ITS RANK

The political dispute between the non-Russian Emigration from the U.S.S.R. and the "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" has added to its course one more event. We are thinking here of the common declaration issued by the national centres and Liberation-Organizations which was reproduced in its entirety in the last number of our journal.

This document seems to us so significant that we consider it appropriate to refer to it once again.

The first thing that must be mentioned: although the declaration was not signed by all existing national centres and liberation organizations, it was nevertheless approved by the most representative and important. Everyone who takes an interest in East-European problems knows what the Foreign Representation of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists stands for, and what part it played in the life of East Europe, the National Turkessian Unity Committee or the Caucasian National Representation. They are organizations which actually lead and set the tone in the political life of their respective nations.

Secondly, the moment chosen for the publication of the declaration is very characteristic. When one heard here and there that the "American Committee" had won an unrivalled hearing among the non-Russian emigres and when people spoke about the "Co-ordinating Center of the Anti-bolshevist Campaign" as if it represented the political wishes of these emigres—all these rumours have been discredited by the declaration. It has been made clear that the national centres and liberation-organizations of the non-Russian peoples still hold themselves aloof from the programme of the "American Committee". It has been made clear that there can be no talk of compromise with this programme, not to speak of complete approval. Furthermore, even those centres who, as it is here and there stated, are either working with, or negotiating with the intention of working with the "American Committee", have signed the common declaration.

Thirdly, organizations have joined in signing the declaration who have been, and still are, waging bitter war among themselves by reason of the disparity among their political, social and spiri-

tual philosophies. When, however, it is a matter of resisting the foreign Russian foe, they subordinate all internal quarrels to the composing of a united front. When it comes to the ultimate welfare of their peoples and the defence of the independence of their nations, they always find a common language.

The common declaration has its political, as well as its moral value, which is not to be under-estimated. It bears witness to forces which today, it is true, are still deeply hidden, but which tomorrow, in the decisive hour, can and will make themselves felt. Every non-partial observer of the political life of the non-Russian emigres can imagine the winding-up of events in Eastern Europe, when they will be determined and moulded by the powers of such moral constancy and by such a clear political programme.

It should also be pointed out that the declaration provides a clear answer to the much-debated question of whether bolshevism and Russian imperialism are mutually opposed manifestations or not. All the signatories are agreed that bolshevism is only a tool of Russian imperialism and they derive that conviction from the centuries-long experiences which their nations have personally undergone.

The "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia" and the non-Russian emigration are still at the starting-points where they were eighteen months ago and until the present day neither side will allow itself to be convinced by the other. The political dispute between them thus continues along the path which has so often been discussed in our journal. The new element, which did not exist until now, in this dispute is that, in the official American foreign policy, new forces have put in an appearance. It is just these new tendencies in the American foreign policy which we have observed since the assumption of the duties of government by the Republican Party that lead us to hope that the "American Committee" and its programme will in future have no support from the State Department. This would rebound not only to the honour, but to the benefit, of the new American government, which would thereby prove that it is not allowing itself to be led by rigid schedules, but by political expediency.



of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

Published by

UKRAINIAN PUBLISHERS LTD.

237 Liverpool Road

London, N.I. Tel. NORTH 1828

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND UKRAINE

TRENDS, HOPES AND EXPECTATIONS

By Z. Poray

"I join with you in the fervent hope that the forty million enslaved people of the Ukraine will once more enjoy freedom and democracy".

This wrote General Dwight D. Eisenhower during the presidential election in October 1952 to Dr. Borys Bazylevych, a former Ukrainian D.P., now residing in Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A. These words had been forthwith reprinted and broadly commented in all Ukrainian free Press throughout the world this side of the Iron Curtain. These words of now President Eisenhower proved that he is fully aware of the present status of the enslavement of Ukraine and of the necessity of her liberation.

The majority of free Ukrainians this side of the Atlantic, quite openly hoped for and desired the election of General Eisenhower to presidency. It was quite obvious, too, that the vast majority of Americans of Ukrainian descent voted the Republican ticket. Of course, the General's expression of sympathy for the enslaved Ukraine was necessarily held in wide and general terms and did not commit his future practical policy to some specified course. There were no promises. And there were no pledges.

Still, the sympathies of Ukrainians went thoroughly with the candidate Eisenhower. Commitments or no commitments, at least there was a chance of a change of previous Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy which left no margin at all for Ukrainian hopes whatsoever.

The democratic Roosevelt-Truman policy engraved itself deeply in the minds and memories of Ukrainians as a consequent policy first of the *appeasement*, then of the *containment* of bolshevism. Both these lines practically denied and repudiated the ultimate Ukrainian liberation aims: after the overthrow of bolshevism, the revival of a united, sovereign, democratic, Ukrainian National State.

The foreign policy of the Democratic administration was deeply statical, conservative, in the bottom even reactionary, bound to preserve the existing status quo, averse to change anything. The main problem of this administration was not to fight bolshevism and Russian imperialism but only to stop and to "contain" it. The Democratic administration was eager to get peace from Moscow at any price, even at the defeatist price of ultimately letting down the definite enslavement of all the peoples devoured by Russia during the Revolution and World War II.

With the Roosevelt-Truman administration there was for the Ukrainians, and for so many more enslaved nations, nothing at all to be hoped for. Mr. George

Kennan's sterile political philosophy of the so-called "sceptical realism" prevailed; this gentleman was the official ideologist of the Truman administration. And this meant by its practical implementation: the constant division of the whole world in two parts—liberal and totalitarian, free and enslaved, democratic and bolshevist. The word "peace" was meant by this defeatist philosophy as the queer, perverse symbiosis of these both principles. Apparently it has not dawned yet in this camp of "sceptical realists" that the world we are living in is *one* world, one and indivisible, which can not be partitioned, and just as the U.S.A. in 1860, can not continue to live as a "house divided"—half free, half slave.

The hopes and expectations of so many peoples and nations surged towards presidential candidate Eisenhower because they awaited that the mortal deadlock of the defeatist policy of containment would finally be broken, the whole previous trend of the petrification of Russian slavery of nations would be reversed, and a clearly dynamic, even revolutionary and revisionistic policy of fighting bolshevism and Russian imperialism, and a trend towards liberation, would ensue.

This surge of hopes had been greatly strengthened and corroborated as candidate Eisenhower repeatedly declared during his election campaign in the first days of September 1952 that the consciousness of the Americans would never be at ease, so long as there are peoples undeservedly enslaved and oppressed by bolshevism. In these statements a clear undertone of uneasy memories was to be heard, a nightmarish reminiscence of American policies of the fading President Roosevelt which were to a vast degree responsible for the present unhappy state of the world. At the same time this was an implicit announcement that in case of Eisenhower's presidential victory, all "secret agreements" concluded by the U.S.A. during World War II would be repudiated which, through the vile misinterpretation of Moscow, led to the enslavement of peoples. Indeed, this announcement had been faithfully kept, as President Eisenhower sent on February 20th, 1953 to the Congress a project of a common resolution repudiating unjust and untenable parts of the settlements of Yalta and Potsdam.

Of course, it is far too early to evaluate the policies of President Eisenhower; these are only the beginnings. But so much can be said right now:

The free Ukrainians discern in the present display of world politics the existence of the opposing—dynamic and static, the revisionistic and the persevering powers,

and they are glad to see that President Eisenhower leads the U.S.A. out from the static and reactionary into the revisionistic camp. The Ukrainians hope for good that this trend will continue. The present shape of world affairs—"the house divided"—cannot stand

The Ukrainians believe that up till now President Eisenhower proceeds in the right direction. But now as then the main problem is and remains—*Russia*.

Disregarding all internal party differences, the free Ukrainian public opinion is united in the view that no peripheral corrections and settlements, such as say—conclusion of the armistice in Korea, a truce in Indochina, repudiation of Yalta etc. can solve the problem properly.

The necessity exists to go to the bottom of the evil—the historical Russian imperialism as such. It makes not much sense to cut away single limbs, or to beat off some sole teeth out of the dragon's jaws; they have the property to rebuild and to revive.

Without the durable liquidation of the Russian imperialism no genuine world peace would ever be possible. But the Russian imperialism can only be liquidated with the liquidation of the Russian empire. Thus, the dismemberment of this huge monster, stolen, looted, cheated and defrauded into one "unity", and kept together only by sheer constraint and terror, is the great necessity and the last main task of our age.

The truth is that below this surface, in the first place the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R., expect fervently, and even feverishly from President Eisenhower that just *he* is the man of the century. able and willing, to break the terrible hold of the Russian bolshevist and imperialist craziness.

We are quite sure that President Eisenhower would never be in the position to avoid the final showdown with the bolshevism—the last historical display of the national Russian imperialism.

With the time going the problem of American allies within the U.S.S.R. would definitely arise. We are of ultimate opinion that the Russians proper, the Muscovites, interested mainly in the preservation, *per fas et nefas*, of their compulsory empire, never will be and never can be the true allies of the free World led by the U.S.A. The repudiation of Yalta and Potsdam, the programme of the liberation only of the nations enslaved by Moscow during and after the World War II, stakes the problem decidedly too narrow. The liberty, too, is indivisible. In the first place the non-Russian nations are the real, dependable, dynamical force behind the Iron Curtain which can be counted upon. The Ukrainians are proud of being the first, the strongest, the best organized nation in the field of forces permanently and unflinchingly opposing

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

EXTENSION OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH UKRAINIAN S.S.R. AND BYELORUSSIAN S.S.R. DEMANDED IN THE U.S.A. CONGRESS

On Monday, February 9th, 1953, the U.S.A.-Congressman *Lawrence H. Smith*, Republican of Wisconsin, introduced in the House of Representatives a *Concurrent Resolution* demanding the American extension of diplomatic relations with the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia.

In our view, if adopted, this Resolution would constitute one of the most important documents in the field of the post-war international relations, and one of the most shrewd moves in the psychological war against bolshevism and Russian imperialism. It would gain innumerable new Ukrainian friends for the U.S.A. But first the text:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SVOBODA; 24. 2. 1953.

No. 7/1953

WHEREAS the Soviet Government in Moscow fosters, through propaganda media, the appearance of independent will and status on the part of The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic; and

WHEREAS, in the historical order, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic exercised its complete sovereignty as a signatory, along with the separate States of Poland and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic, to the Treaty of Riga in 1921, the official text of which appeared in three languages—Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian; and

WHEREAS on the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the sovereign and independent status was affirmed to the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Byelorussian S.S.R. by the First Union Constitution which declared that each of the members Republics shall retain the right freely to withdraw from the Union; and

WHEREAS the Soviet Government has given the impression that it favored the sovereignty and independent status of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Byelorussian S.S.R. when it was stated that Republics should have the right to secede from the U.S.S.R. and that such right was to be more than a meaningless scrap of paper; and

WHEREAS sovereignty and independence of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Byelorussian S.S.R. is set forth in the Constitution of 1936 which provides:

behind the Iron Curtain the Russian imperialism and bolshevism.

We believe to understand from the introductory quotation to this article that President Eisenhower knows his position and the liberation aims of Ukrainians, and appreciates it duly.

"The right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R. is reserved to every Union Republic"; and

WHEREAS said Soviet Constitution provides that each Union Republic has the right to enter into direct relations with foreign States and to conclude agreements and exchange representatives with them; and

WHEREAS said Constitution also provides that each Union Republic has its own Republican military formations; and

WHEREAS the fundamental law as expressed again in said Soviet Constitution provided: "The Supreme Soviet of a Union Republic; * * * (e) Decides questions of representation of the Union Republic in its international relations; (f) Determines the manner of organizing the Republic's military formations"; and

WHEREAS in contrast to the conditions prevailing in other Soviet Republics, the distinctive national banners and emblems of state maintained by the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Byelorussian S.S.R. are presumed to manifest symbolically the sovereignty and independence of these States; and

WHEREAS the people of the United States recognize the sovereignty of the Ukrainians and Byelorussians, which is in harmony with the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence of the United States and, therefore, stand ready to render to these peoples and to the peoples in the Soviet Union any assistance for the strengthening of their freedoms and their economic development; and

WHEREAS it is clearly incongruous from every viewpoint to maintain the recognition by this Government of the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Byelorussian S.S.R. in the United Nations without the peace-oriented opportunity to establish direct diplomatic inter-course with their capitals of Kyiv and Minsk; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States in support of a policy of liberation should proceed to establish direct diplomatic relations with the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and in the creation of posts of representation in the capitals of Kiev and Minsk, respectively, consistent with diplomatic procedure in such matters".

Introducing his *Concurrent Resolution*, Representative L. H. Smith stressed in his supporting floor speech that his Resolution intends to help "to free peoples

WHEREAS the Government of the United States recognizes the delegations selected to represent the Ukrainian S.S.R. and the Byelorussian S.S.R. as accepted nations of the United Nations; and from the steel chains that bind them to communist Russia against their will".

The Smith-Resolution starts quite logically from the premise that once the Republics of Ukraine and Byelorussia possess an internationally acknowledged legal status of independent and sovereign national States, the U.S.A. is obliged to exchange with both of them direct mutual diplomatic relation. Why the U.S.A. fail to do this?

It is not from sheer friendliness and love of humanity that Moscow acquiesced to concede to both these nations within the framework of U.S.S.R. their status of formal sovereignty. It was only after the most brutal and bloody Russian suppression of the liberation struggles of these nations that Moscow was able to incorporate them into the Soviet Union. The Russian acknowledgement of their formal sovereignty was the least Moscow could do morally to keep them under control. Moscow could not help being under constant constraint to repeat interminably the same Big Lie to both peoples concerned: you *are* a free nation, you *have* your own State, you *have* your own constitution, you *possess* your full sovereignty, etc.

But Moscow's "friendliness" never went so far as to allow the fully accredited envoys of foreign nations to have their seats and offices in Ukrainian Kyiv and Byelorussian Minsk,—and to see for themselves what this Soviet "liberty" of Ukraine and Byelorussia in reality looks like.

Yet if the Russians had their nationalistic and imperialistic reasons not to allow foreign diplomats to reside in Kyiv and Minsk, it is difficult to understand why the foreign powers, in the first place the U.S.A., should acquiesce to this? Congressman Lawrence H. Smith bids a quite obvious explanation. He underscored in his above mentioned speech: "Why then, Mr. Speaker, does the United States fail to establish full diplomatic relations with the Ukraine and Byelorussia? No logical excuse exists why this has not to be done. . . There is a suspicion, however, that to do so, would be inconsistent to the Acheson policy of appeasement".

And this hits the bull's eye. Already 1946 the British Government took up this issue and approached Moscow with the proposal to exchange envoys with Ukraine and Byelorussia. But Moscow showed an unhappy face—and London dropped this hot iron hastily. The present reluctance of the Western Powers to tackle the problems of the non-Russian nations behind the Iron Curtain, is something like after-pains and after-effects of

the previous attitude of "good feeling" and appeasement. The former idea was not to "provoke" and not to "irritate" Moscow, and just to keep it "smooth" and "friendly". To-day the Western Powers cherish no more illusions, but the reluctance to become "mixed up" in Russian national problems—remains.

Now, all illusions are gone, it is most obviously in the interests of the effective psychological warfare against bolshevism and Russian imperialism, particularly to expose to the full extent the Moscow's Big Lie of the "liberty" of non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. The Kremlin propaganda would never be able to conceal and to suppress among the 45 millions of Ukrainians the plain truth that the U.S.A. sought the establishment of direct, friendly and peaceful relations with the people of Ukraine, but was prevented in this by the Russian interference and opposition. The Ukrainians were always friendly interested in Americans. There was never a reason for some tensions or bad feelings between these two peoples. The Ukrainian nation is fully aware of the fact that in the U.S.A. 1 and a half million good Americans of Ukrainian descent are living, all of them free and happy people. Why are we not allowed to have friendly relations with Americans?—millions of Ukrainians would ask. The adoption of Smith-Resolution and the ensuing Russian refusal to accept direct American diplomatic relations with Kyiv, would drive into the minds of innumerable Ukrainians the more deeply the already existing clear cognition of the relentless Russo-bolshevik enslavement.

But there is much more at stake than only the actual interests of the Cold War and anti-bolshevik propaganda. The adoption of the Smith-Resolution would be, first of all, an *act of justice*, long overdue, towards the Ukrainian nation as such. This nation continues literally single-handed its never ceasing, terribly sacrificial struggle against the bolshevism and Russian imperialism, now for more than 35 years. Nevertheless, Ukraine is, and till today remains, one of those "forgotten nations" whose resistance against bolshevism the West, for decades, took simply—for granted. Ascending to power the Republican Government of the U.S.A. promised the oppressed East European nations that they may count upon the support of America. The adoption of Smith-Resolution by the Congress of the U.S.A. would constitute regarding Ukraine, at least in the moral and psychological field, a really substantial assistance. The U.S.A. proposal to establish just at the present time, direct diplomatic relations with the Ukraine would be a sign for millions of Ukrainian patriots both sides of the Iron Curtain that they really are *not* forgotten. This would have deep and lasting, very positive psychological effects.

ON THE SIDELINES

When one surveys the present-day policy of England, one can always find reasons which determine its present course and structure, and which make the recent tendencies of the responsible men in the Government more comprehensible. It would, however, be inadequate to attempt to explain these only with the help of purely political factors, without pointing out, before all, a whole series of spiritual and ethical—or it is better to say—mental characteristics of the English and, consequently, of their policy.

In the first place, the matter hinges upon the innate empiricism, which is most strongly marked in the English philosophy of utilitarianism and realises itself in politics and, yet, at the same time has, in its formation, led to every possible variety of experiment. Its form has always been able to deviate from rigid and congealed conceptions and arises only out of the facts and does not exist previous to the facts, in the widest sense of this phrase.

As well as natural cautiousness and reserve must be mentioned one other characteristic—the English optimism which, in connection with native conservatism and moderation, is always ready to overcome every situation with a faith in better things to come, without resorting to extreme methods, e. g. the sword.

Only in this way can we attempt to explain England's whole policy since 1945 which, after Mr. Churchill's unsuccessful attempts while the war was still in progress, to check the late President Roosevelt's generosity and liberality towards the U.S.S.R., was prepared to recognize the afterwards accomplished facts as a foundation and starting point for the further development, on a peaceful basis, of relations between the East and the West. We are not of the opinion that the English version of containment and appeasement are the primary reasons for the much-discussed weakness of old Albion, although, it is quite apparent to everyone that, in the Second World War, she was beginning to be compelled to play second fiddle to the U.S.A. in the matter of global politics.

The innumerable attempts, with the help of both old and new methods of diplomacy and commercial transactions—on the one hand to persuade Russia, even despite her obstructiveness, to a more friendly *modus vivendi*, and on the other, to bring about her necessary weakening by the same means and by separation from her satellites, with the inclusion of China—form the actual structure of English policy during recent years. In one word, there has been conciliation and still more conciliation, which has often passed into importunity. We take as an example the recent participation of Sir Ivone Kirk-

patrick, as the only guest from the West, in the celebrations of the Russian army.

This is not the place to discuss in detail the course and the results of the policy up till now. This is all well-known and we believe that, in many cases, this optimism has led to self-delusion and is still following a mirage. This holds good also for the empiricism, which has often turned into the "empirical" extravagance.

In this connection we take the liberty of taking a few quotations from K.F.B. Middleton's book entitled "Britain and Russia—An Historical Essay". On page 192 is written: "...the British reaction to any threat to a Mediterranean or Middle Eastern State would... no doubt be stronger. For the independence of Greece or Turkey, Iraq or Persia... to a far greater extent... than that of Poland, Hungary or Bulgaria". And on p. 191: "It would be much more surprising, not to say an act of extraordinary and unprecedented altruism, if Russia agreed to withdraw, voluntarily to the frontiers of 1921-39. Nor would Europe in general, and Britain especially, have reason to rejoice"... "The Soviet living-space is so great in extent that the desire to expand for the sake of expansion cannot count...".

We wish now to mention that, in the process of this appeasement, Poland, Bulgaria and Hungary have been lost to the West and the above mentioned countries would have also gone the same way if the U.S.A. had prolonged its Rooseveltian policy. N. B. Persia is, in spite of everything, lost to England.

It would also be incorrect to assume that it was due to English policy that Tito was brought on to the side of the West. We are much more of the opinion that this was due to Tito and Stalin themselves, and, by the way, because the former had no intention of becoming the latter's disciple.

When one attempts, however, to come to the same arrangement with Mao Tse-tung by means of rubber and machinery, one is quite on the wrong track. Above all, the whole idea of the peripheral weakening of Russia is the same as attempting to extinguish a fire at the edge, instead of combatting the core of the conflagration, and its causes. The expensive trade negotiations with the Chinese Communists have therefore no reason and no prospects, although China is suffering from lack of capital and cannot be satisfied by capital-less Russia. In the first place, all real-political and even psychological factors for this are lacking and it is too fantastic to believe that Stalin copied the mistake of the West in the case of China. It is also clear that without these commercial transactions with the West, China would be in a more difficult position, because this would mean a further severe acceleration of her internal economy, analogous to that in the Soviet Union in the first years.

THE SITUATION IN THE U.S.S.R.

(Condensed from "Ukrainian Thought", Nos. 1, 2-3, Vol. IX, January, 1953.)

In the late World War, Germany was occupying a district of the U.S.S.R. which had a population numbering 80-90 million, among which were 30-35 million of Russians; nevertheless there was in its region, no action taken to fight against the German occupiers on behalf of Russia. In spite of the fact that Moscow understands, as none other, the importance of partisan warfare and knows its value, and established continuously functioning, special political and military academies and staffs for the organization of partisan-warfare in its own province, all attempts to organize partisan-warfare in the German-occupied territories of the U.S.S.R. were completely unsuccessful. Above all, in Ukraine were the Moscow-directed partisan activities combatted by the national resistance-movement, which was also anti-German, and everywhere in the non-Russian areas they met with general hostility.

Moreover, looked at from the angle of the very great development of military technique, means of communication and information, defence and similar con-

Nevertheless, a strange note is struck by the recent protests of the English politicians against the new American policy, which find their spokesmen primarily amongst the opposition and also in Mr. Eden. In this situation, it is perhaps better to keep silence, as Mr. Churchill is doing, and to listen, not only to the words of Mr. Nehru, but to those of others, e.g. Mr. Pearson who has clearly identified himself with the new tendencies in the American policy.

This by no means signifies that the new American policy is to be regarded as the best from every angle. That goes also for liberation. There are still many questions unsettled concerning this problem, and there still exists the danger of waverings, as long as it is definitely declared:

1) to mean a national liberation for all subjugated nations, without classing them according to the length of time they have been held in bondage by Russia;

2) to regard as the main objective the abolition of Russia's imperialism in every form, both now and in the future. The conception of the national liberation and the granting of political independence to the liberated peoples signifies, not only a victory in the Cold War, but also a second front in the event of a new war. Thus the success of America's new bloodless campaign is, in the first place, dependent on this question.

Consequently, President Eisenhower's latest policy has been readily approved by Ukrainians, because it means, not only the taking of the initiative in the Cold War out of the hands of Russia, but also strengthens the hope for the liberation of Ukraine.

ditions which, as might seem, seriously limit the conduct of underground or partisan warfare, it has been shown by the late World War that these forms of warfare have expanded very much. (As in France, Yugoslavia, Greece, Poland, Ukraine, Slovakia and Lithuania). Moscow was able to organize and direct revolutionary and partisan warfare in Korea, Vietnam and Malaya, but was unable to accomplish this in the rear of the opponent who was occupying districts of the U.S.S.R. notwithstanding the very favourable military and political situation at the fronts; the German occupation of U.S.S.R. territory had lasted about two years before the German front was broken through in the areas of Moscow, Stalin-grad and Leningrad and simultaneously the impossibility of occupying these points of support became apparent.

These actual political results of the last war are decisive factors in the internal situation in the U.S.S.R., and in its relations with the outer world, and on them has Moscow directed its attention during the post-war period, in order to find some possibility of solving the internal problems which, in the event of the slightest direct military conflict with any other power, would inevitably spell the doom of the U.S.S.R. These difficulties are of the following kinds; organizational, political, moral and economic.

These three groups of problems concerning internal organization and conditions in the U.S.S.R. are the fundamentals upon which Moscow is concentrating all its attention, and it depends upon them whether Moscow will involve itself in any kind of foreign political conflict which might contain the threat of direct participation in war. Because of the present situation Moscow is avoiding, with all the means in its power, the risk of any kind of foreign political conflict.

The weightiest organizational problem of the post-war period was, for Moscow, the *kolkhos* question. During the war, the *kolkhos*-system revealed its complete incapability of assuring a normal provision of foodstuffs for the country and with the entry into the War of the U.S.A., the allies began to send into the U.S.S.R. foodstuffs as well as the war materials. Despite the fact that the *kolkhos*-system was maintained in the occupied areas of the U.S.S.R. by the Germans, who exploited it for their own benefit, the system was nevertheless seriously undermined by them. Moscow's post-war policy of a speedy renewal of the *kolkhos*-system posed, at the same time, some basic problems which brought about the revelation of Moscow's incompetency in this *kolkhos* policy. One of the first of these basic problems was the idea of dividing (parcelling out) the *kolkhos* into *biggish farms*,

i. e. the uniting of 8-10 families and allotment them a definite piece of land, the necessary agricultural machinery and the kolkhos, and the building up of relations between the kolkhos and these large farms, so that the latter should be responsible for a common, fixed proportion of the production. This idea was put into practise to the extent of allotting the kolkhos-worker an individual or family share of the production. After eighteen months, this system was seen to be incompatible with the existence of kolkhoses and one such as led to reversion to old conditions. For this reason this system was abolished and the farms which obtained until the outbreak of war—brigades and the kolkhos-workday—were reintroduced. After the liquidation of this "about-face" in the kolkhos policy, a possibility was sought for in the extreme centralisation and proletarianisation of the kolkhos-workers. Centralisation and expansion of the kolkhoses was to be carried out and their number reduced to a third. This happened primarily in Ukraine and other non-Russian lands. This combination was planned as a general liquidation of the former villages and the herding of the kolkhos-population into so-called agricultural townships. The "concentration" of the kolkhoses has been carried out as a means of strengthening the bureaucratisation and centralisation in the management of the kolkhoses. Yet, apart from the transportation of the kolkhos population into the agricultural townships, a mass-settlement in barracks of these people would entail a great deal of work on the part of the kolkhos-workers—the building of the agricultural townships. That is, working for their own ends *at the cost of the further degeneration of agricultural production*. For this reason, and because of this danger, Stalin has in his theoretical publications on the growth of "Socialism into Communism" raised the kolkhos property to the level of "common national" property. He thus developed the theory that kolkhos agriculture may slowly grow into "common national agriculture". The nub of the matter is that Moscow does not wish to give the kolkhos-worker separate work and to pay for it, even at the lowest price, but to pay in definite proportion to production, as is the case in the whole Soviet industry.

Thus, in the fundamental question of organizing the kolkhos-system, they have, after many attempts and false starts, departed from the social and economic autonomy of an, in a certain sense, independent agriculture (small communal or individual division of labour) on the one hand, and on the other, the centralising urbanisation of the kolkhoses (transportation of the population into agricultural townships), and taken a "middle line". The social-economic and productive autonomy was rejected as a thing which, although tending to increase the general

productivity, led to the rousing and to strengthening of anti-kolkhos activities. On the other hand, there was carried out in the kolkhoses a social-economic differentiation of the workers, by which they were graded by means of bonuses, the creation of petty officials and so-called masters of agriculture, and thus was created, at the cost of the rest, a socially privileged class of kolkhos-workers. This class had to solve the problem of increasing production by means of the mass-apparatus of all-embracing controls and forced labour, the idea of proletarianising the kolkhos-workers was also rejected on the grounds that a complete abolition of the workers' private production for their own domestic use (gardens, small stock, poultry in the private possession of the kolkhos-worker) would cast another burden on the State, that of feeding the kolkhos population. This, however, would cause in proportion to the hunger norm, the decrease of production, from which the State derived profit, and the kolkhos-worker would develop into a simple labourer, which would endanger the productivity of the kolkhoses. From the idea of urbanising and proletarianising the kolkhos-workers only the organizational "concentration" was borrowed which had as its aim the stronger centralization of the management.

In order to eradicate the slightest manifestation of social and economic independence in the kolkhos-workers and to arrest all progress that had been made in this direction during and after the war, the cattle of the above-mentioned people were taken away from them directly after the war and collected together in great herds in the kolkhoses. Until the present day, the Soviet Press has reported nothing of the total amount of cattle, such as that the pre-war level has been reached. It is, however, emphasised at every opportunity that the number of cattle in the kolkhoses and sovkhoses has increased. That means that no, or very few, cattle were to be found in the private ownership of a kolkhos-worker in the Ukraine, where before the war at least a certain number were in possession of the population and comprised a part of the social subsistence of the kolkhos-workers. A second method of socially and economically weakening the position of the kolkhos-workers is the post-war battle with the so-called "dissipation of the kolkhos-property and violation" of the Stalinist kolkhos-statute. In principle, this battle aims at the curtailment of the rights and the liquidation of the private allotments of the kolkhos-workers, in which are included gardens and orchards. In Ukraine, this private allocation of the kolkhos-workers is fixed at 2,500 sq. meters. Although, according to the statute, this allocation can amount up to 2,500 the new families, on account of a government decree, received allotments of never more than 1,500 sq. me-

ters, and if anyone wanted more, this would be branded, despite the fact that 2,500 sq. metres had been prescribed by the statute, as "illegal" and a "dissipation". If, for instance, a new kolkhos family lives in the house of an old one, that can lead to the refusal of the private allotment that is due to them or the confiscation of that which has already been granted. The liquidation and, at the same time, very great cutting down of the land which has been regarded by the kolkhos-workers as private property, are as may be seen from these illustrations of the practices and regulations, the basic methods of socially impoverishing the kolkhos-workers. "In order to bring order into kolkhos-agriculture", stock has been taken off the private land of the kolkhos-workers. This investigation revealed that the majority of the kolkhos-workers were illegally using the ground and were "wasting the kolkhos-property". In one of the published reports which appeared in the Soviet Press it was stated that more than 250 million sq. metres of the ground had been restored to the kolkhoses during this action. When one considers that the unlawful excess, in each individual case comprised at the most only a few square metres and, in the majority of cases, only the hundredth part of a hectare, one can imagine the enormous number of "transgressors" which is represented by this total of over 250 million square metres. The Soviet daily Press reports that the investigation into the private holdings of the kolkhos-workers are continuing and are bringing more and more fresh "extravagances" to the light. When one considers that the yardstick of the "extravagance" which have been exposed and eliminated in connection with the allotment of land amounts to 250 million square metres, and bears in mind the fact that, in a political-economic sense, this amount is very small when compared with the total area under cultivation in Ukraine (500 billion square metres), it is obvious that the fight over each single metre of ground and private property of the kolkhos-workers is primarily a political one. Thus it is regarded by the Muscovite despots in Ukraine (In Russia itself there have been no investigations carried out in connection with the private allotments of the kolkhos-workers and no fight against the "dissipation" of the kolkhos property).

The second basic organizational problem during the war constituted a party question. According to the calculations of the 19th Congress of the Communist Party, which took place in October 1952, the number of party members totalled 7 million inclusive of 900,000 party candidates. It deserves to be mentioned that the number of party members in the Ukraine is 700,000 or 10 p. c. of the total, while the population of Ukraine made up, in the year 1952, 22-23 p. c. of that

of the entire U.S.S.R. This reveals the character of the Communist Party as a Muscovite monopoly-organization which, like the German republic, commends in the colonies a certain number of members for the purpose of executing colonial duties. In the course of the late war and as a result of the measures taken for the recruiting of new members, the Party has, in spite of the great loss of mass-members at the end of the war, nevertheless grown on the whole. If one considers that the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. is not a political party in the usual sense of the word, i. e. an organization of people who are enrolled under a political leadership or who stand for a certain policy, and *rely upon the existing social and economic positions of their members*, but an organization for the purpose of seizing the power over the community and dominating the social and economic positions in it, then membership of the Party produces a change in the social positions of the members. The producer changes into a castle-privileged "organizer-consumer". Thus it becomes clear that serious changes in the number of Party-members, i. e. these "organizers" and "consumers" will create one of the most important general political and social problems. Each Party-member, and with him two or three other people, are excluded from the process of productive work and are included in the number of "organizer-consumers". The higher a person stands in the Party hierarchy, the greater is the number of people around him who, to a greater or lesser degree, are excluded from productive activities and are assigned to the "organization" of the distribution and consumption of the goods.

The excessive growth of the Party is accordingly a growth of the internal social economic disproportions, because every Party-member brings, as already mentioned, two or three workers out of the direct production, which is automatically used for the consumption of this privileged class.

Considering that the point in question is that the Party has one million superfluous members, it is clear that two or three million people have been brought out of the ranks of the productive slave-workers. In this connection, decisions are being made concerning the halting of mass-recruitment to the Party, the increase of internal purges in the Party, and the strengthening of internal discipline; all this with the purpose of decreasing the number of Party-members. The conquest of new territories during and after the war has brought relief to the Party in this respect, as the "organizers" have, to a great extent, again been needed. In the districts of West-Ukraine, "work" has been found for about a hundred thousand Party-members and, in this manner, the "consumption" of "organizers" has once more become considerably greater.

THE RUSSIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

ON THE EVE OF NEW ARRESTS IN MOSCOW AND THE SATELLITE STATES

By A. Kaminsky

The present wave of the anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R., which has created widespread concern in the West, especially after the recent arrests of the notable Jewish scientists in Moscow met in the world-Press with series of explanations, interpretations, comments, etc. Among the more important reasons given for Moscow's recent anti-Jewish line are:

Russia's efforts to bring the Arab world on to her side; the finding of a new scapegoat at whose door can be laid the responsibility for the internal want, and deficiencies; the estimation of Jewry as an unstable element which, in the event of war, would range itself on the side of the West; preparation for a new general purge; elimination of witnesses of the death of Zhdanov.

Without attempting here to analyse and to classify all these explanations according to their real motive and function, because together they actually form one whole, we consider it necessary to emphasize that they were considered and set down only from the standpoint and in the light of the present general political situation i. e. the present status quo. In every case, there is lacking a deeper analysis and, above all, an attempt to find the real origin of the present anti-Semitism, to explain it in the light of the historical, sociological, and ideological complex of Russo-Jewish relation, and thus to place it rightly in the story of the antagonism between Russian imperialism and Jewry.

They must therefore be regarded as secondary results, logically derived from the main phenomenon, i. e. Russian chauvinism, which, sooner or later, especially in its zenith, had to lead to such a form of the Jewish question. Anti-semitism is, and always was, characteristic of Russian imperialism; more, it is an integral part of it. Its roots today lie, not in the daily, practical policy, but deep in the way of thinking, philosophy of life, sociological structure, in the very mentality of Russian imperialism. Russian view on and the way of life is fundamentally different from the Jewish one. The Russian and the Jew live in different world.

This split between the Russians and the Jewry reveals itself on vertical and horizontal planes. To the Jew, with his individualism, empiricism and piety, such characteristics of the Russians, as the extremity of passivity on the one hand and, of aggressiveness on the other—"Oblomovshchyna" and brutal boundless imperialism, the superfluous mysticism and, at the same time, most mundane materialism, and collectivism with its denial of the human and humane, are alien and distasteful. That was one aspect. The

other is on a different plan. It is the question of the psycho-voluntary and, especially the intellectual mass activity of the two peoples, which finds its origin in the above-mentioned elements. In this connection let us remember the fact that in 1912, in considering the Jewish problem in Germany, and particularly in treating of the very strong Jewish element among the professors and lecturers in the German universities, Sombart wrote:

"The Jews are, on the average, much more gifted and energetic than we". With regard to the strong "Judaizing" of the cultural life of Germany which manifested itself mainly in the 19th century, he suggested, even at that time, that a 'numerus clausus' be introduced for the Jews in German universities.

From the very beginning it was the Russian policy to give Jewry, as a group which was hostile because it was in orientation and moreover particularly enterprising and active, no possibility for development in any sphere, and attempted in this manner to avoid the 'Judaizing' of the Russians. From this developed "Acts of Settlement" banishment of the Jewish element into the ethnographically non-Russian lands (Ukraine, Poland), an artificial and planned kindling and maintenance of religious, political, economical, social and even intellectual anti-Semitism, which included the organization by the 'Ochraha' of a whole series of 'pogroms', for which the so-called 'Tshornosotenshtshyna' and urban underworld were employed. Even then it was attempted to make the Jews scapegoats for the internal distress and even for murder, as, for example, after the death of Tsar Alexander II in 1882. There was organized in this year in Kyiv, Warsaw and other cities a series of 'pogroms', as a result of which Jewish property to the value of \$80 million (according to the calculations of an American Congressman named Cox) was confiscated and 100,000 Jewish families were reduced to beggary. These 'sui generis' prophylactic measures against 'Judaizing' found expression in the well-known slogan: "Beat the Jews—save Russia".

Special attention should be given to the problem of the Jewish participation in the Russian Communist Revolution, which was significant in that many Jews became collaborators in the building-up of a new Russian empire—the U.S.S.R. This question, however, should be considered quite objectively and from many points of view, and above all with a proper historical-sociological analysis. Firstly it must be made clear that Jewry played a certain part at this time and in these spheres, not only in the bolshevist,

but also in the other left-wing Russian and non-Russian movements.

Nevertheless, Jewish-Ukrainian relations were at that time positively and correctly defined. Jews were granted, under the act of 9. 1. 1918, a national autonomy (the same was later demanded for all minorities at the forum of the League of Nations), a special ministry for Jews was created with a Jewish minister at the head, inscriptions in the Jewish language on the banknotes and many other concessions. Jews also took part in the building up of the new Ukrainian Army and an exclusively Jewish battalion was formed. And the presence of many Jewish doctors in the ranks of the U.P.A. (Ukrainian Insurgent Army) had a certain tradition. It must also be emphasised that the isolated anti-Semitic actions which took place at this time, were instigated by the remnants of the old Russian reactionary forces, with the aid of the urban criminal element, and could in no case have been subscribed to by any kind of Ukrainian government or by the Ukrainian population at large.

In stating the significant part played by the Jews in the Russian revolutionary groups, particularly in the socialist and bolshevist, the historical-sociological reasons must also be taken into consideration. It is necessary to remember the centuries-long dispersion of the Jews throughout the whole world, which lead, to a great extent, of their dissemination and internationalisation, and the strong tendency of the Russian socialism of this time towards the embracing of internationalism. As early as the year 1873, P. Lavrov, the well-known theoretician and ideologist of Russian socialism, wrote the following in his declaration of policy: "The question of nationality must completely disappear..." That is already 'a prehistoric matter'. Another noted Russian revolutionary of this time, P. Tkatchov, stated, six years later, that "intellectual progress leads to the annihilation of national peculiarities".

Furthermore, it is indeed superfluous to mention that, the programme of Russian Socialism and Communism, with its promises regarding the social and political oppression of the Jews, held a great allurements for the latter.

In considering Russian-Jewish relation during and after the Revolution, one important fact must be noted: on the one hand, the Jews, gradually recognising the true aims of the Russian Communists, which consisted of the reconstruction of the Russian empire and the progressive and permanent nationalisation of Communism, ranged themselves mostly on the side of the "Mensheviks" and other left-wing groups—on the other hand, the Russian Communists, who were revealing themselves in their true colours more, and more, never permitted, during the whole time, the rôle of Jewry in political

life to overstep limits that were dangerous for the Russians. There always existed a quiet anti-Semitism, although it was often employed by the Russians against other nationalities. They accused even the Americans of it. The internal purges, from the time of Trotsky until today, were the result not only of the constant struggle of Stalin and his clique for the Russian tone of the new empire and his personal power, but also the 'de-Judaising' of the Russian political opinion, which was closely bound up with it.

It is well-known that Bucharin was reproached—and this was considered the greatest of his 'sins'—for having called the Russian nation a nation of Obiomoys. In this connection "Pravda" wrote at the time: "It is a historic falsehood and a shameful piece of ignorance to maintain that the Russian nation before the Revolution was a nation of Obiomoys"... "This very Russian culture has played a great part in the development of many other nations of the U.S.S.R. The hatred of the Russian nation is actually a hatred of the whole Soviet Union... for the enemy knows what a strong will, energy, and endurance the Russian nation has displayed". On this occasion is cited Lenin who praised the part played by the Russian nation in the October Revolution its national pride and its beautiful language.

In the article entitled "The Great Russian Nation", which appeared in the "Pravda" of 15. 1. 1937, was the following national creed of the Communists: "We have our homeland, our great language... It is now becoming an international language. All progressive people are learning it. We are proud of the names: of Pushkin, Lermontov, Tolstoy, Bielinsky, Dobrolubov and Tshernishevsky; Mendeleyev, Sitchanov, Pavlov and Lomonosov, the mathematician Lobatshevsky, the heroic explorers Przhevalsky and Miklukha-Makloy, the valiant seaman Laptiev, Syedov and many others, who are building up our national renown... Such a nation is capable of great deeds of heroism and even of miracles".

Yes it is right to add, that the number of Russian scientists, inventors, of all the great names since 1937 has 'increased' in the "Stakhanovite" tempo.

Today, when the internal Russian political development is firmly fainted on, the traditional old Russian State policy, —and in one way and another, Jewry has acquired its political and national home, that gives it the possibility of serving its own people, the present open Russian anti-Semitism is easily understandable.

It was also no coincidence that the strongest Russian right-wing party the N.T.S.—preached anti-Semitism in its programme... just as a well-known representative of the present emigration, speaking at the congress of the recent Russian refugees, which took place in

Munich on November 11th-14th, said of the Russian 'Mensheviks' in America: "Who are the 'Mensheviks'? There are only seven people, five Jews and two Russians".

The tragedy of Jewry lay, and still lies, in the fact that, for so long, it has been unable to lead its own national life. In this connection we can draw a parallel: before World War I the American Jews were, on the whole, strongly anti-Russian and pro-German; as is well-known, even Jewish businessmen, (for example, the banker Jacob H. Schiff) boycotted the loans to Russian, although great benefit was to be derived from it. Then came the war, the peace, and the year 1935... Before and during World War II the American Jews formed a strong central group, which was strongly pro-Russian. Then followed the end of the war, the peace and the year 1952.

The difference? Today the time passes somewhat more quickly.

"BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY" AND MANNER OF LIFE ARE RAMPANT AMONG THE SOVIET MINOR OFFICIALS

We have already much information concerning the ruthless eradication of the Kolkhos-workers' aspiration to private property, and above all concerning the investigation of the size of the private allotments, i. e. the confiscation of the "wasted ground" which generally amounts to a few sq. metres or a hundredth of a hectare (10,000 sq. metres) which exceed the norm of 0.15-0.25 of a hectare. In connection with Stalin's directive on the complete "Socialisation" of the Kolkhos agriculture, that is, liquidation of the remnants of any kind of economic independence of the Kolkhos workers, this process of annihilating the "bourgeois endeavours", has taken on an unusual severity. The Soviet Press, however, reports many things which can be taken as definite conclusions that the "private property ideology" and "way of life" of the Soviet machinery is beginning to take complete command. Even shortly before the last war, it was very rare that one met a district—or area—official of the Communist party or a director of an undertaking, who had his own house, his little farm (cow, pigs, or poultry), or an estate which he could call his own.

Today the newspapers report that in one district the whole District Council, beginning with the Secretary of the local party organization had estates of 5-75 hectares (i. e. 3-4 times as much as is allowed to a Kolkhos worker), are building new houses or even palaces, as they are called by the Soviet Press. In the Horoshkiv district of the Kyiv area, the President of the district Foodstuffs Department, Stepanov, "is building his own house" (Radyanska Ukraina of 2nd Dec. 1952) and the former manager, who is at present an engineer in Kachivka, Strelkov, built so much that the work is not yet finished and the building has begun to fall to pieces*) The chairman of the Executive Committee of the Kachiv City Council, Bulanciv, felt quite at home. "He had the idea of enclosing his estate—and the fence grew out of the earth over-night" (Radyanska Ukraina, Feb. 14th 1953). Such and similar announcements are appearing in connection with other actual and fictitious transgressions or incompetence of the persons concerned, but this element of "one's own house", "one's own estate", "one's own fence appearing over-night", "one's own cow", etc., are very sympathetic and characteristic of "Social consciousness and aspirations" of the Muscovite Soviet machinery.

*) The carrying out of the renovation of the private house, which had cost the State 5,700 rubles, had been excellently accomplished by him.

(Ukrainian Thought)

MEMORABLE DAYS

TARAS SHEVCHENKO, THE GREATEST UKRAINIAN NATIONAL POET

(1814-1861)

There is, in the whole history of Ukraine, no other date which has been unreservedly and unanimously celebrated by all classes, organizations and parties as March 9th—the birthday of TARAS SHEVCHENKO. This day, moreover, coincides almost exactly with the day of the poet's death, March 10th. In the figure of Shevchenko, the Ukrainian nation reveres its martyr, its greatest popular and national poet, as well as its prophet and permanent spiritual leader.

THE MARTYR

The material circumstances of Taras Shevchenko's life were bleak and wretched. Son of a Ukrainian serf, he spent his childhood in his father's poverty-stricken hovel in the village of Moryntsi (Province of Kyiv), in the unfriendly household of a stepmother. Later, he was promoted to the post of servant and house painter to his overlord, the Russian landowner Engelhardt and, as such, he received permission to study painting at St. Petersburg; but it was not until 1838 that, thanks to the magnanimous initiative of the court-painter Karl Brüllow, and the Russian poet Ghnovski, that he was brought out of servitude and thus acquired the opportunity to devote himself, not only to painting, but also to Ukrainian poetry.

Yet this free literary activity of his, as far as one may speak of "intellectual freedom" under the consistently reactionary despotism of Tsar Nikolai I—was of short duration. As early as 1847, the poet was arrested on the pretext of revolutionary and anti-Tsarist activities and was placed as a soldier in a remote garrison in Central Asian Kirghisia, whence he was not allowed to return to Russia, and then not Ukraine, until 1858. Three years later, as a result of the privations he had endured in Central Asia, he died in St. Petersburg without having tasted the joys of marriage and family-life which he valued and so greatly aspired to.

THE POPULAR POET

In so far as the majority of Shevchenko's poems are based upon Ukrainian folk-songs, his poetry has often been compared with that of the Scot, Robert Burns, the Magyar, Patefy, and the Serb Vuk Karadschich. That is true in as far as Shevchenko in his lyrics, particularly in the early (pre-exile) period of his poetical activity, but often later as well, proceeded from the Ukrainian folk-song and brought its motive and external verse-forms to artistic perfection, which has never been surpassed or even equalled, despite the oft-repeated attempts of num-

erous imitators. Without in any way detracting from the Ukrainian folk-song, Shevchenko has succeeded in raising an unadorned native poetry to the highest cultural level of modern European literature.

THE NATIONAL POET

The tremendous value of Shevchenko's poetry in Ukrainian national life was in no way confined to the above; on the contrary, Shevchenko's attainments as a popular poet constitute only a chapter of his entire idealistic and literary achievement. In direct connection with the tradition of the Ukrainian Cossacks of the 17th and 18th centuries, who struggled heroically for national and political sovereignty and succeeded in gaining it for several decades, until it was destroyed by Polish fickleness and Russian intrigues, Shevchenko, the first in the whole Ukrainian realm of poetry to do so, used the national strivings of the Ukrainian nation as material for his longer poems "The Haidamaki", "The Great Cavern", "Irzhavets", and very many lyrics. Shevchenko's patriotic fight against former Polish and the more recent Russian domination of the Ukrainian country, is uncompromising, his hatred of the unjust usurpation of the Muscovite "elder brother" (which he has also stigmatised in his satirical poems "Caucasus", "A Phantasy" etc.) is unconciliatory, and his entire poetic works became in the course of the 19th century, a kind of Bible for all nationally conscious Ukrainians.

THE PROPHET

Thus is the far-reaching influence of the poet upon Ukrainian spiritual life by no means exhausted. His later works, such as the longer poems "Maria", "The Neophytes", "A Muscovite's well", are devoted to very deep problems of human morality, emotional life and piety, preach a lofty code of ethics and prophesy their realisation in Ukraine and in the whole of Europe. They may be compared, as regards their spheres of influence and their contents, with the later works of Victor Hugo, which were so important in the French literature of the 19th century. Shevchenko loved his people and his native land above all, and always in the conviction that this nation should and would continue to wage the war of good against evil, of freedom against tyranny, of justice against injustice. And it is this conviction that to-day makes millions of Ukrainian spiritual followers of their great national poet.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF CARPATHO-UKRAINE

(Reality and Significance)

When, on March 14th, 1939, the independence of the Carpatho-Ukraine was proclaimed, there was fulfilled the centuries-long desire of the population of this part of the Ukrainian country. On the same day, the statute (Osnovnyj zakon) of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Republic was passed by the Parliament of the Ukrainian minor State. Its text was as follows:

Carpatho-Ukraine is an independent State.

The name of the State is Carpatho-Ukraine.

Carpatho-Ukraine is a Republic, headed by a President elected by the Diet of Carpatho-Ukraine.

The official language of Carpatho-Ukraine is the Ukrainian language.

The colours of the national flag of Carpatho-Ukraine are blue and yellow—blue on top, yellow below on the bottom.

The State Emblem of Carpatho-Ukraine is the present national emblem: a bear on a red field on the left hand, four blue and yellow stripes on the right hand as well as the Trident of St. Volodymyr the Great. This part of the act has to be resolved by a special act.

The national anthem of Carpatho-Ukraine is "Shche ne Vmerla Ukraina" (Ukraine Still Survives).

This act becomes valid immediately after its passage.

It is evident that Carpatho-Ukraine had manifested its wish for an independent State. After a long and strenuous struggle for the maintenance of her national identity and after a severely—exploiting Hungarian subjugation, which was followed after the Treaty of St. Germaine, Sept. 10th, 1919, by Czech dominion which, although milder, aimed at eliminating the aspirations for a Ukrainian State and ideas of unity. There ensued a short period of political independence and national reconstruction. This phase of national renewal was thus decisive, and a new step on the path towards Ukrainian national consolidation had been taken.

The statute that was passed on March 15th, 1939, is a significant proof of the reality of the political interests which stir the Ukrainian nation. When, on November 23rd 1938, Carpatho-Ukraine was granted the status of an autonomous Republic, and in the elections of February 12th 1939, 86.1 per cent. cast their votes for the Ukrainian national candidates, it could not be disputed that this part of Ukrainian land, only a small fraction of the whole territory, would nevertheless defend the principle of Ukrainian independence with all the intensity of its will.

But the efforts of the Ukrainian population in Carpatho-Ukraine were not di-

rected only at achieving political independence for this province of Ukraine, but aimed simultaneously at a connection and ultimate union with the other Ukrainian territories. The independence and unity of Ukraine was the ultimate goal which hovered before all Ukrainians. Unity was attained on June 29th, 1945, when a treaty was signed between the Soviet Union, in the first place Ukrainian S.S.R., and the People's Republic of Czechoslovakia, which at that time renounced all claims to Carpatho-Ukraine.

Political independence has, however, not yet been achieved and remains the object of their desires.

The attempts of the lamentably solitary Czech and Hungarian emigree groups to propagate a Carpatho-Ruthenia or a Sub-Carpathian-Russ, in order to create, with the help of subversive elements, aberrations in the camp of Ukrainian independence, as well as the provocative measures of certain circles, now abolished, of the "Committee of Free Europe", are deserving of no special mention and were nipped in the bud.

The reality of Carpatho-Ukrainian independence lies in the concentratedness of the national campaign, and the absolute majority possessed by the Ukrainian population, its importance in the manifesto for Ukrainian sovereignty and its future.

THE 35th ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

On January 22nd, 1918 by the 4th Universal of the Ukrainian Central Council in Kyiv, the independence and sovereignty of the Ukrainian State was proclaimed. When, on November 1st, 1918, the independence of the West-Ukrainian Republic was proclaimed, it could not fail to come to pass that both parts of the Ukrainian land should combine. On January 22nd, 1919, both parts united to form the Ukrainian National Republic (U.N.R.).

The Ukrainian communities of the emigration observed both these Ukrainian public holidays in a ceremonious manner, despite their dispersion in many Western countries.

On this occasion of the 35th anniversary of the restoration of the Ukrainian State, exhibitions, festive concerts and demonstrations had been arranged with special care, especially in all the European and trans-oceanic cities. For this purpose special committees were formed, including representatives of all Ukrainian social, political and cultural organizations. In various cities, many foreign guests took part in these celebrations, in particular the representatives of other nations oppressed by Moscow, and in this manner, they gave evidence of their spiritual unity with the Ukrainian nation.

Numerous American personalities, and especially governors of the individual States, displayed their understanding and, in a way, their fellow-feeling for the Ukrainian nation and its endeavours to restore its political independence, and declared the 22nd of January, or one of the last days of January, "Ukrainian Day".

This declaration was generally made in the form of a statement from the present national representative, and, at the same time, the significance of this anniversary for Ukraine and the whole free, democratic world was given expression, "Ukrainian Day" was proclaimed in the following States: Ohio, Maryland, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Illinois and Wisconsin. In Illinois, the proclamation was as follows: "Whereas, this month

BOOKS REVIEW

THE UKRAINIAN REVOLUTION,
1917 — 1920
A STUDY IN NATIONALISM
By John S. Reshetar, Jr., Princeton,
Princeton University Press, 1952

The young American scholar, John S. Reshetar, who is at present lecturer in political science at Princeton University, has created, out of his original doctoral dissertation, a fundamental study of the weighty problem of the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917 — 1920, whose significance in the pattern of the latest European history is not to be denied. This he has accomplished by drawing upon and utilising, with the greatest care, all the sources and literary works which are at present available.

The comprehensive bibliography of these works comprises the separate subdivisions: General Works on Ukraine, Books and Pamphlets, Memoirs, Documentary Sources and Articles. The author has carefully examined all these sources in an attempt to place before the reader, with great impartiality and objectivity, the value and authenticity of each document. As especially serviceable must be regarded the exhaustive use of the American documentary sources, which up till now have not been drawn upon, either by Ukrainian or foreign authors, when reviewing the Ukrainian political problem of the years 1917 — 1920. To these belong, in the first place, "Foreign Relations of the United States, 1919, Russia — Washington, 1937" and the extremely valuable material from "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, The Paris Peace Conference, 1919 — 13 vol. Washington 1942-1947", which, above all,

throw a very searching light on the political and diplomatic practices of the Western Powers in their dealings with the young Ukrainian state. In addition, one must mention the cautious handling of the writings and utterances of the Ukrainian statesmen and politicians of the second half of the 20th century, which speaks volumes for the author's consummate lack of bias towards any kind of political leaning. The writings, also, of Russian origin, of Maliarewsky, Oberachow, Anishev, and of the Soviet publicists are handled with the restraint of extreme objectivity.

In order to avert idle controversy with possible Russian and anti-Ukrainian critics with regard to the Ukrainian question, the author maintains in the preface that "the fact that Ukraine enjoys the status of a separate republic as well as membership in the United Nations is indicative of the recognition that has been accorded it".

It is not by chance, and even wholly justified, that the sub-title of this work is "A Study in Nationalism", because the Ukrainian revolution of 1917 — 1920 was an ever-widening struggle for the attainment, and later preservation and stabilisation, of the independent Ukrainian national state. It signifies absolutely nothing that the leading Ukrainian men of that time, such as S. Petlura, W. Wynnychenko, Dmytro Doroshenko, and Alexander Shulgin were members of the Social — Democratic, Revolutionary — Socialist, or Social — Federalist Party, or who, in the party-political sense, were inclined to the democratic-left; the fundamental importance of their achievements or failures lies exclusively in their contribution to the Ukrainian national cause. The fact that, at the same time, they strove to improve the social position of their people and to ensure the safety of democracy in Eastern Europe in no way gainsays the aforesaid.

In the classification of his material in chapters — I. Incipient Nationhood; II. The Rise of Central Rada; III. The Republican Revival; IV. The Debacle and VII. In Retrospect, the author has been successful, even if Chapters I. and II. leave something to be desired. These defects lie, however, not in the actual writing, but much more in the pragmatic perception of history, and such treatment of the material by American historical writings that gives, with predilection, a thoroughly exact and comprehensive presentation of the facts, yet, in its estimation of the historical development, connections, origins and inter-relations, is reserved and narrow in judgment.

The first chapter, therefore, suffers from defects on a large scale in a typical introduction, and fixes the beginning of the national liberation effort with Ivan Kotlarevsky (1769-1838). Although, from

marks the 35th anniversary of the proclamation of the free and independent Ukrainian Republic:

WHEREAS, Ukrainians in Illinois are celebrating January 25th as a memorial to a once free Ukraina, and

WHEREAS, Ukrainians in Illinois are observing this day by reasserting their belief in freedom for all people, and reaffirming their conviction that tyranny and despotism cannot long prevail where man so believes, and

WHEREAS, it is known that the love of freedom lives on in the suppressed Ukraina, although the Republic was short-lived and fell under the forcible occupation of the Russian communists in 1920, and

WHEREAS, it is universally recognized that the resistance of the brave and patriotic Ukrainian people to communist totalitarianism has never waned even to this day,

Therefore, I, William G. Stratton, Governor of Illinois, do hereby proclaim Sunday, January 25th, 1953, as Ukrainian Day in Illinois and take this opportunity to ask all the citizens of this State to join with those of Ukrainian descent in appropriately and suitably noting the significance which it has for the Ukrainian people".

(Signed)

William G. Stratton

Governor of Illinois.

It would be a very good thing if, in future, the anniversaries which have to do with the restoration of independent States and the construction of a democratic order therein, were to be accorded similar attention and appreciation in Western circles.

a material standpoint, this method is quite permissible, the historian and sociologist must nevertheless try to trace the origins of a spirit—and also of a political movement, somewhat more deeply than John Reshetar has done. For this purpose, the epoch of the Ukrainian Cossack Republic could have provided very valuable material. In other respects, the author has very pleasingly portrayed the national growth in "Incipient Nationhood". The importance of the work of M. Mikhnovsky also received a suitable appreciation, which is sometimes, incomprehensively, not to be found in other authors.

In the five subsequent chapters, John S. Reshetar Jr. handles, with his own peculiar exactitude, the ups and downs of four years of Ukrainian revolution. Whether it is the activities of Rada and its renewal in the "Republican Revival", or the critical elucidation of the Hetmanate Regime under Pavlo Skoropadsky, everything is regarded from the viewpoint of political consolidation and national integration, and suitably commented upon. Extra special attention is given to the 4 Universals, i.e. Messages to the Nation (June 23., July 16., Nov. 20, and Jan. 22, 1918), from which the legal foundation of the Ukrainian national status developed, and, if not always happily formulated and conceived, form, together with the Hetman-decree, a chapter in the Ukrainian national revival which is not to be under-valued.

Thorough examination of the Polish-Ukrainian treaty of April 21, 1920, the Treaty in Riga, March 1921, and the continuous conferences and negotiations 1918-1919 show the difficult circumstances in which the young Ukrainian state found itself, in the international sphere, and finally how it was handed over, partly to the Poles, and partly abandoned to Bolshevism. This attitude on the part of the west was, at the best, confirmed by the statements, incorrect, in contradiction to the truth, and, last but not least, absurd—of the American Secretary of State, Lansing, in his letter to the American delegation in Paris on October 29, 1919: "On the basis of past investigation, the Department is disposed to regard the Ukrainian separatist movement as largely the result of Austrian and German propaganda seeking the disruption of Russia. It is unable to perceive an adequate ethnical basis for erecting a separate state and is not convinced that there is a real popular demand for anything than such greater measure of local autonomy as will naturally result from the establishment of a modern democratic Government, whether federated or not. Page 287-288. (Similar senseless assertions are still being made in the U.S.A., even today).

Reshetar regards the reason for the failure of the Ukrainian revolution too often as "in large measure, a result of undevelopment of national movement." (P.319). The established facts that "the Bolshe-

viks were aided indirectly by the Volunteer Army and the Poles, who were also attacking the quickly-formed, inexperienced, and somewhat traditionless Ukrainian forces" (P.329) and, "numerous attempts to obtain recognition and aid in foreign capitals and at the Paris Peace Conference ended in failure, and the government of the Ukrainian People's Republic was compelled to go into exile in 1920, but only after a heroic and costly struggle" (P.5), are much more to be regarded as the cause of the miscarriage of the Ukrainian struggle for liberty, as well as for the failure of its leaders. The leading personalities of the Ukrainian revolution were convinced democrats, who believed in justice, peace and liberty, yet "most of these men were intellectuals experienced in theoretical disputation, literary endeavour, and scholarly research, but hopelessly deficient in the art and science of politics - the endless struggle for power" (P.136). If they had proceeded according to all the rules of power politics and not believed in so many ideals, then they would have had success in what is, in the words of Reshetar, "a cruel, interminable and fascinating game" (P.315) and in which no very great sentimentality is permissible.

In the Great Eastern Revolution of 1917 - 1920, a renewal of the Ukrainian State was not achieved; the Ukrainians have learned something from this and, with their nationalism, have created for themselves a weapon, *which will bring about the desired result*. In conclusion Reshetar says very logically that "Ukrainian nationalism has become a vital factor in any analysis of Eastern European politics, and it is commencing to receive recognition and the attention which it rightly deserves in the field of Slavonic studies" (P. 331).

Yaroslav Z. Pelensky

* * *

A BOOK ON THE UKRAINIAN CHURCH

Owing to the endeavours of the Ukrainian Catholic clergy in Rome, there was published in January of this year a white book on the religious persecutions in Ukraine. It was published in Italian under the heading of "Primo incatenati. . .".

The book is based upon a collection of documents and other material dating from 1945 onwards; the foreword is by His Excellency Bishop Ivan Buchko. The contents may be divided into the following sections; detailed information concerning the general history of the Ukrainian nation and its church (988-1917), a chapter on the Ukrainians' encounter with Communism, i. e. a forcible introduction by the Muscovite occupying forces of a misguided system and ideology. In the second half of the book, the martyrdom of Catholicism in Ukraine is illustrated by an account of the story of Ukrainian Catholic Church and its destruction by Moscow in the years 1945-1952. There follow very detailed statistics which reveal the monstrosity of the crimes which Moscow has committed against the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

This book also contains illustrations and photographs of the bishop-martyrs. It all furnishes one with a very positive insight into the ecclesiastical history of Ukraine.

THE SCOURGE OF RUSSIAN IMPERIALISM

(Continued from Page 1)

mensions. He reached in the course of his life for what the strivings and the endeavours of ten predeceasing Tzars were needed. But the trend was always the same. There is no limit for Russia's glutony.

For the first time in the history of the U.S.A. foreign policy a genuinely realistic view of Russia's imperialistic policy was viewed in the American Congress on June 26th, 1951, at the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives by the Secretary of State Dean Acheson. According to the report of *New York Times* of June 27th, 1951, Mr. Acheson said:

"The makers of Russian policy, whether Tzarist or Communist, have always taken a very long view and think in terms of generations where others think in terms of a few years or a decade at most.

"The leaders are land-minded, and have a deep and abiding and, in the historical view, justified confidence in the vastness of Russia as a factor in her security.

"The ruling power in Moscow has long been an imperial power and rules a greatly extended empire.

"It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the Duchy of Moscow to a vast empire has got to be stopped".

In its own commentary on Mr. Acheson's statements, the *New York Times* of June 28th, 1951, in the article "Realism About Russia" adds:

"Viewed in the light of this history there is a peculiar unreality attaching itself to the American policies which after the First World War opposed any "dismemberment" of the Russian Empire even by nations fighting for their freedom, and which during the Second World War facilitated a further expansion of that empire in the name of military expediency and effort to satiate the insatiable."

Whatever happens after the death of Stalin, one trait to be taken with deadly certainty: the pressure of Russian imperialism will never cease. Maybe, some changes and variations will take place in its future manifestations, the phenomenon of Russian possessed imperialism will remain. Perhaps the death of Stalin will bring many such outward changes. But it will not solve the problem of the liberation of the peoples enslaved by Russia, nor bring about the deliverance of the whole world from the scourge of bolshevism. Not the death of Stalin, the death and the disappearance of the Russian empire as such will be the proper solution. Else, there is no hope for the world's freedom and liberty.