



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. VI No. 3—4

LONDON, MARCH—APRIL 1954

Price 1 s

CONTENTS:

SOVIET PEREYASLAV CELEBRATIONS	1-2
P. Poltava	
PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR AND THE TASK OF THE UKRAINIAN NATION	2-4
25th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDATION OF THE ORGANIZATION OF UKRAINIAN NATIONALISTS (O.U.N)	4-7
WHAT ABOUT THE POLICY OF LIBERATION?	7-8
CONVINCING ARGUMENTS	9
DISGUISED RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA	9-10
COMMUNIST INTERPRETATION IN "THE TIMES"	10-11
Prof. Dr. V. Derzhavyn	
UKRAINIAN LITERATURE UNDER THE SOVIET OCCUPATION	11-12
BERLIN (Futile and endless negotiations)	12
DECLARATION	13
John F. Stewart	
EAST-WEST TRADE	14-15
UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN	15
IN ANSWER TO AN ARTICLE	16

Soviet Pereyaslav Celebrations

The celebrations organized by the Russians to mark the 300th anniversary of Pereyaslav, reported in the news section of our journal, have a political significance, the effects of which are not only taken into account by the Kremlin but also by others. Party propagandists are holding meetings in all the schools, industrial concerns, factories, and kolkhoses, to explain to the Ukrainian population, the "advantages" of the "union" with Russia. It is indicated from the "20 theses" and the leading articles in "Pravda" and "Iswestija", that the Bolshevik rulers regard the national problem as extremely important, as these celebrations" are to be continued in May.

Even the worst terrorism has failed to prevent the national development of the Ukrainian people, and their achievements have spurred other nations within the Soviet Union to greater efforts.

If one disregards the superficialities about the "celebrations" and considers the inner meaning, it becomes obvious that the following points are of primary importance:

1) The Soviet Russians wish to prove that the Ukrainian nation was allied to the Russian nation from the commencement of its history and that both peoples referred to a common state as their own from the days of the Kyiv Rus.

2) The Soviet Russians also maintain that the alliance between Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and the Moscow Tsar was an act of "union" of the two nations, and all military operations carried out by the Ukrainian Hetman are explained in this manner. The Soviet Russians also attempt to "prove" that a firm "national friendship" existed between the individual nations of the present Soviet Union, as early as the mid-17th century.

3) Referring to more recent historical developments, the Soviets affirm that the Lenin-Stalin policy of nationalities is thus a product of a long series of historical events, and that there are no longer any obstacles to a "lasting" union of those nations with Russia.

These arguments have often been refuted by impartial evidence. However, we should like to stress that the Kyiv Rus was never the common state of the Ukrainians and Russians nor were there any very close ties. Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky did not wage any wars with the intention of achieving a union with the Russian nation, but simply made a forced alliance with the Russian Tsar, because of the favourable military situation. The "progressive" nationalities policy of the Russian Bolsheviks, was never aimed to give the nations freedom and independence, but was solely a means of suppressing and exploiting them.

The fact that these "celebrations" are not only being held in Ukraine, but also in the more remote districts of the Soviet Union, Archangelsk and Kolyma, indicates that the Soviets are trying to give the union of the nations within the U.S.S.R., an ideological character, which is a direct contradiction to the real facts and conditions. Statements to the effect that Russia "helped" Ukraine three hundred years ago, will never convince Ukrainians who know the true facts of Russian history.

The foregoing also applies to the propaganda disseminated by the Soviets in the countries of the free world. Even in South America the Communist parties have devoted considerable attention to this event, and the Communist press in all the countries have published the "20 Thesies."

P. Poltava

PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR AND THE TASK OF THE UKRAINIAN NATION

TRANSLATED FROM AN "UNDERGROUND PUBLICATION" IN
UKRAINE, ISSUED BY THE INFORMATION BUREAU OF
UKRAINIAN SUPREME LIBERATION COUNCIL
(U.H.V.R.)—VOL. No.9—MAY 1951

The Role of Bolshevik U.S.S.R. in the Preparation of a New War

The Russo-bolshevik imperialists are trying to lay at the door of the Anglo-American block the guilt for the present world tension and bolshevik propaganda tries to "prove" that it is the ruling circles of the West that are aiming at a new war, not the government of the U.S.S.R..

In reality, the opposite is true, as can be judged by these facts:

First, on June 25, 1950 war activities started in Korea. On that day North-Korean troops occupied a considerable slice of South-Korean territory. In the course of the months of July and August 1950 the North-Korean army developed such a furious offensive that almost the whole of the Korean territory fell into its hands.

Considering this fact, can it be possible that this war was prepared and started by South-Koreans? The experience of all wars is against such an assumption. The superiority is always at first with the side which assails, and the war in Korea was no exception. The language of facts and events is much more convincing than bolshevik propaganda. The circumstances in which the Korean war broke out

Unfortunately, part of the free press in the Western World has also published the Bolshevik arguments and the Russian falsifications of history, word for word.

Mention has already been made of the political nature of the "celebration." Their aim is to strengthen the "everlasting friendship" of the nations of the Soviet Union and to create the impression that all the nations have equal rights but are guided by their "big brother, Russia." Russian Bolshevik propaganda will never be able to conceal the truth about an event, which has been recorded in the annals of history, for the past three hundred years, and the results of which have long since been superseded by other historical facts.

The feelings, which have been caused by these communist celebrations, will make the Ukrainians realise that the prevailing conditions must be overcome, and the Pereyaslav Treaty relegated to the past with Russian political tutelage.

and its development; the confusion and the panic in the Western World in connection with this war; the universally known mendacity and cynicism of the bolshevik propaganda—all this indicates beyond all doubts that the war in Korea was prepared and provoked by the North-Korean stooges of the Russo-bolshevik imperialists.

Secondly, in the winter of 1950, the Asian members of the United Nations had proposed a conference of 7 powers in order to reach a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict. The Western states agreed on one condition: before the conference should start, war activities must be stopped. But the Russo-bolshevik imperialists and their satellites refused.

Thus again the same question emerges: is it possible for a side that really wishes for a peaceful settlement, to decline the possibility of a solution by reason of such a trifle?

From the behaviour of the bolshevik imperialists and their satellites in the Korean conflict it is* clear proof that they do not wish for a settlement of the Korean conflict, but on the contrary, they aim at the inflammation of the war, by ordering their Chinese puppet to enter the conflict, and declined any attempt at a peaceful settlement of the conflict. All these facts furnish clear evidence that:

1. The warmongers are not the ruling circles of the Western powers, Truman, Acheson, Marshal, or Churchill, but the Moscow chieftains—Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov, and the whole Politbureau of the Kremlin;
2. the most reactionary, cruel, aggressive, and also the most dangerous to humanity is today the imperialism of Moscow, the Russo-bolshevik pretenders for world domination;
3. the most potent enemies of the Ukrainian nation, and the enemies of the peoples of U.S.S.R., and indeed of the world, are the Russo-bolshevik imperialists.

The war in Korea has thoroughly unmasked the Russo-bolshevik tyrants and bared before the eyes of all mankind their greedy, voracious, bloodthirsty

* (This publication was written in the beginning of the year 1951.)

face, which is deaf and blind to all the sufferings and miseries of human beings throughout the whole world.

Drunk by victory over Hitlerite Germany and Japan, counting on their military superiority over the West, they are trying to widen their regime of terror and exploitation, of suppression and annihilation, over the whole of Europe and Asia, at least.

Such is the true role of the Russo-bolshevik clique in the preparation of a new World War, and these are the main aims of their politics.

The Mendacity of the Bolshevik Peace Propaganda

After what has been said about the true role of the bolshevik imperialism with regards to their preparations for a new world war, it is not difficult to understand that the activities of the bolsheviks for peace and against war are no more than a cynical deception of the toiling masses of U.S.S.R., and of the whole of mankind. In the same way, the Russo-bolshevik war instigators are trying to place the guilt for such a war at the door of their adversaries. They know very well how deeply all the nations of the world hate and detest imperialistic wars and, consequently, the bolshevik tyrants are trying to mask themselves. All their activities "for peace" are no more than a smoke screen, behind which they are trying to conceal their criminal aims.

But the Ukrainian nation will not be deceived. We hope too that the whole world will not allow Moscow to deceive it.

Behind the emblem of the dove, which is used by the Kremlin for their "Peace offensive", the nations know only too well that the Russo-bolsheviks are preparing for another bloody war, involving the whole world.

The Anti-liberation Policy of the Western Block

The official programme of the Western powers in their struggle against the Russo-bolshevik block has not been too clear until now. There are, however, some indications which allow one to make some pertinent deductions.

The first indication is the generally negative attitude of American, and equally of British, political thought with regard to the idea of the independence and the national sovereignty of all the countries in the world which are striving for such an independence. The majority of the American political ideologists are expressing themselves against the division of the world into small, independent, national states. Many of them call the principle of self-determination of nations, brought forth and propagated in

1918 by President of the U.S.A. W. Wilson—"the most tragic error" of this President. The present ideal of the American, as well as of the British politicians is the creation of such supra-national political structures as say, the United States of Europe, or even—the United States of the World. Consequently, the idea of the reconstruction of the U.S.S.R. on the lines of the principle of the state independence of all the single nations of U.S.S.R., is, at present, in the leading Anglo-American political circles not very popular. These circles propose the preservation of the territorial integrity of the present U.S.S.R. They recommend rather the change of the political, social and economical order inside the U.S.S.R., but not a profound national reconstruction of the bolshevik prison of nations.

We will not try to argue here how erroneous such a Western attitude is and, in the present conditions of the U.S.S.R., strictly reactionary, too. The readers of our "underground literature" can be informed about that by our "underground political publications." Here we would like to indicate only that the main error of the American ideologists lies in the fact that they under-emphasize the national factor in Europe and Asia.

Another indication concerning the aims of the Western powers in the coming war against the U.S.S.R. can be deduced from the active support given to emigré groups from the territories of the U.S.S.R., chiefly Russian groups, by the ruling American circles. This support is rendered to groups which profess to fight for the change of the internal order of the U.S.S.R., but not the reconstruction of the U.S.S.R. according to the principle of full state sovereignty of the subjugated nations.

Special support and sympathy is given to Mr. Alexander Kerensky of Russia well-known from the 1917-1918 revolution. Mr. Kerensky's proposition is as follows: after the downfall of the bolshevik regime, an all-Russian Constitutional Assembly should be convoked, i. e., an Assembly manned by delegates from all the territories of the U.S.S.R. This Assembly would have the power to decide the future of the single non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.. Obviously, such a conspicuous Russian imperialist and chauvinist as Mr. Kerensky, well-known to the Ukrainians, does not for a moment think that the proposed all-Russian Constitutional Assembly would vote for the separation of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Caucasus and other non-Russian territories from Russia. Kerensky would like to hide Russian greed for new occupation of non-Russian territories, or at least, to win time for the preparation of

such an occupation under the professed democratic formula of such an Assembly. For instance, in 1917 this Kerensky agreed, only under the terrible pressure of the intra-Russian difficulties, and after the ferocious political battles with the Ukrainian Centralna Rada (the democratic Ukrainian Parliament), to recognise it as the autonomous supreme government in Ukraine. And now, today, the American friends of Mr. Kerensky would like to see him as the leader of all political forces which are interested in the downfall of the bolshevik rule in the U.S.S.R. They would very much like to see the Ukrainian independent liberation movement brought under his direction.

Considering the trend of the Anglo-American policy, the Ukrainian nation is fully entitled to forecast that the future war will in all probability not affect their liberation.

Possibly, the Anglo-American side has no predatory ambitions concerning the U.S.S.R., and Ukraine, but they support the powers which are inimical towards Ukraine, and which aim at the preservation of Russian colonial domination over the non-Russian peoples and their territories. Consequently, the policy of this block concerns the 40-million Ukrainian people, as it would appear to have a clear antiliberation character. If the Ukrainian nation, and all the other peoples of the U.S.S.R. cannot count upon the adherence and sympathy of the Anglo-American side for their national and state liberation in the future war, then it can be assumed that neither side will fight for their liberation.

In such a case the Ukrainian nation, and all the other subjugated peoples of the U.S.S.R., would not greet this war as a war of liberation, nor the Western adversaries of the U.S.S.R., as their sincere friends.

The Main Tasks of the Ukrainian Nation

The main tasks of the Ukrainian nation at the present time of world history are as follows:

1. Not to be deceived by imperialistic propaganda of any kind, especially from the Russo-bolshevik quarter. The Ukrainians are to have and to keep their own independent view, concerning the present international relations.

2. Not to be used as a pawn by any imperialistic policy of the contesting blocks. Nor to be made to supply man power for cannon-fodder in the name of victory by any imperialism;

3. To preserve in the future as in the past a thoroughly independent character of Ukrainian liberation policy.

4. To continue the active struggle for the preservation and further development of its own liberation forces on its

own native soil, as a sole guarantee of our victory in our struggle for liberation. *This is the basis of Ukrainian liberation policy.* By this plan Ukrainians have the duty first of all, to continue the active fight for the preservation of the Ukrainian liberation *underground*, and its further development, as the sole organized, experienced and tested political and military hard core of the liberation movement in occupied Ukraine, which can use *each war solely and exclusively* in the direction of the liberation of the whole Ukrainian nation.

The Ukrainian Nation and the Russo-Bolshevik Allegedly Peaceful Propaganda

The preparing and unleashing of a new world war by the Russo-bolshevik imperialists has got to be answered by the Ukrainian nation by means of strengthening the liberation struggle and by the continuous undermining of their military and economic power.

This struggle should be strengthened by individual clandestine sabotage of production: by the disruption of the plans of production and by wrecking contracts at the "socialist competitions." They should avoid being included in the Stakanov-movement by all possible means; they should not perform more than their coercive norms; to disorganize the terms and dates of agricultural deliveries; to delay the thrashing of the grains; to secretly damage machines and other working tools and appliances in industry, transportation, etc. etc.

It is necessary to create new and growing difficulties everywhere and not to allow them to fulfil their criminal plans for the preparation of the new war smoothly—such is at the present time the main fighting task of Ukrainian peasants, workers and the creative intelligentsia.

By secret individual resistance the Ukrainian people would be in the position to deal the Russo-bolshevik enslavers very serious blows. The weaker the military and economic power of the U.S.S.R. would become, the less bloody the coming war would be, and the smaller sacrifices the Ukrainian people would have to pay on the front of the imperialistic war, as well as during its own war of liberation.

The mendacious bolshevik propaganda "for peace" has got to be answered by equal moral resistance. Especially avoid all agitations "for peace", shun as far as possible all participation at "peace" meetings, conferences, congresses etc. etc.

Every patriotic Ukrainian man or woman who understands the "peace" propaganda should expose these lies to friends and relatives. It is essential to prove by all available arguments the true

role of the Russo-bolsheviks as the instigators of war at the present time.

Such an enlightening work would help the education and the development of anti-bolshevik consciousness of the Ukrainian nation.

The second fighting slogan of Ukrainian patriots at the present time is to prevent the deception of the people and to expose the true ultimate aim of the communists.

The Ukrainian Nation and the Third World War

In the event of a 3rd World War, or some other war in which the U.S.S.R. will participate, the Ukrainian nation should take full advantage of the opportunity to regain her national, state and social liberation through the defeat of the Russo-bolshevik rule in Ukraine.

This would be the responsibility of the liberation movement directed by the Ukrainian revolutionary underground. Consequently, their main duty is to preserve capability of action and to develop all necessary preparations in view of the coming events. Practically, the sole guarantee of our victory is an efficiently working Ukrainian underground, and it is the duty of the nation to give it every support possible, even more at the present time than in the past.

Every Ukrainian who is a member of the Soviet armed forces, whether a private, sergeant, or an officer sent by the Russo-bolsheviks to some of the fronts of such an imperialistic war, has a primary obligation to fight for the total defeat of the Russo-bolshevik domination in Ukraine. The liberation struggle inside the Soviet armed forces could deal the most decisive blows at the Russo-bolshevik war machine.

Equally, all Ukrainians working in the rear should fight, too, during the war with the aim of the downfall of the Russo-bolshevik domination in Ukraine, and for the liberation of the Ukrainian nation from the Russo-bolshevik yoke.

The Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council as the leading organ, would give the Ukrainian nation the exact directives how to behave and how to wage its liberation struggle at the proper time. All Ukrainians are obliged to carry out such directives, accurately courageously and sacrificially. This is one of the most important preconditions of our victory. Every man and woman should be ready to follow the call and rally under the banners of the all-national liberating revolution in the name of the final destruction of the Russo-bolshevik domination, and removal from Ukraine.

The nation must counteract all Russian political forces which would attempt to keep Ukraine in "federation" with

25th Anniversary of the Foundation of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.)

28. 1. 29—3. 2. 29.

A fearful winter

The winter 1928/29 was one of the most severe ever known in the history of Europe and Eurasia. All European rivers, even those in Spain, Italy and Greece were frozen. Birds died on the wing. One third of European locomotives broke down, and international communications were thoroughly disorganised.

These were the weather conditions when the **First Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists** was held secretly in Vienna, from January 28, till February 3, 1929. Thirty four delegates, entitled to vote, from different provinces of Ukraine, and an almost equal number of guests were present. Some had to cover journeys of more than 1000 miles. Others had to come to Vienna illegally, particularly those from the West-Ukraine, which was occupied at that time by Poland, and had to cross by foot the Carpathian mountains and forests during that fearful winter.

The historical background

The severity of that winter was symbolic: Ukraine of those days had to suffer an equally severe time political-

Russia. This is shown by our centuries long historical experience.

The approaching World War would, in all probability be conducted in more favorable internal and external conditions than the two previous ones, as the Western powers had Russia as their ally and, consequently, were vitally interested in the preservation of the Russian empire, but now are themselves mortally endangered.

Our destiny lies in our hands. Our liberation depends entirely on our ability to wage and develop an adequate broad and persistent struggle against the Russo-bolsheviks.

We believe firmly and unflinchingly in the liberty-loving spirit of the Ukrainian nation: of its deep hatred for the Russo-bolshevik enslavement: in the desire of the Ukrainian masses for their national and social liberty; in the yearning of Ukrainians to lead a really free, prosperous and happy life—without "protectors", "liberators", and other foreign managers and supervisors.

When the testing time arrives, we know that the Ukrainian nation will come through with all honour and glory.

ly. After the breakdown of the armed Ukrainian national liberation struggle at the end of the Great Revolution 1917-1920, and the collapse in 1920 of the independent Ukrainian national democratic State—the Ukrainian National Republic (U.N.R.) which was established in 1918, for 2 years—Ukraine was divided into four parts. The armed aggression and the terror of the Russo-bolshevik regime, as well as the imperialism of other neighbours of Ukraine proved, at that time to be stronger than the Ukrainian national resistance. The largest part of Ukraine came under Russo-bolshevik occupation in the form of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic; the second largest part, Western Ukraine, was forcibly included in Poland. The remaining parts were incorporated into the Kingdom of Roumania and the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

With advancing years all these foreign regimes in Ukraine became more ruthless. All of them aimed at the political, cultural, social and economic suppression of the Ukrainian nation.

To appreciate fully the political and historical importance of the First Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists in Vienna, its historical background in all four parts, especially those in the U.S.S.R. and in Poland, must be understood.

The Soviet Ukraine

The military defeat of 1919/1920 did not weaken the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement, but it took on a different form. Under the Bolshevik occupation, the Ukrainian national resistance at first took the form of open uprisings and rebellions. This continued long after the war had ended. Later, after the Soviet regime grew stronger, the Ukrainian national resistance assumed the form of secret political organizations. The most important of these was the "**Union for the Liberation of Ukraine**" (S.V.U. = "Soyuz Vyzvolennia Ukrainy"). The monster trial of some of its members, with **Professor Yefremov** at the head, staged by Moscow, proved that this was a movement to which all social classes of Ukraine belonged.

From 1928 Russian reaction began in Ukraine by the liquidation of prominent people in all cultural and social

walks of life, followed by the annihilation of the political leaders of Ukrainian S.S.R. It was also the commencement of the first Stalinist 5-year-plan; the total collectivization of individualistic agriculture in Ukraine was at stake. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were sent to concentration camps and jails, or were shot outright by the N.K.V.D., then known as the G.P.U. These ferocious Russian measures revealed the utter futility of legal forms, of struggle against Russo-bolshevik totalitarianism which in turn accentuated the **underground forms** of struggle for liberation. Several millions of Ukrainians died of starvation in the artificially created famine in 1933. All this horror did not break the spirit of Ukrainian nationalism; which remained as the outward manifestation of the Ukrainian people's desire for freedom and independence.

Ukrainian nationalism proved to be a tremendous spiritual, social, and political power, able to inspire the whole nation to outstanding, even heroic deeds and achievements. But, owing to the terrible pressure of the Russo-bolshevik regime, it has a rather scattered and incoherent character. The problem was to connect and to mould all these manifestations into one ideological and organized shape. The exterminating Russo-bolshevik offensive against the Ukrainian people had to be answered by adequate counter-measures. Consequently, the founding of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, as the central directing body of the whole Ukrainian nationalist movement, became an impending necessity.

Western Ukraine under Polish rule

Ukrainian political struggle for independence and national statehood developed along different lines in Western Ukraine under Polish rule. Owing to the political and military help of the Western Allies, chiefly of France, the Poles succeeded in 1919 in defeating the Western Ukrainian army. They occupied the territories of Western Ukraine and annihilated the democratic statehood of the Western part of the Ukrainian National Republic. These lands were illegally incorporated into Poland against the expressed wishes of the vast majority of the native population, which was Ukrainian. By virtue of the decision of the allied Council of Ambassadors in 1923, these lands were to have full autonomy. However, the Polish government never observed these stipulations. In the first years of the Polish occupation, Ukrainians had

a few opportunities of fighting for their political and national rights by legal democratic methods. This was being done by Ukrainian political parties. But in principle, no Ukrainian recognized Polish rule over Western Ukraine. This attitude was observed amongst others, in the way that in all Ukrainian publications Poles were always referred to, as the occupying power; this emphasizes the illegal and temporary nature of the existing state of affairs.



Lieutenant-General
TARAS CHUPRYNKA
(SHUKHEWYCH)

(† 5. 3. 1950)

Head of the O.U.N. in Ukraine
Commanding General of U.P.A.
Head of the General Secretariat of
U.H.V.R.

But gradually Poland changed more and more into a totalitarian, fascist country which convinced the Western Ukrainians, that legal political struggle in Poland was finished. The possibilities of conducting such a form of struggle were becoming more limited, and at last, shortly before the outbreak of the 2nd World War, vanished completely. This was the reason why the legal Ukrainian political parties in Poland began to lose their influence among the masses.

"Ukrainian Military Organization" (U.W.O.)

There also existed in Poland a strong nationalistic Ukrainian underground movement which expressed their stubborn point of view in relation to Poland. This was the **Ukrainian Military Organization** (U.W.O.—"Ukrainska Wijskova Organizatsia"), founded by former officers of the Ukrainian armies. The aim of U.W.O. was to prepare an uprising against Poland. It countered the Polish extermination policy with armed acts of national self-defence against those Poles who were the most ruthless and guilty in the eyes of the Ukrainian people.

This Organization was very popular with the former soldiers of the Ukrainian armies, and was led by **Colonel Eugene Konovalets**.

At first U.W.O. had no political ambitions and regarded its role only as that of an "executive weapon" in the hands of the parties. But as Polish policy became more and more fascist, they necessarily became more and more opportunistic. Finally the patriotic U.W.O. was no more in the position to support and obey the opportunistic directives of the Ukrainian legal parties. The leaders of U.W.O. saw that the present framework of its organization was too narrow, with its influence on the masses mounting steadily, and that it was necessary to transform it—from a **military** revolutionary to a **political** revolutionary organization. Simultaneously, it was necessary to expand the Western Ukrainian unit to an all-Ukrainian revolutionary organization, by uniting all the revolutionary forces of Ukraine and to launch one united action for the restoration of Ukraine's political and national independence.

The living conditions of Ukrainians in Roumania and Czechoslovakia were similar and led to the same conclusions: the necessity of the creation of an all-Ukrainian political liberating revolutionary organization uniting all Ukrainian patriots, independents and nationalists. It was quite clear to all, that no evolutionary process in U.S.S.R., or in Poland could ever free Ukraine, and that this could only be achieved by a national liberating revolution.

O.U.N.

This was the Ukrainian political and historical background to the winter assembly in 1929 in Vienna, of outstanding Ukrainian revolutionaries and leading political figures. As the result of the Vienna deliberations the existence of the former "Ukrainian Military Organization" (U.W.O.) was cancelled, and instead the "**Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists**," under the leadership of Colonel Eugene Konovalets, was created. It was destiny for these three initials: "O.U.N." to become prominent in Ukrainian national history during the next 25 years.

From now on a clearly formulated policy of Ukrainian nationalism was set and a coherent constitutional, cultural, economic and social programme was developed. By "**nationalism**" was meant the restoration of a completely independent and sovereign Ukrainian national state. This movement was based on the interests of the Ukrainian people, and was the expression of their

will to freedom. This Ukrainian "nationalism" is a completely constructive spiritual, moral and political power and has nothing in common with the covetous, devouring chauvinism of nations who already possess independent statehoods, but are trying to lengthen their boundaries by the subjugation, occupation and exploitation of other nations. It is characteristic that the Russo-bolsheviks have always referred to the liberation struggle of the Ukrainian nation, and all other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union, as "damned bourgeois nationalism", with growing passion and hatred.

The Leading Ukrainian Political Power

In the course of the past 25 years the O.U.N. became a tremendous power in the political, cultural and social life of the whole of Ukraine. This organization influenced the historical course and the political destiny of all 4 powers which were or are occupying Ukraine—Poland, Roumania, Czechoslovakia and—at present the U.S.S.R. Beginning in 1929 the O.U.N.'s activities grew more and more. Special attempts led by Colonel Eugene Konovalets were made in the territory of the Ukrainian S.S.R., which were so successful and so dangerous to the Kremlin, that the Russo-bolsheviks were compelled to employ radical counter-measures. Colonel Eugene Konovalets was assassinated in Rotterdam in 1938 by an agent of the N.K.V.D., in the same way as Symon Petlura the former president of the Ukrainian National Republic had been, in Paris in 1926. But even this great blow did not weaken the determination of the Ukrainian people to continue their struggle for liberation.

Historical achievements

The history of O.U.N. if written in detail, would fill many bulky volumes. This article allows no more than to enumerate the main achievements of O.U.N. in the fateful years shortly before 1930, to the present day. On the eve of the Second World War the situation in Ukraine was that the main weight of the struggle for liberation rested principally on the shoulders of the Ukrainian nationalistic underground.

Carpatho-Ukraine

This proved to be true in the case of the collapse of Czechoslovakia. The result of O.U.N. activities was the creation of the independent Carpatho-Ukrainian state in 1938-1939. The O.U.N. did not expect this state to survive for long—because of its size, geographical location and economic

resources, but it was a demonstration before the whole world of the Ukrainian nation's desire for freedom and independence. The leaders, officers and men of the small Carpatho-Ukrainian army which fought valorously against renewed Hungarian, Czech and Polish aggression were for the most part members of O.U.N.

1941: Re-establishment of Ukrainian State

The O.U.N. was resolved to use the approaching 2nd World War as an opportunity and a means to re-establish the suppressed Ukrainian national state. In April 1941, two months before the Nazi war against U.S.S.R., the O.U.N. resolved at its Second Congress in Krakow that the Ukrainian nation would continue its struggle for liberation and a state of its own, disregarding all possible territorial changes in Eastern Europe. On June 30th, 1941 the Ukrainian National Assembly in Lviv, convoked by the O.U.N., proclaimed a Caretaker Ukrainian Government, charged with the task of re-establishing a Ukrainian state. The Nazis countered this Ukrainian move with reprisals and violence. The Ukrainian government was arrested, thousands of patriots were banished to concentration camps. A relentless struggle began between the Nazi aggressor and the revolutionary Ukrainian spirit. **Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.)** The most important and best known part of this struggle was the vast guerilla warfare against the Nazis, as well as the Russo-bolshevik occupants. In 1943 all Ukraine seethed with guerilla activities. Guerilla groups called "Marching Groups" were formed by O.U.N. in 1941, and in 1942 "Units of Ukrainian Nationalists" sprouted out everywhere, particularly in the forest regions of Northern, Central and Southern Ukraine; they were eventually united in early 1943 under one supreme command. Thus the famous **Ukrainian Insurgent Army** ("Ukrainska Povstancha Armia"—U.P.A.) came into being. The O.U.N. provided the U.P.A. with its best military and political leaders; in short, U.P.A. was primarily a product of O.U.N. The war against Germany was wholeheartedly approved by the Ukrainian people, who consequently gave full support to the U.P.A.

A.B.N.

The Ukrainian struggle for liberation answered the desires of other enslaved nations. O.U.N. and U.P.A. were able to mobilize all these non-Russian nations effectively. The fundamental slogans under which this struggle was fought, and is still being

fought, were "**Freedom to Nations**" and "**Freedom to Individuals.**" In the name of these ideals a vigorous campaign was conducted against the German and Soviet imperialisms. As a result of this policy a "Conference of the Enslaved Nations of Eastern Europe" was held in 1943, at which the "**Antibolshevik Block of Nations**" (A.B.N.) was formed. Again the O.U.N. representing the Ukrainian segment of A.B.N. sent its ablest and most energetic leaders.

Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council

The tremendous growth of the O.U.N. and U.P.A. created new organizational and internal political problems. As early as 1944 it became evident that the supreme political and military command of the Ukrainian struggle for liberation cannot rest in the hands of one party only. Although created by the O.U.N., the U.P.A. became all-inclusive and all-national in character in a very short time. The ranks of U.P.A. were swollen with Ukrainians of all walks of life, whether they were members of O.U.N., or not. First the U.P.A. became an armed political organization common to all Ukrainians, in which the whole Ukrainian nation participated and took pride. It was now necessary that a supreme political and state organ should crown the national struggle, in which all strata of Ukrainian national life should be represented. In June, 1944, a **Ukrainian National Congress** was convened on the territory occupied by U.P.A., attended by representatives of various political groups and parties as well as all social classes from all over the Ukraine. This Congress gave birth to the **Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.)**, as the supreme state organ of the Ukrainian nation, for the duration of the struggle for freedom and statehood. This Council is O.U.N.

built on democratic principles. Its executive is the Secretariat-General. Although the O.U.N., as well as other forms of political and social life of free Ukraine came under the rules at the Constitution of U.H.V.R., it should be borne in mind that the prime source of creation and existence of U.H.V.R. was and still remains the O.U.N..

Finally, after the 2nd World War, although the main bulk of the activities of O.U.N.-U.P.A.-U.H.V.R. remains in Ukraine, the O.U.N. developed large scale activities amongst the vast Ukrainian political emigrants in the Western World. A propaganda

WHAT ABOUT THE POLICY OF LIBERATION?

Remarks on the forgotten book, by James Burnham

One of the policies advocated by the Republican Party in their presidency election campaign concerned Eastern Europe, and was known as the *Liberation Policy*. The opinion was expressed that a re-orientation of America's foreign policy as regards the East European nations suppressed by bolshevism, was possible, but not, however, agreed as to the extent of this new policy. One side expressed the opinion that the new foreign policy would include only the so-called satellite states, whilst the other side maintained that it should also include all the nations of the present Soviet Union.

It is exactly a year ago that James Burnham's book, "Containment or Liberation," was published in New York, in which he set down the problems, tactics, and aims of this Liberation Policy. The book was not a success with the American public, and the American press kept quiet on this subject. Now is the time to enquire whether James Burnham's theories have been re-echoed by America's foreign policy.

Two events in the last month of 1953 have undoubtedly attracted the attention of all those interested in world politics. The Bermuda Conference and President Eisenhower's address to the U.N. Assembly, which dealt with the problem of lessening the tension in the international situation both contained certain ideas which referred to America's Soviet policy and also to her relations with the East European nations.

At the Bermuda Conference the leaders of Britain, France and America came to the conclusion that the position of the

campaign was launched amongst the Western nations, with the aim to make the Ukrainian liberation cause known and understood.

The Ultimate Goal

Thus, after 25 years of persevering and sacrificial work, the O.U.N. can look back to really conspicuous historical, political and social achievements. The O.U.N. became an inseparable part of modern Ukrainian history, in its struggle for liberation and creation of an independent Ukrainian national State. It can be taken for granted that the O.U.N. will not rest until the ultimate goal of the whole Ukrainian nation is reached—the liberty and sovereignty of a free Ukrainian National State.

East European nations was by no means enviable.

"We cannot accept as justified or permanent the present division of Europe. Our hope is that peaceful means will be found to enable the countries of Eastern Europe again to play their part as free nations in a free Europe."

The American President in his address to the U.N. Assembly on December 8, 1953, made various statements which in theory sound quite positive but, regarded from the concrete aspect (especially with reference to the Soviet Union and Russia), appear very questionable. As regards the fundamental attitude of the United States Mr. Eisenhower said,

"It is with the book of history and not with isolated pages, that the United States will ever wish to be identified. My country wishes to be constructive. It wants agreements, not wars among nations. It wants, itself, to live in freedom and also that the peoples of every other nation may enjoy equally the right of choosing their own way of life."

On the question of a concrete policy on the part of the United States towards Russia Mr. Eisenhower made the following statements:

"Very recently, we have received from the Soviet Union what is, in effect, an expression of willingness to hold a Four Power meeting. Along with our Allies, Great Britain and France, we were pleased to see that this Note did not contain the unacceptable conditions put forward previously."

"We will concentrate on the single purpose of emerging from that conference with tangible results towards peace—the only true way of lessening international tension." "We never have, we never will propose or suggest that the Soviet Union surrender what is rightfully theirs."

"We will never say that the people of Russia are an enemy with whom we have no desire to deal or mingle in friendly and fruitful relationship."

Actually, these ideas are not new. Basically, they are the principles contained in the Containment Policy, which George F. Kennan attempted to put into practice. Briefly, the Russians shall be allowed to retain their present "possessions" and only those countries which hitherto have

been free, are to be defended. There is no obstacle to an agreement being reached.

Burnham's Criticism of the Containment Policy

The Containment Policy, which led to an expansion of the Bolshevik sphere of influence, was sharply criticized by James Burnham. This author defined the six fundamental faults of this political or rather ideological foreign conception as follows:

- 1) "The policy of containment is internally inconsistent. It both denies and presupposes the 'co-existence of socialism and capitalism', as it is termed in communist propaganda."
- 2) "From the strategic point of view, the policy of containment is purely defensive."
- 3) "A defensive strategy, inadequate in every case, is triply so when applied to the Soviet Union. An opponent located in a relatively small territory, with a small population, weak in resources or passive in attitude, might be successfully 'contained' for some while. On all accounts, the Soviet Union is the opposite to such a convenient opponent."
- 4) "The positive point of the policy of liberation is the proposal to 'build situations of strength': that is, to improve the economic, social and military conditions of the non-communist nations, so that they will become outposts against Soviet advance. The difficulty with this praiseworthy aim is that under the perspective of containment, it is impossible."
- 5) "The policy of containment excludes the initiation of any action within the Soviet sphere. This means that the Soviet leadership is given a free hand to complete the consolidation of the newly conquered regions, and to promote their economic, social and political integration into the Soviet system."
- 6) "Spiritual force is needed together with a firm resolution to sustain an unyielding effort through periods of failure, loss and sorrow. It is perhaps the crucial defect of the policy of containment that it is incapable of meeting this moral and spiritual demand."

All the arguments propounded against the Containment Policy have been summed up intentionally, as both the Bermuda Communiqué and Mr. Eisenhower's address fundamentally represent a return to this policy. Recent political moves by the Soviets have indeed been crowned with success, by the acceptance of the Soviet suggestion that a Four Power Conference (without any formulated terms) should be held. American foreign policy

is now finding new formulas, which although not identical with the word "Containment" are nevertheless in opposition to the conception of "Liberation." William Henry Chamberlin makes an unsuccessful attempt in his latest book, "Beyond Containment" (Chicago, 1953), to adopt an intermediate attitude.

Liberation Strategy

Mr. Burnham rightly emphasizes that that there are fundamental differences between the conception of the Soviet Union and Russia, and that Ukraine has a right to a general liberation and the best chances. "In political weight national liberation comes first, but the policy sells individual and social liberation as well. Communist imperialism enslaves individuals, classes, religions and other social groups."

This is brought out clearly in Part VI (The East European Strategy) where the Liberation strategy as far as the East European countries are concerned is summed up. Unlike most Western authors, James Burnham affirms that the basis of the imperialism of the Soviet Union is not only "the communist world revolutionary enterprise" but is also traditionally Russian imperialism. Since it has no national unity, liberation strategy must be attuned particularly to those national movements for freedom which are still powerful at the present time. "The skeleton of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, which became a formidable anti-Bolshevik as well as an anti-Nazi force during the latter part of the war and the following year or two still exists in Ukraine and carries on limited activities."

Furthermore, liberation strategy must include the entire Soviet sphere of influence in order to keep it in check and create obstacles which will deter Moscow from carrying out further plans of aggression. Nothing could be more dangerous than a period of rest which might enable the Russian rulers to strengthen their position. The author very rightly remarks that if liberation strategy were applied, the Soviets would not react with open war, a fact which is feared in many quarters in the West (especially in left-wing quarters). According to his opinion the following factors have so far deterred them from engaging in an extensive, open and armed conflict:

"First, the superiority of United States production and technology, and thus the American armament potential.

Secondly, American superiority in atomic armament and in the ability to deliver atomic and other weapons of mass destruction.

Thirdly, internal Soviet difficulties which arise from individual class and

national tensions. The Kremlin fears that under the strain of general war these tensions might become so acute as to lead not only to military defeat but to the end of the Soviet system. That is why the Soviet leaders have felt it essential, before starting a general war, to consolidate the internal regime of their Empire by a campaign of terror, indoctrination and genocide."

Ukraine and the Policy of Liberation

In the third part of his book James Burnham also deals with the Ukrainian problem as an essential part of the Liberation concept. In an unbiased manner he examines the entire national problems and stresses that they are of primary importance. He points out that the Western boundary of the Soviet Union in 1939, which in view of the present situation is speculative, should be taken into consideration.

From the political point of view there is at present no difference between the actual position of Rumania, Hungary, Ukraine or Byelorussia. The governments of all these countries are the puppets of Moscow, their Communist Parties are controlled by one head party, and they are the agents of one party, namely the Communist Party.

As regards their legal international status, Ukraine and Byelorussia are members of the U.N. as are Poland and Czechoslovakia. Membership of the U.N. as far as the two former countries are concerned, is not merely the result of a trick on the part of the Kremlin, which would like to have a large number of votes in this organization, but a positive political achievement of these two nations. "The principal motive was undoubtedly to try to give a safe and diverting outlet to the pressure of Ukrainian and Byelorussian nationalism."

Finally, the Liberation policy must be based on universal and moral principles, which undoubtedly include the concept of freedom and national independence. A policy which is not based on fundamental principles of this kind will in the long run prove unsuccessful, for a purely materialistic attitude in this respect will most probably go hand in hand with counter-espionage and secret service organizations.

"The policy of liberation recognises the right to self-determination and therefore to independence, of all the nations of the Soviet Empire, including the nations located within the pre-1939 Soviet boundaries. If liberation actually leads to the fractionalizing of the present Soviet Empire into several wholly independent sovereign and rival states, this will at least remove the intolerable threat to world security which exists because of the control

of all central Eurasia by a single aggressive Power."

James Burnham above all stresses the primary importance of the political element in dealing with the East European problem, and refutes the "arguments" of the Russian emigration imperialists and their Western friends. He rightly emphasizes the fact that the successive stages of political development can at best be liberation, independence, and federation. In this connection he is thinking of the Russian "federalist" ideology which seeks to conceal its imperialist aims by resorting to political phrases which are more acceptable to the Western world.

"Our proposal must be for the freedom of all the nations; an Ukrainian has the same right to freedom as a Pole or a Russian. Only this universal interpretation, which is recommended alike by expediency and justice, will release the centrifugal energy of all the Soviet Empire. A power which if given a chance to express itself can shatter the imperial structure. It would be ludicrous to interpret a struggle against communism as a fight to preserve the Russian Empire. If Russians who claim to be anti-communists refuse to extend the goal of freedom to non-Russians, then we must wonder whose side they will be on when a showdown comes."

James Burnham was, of course, not able to deal with every problem concerning the suppressed nations in his book. Moreover, he intended his book as the basic formulation of a new political ideology which could then have been enlarged upon. For this reason certain discrepancies and inaccuracies are of no significance. What is more important is the fact that the question of the *liberation of the suppressed nations* was raised a year ago. We may well ask ourselves at the present time whether this question is still being discussed, and what the attitude to the Policy of liberation is today.

It is only too obvious from the comments on the Bermuda Conference, from Mr. Eisenhower's statements, and from the daily routine-policy that the policy of liberation has not been adopted by the Western World. No reasons have been given for this, and we ask, what about the policy of liberation?

Jaroslav Z. Pelenskyj

"UKRAINIAN OBSERVER"

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

published by

Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,

237, Liverpool Rd.,

London, N.E. Tel. NORTH 1828.

CONVINCING ARGUMENTS

When Admiral *George Mentz* made his speech on November 26, 1953, in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Anti-Bolshevik Block of Nations (A.B.N.), it was known by the free Ukrainian community in America that he did not share the views of the "American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism" and that he was opposed to their present leadership. Moreover, Admiral *George Mentz*, as an unbiased American, had shown an attentive and kindly interest in the struggle of the suppressed nations. But he excelled himself by his analysis of Russian imperialistic Communism in his address. At the beginning of his speech he made the following striking statement:

"It is in every sense an honour, because I know full well of the gallant and fearless campaign of the A.B.N. to expose the terrible dangers of Russian Imperialistic Communism, and your untiring efforts to awake free people to this real menace and your firm allegiance to those dynamic political principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence."

Admiral *Mentz* rightly opposed the "objections" raised by the representatives of the individual nations of the West and convincingly refuted them. The first of these objections refers to "non-intervention in the internal affairs of the U.S.S.R., because the Soviet citizens might otherwise unite with the Kremlin. The absurdity of this was proved by means of convincing arguments and those who advocated this were designated as "either agents of the Kremlin, or plain fools."

Continuing, Admiral *Mentz* pointed out that the suppressed nations could not refer to a fatherland united with Russia as their own and that Stalin had not succeeded in extirpating nationalism in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Proof of this, he added, was in the speech made by Malenkov at Stalin's funeral, in which the national aspect had been stressed.

The assertion that those who advocate an independent Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, etc. are "separatists" is equally absurd. It is very strange that such outmoded ideas should be upheld in America, the country in which the right to safeguard national freedom is based on the Declaration of Independence.

The fifth problem to which Admiral *Mentz* devoted considerable attention referred to the existing relations between the suppressed nations and the Russian nation. The opponents of national liberation have endeavoured to instil into the

Disguised Russian Propaganda

JOURNAL OF THE INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF THE HISTORY
AND INSTITUTIONS OF THE U.S.S.R. (RUSSIAN: VESTNIK
INSTITUTA PO IZUCHENIYU ISTORII I KULTURY
S.S.S.R.), Vol. I-V, Munich, 1951-1953

The Russian "Institute for the Study of the History and Institutions of the U.S.S.R.," was founded in Munich at the end of 1950 by the aid of funds from American private circles (which also finance the "American Committee for the Liberation from Bolshevism"). Its publications (which are published in Russian, but always include fairly detailed English, German, and French "summaries" and thus have a considerable circulation) advocate the fundamental theory of the Russian anti-Soviet emigrants, who are, practically without exception, agreed that a successful struggle can only be waged against Soviet Bolshevism, if the Western Major Powers guarantee the unity and integrity of the Russian imperium in principle, at least within its frontiers prior to 1939. Otherwise "Russian national sentiment" will object to any interference on the part of the Western Powers and will prefer to endure "a bad dictatorship" on the part of the Communist rulers rather than the "partition of Russia." These views indicate the hostile political attitude of this "Journal" to the struggle for national independence which is being fought by all the non-Russian nations. What concerns us more at the moment is the manner in which this "Journal" deals with the Ukrainian problem.

Since the authors of this "Journal" are obviously striving to preserve an outward appearance of scientific objectivity they prefer to desist from stating direct views on Ukrainian problems. Despite the fact that the reader is assured again and again in numerous articles on the most varied subjects, that there is no national struggle within the Soviet imperialism against the "elder Russian brother." The whole Russian nation is apparently suffering under the bolshevist yoke just as much as the

former non-Russian nations, but no concrete arguments for this bold paradox are to be found anywhere in any of the five volumes of the "Journal" so far. That this restraint is by no means based on motives of scientific conscientiousness, but solely on the fact that they want to hush up all problems which are disagreeable to Russian imperialism, is all too obvious, from the systematic consistency with which they ignore all Ukrainian questions, or else mention these in such a manner as to suggest that Ukraine is nothing more than one of the many "Russian" territories (as for instance in the same way as the statement made by *George Kennan*, which has become "classical," regarding the State of Pennsylvania in the U.S.A.).

In an article by *I. Smirnov* in Vol. I which discusses the "new ideological purge" in Soviet art, literature, and science in the year 1951, corresponding reprisals in Ukraine are indeed mentioned but an explanation is promptly given, that in the first place they do not represent a "campaign against nationally minded elements in peripheral republics" but are based on much deeper reasons: "the Kremlin is preparing a new foreign political venture (a forecast, which during the past two years has, incidentally, proved false—V. D.'s remark) and for this reason it is necessary to strengthen the moral and political unity of the Soviet nation," that is to say, to carry out another ideological purge". No one, and the author least of all, believes in an allegedly abstract "Soviet patriotism" on the part of the "Soviet nations."

On the question of the artificial creation of a famine in the rural areas the authors refrain from referring to the dreadful famine in Ukraine from 1932 to 1933 and mention a supposed "genuine famine in the rural areas of the Volga district in the winter of 1939-1940", which surely never resulted in millions of deaths as was the case in Ukraine. Otherwise they briefly write about "a famine such as had never been known before in Ukraine, in Northern Caucasia, Northern Kazakhstan, and in some of the Volga districts," in order at least to link up "some of the (ethnically Russian) Volga districts" somehow with Ukraine and so-called Northern Caucasia (which is the preponderantly Ukrainian territory of the Kuban Cossacks, from the

American public, the idea that everyone who talks about Russian Imperialism in connection with Bolshevism is anti-Russian! This false imputation was refuted by Admiral *Mentz*'s concise arguments.

The Russian masses are reproached though, because they show no resistance against despots, dictators, and totalitarian systems.

Thus another well-known American in public life, Admiral *Mentz*, has expressed his adherence to our ideas,—a fact which deserves mention and which indicates that these ideas are the most objective.

ethnic point of view), although no named villages or rural areas were wiped out completely by famine in 1932 and 1933 in those Volga districts mentioned.

Anything connected with the armed national struggle of the Ukrainians against Russian imperialism is omitted intentionally. It is possible that *N. Galay*, for instance, has never heard of the Ukrainian "blue" and the Ukrainian "grey" divisions, consisting of Ukrainian prisoners-of-war, which were formed in Germany during World War I, but he mentions such details as the existence of a Finnish battalion in the German army and of a Georgian battalion in the Turkish army; when the same author deals with the "partisan movements in the U.S.S.R. during World War II," he discusses in detail the fairly unimportant anti-Soviet activity of various groups of partisans and deserters in (ethnically Muscovite) Russia and throughout Siberia at some length, but dismisses the subject of the long struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.) with an insignificant remark about "remnants of anti-German partisans and Ukrainian and Caucasian national partisan groups," although the information about the activity of the U.P.A. in Soviet Ukrainian territory was in the Soviet literature which he himself quotes (Kolpak, Vershigora, etc.)

Not even when a harmless—at least one would assume it to be—subject like "Soviet Museums in the Propaganda system" is discussed does Ukraine come off unscathed; for it is precisely in this article paradoxically enough, the Ukrainian that pre-revolutionary museums are dealt with in the sections on "Museums in Russia." Also the important cultural role played by the Ukrainian museums in the revival of Ukrainian national sentiment at the beginning of the twenties is described merely as a "movement to promote knowledge of the country" which is the interpretation construed by the Russian "colder brother."

Even in the brief notes appended to the "Bibliographical Index of New Literature Concerning the Soviet Union and Communism" the tendency and intention to hush up anything that is specifically Ukrainian is very obvious. The following note concerning "The Time of the Assassins" by *G. Blunder* (Philadelphia, 1952) states "The work gives an account of the German occupation of the town of Khar'kiv in a belletristic form." Naturally, no mention is made whatsoever of the fact that Blunden's novel deals mainly with the national Ukrainian (anti-German and anti-Soviet) resistance movement. The verbose note on the fundamental work by *R. Smal-Stocki*, "The Nationality Problem of the Soviet Union and Russian

Communist Interpretation in the "The Times"

It is natural for the Bolshevik press to conduct a campaign against "bourgeois nationalism." The nationalism of the subjugated nations in the U.S.S.R. is the greatest danger to the Bolshevik totalitarian system, and the present rulers in the Kremlin are well aware of this. They know only too well that the strength of Ukrainian national resistance is too great to be treated lightly.

It is odd however, that there are politicians and journalists in the West, who not only oppose but even surpass the Russians in this respect. One of these journalists recently proved worthy of the Stalin Award,—no other than *Isaac Deutscher*, whose lengthy article on "Changes in the Ukraine" (300th Anniversary of Union with Russia) was published in the London "Times" on January 15, 1954.

We do not intend to discuss the entire subject-matter of this article, although it contains statements which are neither based on historical investigations nor on an adequate political analysis; for instance, like the following:

"Throughout their history the Ukrainians were incapable of forming a truly independent national movement of their own. Revolting against Russia they hired themselves to the Polish nobility, to the Turkish Sultan, and, in more recent times to Austro-Hungary and Germany; and each time they were disillusioned

Communist Imperialism" (Milwaukee, 1952), is even more peculiar. Incidentally, readers of the "Ukrainian Observer" will already be acquainted with this work as it was reviewed in detail in No. 10-11 (1953). Mr. A. H. now reviews it as follows:

"Although the author writes about a traditional Russian imperialism he is forced to admit that Soviet imperialism is a much more dangerous phenomenon than the imperialism of tsarist Russia. He discusses the nationality problem, in order to direct the attention of the Western countries and the U.S.A. in particular to this question. He examines the national policy of Bolshevism from the point of theory and practice. He stresses the fact that Communist aggression cannot be brought to a halt by any compromises or retreats of the nature of the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam Agreements. The author notes that the foreign policy and home policy of the Communists have been co-ordinated and maintains that the weakness and the strength of the Communists lies in this fact."

the Bolshevik "interpretation of history" and is typical Russian propaganda, but they also completely distort historical facts. Every serious-minded journalist knows full well that the Ukrainian nationalist movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was and still is a completely independent phenomenon, and that both the government of the Ukrainian National Republic (U.N.R.) and also the revolutionary Ukrainian government, which assembled in Lviv on June 30, 1941, were strongly opposed to German imperialism and national socialism. It cannot possibly be said that the Ukrainian nationalists, who were put into concentration camps by the Nazis, "sold themselves" to Germany.

And the statement is by no means the most questionable of Isaac Deutscher's assertions. One could, of course, make excuses for him by affirming that the information he had was one-sided. The following sentence in Deutscher's article illustrates his idea of an "objective report" and journalistic "fair play":

"The Polish Ukraine was the homeland of an intense fascist brand of Ukrainian nationalism, which began to foster within the united Ukraine, and long after the war the fascist gangs of Bandera raided, terrorized, and pillaged the lands between Lvov and Kiev."

Even the Communists, in their publications, when describing the Ukrainian national underground movement as the "bourgeois-nationalist agent of American imperialism and the Vatican", have never reached the conclusion arrived at by Deutscher. Apparently their opinion is not sufficient for Deutscher, and he maintains that the Ukrainian nationalist movement merely consists of "fascist gangs." The author of the leading articles in the Moscow "Pravda", no doubt envied him his "excellent" description.

This matter is however, far too serious to be treated lightly. Isaac Deutscher is obviously trying to discredit the strength of the Ukrainian national revolutionary underground movement, together with the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.), the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.). These organizations have definitely proved by their programme and their activities, that their aim is directed towards the establishing of a democratic Ukrainian State. Indeed, they are the only organizations which have waged a two-front war against Bolshevism and National Socialism.

Continued on Page 16

Prof. Dr. Volodymyr Derzhavyn

Ukrainian Literature Under the Soviet Russian Occupation

The Poetry of the Older Generation

In order to understand the shortlived, but nevertheless productive, golden age of Ukrainian poetry between 1917 and 1933 (before it was ruthlessly extirpated by the Soviet Russian secret police) it is necessary to distinguish between the older and younger generations of poets. Purely chronological circumstances are not of so much significance, as rather the fact that the older generation of Ukrainian poets (most of them were born prior to 1895) were already mature men and writers before the Bolshevik October Revolution occurred, and most decidedly rejected the social propaganda of Soviet Communism, at least in the beginning. Later on, when Ukrainian writers were faced with the difficult choice of either joining forces with the Soviets, at least to all outward appearance, or ceasing to write, the poets of the older generation adopted an attitude of apparent "loyalty" towards the Soviet regime, and chose this way as the "lesser of two evils." With few exceptions, none of them were sincere friends of the Soviets or Communist "supporters."

This is not surprising, for they belonged to that great *national* movement in Ukrainian literature, initiated by the great West Ukrainian poet, belletrist, writer, and literary historian, *Ivan Franko* (1856-1916) and the talented Central Ukrainian poetess and playwright, *Lesya Ukrayinka* (1871-1913). This movement did not aim to achieve any social changes but rather the restoration of the national independence of Ukraine. (The revival of the Ukrainian sovereign and national state 1918-1921), which eventually had to yield to the military superiority of Soviet Russian Communism after an heroic fight for freedom for four years; was for the most part the achievement of the same generation and national elite which later, in the course of the 1920's, strove to preserve the national character of Ukrainian literature and for this reason was gradually and almost completely eliminated by the Communist.)

If Isaac Deutscher was not acquainted with conditions in the U.S.S.R., one might assume that he had been the victim of incorrect information. But his past activity as a Communist is well-known, and he has always supported Bolshevik ideas, so it is obvious that he was acting on behalf of Moscow when he wrote this article.

This generation was in their fundamental attitude thoroughly anti-Soviet, and it is due to their perseverance, self-sacrifice and patriotism that Ukrainian national culture did not collapse when Soviet measures were enforced in the country. They continued to fight for national freedom in the field of culture, at least, for over a decade. In the sphere of poetry the so-called Kyiv *neo-classical* school (represented by *Mykola Zerov*, *Maksym Rylsky*, and *Pavlo Fylypovych* as the leading poets) was of decisive importance. We have already mentioned the literary activity and achievements of this school in a previous article in this journal ("Neo-Classicism in the Modern Ukrainian National Poetry," published in the "Ukrainian Observer," April-May, 1953, pp. 10-12). The representatives of other literary trends also created much that was valuable in the artistic sense and irrevocable from the national point of view.

The Impressionists

Apart from the neo-classical trend the artistic style of the entire older generation of Ukrainian poets can be described as impressionist, with a tendency to symbolism. The "true" impressionists, who had predominated in Ukrainian literature during the years 1905 to 1920, had for the most part gone into political exile and as a result their works were very soon banned in Soviet Ukraine. *Oleksander Oles* (1878-1944), the generally acknowledged master of impressionist lyrical poetry, famed for the musical harmony of his language and esteemed for his patriotism which accepted no compromise, was one and several other well-known lyric and romantic poets followed him into political exile, as for example, *Mykyta Shapoval-Sriblynsky* (1882-1931), a poet of great sensitiveness and a literary critic, and *Spyrydon Cherkasenko* (1876-1939), who had a preference for "urban" themes and political poetry. Oles' most important rival in the field of true lyricism, *Hryhoryj Chuprynka* (1879-1921) was killed in fight against Bolshevism. Others, who in the early 1920s, ventured to return of their own free will to Soviet Ukraine, as for instance the manysided and gifted lyric poet, *Mykola Vorony* (1871-1935?), and the satirist and humorist, *Volodymyr Samiilenko* (1864-1925) bitterly regretted this step later on. They

found it impossible to adjust themselves to the grim reality of the Soviet regime and accordingly ceased to write, a fact which, incidentally, did not prevent them from vanishing into Siberian concentration camps. M. Vorony and many other well-known lyric poets, who, although they had remained in Soviet Ukraine, and had practically or completely ceased publishing their works, suffered the same fate. They included *Mykola Chernyavsky* (1867-1935?), known as the poet of love-lyrics, *P. Kapelhorodsky* (1882-1937?), who inclined to melancholy, and *Mykola Foyiansky* (1837-1937?), who, from the artistic point of view, was by far the most outstanding of the Ukrainian impressionists and whose delicate style is, as it were, a transition to the Kyiv neo-classical school. Other poets only managed to escape Soviet Russian reprisals because their lyrical poems had been forgotten by the 1920s, as for instance *Khrystyia Alchevska* (1882-1933), the naive and outspoken poetess, and *Ahathanhel Krymsky* (1871-1941), the outstanding Orientalist and literary historian, whose works are characterized by pantheism. Incidentally, *Petro Karmansky* (born in 1878), the former master of West Ukrainian impressionist poetry, has been living under the tyranny of the Soviets since 1944, and appears to have ceased his literary activity.

A political exception among the impressionists of the 1920s was *Evhen Hryhorchuk* (1894-1923), a most gifted lyric poet, who, as a convinced national Communist, was so bitterly disappointed by the results of the Soviet Russian occupation regime in Ukraine, that he committed suicide.

The Symbolists

The poetry of the symbolists met with a far greater response in the 1920s. Although there is no sharp dividing-line between Ukrainian impressionism and symbolism, a new era in Ukrainian lyrical poetry began with *Pavlo Tychyna* (born in 1891), whose poems though mostly intentionally vague, are full of profound moods and sentiments. He succeeded in giving Ukrainian symbolism a mystical and pantheistic strain based on national folk-songs. Unfortunately, however, his descriptive style did not last long. His exaggerated striving to find "modern" artistic forms, prompted him to resort to futurist distortions of verse and metre, and his undisguised servility to the Communist regime—a regrettable exception among the poets of his generation—caused his later works to deteriorate to the level of instruments of Soviet Russian propaganda and deprived them of all artistic value. The only collections

of his poems which are of lasting value are those published between 1918 and 1921, of which the most outstanding is his first work, "Sonyashni Klarnety" ("Sun-Clarinets," 1918).

A much firmer national stand was taken by the West Ukrainian symbolist, *Dmytro Zahul* (1890-1935?), who preferred to leave his native country after it had been partitioned between Poland and Rumania and emigrated to Soviet Ukraine. There, as a literary critic, he manifested an "orthodox" Marxist attitude. In the end, however, he was regarded as a political suspect by the Soviets and arrested. Nothing has been heard of him since. The following poem, written in his early days, serves to illustrate his rather vague mystical and pessimistic lyricism, which was mainly influenced by German symbolism*:

Volodymyr Svidzirsky

Beyond the veil a dimensity
There live such people as I;
And here, unknown to the immensity,
Deploring wretched fate,
My soul could only cry.

I duly struggle with that impediment
Now in a thousandth year,
But with my thoughts of silent stead-
iment

I can't proceed from earth
Into the other sphere.

Or may someone by hands of hardihood
Disjoin the veil of realm of day?
Who can present a strength of hearty
mood,

Of such a hearty mood,
As long ago I was untoldly gay?

The same fate overtook several other outstanding impressionist-symbolist poets. *Oleksa Slisarenko* (1891-1937?), better known as a prose-writer, *Yakiv Savchenko* (1890-1937?), who already in the early 1920s exchanged poetry for "Marxist" literature criticism, and *Mykola Tereshchenko* (born in 1898), who from having originally been a symbolist became the willing tool of Soviet Communist propaganda and for this reason was probably pardoned, by way of exception, during World War II. A tragic fate befell *Volodymyr Svidzinsky* (1885-1941), who, after P. Tychna's degradation, was probably the most outstanding representative of Ukrainian symbolist poetry, and whose works did not become widely known until the end of the 1920's.

* All the English adaptations quoted here are by the Ukrainian poet and literary historian, *Yar Slavutych* (born in 1918, and at present working in Philadelphia (Pa.) as a political emigrant).

When Kharkiv (East Ukraine) was forcibly evacuated in October, 1941, he was arrested by the Bolsheviks and together with the hundred other "political suspects" was burnt to death in a barn. The strange emotional delicacy of his lyricism can be seen from the following:

I put to flight my reedy arrow
Exactly tarred on edge.
It sang above the lofty bushes
And fell beyond the bedge.

But there the stupid catt'e grazed,
A creature, lazy meat,
Who dully tramped my lovely arrow
With sharp and cloven feet.

Alas! How zealously I tackled
The stalk, beloved by light!
With what rejoicing to the sunbeams
I trew my singing flight.

O dusky tar! My pions anger
Is boiling, held by sparks.
Why did I dip this child of summer
On your betraying darks?

V. Svidzinsky also enriched Ukrainian poetry by his excellent translation of Hesiod, Aristophanes, and Ovid.

The Futurists

It is no mere coincidence that the "more radical" trends in European literature during the years 1910 to the 1920's—futurism, dadaism, expressionism, etc—called forth no great response on the part of the older generation of Ukrainian poets. Although *Mykhayl Semenko* (1892-1935?), the extremely creative lyric poet, who was by no means averse to mystification, organized a "pan-futurist" group called the "Nova Generatsiya" ("The New Generation") which preached a radical "revolution in art," it is significant that what he himself wrote in this group are worthless trifles (or abstract theories), whereas his few poems are truly impressionist, and not without a certain delicate and pleasing playfulness, as can be seen from the following:

Card

I glean the silver of existence
and the occasion
into a card's restricted distance
and complication.

Once more the impotent reflection
and sunny tender
supply my error's incorrection
and wording splendor.

It is hard to find what political danger the Soviets could possibly have discovered in such a literary trend, which was averse to all national tradition, to let the creators of such a movement (and almost

Berlin

(Futile and endless negotiations)

One of the rules in politics is that negotiations are conducted even when there is hardly any likelihood of their succeeding. There are two reasons for this procedure: in the first place, to avoid the risk of not finding a possible solution, and secondly, in order to start from a better initial position if further negotiations are held in the future. In addition, the three Western foreign ministers, attending the Berlin Conference, no doubt had the sincere desire to bring about a partial peace at least, in order to satisfy, to a certain degree, the longing of mankind in this respect.

Molotov's presence at this Conference was, however, prompted by other motives. Officially he went to Berlin in order to negotiate on the question of Germany's reunification and on a peace treaty with Austria, but actually, he had other aims in mind. Molotov only wanted to talk, act, ferret out secrets, and deceive the other parties and then, by a large-scale attack, bring about dissension among his Western partners. But in this aim he failed. The only result of this Conference which can be regarded as a positive one, is the fact that Mr. Bidault refused to be tempted by attractive Russian offers and, despite the pro-Russian attitude of the extreme left and right wing of the French Parliament, firmly supported the E.D.C., and did not allow Molotov to influence him into making any move which was based on anti-German sentiments. But this was the only success scored by the Western world at this Conference, and it was not much. In any case, a conference based primarily on a defensive attitude was hardly likely to have much success.

It was impossible to achieve any new solutions. Molotov refused to allow himself to be persuaded into adopting a compromising attitude, in the case of the

all its adherents) simply vanish without a trace. There can only be one reason—everything in Ukrainian literature which is not created according to the Russian pattern is regarded with suspicion by the Soviet Russians. And futurism was not invented by the Russians!

In conclusion, the older generation of Ukrainian poets did not, it is true, produce many outstanding works, with the exception of P. Tychna's early works and those of the entire Kyiv neo-classical school, but they did consistently preserve the cultural and historical continuity of the national literature of Ukraine despite the fact that the ruthless pressure of Russian bolshevism increased steadily.

German and Austrian questions, and continued to stress the aggressive intentions of the Western Powers and the imperialist aims of the U.S.A.

The concession made by the Western Powers to an Asia Conference, can only be regarded as a disadvantage for them, as it represents the first step to legalizing bolshevist influence in Asia. The work of the United Nations, who defended South Korea is thus undermined, and a further precedent for the extension of the Soviet veto privilege has herewith been established. Even at this early date it is possible to foresee that the Asia Conference, in the same way as the Berlin Conference, will only result in an agreement being reached to continue negotiations.

One can but ask—how long and to what purpose are negotiations with the Soviets to be continued? Since it has apparently become an established custom for the Russians to reply to all suggestions with "No", then is it surely time to cease negotiating with them. No one will deny that the present Malenkov regime is interested in consolidating and maintaining the status quo which has been achieved, and which is being enlarged on a much greater scale for further aggressive operations. If the Russians had their own way, the Cold War would be continued with even greater force. The Russians have never sincerely wanted to ease the tension in the international situation, as their aims have always been concentrated on further aggression.

A critical survey of Soviet policy must, of necessity, banish all illusions which have ever been entertained as regards the likelihood of a genuine peace being achieved, or of a change in the Soviet regime. The Soviets have thus regarded the Berlin conference as a first class opportunity to conduct a propaganda campaign, and are now using the negative results to wage further Communist "wars to achieve peace."

After nine year's experience with the Soviets, it should be obvious that their political system and methods are opposed to the order of the free world, and that the totalitarian spirit of this regime is by no means in keeping with an atmosphere of peace. The motto of the free Western world has so far been to achieve strength, and negotiate. Negotiations will indeed be necessary in order to prove the strength of the Western Powers. But if peace is to be achieved and if those on the other side of the Iron Curtain are to participate in this peace, and who, by their steadfast and unwavering attitude, are at present doing their share to strengthen the Western world, then it is imperative that the Western Powers should change their motto, and should strive to become strong and act!

DECLARATION

BY A MASS MEETINGS OF UKRAINIANS IN LONDON, MANCHESTER, NOTTINGHAM, BRADFORD AND EDINBURGH, TO COMMEMORATE THE 300 YEARS' STRUGGLE OF UKRAINE AGAINST MOSCOW

We, Ukrainians who have met on 11th April 1954, in London, Manchester, Nottingham, Bradford and Edinburgh to mark the 300 years struggle of Ukraine against Moscow, want to tell you of the origin and progress of that struggle.

In 1654 circumstances forced Ukraine, under her great leader, the Ukrainian Cossack Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, to seek an alliance with Muscovy against the Poles, from whose rule Ukraine had earlier freed herself but against whom she was too exhausted to maintain her independence without outside assistance. The Muscovites concluded an entente, but with the secret intention gradually to subdue Ukraine, by hook or by crook. Russia's hidden policy was revealed before long and met with determined resistance.

The struggle of Ukraine against Moscow's progressive encroachments on her liberty has lasted for 300 years. During all these many years its character has often changed and it has assumed varying forms. At times, on the surface, it appeared to have died down, at other times it was intensified and blazed out in bloodshed and open war, in which Russia from time to time suffered serious defeat. This struggle showed both Muscovy and the entire world the **strength of the Ukrainian Nation and her inflexible determination to gain her Liberty and to re-establish an Independent and United Ukrainian State.**

Soviet propaganda, distorting historical fact, tries to convince the Ukrainian people as well as the outside world that the alliance of Ukraine with Russia in the middle of the XVIIth century was a voluntary union for all time of two peoples, and makes every effort to persuade the Ukrainian people that any struggle against Moscow is hopeless, and that it is pointless because, according to Soviet propaganda, it was, and is, Moscow's only desire to further the liberties of Ukraine and to help her people to free themselves from foreign enslavement.

In celebrating the Tercentenary of the "union" of Ukraine with Russia, Moscow aims at the moral and material disarmament of the Ukrainian people and attempts to prove to the Western world that the Ukrainian question is

exclusively a Russian affair which, Moscow alleges, was solved a long time ago, when Ukrainians had joined Muscovy "of their own free will and for all time."

To lend colour to their deception, "official" Russian scientists in their pseudo-scientific pronouncements are not ashamed to deny the well documented conclusions of science regarding the essential ethnological differences between Ukrainians and Russians. Official Russian scientific theory asserts unblushingly that Ukrainians and Russians come from "a single stock of the ancient Russian race."

How happy the Ukrainians were under the Russian yoke and how friendly to their Muscovite conquerors can be inferred from the following facts:

a) The defeat of the Muscovite armies at Orsha in 1514 by the combined Ukrainian and Lithuanian army by the Ukrainian Prince Constantine Ostrozhskyj.

b) The siege of Moscow in 1613 by the Ukrainian Cossacks under the leadership of Hetman Petro Konashevych-Sahaydachnyj.

c) The complete annihilation of the Muscovite army in the battle at Konotop, in 1659, by the Ukrainian Cossacks led by Hetman Ivan Vyhovskij.

d) The destruction of Muscovite garrisons in Ukraine in 1666 by Hetman Petro Doroshenko.

e) The rising of Hetman Mazepa, the hero of Byron's poems, and the battle of Poltava in 1709;

f) the Russo-Ukrainian war in the years 1917 to 1921;

g) the continued guerilla warfare in Ukraine after the defeat of 1921;

h) the struggle of the Ukrainian Resistance Army during the Second World War, and its continuation after the war up to the present moment.

All these facts bear eloquent witness regarding the alleged cordial relations between Ukrainians and "big brother Russia."

The Ukrainian nation cannot speak her mind. Russia holds her captive and has silenced her voice. So we, Ukrainian exiles, must speak for our enslaved Ukrainian people, of their true will and hope, and reveal the lies

EAST-WEST TRADE

HELPING MOSCOW'S WAR AIMS

by John F. Stewart

No more that the Soviet Government makes is unrelated to the age-long steady Russian (not only Bolshevik) march to world conquest; the present Kremlin encouragement of East-West trade is no exception. Moscow is not scared by the American possession of the frightful hydrogen bomb, which the Russians also have. And they have no scruples in sacrificing millions of their peoples if that helps on their policy. They had no scruples in starving to death six million Ukrainians in 1933 to force acceptance of collectivisation—murdering men, women and children. What the Russians are afraid of now is revolt among the non-Russian people of the U.S.S.R., who number two or three times the actual Russian population.

Moscow has promised all these peoples a large increase in consumer-goods production in two years; Ukraine, the largest of the non-Russian states with a population of 45 millions, has been bribed by being presented with the Crimea, hitherto ruled directly from Moscow. An increase of consumer goods by Soviet production cannot be attained without being at the expense of heavy industry (manufacture of war equipment), and Moscow has no intention of this happening. There will be some slight improvement, mainly through the importation of foreign goods and this will have a great psychological effect in the event of a war at an early date. The Soviet peoples will be given the impression that their situation kept improving, and that, but for the war, Communism would have realised its paradise for the worker. The expectation is that this will make them unresponsive to anti-Communist propaganda, and that they will then fight for the Communists. Moscow, as it is well qualified to do, will see that the responsibility for the war is placed on the shoulders of the West.

Russia has had incomparably greater success in territorial gains since the war than at any period in her history. She has always been a predatory and aggressive Power, attacking and annexing smaller neighbouring countries. The usual method is by worming herself into the confidence of the intended victim, weakening from within, and then destroying. This exactly what Molotov intends to do

of Russian propaganda about the "union of Ukraine and Russia." We tell you this: the Ukrainian people have fought for 300 years, they are and will go on fighting for a Free and United Ukraine, until final victory is theirs.

if admitted a member of N.A.T.O. Key positions would be obtained, dissension sown, and the inevitable end would come. The assurance of Moscow in proposing this shows how completely confident it is of again fooling the West.

The Treaty of Pereyaslav is an outstanding example of Moscow's methods and success.

Is there any evidence that Russia intends war? On Red Army Day, a number of Soviet Marshals and Generals made this clear in their speeches and articles. Their armaments had been tested in the Korean War, as it was intended they should be, and were found satisfactory. While this country destroyed immense quantities of arms and military equipment after the war, the Russians seized every scrap they could find in the invaded countries—arms, guns, tanks, lorries, cars, railway lines—everything they could transport, took it all to Russia and had it repaired there and stored for the next war, for which they were obviously even then preparing.

Between the wars, the Russians built immense armament factories with their accompanying towns in preparation for the next war; it is significant that none of these was built in Russia proper in Europe, but well behind the Volga and the Urals. It is also significant that the Russians have changed the standard European railway gauge in the west European countries they have occupied to the Russian wide gauge, and have connected far advanced strategic western localities in those countries directly with the great armament towns in the east; these broad gauge railways would seriously hamper the movements of West forces.

In a West counter-attack, the objectives would be the great armament factories and the sources of food supplies; the factories are safely ensconced in the east, and now it is the turn of the sources of food.

It has been recently proclaimed that many millions of acres of virgin land are to be brought into cultivation, which will produce many millions of tons of food grains, principally wheat, of which there is no scarcity at present in the U.S.S.R., which has, indeed, been exporting large quantities. These virgin lands are far east, in Siberia, Kazakhstan, Ural and Volga lands, and their full production will be harvested in two years—in the same period in which Soviet citizens are promised better living conditions. And then Russia will be ready to attack. It is to be noted that, while so much virgin soil is to be cultivated in the east, there

are millions of acres lying fallow in western (European) Russia, even as far west as the Baltic States, which with the denser population and easy access to western markets, would naturally be first cultivated if the object of the harvests were merely trade.

Meantime, proposing "Talks" at Berlin, Geneva and elsewhere, not meant to lead to anything, and initiating discussions on possibly joining N.A.T.O., gives Moscow the breathing space it needs and of which it is taking full advantage. Is there evidence of the West doing the same? None that any thinking person can see. All that we are proposing to do will only increase Russia's war potential. As for supplying machine tools, textile machinery and so on, Russia is perfectly able to make these at home; she has the raw materials, the unlimited labour and the technical skill, augmented by the deportation of the cream of German engineers to the Soviet Union. And we could not have pleased Russia more than by the panic the civilised world is in on account of the hydrogen bombs. Our politicians are guilty of either dangerous optimism or dangerously concealing the truth.

There is no change in the fact that Russia, as for hundreds of years, is a menace to the whole of civilisation, and the panaceas proposed are mere trifling. There is only one way of ending for good the Russian danger to the world, and that is by finding means to free all the non-Russian peoples in the U.S.S.R. and the satellites—they are all seeking freedom and they are all countries with great experience of self-government and with traditions of freedom, Christianity and civilisation going back centuries before we ever knew Russia. If they are free, and especially Ukraine, the power of Moscow for evil is gone, and none will interfere with her. How to go about it? Well, the Russians themselves have furnished material for start.

They have insisted that Ukraine and Byelorussia are completely free and independent republics, and on this insistence, they managed to get both elected full members of United Nations. Further, Article 17 of the Soviet Constitution gives any State the right to secede freely. Why not accept the Soviet assurance and take steps to establish direct diplomatic relations with these countries as we have with other nations? There is such a movement in America which has support in Congress and in the country. It would at least test Moscow's sincerity. This position will have to be faced sooner or later. Will Sir Winston's well-known courage prompt him to take steps similar to those taken in America? And to adhere to them? And to adopt the Russian method of dis-

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

THE 300TH ANNIVERSARY OF PEREYASLAV

(How Communists celebrated the Treaty)

(Editor's note: An article in the last edition of our journal dealt with the Pereyaslav Treaty. Elsewhere in this journal the Soviet interpretation of the treaty is analysed. We are publishing a number of Moscow and Kyiv radio and press reports in our section entitled, "Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain," which refer to various Soviet celebrations and social events held throughout the entire Soviet Union. They plainly indicate the manner in which Moscow is seeking to use this political act for the purpose of suppressing Ukraine.)

(December 14, 1953) Preparations for the celebrations to be held on the occasion of the 300th anniversary of Pereyaslav have begun in Magadan on the Ochotsk-Sea. Exhibitions of Ukrainian literature are being organized in clubs and libraries. In addition, films are being shown in Magadan and in other towns of Kolyma which depict the life of the Ukrainian people. The Ukrainians know only too well what "living with" the Russians in Kolyma was like, since thousands of Ukrainians were abducted and taken to Kolyma.

* * *

(December 16, 1953) In Turkestan preparations are also being made for the celebration to be held in connection with the 300th anniversary of Pereyaslav. Exhibitions of the works of Ukrainian writers are being held in libraries, clubs, and centres of culture. *Honchar's* novel, "Praporonosci" ("The Standard-bearers") is to be published in Turkestan by a Turkestan publishing firm in the very near future. Extracts from *Taras Shevchenko's* works are also to be published in Turkestan. Various Turkestan writers are engaged in compiling a large work which is to depict life in Ukraine. The poet, *Ama Kalich*, the writers, *Berda Kirbajev*, and *Kara Sukhijev*, as well as several other authors are to be participate in this work. The composers, *Wili Mukatov*, *Donnotar Owezo*, and *Amir Kulijev*, are to compose new songs on the theme of the "lasting friendship" of the nations of the Soviet Union. In addition, plays by *Iwan Franko* and *O. Kornejchuk* are to be performed in the Turkestan theatres.

* * *

integration from within? Time is on the side of Russia.

Meanwhile, in the 200 millions of the non-Russians under Moscow tyranny we have unconquerable potential allies, waiting for the West to offer them at last moral support in their struggle for freedom. They will not wait for ever, and our prolonged neglect might convert them into potential bitter enemies, which would mean our doom. This would be all the more likely if we propose to defend ourselves by dropping hydrogen bombs on their homelands.

These peoples are getting suspicious, and are beginning to think that they are merely being made pawns in a game between greater powers, without the least consideration for them, and are being driven to the conclusion which is fairly wide-spread in many parts of the world that, behind all Western and Soviet manoeuvres there is some sinister power which is using politicians of all countries as marionettes for sinister purposes of its own.

A conference of the leading economists of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. and of the other republics began in Moscow on December 19, 1953. The chief report was given by *Wiznyk*, the candidate of the department of historical sciences, who dealt with the development of economic relations between Russia and Ukraine since the Pereyaslav Treaty.

* * *

(December 19, 1953) An exhibition has just been opened in the ancient Ukrainian town of Lviv. The exhibition, which is being held in twelve rooms of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, presents much material on the Ukrainian struggle for freedom against Poland during the years 1648 to 1654 and also various historical forgeries, as far as the "lasting friendship centuries" between Russia and Ukraine is concerned. More than 100 pictures have been painted by artists of the town and an exhibition of these works is to be opened within the next few days.

* * *

A conference is being held on December 20, 1953, in the town of *Zhdanov*, by the heads of museums in connection with the celebration of the Pereyaslav Treaty anniversary. The members of the conference visited the municipal museum for folklore. Many of the objects and books in this museum are typical of the era of *B. Khmelnytsky* and of the struggle of the Ukrainian nation for national independence.

* * *

(December 21, 1953) Preparations are being made in Kirghiz in connection with the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. More than 4,000 agitators carrying out a large-scale propaganda campaign in the factories, kolchoscs, sovkhoscs, and M.T.S. in this republic. In addition, a series of lectures on the Soviet Ukraine are being prepared which are to "illuminate" the events of the year 1954. More than 600 lecturers are to visit the villages and outlying districts of the Republic.

* * *

On December 26, 1953, a large consignment of coal from the Stalin Mines in Donbas was sent to Russia. This is the fourteenth consignment which, by way of surplus, has been handed over to Moscow in "gratitude for the unification with Russia." In order to celebrate this anniversary in a "fitting" manner the miners were to raise more than another 1,000 tons of coal in 1954 which is to be supplied to Russian towns.

* * *

(December 23, 1953) Moscow has issued orders to the effect that Ukrainian scholars are to make active preparations for the "Pereyaslav Celebrations." The historical institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has released the first volume of Ukrainian history for publication in the Ukrainian and Russian languages. In collaboration with the Academy a compiled work on the economic, political, and cultural relations of Russia and Ukraine is to be published in three languages.

* * *

(December 24, 1953) In connection with the Pereyaslav celebrations, collections of Ukrainian stories, in a compiled work consisting of extracts from the writings of Azerbaijan and Ukrainian authors on the subject of "Friendship among Nations", and lyrical poems by Ukrainian poets are being published in Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan. The works of Ukrainian authors are widely read in Azerbaijan and are very popular there. Numerous editions of the works of *T. Shevchenko*, *I. Franko*, *Lessya Ukrainka*, and Soviet Ukrainian writers are to be published in the near future.

* * *

(December 27, 1953) *Natan Rybak*, the author of the novel, "Pereyaslavskaja Rada" ("The Pereyaslav Council") paid a visit to Moscow at the end of December. The second volume of his novel which deals with the period after the Pereyaslav Council (1654-1668) appeared recently. Both volumes of this novel are full of Russian propaganda about the "union of the Ukrainian nation" with the "elder Russian brother."

* * *

(December 28, 1953) The leaders of the workers in the Cherkassy M.T.S. (district of Kyiv) have already announced that "Socialist Competitions" are to be held to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the "union of Ukraine and Russia." Among other things, 26 cwt of corn are to be produced per hectare this year. Economic exploitation has thus once again found an "excellent ideological" basis.

* * *

On December 30, 1953, an exhibition was opened in the State Library of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic in Tallin in connection with the 300th anniversary of Pereyaslav. The exhibition consists of pictures by Ukrainian painters, works by Ukrainian authors, and publications by Estonian writers on Ukraine.

* * *

(January 3, 1954) On the occasion of the 300th anniversary, the Georgian theatres will in the coming weeks, perform plays by Ukrainian, Soviet and Russian writers. The state theatre in Rustaveli will perform *O. Kornejchuk's* play, "Bohdan Khmelnytsky."

A film festival week is to be held in Archangelsk from January 8, 1954 onwards to celebrate the 300th anniversary of Pereyaslav.

* * *

(January 8, 1954) A series of lectures in the theme, "The 300th anniversary of the union of Ukraine and Russia—a festival for the entire Soviet nation" have been held at the administrative headquarters of the mines in Ordzhikidse (in Georgia). More than 400 miners of the "Stalin Mine" attended a lecture entitled "Bohdan Khmelnytsky—the famous statesman and leader."

* * *

(January 8, 1954) The Smolensk district newspaper, "Robochyj Put" ("The Workers Way") reports that the various cultural societies of the district have begun making preparations for the celebrations to be held in connection with the anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty. A series of club-evenings are to be held in January. The district headquarters of the Communist Party has furnished the cultural societies with material to be used for the lectures which are to be given at these club-evenings.

A number of lecturers and propagandists are to give addresses in various towns of the district and explain the significance of this anniversary to the workers.

* * *

More than 2,000 workers of the Sverdlovsk region (district of Leningrad) attended the big social evening held on January 8, 1954, in the Kirov Palace, to mark the anniversary of Pereyaslav.

* * *

(January 11, 1954) Preparations for the celebrations to be held in connection with the 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty are also being made by the population of Kazakhstan. Lectures on the history, geography, and economy of Ukraine are being held in the factories in the towns of Alta-Aty, Karakanda, Chinkent, Balchat, and Ust-Kamenshorst.

An exhibition on Ukrainian history according to the Russian interpretation has been opened in the library in Alta-Aty. The Shevchenko museum in the town has also organized an exhibition consisting of gifts from the Academy of Science of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

* * *

(January 11, 1954) A film festival week in Krasnodar to mark the 300th anniversary of the Pereyaslav Treaty opened with the showing of the film, "Bohdan Khmelnytsky."

In Answer to an Article

EDITORIAL: *We have received the following letter from Mr. M. Kiss, well-known and active Hungarian patriot.*

As his views concern the Ukrainians, we are pleased to publish this letter as it throws light on the right interpretation concerning relations and the possibilities of co-operation between our nationalities.

Captain Miklos Borosnyay, leader of the Hungarian ex-Servicemen in this country published an article on February 16th, in the issue of the "Angliai Ujmagyarsag" under the title "There Was No Tartar Invasion In Hungary." Capt. Borosnyay dealt with certain historical events in his article in connection with the Ukrainian commemoration festivals of the seven-hundredth anniversary of King Daniel's reign. Not being an historian I am not in the position to start an argument with Capt. Borosnyay. Yet I have to deal with the political aspects of his article that concern both Ukrainians and Hungarians.

The tone of his article is very hostile indeed towards the Ukrainians. He tries to belittle their historical achievements, and finally accuses them of imperialism, demanding territories that justly belong to other countries. At the end of the article he launched an attack on the Hungarians who are pro-Ukrainian. "And have those Hungarian exiles," he puts the question, "who are supporting Ukrainian interests, ever thought of supporting Hungarian national interests with the same energy?"

As we are certain that he meant those Hungarians who are associated with the A.B.N., we are anxious to reveal the truth in connection with his charges. We, the Hungarians refugees in the A.B.N. co-operate sincerely with our Ukrainian friends, and we would like to emphasise that our only aim is the liberation of our country. Regarding the disputes about the Hungarian frontiers, we accepted the principle of self-determination without making any concrete agreements on the future frontiers of our country. Did Capt. Borosnyay mean that we should insist on historical rights, against the will of certain ethnical groups? Such a policy may result in popularity amongst extreme nationalists, but it would isolate Hungary dangerously in Central Europe. If this is the policy of the Hungarian ex-servicemen, then we are justified in our view that they are extreme right-wing hotheads.

DISGUISED RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA

Continued from Page 10

with their new masters and forced into dependence."

Not only are these statements based on Who would assume from all this misinformation in Professor Smal-Stocki's book that it represents a documentary accusation against the Soviet (and pre-Soviet) Russification policy in Ukraine and also against Russophil tendencies in America at the present time?

Obviously, this kind of misinformation is bound to influence the co-workers of the "Journal" unfavourably and prompts them to make assertions which are in no way in keeping with historical truth. For example G. Akhminov maintains that the statement made by F. Beck and W. Godin ("Russian Purge and the Extinction of Confession," London and New York, 1951), that the extensive terrorist measures under Yezhov had chiefly decimated the intellectual classes of the population and had hardly affected the "lower classes", does not hold good for the entire Soviet Union but for Ukraine, where the position of the masses had, as far as we know, improved considerably, especially as a result of the good harvest in 1936 and 1937." What good harvest and the reign of terror of a sadist and psychopath (who had Stalin's support) have in common we do not know, but it was precisely in Ukraine and in all the other non-Russian "Soviet republics" that the Yezhov terror raged amongst the masses of the farmers and agricultural workers, as was proved by the number of mass-graves found in Winnitzia in the summer of 1943.

It is therefore all the more interesting to note that occasionally the co-workers of the "Journal" make certain statements which are in direct opposition to their

consistently anti-Ukrainian attitude, and have only been published owing to inadvertence on the part of the editor. Y. Valenski, for instance, concludes his somewhat confused and by no means pro-Ukrainian article, "A problematic subject," with the following words: "The position of the Ukrainian historians is doubly tragic: apart from the demands and threats which hold good in general for the U.S.S.R., the sword of Damocles is constantly hanging over their heads inasmuch as they are accused and suspected of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism." Also is it not possible to conceal the fact that whereas the churches and monasteries which had been built after 1700, were nearly all demolished in Moscow and Leningrad, because they were allegedly "of no value as historical works of art," but the mass destruction of important buildings of artistic, national, and cultural value in Ukraine and other non-Russian "Soviet republics" was not determined by any such chronological and aesthetic restrictions, but was carried out systematically at the orders of Moscow.

In conclusion, we would point out the marked tendency in the subject-matter published in the "Journal,"—is that only a single Ukrainian work, E. Pizyur's, "Dissertation on the Expansion of the Collective System," is discussed in detail in any of the five volumes of the "Journal," because it deals with "the problems of the Soviet Union in general," (Vol. III, p. 139). It is truly significant that the "Institute for the Study of the History and Institutions of the U.S.S.R. is only interested in Ukraine, in so far as it can be represented as an "inseparable part" of the "Soviet Union as a whole," contrary to historical facts; as regards all other aspects of Ukraine the "Institute" has apparently decided that it is better to keep silent.

V. D.

If we want a new and a better world than the present one we must have an entirely different attitude. This means we must try to understand each other in the spirit of genuine Christianity. I am certain that there is no problem we could not solve, if we follow the teaching of the Sermon On the Mount. Beyond historical rights and national pride there are the eternal values of humanity: love, peace and mutual forgiveness.

I wish Capt. Borosnyay could understand this, and instead of intriguing against his non-extremist countrymen, would adjust himself to the political and moral standards of the Western way of life.

M. Kiss
Chairman, A.B.N. Youth,
Gt. Britain



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. VI No. 5—6

LONDON, AUGUST—SEPTEMBER 1954

Price One Shilling

CONTENTS:

NEW TACTICS OF THE M.G.B.	1-2
REPORTS OF THE FIGHTING IN UKRAINE IN 1952	2
CHRONICLE OF UKRAINIAN LIFE IN THE FREE WORLD	3
A.B.N.'S FIGHT IS OUR FIGHT Professor Lev E. Dobriansky	4
STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE UKRAINIAN ORGANISED RESISTANCE MOVEMENT Y. Stetzkó	5-6
LIQUIDATION OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL MILITARY GROUPS AND OFFICERS WITHIN THE RED ARMY Major M. W. Aytugan	7
PEREYASLAV	8-10
THE CRIMEA AND THE KREMLIN 'LOVE' FOR THE UKRAINIAN NATION S. Lenkowsky	11
KERSTEN COMMITTEE	12-13
TSCHU-EN-LAI. Centre forward of the Soviets G. H.	13
MOSCOW ATTACKS O.U.N.	14
TURMOIL ON THE VIRGIN SOIL OF KAZAKHSTAN	14
THE FIGHT OF THE UKRAINIAN UNDERGROUND MOVEMENT CONTINUES	15
THE RUSSIAN CHURCH IN THE SERVICE OF THE REGIME N. Ekhadieli	15
UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN	16

NEW TACTICS OF THE M. G. B.

This article comes to us from well-informed Ukrainian emigrant circles—Ed.

During the past months the Western press and various emigrants' papers have devoted considerable attention to the fact that certain "emigrants" have gone over to the Soviet camp. The stir caused by the sensational case of Wanda Weber and Jan Homa—who on their return to Warsaw tried to compromise Polish emigrants by newspaper articles and reports over the Warsaw radio—had not even had time to quieten down when the case of Mr. Bogumil Lauschmann, a former Czech minister, was published in the world press. American, British, and West German counter-espionage services did their utmost to clear up the mystery surrounding Mr. Lauschmann. All these efforts, however, proved unsuccessful. It was Mr. Lauschmann himself who explained his action by announcing on the Czech radio and in the press that he was "disappointed" in the Western world and was returning to Prague.

A planned series?

It was not long, however, before the M.G.B. produced another remarkable case. On Tuesday, April 13, 1954, the Berlin head of the N.T.S. Dr. Alexander Truchnowitsch, leader of the "Revolutionary Section of the Underground Service of the N.T.S." in the Soviet Occupied Zone, and president of the Russian section of the German-Russian Friendship League in Berlin, disappeared.

The East Berlin Broadcasting Corporation relayed a statement by Dr. Truchnowitsch to the effect that he had "voluntarily severed his connections with the N.T.S., which is run by agents, and gone over to the Soviet side". Once again the counter-espionage services of the Western

Allies and the competent German authorities in Berlin did their utmost to clear up the details connected with Truchnowitsch's disappearance. But the more paper they accumulated in these efforts, the less clear did the whole affair become. In the end no official communiqué about a new abduction was issued, probably because it had become obvious in the meantime that Truchnowitsch had not been abducted, but evidently belonged to that category of persons who abduct others.

That was not the end of personnel changes among the bolshevist agents. Less than two weeks later the East Berlin radio, the Soviet broadcasting station Kyiv, the newspaper *Radyanska Ukraina* ("The Soviet Ukraine"), and subsequently the entire Soviet press issued the following report: On April 26 a member of the Ukrainian Socialist Party, Josef Krutij, placed himself at the disposal of the D.D.R. counter-espionage services in Berlin, and supplied them with material about the "work" of Ukrainian emigrants as "agents". Once again investigations were carried on, material, etc. was collected, and as in all the above-mentioned cases the circumstances of the disappearance were not cleared up.

Recall of Soviet agents

What are the motives behind all this? The M.G.B. has tried to compromise Polish, Czech, Russian, Ukrainian, and other emigrants in turn. This is the conclusion which has been reached by the majority of circles interested in the matter. But this assumption is still no explanation of the reason why the M.G.B. within a relatively short time has recalled so many of its agents, incidentally of

various nationalities. Any attempt on the part of the M.G.B. to compromise the various emigrant groups by announcing that bolshevist agents have been active in their ranks would be highly detrimental to the further activity of M.G.B. agents in their midst. It seems more likely that the M.G.B. is having to recall the former staff of agents of Beria, the M.G.B. chief who has meanwhile been liquidated, and is replacing them by new and more trustworthy ones.

Mikolaj Chochlov

The following fact shows that this assumption is probably correct: eight days after Dr. Truchnowitsch's recall a staff officer of the M.G.B., Mikolaj Chochlov, appeared in Frankfurt. He had allegedly been instructed by the M.G.B. to murder the chief of the counter-espionage section of the N.W.S., Gregor Okolowitsch, but he had suddenly decided to warn his victim and to ask the Western Allies to grant him asylum. He was granted asylum and is still in the West. In our opinion this trick on the part of the M.G.B. by means of which Truchnowitsch was recalled in order to be replaced by a new agent, has proved successful. Such experiments cost very little, for what had Chochlov to offer the Western Allies in exchange for freedom of movement in Western Germany in Truchnowitsch's role?

No special insight is needed to make one realise that the information offered to the Western Allies merely concerns the past, just as the former M.G.B. chief, Beria, is himself a thing of the past. Chochlov did not make any statement about the tactics, methods and personnel of the M.G.B., with the exception of the two victims of the M.G.B., the two Germans, Weber and Kukewitz, who will be called to account for their activity as spies before a German court in the near future.

The credulous Allies

We are surprised at the naivety of the Western Allies, who pave the way for bolshevist agents in the free Western world and in return only receive information which is out-of-date, for instance about the abduction of General Kutepows, the murder of Trotzki, the activity of Soviet partisans in the Minsk district (in 1943 and 1944), conditions in the theatre and actors' colony in Moscow or other matters which are no longer of current interest, about which Chochlov talked at length. The

activity of the Soviet partisans in the Minsk district has been described in detail by their commanding officer, M.G.B. Colonel Dmitrij Medwedew, in his book, *The Strong in Spirit*, and for this reason Chochlov was not able to "reveal" any new facts on the subject.

Soviet propaganda has made use of Beria's liquidation and also of the present recall of his staff of agents for the purpose of striking a blow against various resistance movements by ascribing to them the usual diversionist and agent activity on behalf of the Western Allies. And this was precisely what the statements, broadcast lectures, and articles of the agents who have been recalled were meant to prove.

These tactics on the part of Moscow are by no means new to us: during the whole of the time that our subjugated peoples have been fighting for freedom Moscow has always tried to make out that this fight is an activity which is carried on by agents who are prompted by external powers. Unfortunately the West still fails to realise one fundamental fact, namely that in Moscow political regimes, persons and methods are subject to change, but that Russian imperialism on the other hand remains unchanged, and that for this reason there can be no other means of fighting it but by co-operating with the revolutionary liberation movements of those nations which have been subjugated by the Russians. Russian "deserters" in this cold war are best dealt with according to the old adage, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes"!

Although they are not 'emigrants', the 'defection' of Dr Otto John in July, and that of Herr Schmidt-Wittmack this month bring the list of those who are alleged to have lost faith in the West up-to-date. It is noteworthy that in most of the cases the stated reasons for seeking 'asylum' East of the Iron Curtain vary with the individuals concerned. In this way the sum total of complaints of Western inadequacy grows steadily as the series lengthens. This catalogue of grievances supports the theory of a deliberately planned campaign of disparagement which, by its very boldness, tends to hide from the casual onlooker the fact that, just at the moment, there does not seem to be any particularly good reason—either political or economic—for deserting the West.

REPORTS OF THE FIGHTING IN SEVERAL DISTRICTS OF UKRAINE IN 1952

In the quarterly report of the O.U.N. for October-December, 1952, it is stated that a group of bolshevist riflemen discovered a subterranean bunker in the forest of Wolyniak on October 21, 1952. The Ukrainian insurgents in the bunker resisted the attackers and shot the head of the political district-group of Tschernowomoarmijak, also wounding two other Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks then spread rumours that Ukrainian nationalists, as English and American spies, aimed at setting up an independent capitalist Ukrainian state; that a document was found in the bunker dealing with the recruiting of new members; and that such literature circulated by "the bandits" was merely pro-English and pro-American and meant the downfall of the Ukrainian nation. The population was therefore warned to desist from co-operating with insurgents, and exhorted to persuade the latter to report to the security organisations of their own free will.

The same O.U.N. report quotes several examples of resistance by farmers on religious grounds. In the district of Pomorjany the landworkers refused to work in the fields on holy days. In the autumn of 1952 an order was issued to the priests of the district to hold divine service early in the morning so that farmers would not be late for their work. It also reported from the Solochiv district that the population has objected to working in the kolkhozes on Sundays and on holy days. Owing to a shortage of priests, the population there attends services in those churches in neighbouring villages where services are still held.

The following incidents are typical of the political attitude of the population. A small group of insurgents wanted to buy food in one of the villages in the district of Solochiv: they asked two peasant-women who were at work in the fields whether there were any enemies in the village. The peasant-women warned them that there was a Bolshevik detachment there. When the insurgents set off in the direction of the village, the peasant-women stopped them, gave them some bread and cigarettes, and begged them not to proceed, but to take care not to run into danger.

In another village, some insurgents went to a farmer, who said to them: "Don't risk your lives. Tell me what you need, and I will go and get it for you. Don't tempt death—you have been decimated often enough, as it is."

CHRONICLE OF UKRAINIAN LIFE IN THE FREE WORLD

The Union of Ukrainian Women of America (S.U.A.) has taken part in the International Council of Women's Congress which was held in Helsinki (Finland) from June 8-18, 1954. S.U.A. a member organisation of the National Council of American Women was represented at the Congress by its head, Mrs. Olena Lototska, who had been invited to join the American delegation. The Congress, held under the title, "Women in the Atomic Age", was attended by women representatives of all the specialist sciences. Mrs. O. Lototska represented the U.S.A. on the Resettlement Committee. Now that the Congress is over, she is visiting some of the Ukrainian settlements in Germany, France, and Britain.

Sculptures by Gregory Kruk and paintings by Severin Boraczok were exhibited at an Ukrainian art exhibition in Paris from June 15-30, 1954, at the Simon Badinier Gallery. The catalogue included an appreciation of Gregory Kruk's work by the authoritative connoisseur, M. Jean Cassou, Director of the National Museum of Modern Art. The note on Severin Boraczok's work as a painter was written by H. de Gourlan, the art-critic, and the catalogue also contains short biographies of the two artists.

The Territorial Conference of the Union of Ukrainian Workers in France (O.U.R.F.) was held in Paris from June 19-20, 1954. O.U.R.F. is the largest and strongest Union in the Conference of Ukrainian Free Professional Organisations (K.U.V.P.O.) which at present represents the Ukrainian free professional movement in France. O.U.R.F. holds its Conference every two years, and, during the intervals, provincial, regional and district conferences are held. Besides the preparations for celebrating the tenth anniversary of the inauguration and work of the Ukrainian free professional movement, the first Conference of O.U.R.F. summarised that ten years of activity, analysed it objectively and critically, and worked out a wide plan of future work, bearing in mind the conditions and needs of the Ukrainian national community in the Motherland as well as in emigration.

The *Slavonic and East-European Review* of June 1954 published a very favourable review of the Encyclopaedia of Ukrainian Studies. The appreciation was contributed by Professor V. K. Matthews, of London University, a well-known authority on Slav Language and Literature.

A memorandum has been sent to President Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles by the Head of U.K.K. on the occasion of the Eisenhower-Churchill Conference. The memorandum expresses anxiety about the lack of accurate knowledge of Eastern European problems displayed by Winston Churchill, who constantly refers to "190 million Russians", and who speaks of Russia as if it were a uniform country.

The Briton, William Piddington, who returned from exile in the remote camps of Vorkuta, has written to the administration of S.U.B. in London, stating that he is a friend of Ukrainians, and describing his meetings with Ukrainian partisans sentenced to between ten and fifteen years imprisonment.

A striking cultural manifestation took place in Toronto from July 3-5, 1954. This was the first meeting of Ukrainian artists of the U.S.A. and Canada. The programme included an exhibition of Ukrainian art, a widely representative concert, a public conference of artists, and a ball for artists. The exhibition was opened in the Gallery of Artists of the all-Canadian National Exhibition on July 3. The first day there were 1500 visitors. The concert took place in the park belonging to the Gallery on July 4, and was attended by about ten thousand persons.

The following artists took part in the concert: Mykhaylo Minsky, baritone; Daria Hordynska-Karanovych, pianist; Stefa Fedchuk, soprano; Roma Pryima, ballerina; Yevhen Tsisyk, violinist; Lyuba Levytska, soprano; Yaroshevych, baritone; Veronika Maxymovych, mezzo-soprano; Khrystyia Kolesa-Gerych, cellist; Lew Reynarovych, baritone; Vasyl Tesyak, tenor; Borys Maxymovych, pianist; Natalka Nesenko, soprano; Mykhaylo Holynsky, tenor, and the eleven-years-old Roman Rudynsky.

The forum of Georgetown University in Washington U.S.A. organised a televised "discussion" of bolshevist genocide. The following persons took part in the discussion: Raphael Lemkin, professor at Yale University, author of the text of the Convention against genocide which was accepted by the U.N.; Dr George Finch from the Faculty of Law, International Affairs Department, of Georgetown University, an outstanding lawyer, and one who opposed the ratification of that Convention; and also Lev Dobriansky, professor at the University of Georgetown and head of U.K.K., who attempted to explain the real meaning of genocide in the U.S.S.R. In a press-communicé on that point, the University of Georgetown stated that the U.S.S.R. is the worst murderer of the present-day world, one who "with bloody hands" has signed the U.N. Convention, and thus, by its very shamelessness, has created an embarrassingly paradoxical situation.

THE UKRAINIAN INFORMATION SERVICE

announces

that this current number of *The Ukrainian Observer* is the last to be published.

This monthly newspaper is ceasing publication because

THE ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINIANS IN GREAT BRITAIN, LTD.

is preparing a Quarterly Magazine to be called

THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Readers are assured that the ideas presented in the *Observer* and the constant supply of reliable news of Ukrainian affairs will be maintained and expanded in the *Review*.

The *Ukrainian Review* will provide readers with up-to-date articles on the struggle for liberation and relevant information about international affairs from both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Reviews of books will also be included, together with notices of all other Ukrainian cultural activities.

The *Ukrainian Review* may be ordered from:

The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Ltd.,
49, Linden Gardens, Notting Hill Gate, London, W.2.

A. B. N.'s FIGHT IS OUR FIGHT

by

Professor Lev E. Dobriansky. President of the Ukrainian Congress of the U.S.A.

A speech given in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York on the tenth Anniversary of the foundation of A.B.N.

On this day, the day after Thanksgiving, I want to introduce my talk by recalling that at Thanksgiving time we are thinking in terms of liberation. Today we are thinking of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, the unity of all the captive nations within the Soviet Empire, and we are all expressing our thanks for being together on a free terrain to talk in terms of freedom and to be prepared to fight as one for freedom. We of the Ukrainian Congress Committee have been carrying on a fight which is also the fight of all Ukrainian friends of A.B.N., a fight which is identical with that being carried on by many of our Asiatic representatives.

And I am very much impressed, and I think Congressman Armstrong and others should be jubilantly impressed, by the addresses of the Ambassador from Korea, by the gentleman who represents China, and by a Turkist-anian. Also, I must add, it was a great pleasure to me to sit here and observe the presence of a representative of the infrequently mentioned Idel-Ural Republic. We are acquainted with many of these areas, and all of us are speaking the same language.

Relations with Korea and China

Now all that I can do in this limited time is to lay bare a few perspectives. I have listened to the Ambassador of Korea telling us that, in June 1950, a day or so after the invasion of Southern Korea, the Ukrainian Congress Committee sent a message to the Korean Ambassador in Washington to which he responded with warmth and sympathy. And why was this? Because the common denominator in this so-called struggle against Communism is patriotism, is natural love for the soil, for the culture and for the whole life of a nation. A Korean would understand that, because his Korea is being destroyed in the same way that Ukraine, Turkistan, the Idel-Ural Republic, the Baltic Nations and many others are being destroyed by Communist Imperialism. The same thing occurred in respect of China. Immediately, on the announcement of the resolution prohibiting the admission of the delegate from Communist China to the United Nations, we of the Ukrainian Congress Committee took up

our position in support of that resolution. We are driven, not only by sympathy, but by self-interest also, by our own love for a country, love for our national tradition.

Freedom—a fundamental notion

It may startle some people to hear that it was actually a Russian philosopher and several Russian political theorists with a degree of intellectual honesty who declared that if a nation would be genuinely free, then that nation could not afford to dominate other nations. Now what we all seek for the American nation, for its security, for the preservation of its democratic institutions and its prosperous future, is in fact freedom, self-determination, national independence, self-government. I use all these terms, because they all mean basically the same thing. When we put forward such notions on behalf of a non-Russian captive nation within that vast Soviet Empire, then we are really putting forward the same notion of freedom—and such a notion must also apply to the Russian nation itself.

Russia—enemy of freedom

Here in this country there is still much for us to do, if we are to apply such a theory to the Soviet Empire, and it is on this point that I will conclude my talk. We have made considerable progress these past few years, though I cannot list all the efforts that have been made, nor all the individuals who have come to see the truth, though they are to be found in every sphere of activity, from the highest policy-making Board to many Study Groups. Only last week I was asked to talk about Soviet Economy to a group in Washington, called the Military Occupational Group, one of about four or five in the country. At that particular meeting there were from fifty to seventy-five officers, some of whom came from Executive Agencies such as the Foreign Operations Agency, the State Department, and so on. This group is drawing up plans, since no-one, we pray, would deny that conflict with the Soviet Union will mean a victorious occupation. I was very interested to see how far this group appreciated the true state of affairs within the Soviet Union, for although I was supposed to talk about Economics, yet it is clear to anyone that Soviet Economy is three-quarters Politics. And after two and

a half hours, I found that many of the members had a very profound understanding of this point. They had statistics compiled by various agencies; they also had Turkist-anian acquaintances from the five republics of Turkistan, and contacts with numerous other nations within the Soviet Union.

Now where do we—as Americans—stand with regard to these problems and to the future? It seems clear that for the present we must persevere and continue our educational work here in the United States. Once someone takes an interest in the Soviet Union, he can be given the A.B.C. of that country and shown that it is not identical with Russia. For if the Soviet Union were extended to include all the peoples that we erroneously call the satellite states, would that make a Pole a Russian, a Hungarian a Russian, and so on? Soon our listener finds his intellectual appetite aroused, and he seeks to find more and more information on these vital issues. One can argue that when there are so many allies within the Soviet Union, allies for the United States, it would be inane to ignore their existence. That is how he comes to look at the problem, that is how his thoughts begin to shape. And it is the duty of all of you as Americans, as would-be Americans for those who wish to become citizens of this country, to see that America continues this crusade, this gallant fight, this unyielding struggle on behalf of the greatest part of humanity.

(from notes)

FROM THE RUSSIAN PRESS

Under the heading "Bookshelf", *Pravda* (Truth) on July 26th recommended seven recent publications. Six of those books are anti-religious:

1. *Socialism and Religion*, by V. I. Lenin—a book about the attitude of the Communist Party towards religion, an edition of 200,000 copies.
2. *Religious Superstition and its Dangers*, by A. Pavelkin—100,000 copies.
3. *Religion—Enemy of Science and Progress*, by V. Prokofiev—100,000 copies.
4. *The Marxist Philosophical Materialism—Theoretical Weapons in the Fight against Religion*, by P. Kolonytsky—182,000 copies.
5. *K. A. Timiryazev's Fight Against Idealism and Religion*, by H. Platonov—85,000 copies.
6. *I. I. Mechnikov and his Fight*, by D. Ostryanin—136,000 copies.

Yaroslav Stetzko

THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE UKRAINIAN ORGANISED RESISTANCE MOVEMENT

In the light of home documents

published by the Ukrainian Underground in the year 1950-53

By order of the Commander-in-Chief of U.P.A. and according to the Declaration of the Governing Body of O.U.N. in June 1946, the fighting tactics of the National Liberation Movement were changed after the end of World War II.

Tactics and strategy adopted by O.U.N., U.P.A. and U.H.V.R., are elaborated in underground publications which include the following: (a) P. Poltava: "About our Plan of Battle for the Liberation of Ukraine in its present situation, in 1951." *Freedom for Nations*, printed by the O.U.N. Press.

(b) Z. S.: "The Form and Tactics of O.U.N. in its Fight for U.S.S.D. are right." *What do we Fight For, and How*. 1950.

(c) P. Poltava: *What is the Object of our Fight*. 1952.

(d) R. Mokh: *The Prospect of our Fight*. 1949.

(e) P. Poltava: *Why was the Insurrection Movement of 1648 Victorious?* 1948.

(f) S. Khmil: *The Ukrainian Partisan Warfare*. 1953.

(g) *The Information Bureau of U.H.V.R.* No. 7/50 March 1950. Page 2.

Aims of the Movement

The way to liberation is clearly defined by the resolutions of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Congresses of O.U.N., the first three Conferences of O.U.N., and also by the Decisions incorporated in the Declaration of the Governing Body of O.U.N. in June 1946. P. Poltava, in *Who are the Banderaites*, states them thus:

"In order to gain our ends, we expand our national and social liberation revolution in Ukraine, and amongst other nations of the U.S.S.R. We call upon all nations enslaved by Soviets, the masses of working people of all nationalities in the U.S.S.R., to join our fight, which is aimed at the overthrow of the Bolshevik regime."

Z. S. in (b) above, says:

"The Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement represented by O.U.N. views the underground revolutionary liberation fight in all its spheres—spiritual, political, economic and so on—as the only possible and the surest, though thorny, way to the liberation of Ukraine." p. 3.

"We shall be victorious, if we prepare the nation to win independence by an all-national movement, if we change the insurrection ranks into a million-strong army, and if we are able to win a decisive battle by it." p. 3.

"By the word 'fight' we understand not only an armed conflict and struggle between two armies; 'fight' means to us resistance, defence, the offensive in every sphere—ideological, political, military, economic, and so on." p. 7.

"... it is the task of the Ukrainian underground, O.U.N., to prepare the Ukrainian nation for the building-up of its state, the creation of an army a million strong which will not know the words 'prison', and 'backward', to train leading cadres for the political and military executives and to make it possible for that army to win and to establish U.S.S.D." p. 7.

Freedom from foreign influence

Z. S. continues on page 8 of (b) thus:

"We positively reject the opinion that in the event of war against the Bolsheviks the fate of Ukraine and other nations will be determined by the Great Powers regardless of our will and our preparations."

"... we must cease to be always a victim of various 'liberators', to be subdued again and again; we must create our own forces and, making use of favourable internal and external conditions, defend our own interests, and realise U.S.S.D." p. 9.

"Fight against the spiritual, physical and material annihilation of the nation, fight against mobilisation to foreign armies; fight against deportation, drudgery; fight against occupation taxes; fight against the collective farms, and so on—a universal fight against invaders of every kind..." p. 12.

"Every fight, be it defensive or offensive, successful or unsuccessful, every shot fired in defence or offensive, every resistance by Ukrainian peasants, workers, intelligentsia, school-children, youths, old men, girls, old women—all that accelerates the process of the... anti-bolshevik revolution." p. 12.

"Until now, the strength of the Russian imperialists—white and red Russians—consisted in our weakness

and that of all the nations enslaved by them, fear of the police terror and its victims, the absence of a planned and united fight by all the nations. The remnants of that weakness must be rooted out; courageous, heroic men must be led to the front. If 210 million (the number of the enslaved nations, without the Russians) or half of that number, or at least our whole nation, becomes a nation of fighters, it will certainly be the end of Bolshevik rule." pp. 12-13.

"Our fight is not the fight of the Kholodny Yar insurgents who restricted their action to individual encounters and a few areas."

"Our Organisation is a large fighting machine which ceaselessly advances along a very long road... It does not restrict itself to acts of terrorism; it does not cause premature insurrections; it prepares what is necessary in all spheres for the decisive battle against Bolshevism for victory... The Russian imperialists have never been faced with such a fight, such an organisation." p. 14.

This opinion is supported from the historical point of view by P. Poltava in (e), his analysis of the times of Khmelnytsky. On page 28, he collects all the analogous elements of Khmelnytsky's successful revolution in order to justify our present conception of revolution.

Also this point of view is supported by R. Mokh (d) where he dwells upon the connection of the political revolution with the spiritual one:

"... we are not satisfied with the political revolution; we need a spiritual revolution which must prepare for the political one." p. 13.

"The Ukrainian soul is being depraved (by Russia), and this has never been done by anyone to such an extent." p. 12.

"Our victory depends upon 1. our own forces, 2. the enemy forces, and 3. the international situation." p. 14.

"Our own strength is the most important factor in our liberation fight." p. 21.

The changing nature of the national liberation movement

In his last two works, (a) and (c) above, P. Poltava dwells on the more precise definition of the tactics of the fight today. In view of the changed conditions of the post-war world, he says, "since 1946 the Ukrainian liberation revolutionary movement has changed from a wide insurrection into a deep flowing underground movement."

Continued overpage

In practice, this change has manifested itself primarily in the following ways:

1. Little by little, according to circumstances and needs in individual regions, the units of U.P.A. were disbanded, and their members, commanders and soldiers included in the frame-work of the underground network.

2. The whole underground movement, and all its work, became strictly confidential.

3. Contrary to what was done during the period of widespread action by U.P.A.—aimed principally at preventing the enemy from extending his power beyond certain districts—the work of political propaganda and political organisation was now brought to the fore. The armed underground is today the basic form of the fight of the Ukrainian liberation revolutionary movement in the U.S.S.R.

In (a) on page 7, P. Poltava speaks thus of Ukraine:

"Thanks to our underground network, we rule almost completely over about one-third of the territory of Ukraine. . . . Our publications reach all corners of Ukraine, and into various republics of the U.S.S.R. In 1948, about 70 different pamphlets, leaflets, newspapers and *belles lettres* were published in our underground printing works in thousands. and again on page 8:

"The underground needs reinforcement . . . tens of thousands of insurgents and members of the underground organisation have died the death of heroes during the last few years."

On this last point, Marko Boyeslav published in 1950 a pamphlet, *Our Liberation Fight and the Problem of Sacrifices*, in which he answers the following questions which have worried many members of the community, and which are quoted below from page 1:

- "1. Must the number of victims be so great?
2. Is it really of use at the moment to make such sacrifices?
3. Is there any way of lessening the number of victims?"

In conclusion, (c) includes a special communiqué under the heading, "About the Armed Action of U.P.A., and the Underground Organisation in Ukraine under the Russian Bolshevik Occupation," giving a partial report for the period January—June 1949 on the change of tactics, and a detailed enumeration of new forms of fighting which show us how the phase of the liberation movement appears in action.

The struggle intensifies

In connection with the recent unheard-of, cruel Bolshevik action intended to destroy revolutionary forces in Western Ukraine, O.U.N. focused its attention on the defence of that base and on renewed attack against the enemy.

In (c), P. Poltava considers the importance for general strategy of Galicia, Volhynia and Bukovyna (Z.U.Z.). Russia sees in these areas a threat to her empire "thanks to the highly national conscience of the nation working for independence", p. 5, and "thanks to the high spirit of revolution among the masses of the people", p. 6, "who do not fear the enemy but attack him at the first opportunity." pp. 7-8.

"Having the revolutionised masses with us, we are today much closer to our aim—the state—than was the case on former occasions." p. 7.

"A leader of the Polish liberation movement under the tzarist occupation in 1905/6 regarded the encounters of Polish demonstrators with the tzarist police and Cossacks in Warsaw as a decisive moment because the Polish masses overcame their fear and began to attack the enemy."

"Thanks to the existence and activity of O.U.N. in Ukraine and particularly in Western Ukraine . . . there are today in Western Ukraine two states—the formal Bolshevik state and the actual underground independent Ukrainian State." p. 8.

"The aim of our offensive is to control the whole of Ukraine—from Tysa to Kuban and from Chernihiv to Odessa . . . Every lost village, every region where the organisation has been liquidated, undermines our base of further attack." p. 12.

"We must regard it as a law, that the masses offering resistance to occupation must always be supported and led." p. 15.

The author quotes a series of facts which corroborate the above thesis. For instance, there is a declaration by the wife of a member of U.P.A., a Ukrainian woman from S.U.Z.; that of a Ukrainian soldier of the Red Army; of a Russian soldier of the Red Army; and of Ukrainians from Odessa and other territories of S.U.Z.

Social Elements in the U.P.A.

In (f), S. Khmil elaborates a universal plan by the underground organisation for the preparation of insurrection, relying upon its own forces. The soul of every Ukrainian, the inclusion of the whole life of the

people, results in the varied social structure of U.P.A., viz:

"Peasants 60%, workers 25%, intelligentsia 15%."

"When the Bolsheviks drove the Germans westwards and the question of war against the allies was discussed, our units swarmed with workers from different industrial centres, from the woodworking industry, oil-industry, food industries, tanneries, and also artisans from towns." pp. 17-18.

"Peasants, particularly poor peasants, joined U.P.A. in large numbers. Peasants belonging to that group were good soldiers, healthy, modest, firm, courageous."

"Small farmers are staunch and serious; they are great patriots. Workers are intelligent and agile..."

The author points out that these statements completely disprove the Bolshevik thesis of "the country of workers." Being aware of the corrupting work of Russia, the U.P.A. includes political instruction in the education of soldiers.

The Ukrainian Liberation Movement and the West

The attitude of the Ukrainian revolutionary-liberation circles towards the Western Powers has been presented by P. Poltava in (g) May 1951, No. 9. He also commented on the propaganda of the western world in an open letter to the "Voice of America."

In conclusion we would like to explain that the Ukrainian nation has its underground **Ukrainian State** represented by U.H.V.R., which is its underground government; U.P.A., which is the armed arm of the nation; and O.U.N., its political organisation, which is playing a most important part in preparing the people for the decisive liberation fight of the whole armed nation, and which is the manifestation of that underground state. We do not regard the Ukrainian S.S.R. as a Ukrainian state: the Ukrainian state whose restoration was proclaimed by the act of June 30, 1941, against the will of the Germans and the Russians is today symbolised by the liberation underground formations. If the western world would meet half-way those ideas which we have been describing in the authentic words of leaders of fighting Ukraine—most of whom have already died—then the menace of Bolshevism would perish and victory over it be guaranteed.

Major Mustafa Wali Aytugan (Tartarian)

Liquidation of the Ukrainian national military groups and officers within the Red Army

I, commander of a hundred men at the Tartaro-Bashkirian Cadet College in the capital of the Autonomous Tartarian S.S.R., Kazan, which was a school for the training of officers for the Turko-Tartarian divisions, was transferred in 1931 by the Commissar of our College, Nichmat Anikiev, to the Ukrainian Red Military Academy, a College for officers in Charkiv. In Charkiv I was welcomed as a foreigner. I was asked about our national military College, our culture, our holidays, customs, etc. I was surprised to find that all commands and instructions were given in Ukrainian. Nearly all regulations were translated from Russian into Ukrainian. In the barracks, classes and club rooms pictures of Shevchenko, Gogol, and other Ukrainian writers were hanging next to the portraits of party leaders like Petrowski, Kossior and others. The whole staff seemed to me to be Ukrainian. I had a chance to notice how contemptuously the Russian language which I was obliged to use was regarded: my companions regretted that they could not speak with me in Tartarian. I was in a group of a hundred men under the command of the officer Klimenko, and the relations between those taking part in the course, the officers, and myself, were excellent.

After I returned to Kazan, we re-organised our College after the Charkiv model, and one year later Klimenko came to us in Kazan on a similar mission.

Since 1932, Moscow has started gradually to liquidate the national and territorial divisions and military academies. In 1936, I was transferred from my native country to Ukraine, which was a foreign country for me. I went to Sumy as a lecturer on general military tactics. The students of the military college at Sumy, who were accustomed to speaking Ukrainian, could not understand my lectures which were held in Russian, and they asked many questions. I had hardly become acquainted with the other lecturers and the staff of the school when they began to disappear, being replaced by Tartars, Uzbeks, Armenians, Georgians and—in the most important positions—by Russians. Some of the Ukrainian officers were arrested, others were hastily transferred, and a third group disappeared to unknown destinations.

The school was visited by Control Commissions from time to time, and

in 1937, I noticed that more and more of my students were absent from my classes. At first we were all surprised at this, and did not know what had become of them, but later it was recognised that the G.P.U. had come for them at night, and the other students just did not say anything about it. It also appeared that teachers and students who had only just arrived were arrested. Thus, for example, a new lecturer on Topography, a Greek, disappeared without leaving any trace only one week after his arrival at the College. Such conditions intimidated everyone, including myself, and I expected daily that the G.P.U. would also come for me.

A Ukrainian U.V.O. victim

The case of a lecturer on Artillery, a Ukrainian, whose name I have forgotten, deserves special mention. I was awakened at night, and there was the G.P.U. Commissar of the school with two unknown men in the hall. They asked me in a polite way to help them to search the lecturer's apartment. Under the circumstances, of course, I dared not refuse. They showed me the official search-warrant and ordered me to take a list of the books from our library which belonged to this lecturer. I wrote down the names of some 150 books about political and military matters; among them was a booklet by Fakir, the shot U.V.O. commander, called *Fighting with the help of small flags*, written in Ukrainian, and a history text-book with a picture of Bohdan Khmel'nitsky, also in Ukrainian. In Fakir's booklet, there were many little red and blue flags on each page which were used as symbols for the smaller military units in action, and in these little coloured flags one could see, holding them against the light, the Trident, the Ukrainian national emblem, in faint lines. After this search the lecturer was arrested and disappeared for ever. His family was evicted from their apartment in the barracks. And similar cases occurred in all national units in the Red Army.

In May 1937, I was transferred to the 3rd Tartarian division in the Crimea, and I travelled through Charkiv, as I wished to re-visit the Red Military Academy. But it was no longer there. Instead was the Charkiv Infantry School, commanded by a Russian. There were students from various nations, and when I asked about the old staff, I was told that "this national-chauvinistic nest had been

dispersed like ashes." Many of the officers and students had been shot or sent to Siberia. When I reached the Crimea, I did not find a single Tartarian division: there was only an ordinary 3rd division, and those who had belonged to the Tartarian division had been transferred to Kamchatka, Moscow, Siberia, and so on.

The very fact that such national military groups were existing used to further the spirit of the population and promote the tendency towards independence and separation from the U.S.S.R. This example may be given here: In 1931 there was a rebellion of farmers against the system of collective economy in the village Tshuwash-Kupri, a rebellion which spread all over the district. One battalion of the Tartaro-Bashkirian military school and one regiment of the 1st Tartarian division were sent to suppress the rebellion. The soldiers, however, did not shoot at the rebels, for they were their brothers. These national units were then replaced by a G.P.U. regiment which had the strength of a division. This regiment was stationed in the area of Kazan, and consisted of men from Moscow. It suppressed the rebellion in due course.

G.P.U. units were usually stationed in the capitals of the Republics of the Union and were entrusted with security services. Here is another example of their work.

In 1929 seven rural districts around the town of Nucha in Transcaucasia rose in rebellion. The authorities sent the Azerbaijanian division, which was stationed in the town of Nadsha, to suppress the rebellion. This division proved unfit for action since none of the soldiers wished to shoot at the rebels, and many of them deserted. Moscow was forced to replace this division by the 2nd division, a unit called after Stjopin, consisting of Russians from Krasnopresnensk, a town in the neighbourhood of Moscow. In 1924 the same division had suppressed a rebellion in Georgia. During the suppression of the rebellion of 1929 it was found that the rebels were using quite modern rifles manufactured in Ishev, and later it became known that the rebels had been supplied with these by the Azerbaijanian division. Moscow, convinced by such facts of the disloyalty of its national units, began to liquidate them. The best and most national-minded elements were shot, while many went into exile, the rest being dispersed all over the U.S.S.R. in small units. In this way the "territorial system" of the Soviet Armed Forces was destroyed, for it was dangerous to Moscow on account of its staff of nationals and its autarchic tendencies.

P E R E Y

MOSCOW'S SPECULATIONS OVER THE TREATY OF PEREYASLAV

Manoeuvres to divert Ukraine from its Efforts to obtain Independence

On Moscow's instructions lavish and lengthy celebrations were recently held to mark the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav, which was concluded on January 18, 1654, by the Ukrainian Hetman, Bohdan Khmelnytsky, and the Russian Tzar, Alexej Michajlowitsch.

What were the terms of this treaty, and what aim had the Kremlin rulers in mind when they decided to celebrate its anniversary in so grand a style, and when they issued instructions as to how this historic event should be interpreted?

Three hundred years ago, as all of us know, the Ukrainian Hetman, Khmelnytsky, was obliged to enter into an alliance with the Russian Tzar, Alexej, during the Seven Years' War with Poland, solely in order to safeguard the independence of the newly created Ukrainian state against Polish intervention. Russia, however, violated the treaty during Khmelnytsky's lifetime, and the latter was obliged to enter into negotiation with Sweden and Transylvania in order to protect his country against the murderous designs of his Russian ally. Khmelnytsky's successors, Vyhovsky, Doroshenko, and Mazepa, were forced to continue this political course, and together with Poland, Turkey and Sweden they waged wars against Russia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in order to free Ukraine from the clutches of Moscow into which it had fallen since the violation of the Treaty of Pereyaslav. This political course on the part of Ukraine proved decisive during the years that followed and in particular during the heroic fight of the Ukrainian nation against Russian supremacy in the twentieth century.

Now, 300 years later, the Russian Bolshevik rulers in Moscow have suddenly seized upon the idea of interpreting the historical episode connected with the Treaty of Pereyaslav as an important turning-point in the history of Ukraine and of describing it as "the fulfilment of the historic aims" of the Ukrainian nation after their union with Russia. Accordingly Moscow issued orders that the 300th anniversary of this antiquated treaty was to be celebrated as the "voluntary union" of the Ukrainians and the Russians in the spirit

of Slav brotherhood, just as if these two nations had formed an alliance for life.

Moscow's false propaganda

In order to obliterate historical facts, namely that resistance to Russia and an uncompromising fight for political, cultural and economic emancipation can be traced right through the history of Ukraine during the past 300 years, Moscow disseminated as many lies as possible as propaganda in the course of the anniversary celebrations. With the aid of skilful misrepresentations, literature, films, exhibitions, and agitations, Moscow tried to convince the Ukrainian masses that the enslavement of Ukraine by tzarist Russia meant "progress" for the Ukrainians and above all that subjugation by the Russian Bolshevik regime had brought them social "liberation." In the tumult of these lavish celebrations the impression was to be created that the union of Ukraine and the great Russian Empire had brought the Ukrainians the "fulfilment of the desires they had cherished for centuries" and had been a "great blessing" for Ukraine, and that for all these things the Ukrainians were indebted for all time to their "big brother", the "great Russian nation", and above all to the Russian Communist Party. The alliance between the Russians and the Ukrainians during the centuries was depicted as a harmonious idyll, whilst the "class enemies" of both nations were blamed for any "disturbances" which had occurred in the course of this "harmonious alliance." It was stressed that the bolshevik revolution had put an end to all such disturbances for good, and that both nations, in the bosom of their mutual "Soviet motherland", now had a chance to enjoy prosperity, technical progress and advantageous cultural development.

Aims to destroy Ukrainian Nationalism

By means of these fairy-tales and deceptions the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party tried to turn the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav to account, in order to create the impression of an alleged equality and brotherhood of the Russian and Ukrainian nations and thus frustrate the efforts of the latter to obtain their national freedom

and independence. In order to achieve this aim the Communists resorted to every possible means of propaganda. The various academies of learning and certain scholars were instructed to publish suitable "documentary collections" and "scientific" works. Writers, poets, musicians, painters, sculptors, choirs, and those engaged in the theatrical and film professions were informed that it was their duty to glorify the "inviolable friendship" of the Russians and the Ukrainians. Various appropriate exhibitions were held in museums and libraries. Mass meetings, lasting from early in the morning until late at night, were held in the villages, factories, and schools, in the course of which suitably prepared lectures and speeches were given. Socialist working competitions, the aim of which was to establish records in certain types of work, were, of course, also held—all in honour of this "historic event."

In addition, all sixteen republics of the U.S.S.R., including the satellite states of Northern Korea and Mongolia, participated in the anniversary celebrations in some form or other. For months on end tourists from all over the Soviet Union undertook excursions and marches to "historic" places. Special postage-stamps and badges were issued to commemorate the historic day, and school-children were forced to write essays at home and during school-hours about the significance of this event from Moscow's point of view. To mark this anniversary, streets were renamed and the "historic" town of Cherkassy was made the centre of a newly established administrative area.

The Communists, however, did not stop at demonstrations of Platonic friendship. In order to prove their "everlasting friendship" to the Ukrainians, the Russian Bolshevik rulers in Moscow decided to unite Crimea with the Ukrainian Soviet Republic by a special decree. But this is most certainly nothing more than an illusory "present", for in reality Crimea and the entire "Ukrainian Soviet Republic" will continue to remain under Russian tyranny.

The truth: W. Ochrymowych

It truly seems historical irony that simultaneously with the climax of these exaggerated celebrations in Ukraine the military tribunal in Kiev sentenced W. Ochrymowych, one of the supporters of the Ukrainian fight for freedom and a member of the leading national

Cont'd at foot of Page 9, Col. 1

ASLAV

On December 9, 1953, *Pravda* published a joint Decision of the Central Committee of K.P.S.S., the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., concerning the 300th anniversary of the Re-union of Ukraine and Russia. It had been resolved to "mark that anniversary in 1954 as a notable event of history, a great national festival of the Ukrainian and Russian nations as well as of all the other nations of the Soviet Union."

In the same issue of *Pravda* was a long editorial under the heading, "The great strength of the friendship and fraternity of nations." This dealt with the same subject, and commented at length upon the above Decision—i.e. it was re-written and some of its sentences and punctuation were rearranged. In accordance with Soviet practice, the Decision was also reprinted in *Radyanska Ukraina* ("Soviet Ukraine") and in a series of central newspapers as well as in the regional and district press of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

This important action of the supreme organs of the U.S.S.R. completed preparations for the celebration of the "Re-union", and initiated the festivities. In this way, besides matters of economic and social policy dealt with in recent programme speeches by Malenkov, Khrushchov and Mikoyan, and besides

revolutionary organisation, the O.U.N., to death. To conceal the truth as regards the national revolutionary fight of the Ukrainians, the reason adduced for this sentence was that the accused had acted as an agent for the American secret service. This, too, is the only reason why, contrary to the usual practice, this sentence was made publicly known throughout the country, whereas, up to now, active supporters of the Ukrainian fight for freedom have been executed *en masse* in secret.

Moscow's true attitude towards the Ukrainians, which was to be disguised by the anniversary celebrations, is convincingly illustrated by the campaign which is at present being conducted and which aims to exterminate the Ukrainian underground movement by the mass deportation of the young people of Ukraine from their native country, and the systematic settlement in their stead of Russian and other new settlers from the Asiatic republics.

S. L.

300th ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENSLAVEMENT OF UKRAINE BY RUSSIA ALL UNION CELEBRATION

decisions by the Soviet administration in respect of industry, agriculture and trade, the question of the relations of Ukraine with Russia was raised as a central political problem inside the U.S.S.R.

The political propaganda campaign with regard to the "Re-union" was launched on a large scale, affecting all spheres of Soviet life—party, administrative, cultural, economic, military. The Soviet press began to publish lectures on such subjects as "The historic friendship of the Ukrainian and Russian nations", "The liberation fight of the Ukrainian nation in the years 1648-1654, and the re-union of Ukraine and Russia", etc. which were given in villages and towns, at party conventions and public meetings, in factories, M.T. Stations, state farms, schools and the higher educational institutions.

At the same time compulsory reading of the "Decision" about the 300th anniversary began everywhere. Writers and poets started to write new novels and poems in honour of the noteworthy date and of "the elder brother"; composers worked on new operas, songs and marches; scientists busied themselves discovering new falsifications of history.

Radyansky Pysmennyk (Soviet Writer) is preparing to publish a collection called "The Chronicle of a Great Friendship"; an almanac "For ever with you, Russia", is to appear in Lviv; the composer Dankevych has already purged his opera "Bohdan Khmelnytsky"—libretto by W. Wasilewska and A. Korniychuk—of the passages that dealt with historical fact; film producers have revised the film on Khmelnytsky, and prepared a new arrangement based on present requirements; M. Hrechucha has published a long article in *Radyanska Ukraina* under the heading, "The good fortune of the Ukrainian nation in the fraternal family of Soviet nations", in which he heaps abuse on "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists."

Not only in Ukraine, but in Moscow, Leningrad, Vladivostok and all over the U.S.S.R., in literary clubs and libraries, exhibitions have been prepared; under brazen titles such as "socialist competition of the workers of Leningrad and Ukraine", "socialist competition of the Voronizh and Poltava collective farmers" and the like, socialist competition is being carried on between factories,

plants, state farms and collective farms in Ukraine, in Russia and in other republics.

On the occasion of the 36th anniversary of the October revolution, while reviewing troops in Kyiv, General Chuykov took the floor and said that "in fraternal union with the great Russian nation and other nations of the Soviet Union, Soviet Ukraine has achieved a great success in its economic and cultural life, giving a hearty welcome to that great triumph of friendship of the nations of our motherland—the 300th anniversary of the re-union of Ukraine and Russia."

Failure of the Lenin-Stalin national policy

It is a fact that Russian policy with regard to Ukraine has remained the same during the last 300 years, invariably aimed not only at the destruction of Ukrainian independence, but also at the Russification and enslavement of all Ukrainian lands. Therefore it should not be surprising if the above-mentioned "Decision" says clearly that "the union of Ukraine and Russia, in spite of the fact that at that time Russia was governed by the tzar and by landowners, was of great progressive importance to the further political, economic and cultural development of the Ukrainian and Russian nations. The union of these two great Slav nations... Russia and Ukraine, was the only wise course of action to take against their enemies."

Certain concessions and grants were only tactical deviations from the general line of Russian policy, or maybe temporary oversights in Petersburg or Moscow. However, the most serious concessions made by Russia were caused by organised force and resistance in the Ukrainian nation.

Today that policy has been experienced to the full—the long series of oppressive orders, "thanks to which the Ukrainian nation has been able to realise its national revival, having united all the Ukrainian lands in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist State." The "friendship of nations" is, as is known, an official mask.

The grandiose celebrations of the 300th anniversary are supposed to prove the success of that "national policy." In reality, however, they are attempts to conceal their bankruptcy.

Continued overpage

A summary of Russian policy in Ukraine for the last 30 years, years full of terrible and unscrupulous Russification and extermination, does not give Russia any cause for optimism despite heavy Ukrainian losses. The Ukrainian problem has not been solved; on the contrary, due to the national force of the Ukrainian nation and its organised fight, Moscow has been compelled to make new tactical deviations from its general policy. The political development of Ukraine has not gone along the line of "re-union with Russia"; rather it has consistently aimed at separation, and this has been furthered by the Russification policy of the Kremlin in all its many guises—national oppression, filling up the party and administrative apparatus with Russians, open Russian racialism, and a population policy which, along with displacement of the population, spread the bacteria of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism" all over the U.S.S.R. Consequently, the split between the Ukrainian and Russian nations is today deeper than it was before.

The changes in Ukraine after the death of Stalin, particularly the removal of Melnikov, were the first evident acknowledgement of the bankruptcy of the Stalin national policy; they cannot be regarded only as the personal rivalry of cliques for power. Although Beria—who, thanks to his post, could better estimate the whole importance, seriousness and maturity of the national, and particularly of the Ukrainian, problem in the U.S.S.R.—was the chief promoter of those unimportant reforms, it is also certain that Malenkov understood the internal situation, for his personal consent was necessary for the removal of Melnikov; and he did not re-instate Melnikov even after the removal of Beria. It follows that both cliques considered it necessary to relax the policy of their predecessor Stalin, and shows rather more realistic thinking on the part of the new Russian rulers.

It is probable that Beria would have retreated still further, but he was among Russian chauvinistic circles dominated by Stalin. It is possible that we would have seen some remarkable events if he had succeeded in breaking out of the Russian environment and escaping to Ukraine or Georgia. In this connection, the fact that General Chuykov was at that time appointed Commander of the Kyiv military district was not a mere chance if one remembers that it was Russian Army circles who helped Malenkov to liquidate Beria; neither is it surprising that in his speech of August 8, 1953, Malenkov connected "the friendship of the Soviet nations" with the case of

Beria, declaring: "the friendship of the Soviet nations has never been so strong and unshakable as it is today. True, there are politicians abroad who regarded the unmasking and disarming of the people's enemy, Beria, as a weakness of our country, but those politicians were short-sighted indeed."

It is known also that in the bill of indictment against Beria he was accused of trying to disunite the "fraternal nations." Russian political circles today are not only aware of the basic nationalist tendencies in Ukraine, but also they quite correctly estimate their force and do not deny them. Hence on the one hand they define nationalism rightly and call it by its proper names—*independence, sovereignty, united states, etc.*—and, on the other hand, they try by every means to satisfy it by a fictional reality, to prove that all these demands have already been fulfilled thanks to the help given by the Russian nation in the form of a common Russian state. Thus *Pravda* assures us that "the Ukrainian nation has already realised its everlasting dream and created a national Ukrainian Soviet State", and "that the better sons of the Russian nation have always been in sympathy with its just fight, and acknowledged and protected the right of Ukraine to national independence."

It can be clearly seen from the above that great importance is attached by the Kremlin to Ukrainian-Russian relations as the main problem of the internal policy of the U.S.S.R., a problem full of contradictions and danger. One can see the fear of losing Ukraine which would mean the downfall of the whole Soviet Empire. Hence also the emphasis on "the unshakable and everlasting friendship of the Ukrainian and Russian nations, of all the nations of the Soviet Union, which is a guarantee of their national independence and freedom, of the flourishing of national culture, and of the growth of the Ukrainian nation as well as of other nations of the Soviet Union."

But the importance of the celebration of the 300th anniversary is not exhausted in the sphere of internal politics. They play an especially important part in Russian foreign policy as a demonstration and manifestation of its force and solidarity, which is in fact greatly weakened by the urgency of the Ukrainian problem. At the 19th Congress of K.P.S.S., Malenkov reported on the "further establishment of the Soviet social and state system" and discussed the friendship of nations, referring deliberately to World War II in these words: "Taking the offensive against our country, the Fascist invaders counted on

the internal lack of strength of the Soviet social and state system, the weakness of the Soviet rear..." Today Russia is trying to convince the world that the problem of the independence of Ukraine has already been solved, that the Ukrainian nation stands in "a firm and everlasting union with the Russian nation", and that there is no "weakness of the Soviet rear..."

At the same Congress, Malenkov declared: "In the capitalist world, there has taken shape in the person of the U.S.A. a new centre of reaction and aggression; it is this centre that threatens the cause of freedom and the national independence of nations." Today *Pravda's* official policy is to play the part of a protector not only of the "independence" of France, but also of Ukraine. Though it may be chance that a day after the publication of the "Decision", *Pravda* published an editorial headed "France and the Problem of European Security", yet this fact is significant and symptomatic. But the weak point of Russia, Ukraine, is certainly no less dangerous to it than the weak point of the West, France, to the U.S.A.

The present campaign emphasising the "friendship" of Ukraine and Russia can be regarded as political propaganda in preparation for a new offensive, exactly as the ostentatious "state funeral" of the Metropolitan Sheptytsky preceded an intensified attack against the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

In general, it should be expected that this new action will include all spheres of Ukrainian life; therefore, the last "voluntary" resettlement of able-bodied Ukrainian families from Western Ukraine in the Amur country and the Sakhalin region should be regarded as an integral part of that action.

It is significant that Kruglov is assisted in his work by Strokach, who gained much experience in underground work during World War II; he was recently re-instated in his former post at the Ministry of Home Affairs of the Ukrainian S.S.R. in Kyiv.

We do not doubt that new police and military actions against our movement will remain as fruitless as formerly.

But in the text of the "Decision" it should be noted that not only Ukrainian nationalists, but also imperialistic chauvinists have for the first time been called enemies of the friendship of Ukraine and Russia. Therefore we may assume that what is at issue is not only the masking of the real chauvinistic tendencies of the Kremlin today to cause more confidence in Ukraine and abroad, but also the preparation of a new all-Union purge in which many of those who helped in the liquidation of Beria will fall as victims to Malenkov.

S. Lenkowsky

The Crimea and the Kremlin "love" for the Ukrainian nation

The decision of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. of February 19, 1954, on the administrative inclusion of the Crimea within the Ukrainian S.S.R., was a theatrical gesture by Moscow. The reasons for that inclusion as given by the Kremlin leaders were the geographical nearness and the close economic and cultural relations of Ukraine and the Crimea.

Those reasons are objective: they have always existed. They existed even at the time when the Bolsheviks, having seized power in Ukraine and colonised it under the name of "Union Republic", separated from it the Ukrainian regions of Kursk, Bryansk, Krasnodar, the western regions of Rostov and the Crimea; and when, despite the geographical, geopolitical, strategic, economic and even administrative absurdity of that decision, they annexed the Crimea to Russia as an allegedly "autonomous" republic.

In order to strike their own roots, the tzarist, and later the Kremlin, rulers year by year settled "truly Russian" commissars and a great number of Russian officials and their helpers in the Crimea. Like locusts, the Russians occupied the seaport towns, the complicated economic-administrative machinery, the management of the fishing, fruit and canning industries, the organisation of health resorts, sanatoria and so on. Hard manual toil was left to the natives, Tartar and Ukrainian collective farmers, herdsmen, fishermen, wine-growers, miners, longshoremen.

The Russian lash over the Crimea—the party apparatus and the N.K.V.D.—forced native labour into two camps. The Communist Party, according to its deadly plans, aimed at the demoralisation of all national and traditional social groups, and has for years poisoned the youth of the native population with the opium of Marxist doctrines in order to produce fanatic support for itself. This training of new janissaries, red janissaries of the Kremlin in the Crimea—this was the method of the Party. In addition, there was the way of Cheka, the M.G.B., N.K.V.D., M.V.D.—deliberate oppression of all the elements that refused to tread the path of Bolshevik janissaries. Executions, deportations, daily individual terrorism, finally mass expulsion of the 250,000 Tartar people from the Crimea in 1944 and the prolonged colonisation of the Crimea with tried Kremlin henchmen, all these measures

seem to have strengthened the position of the Russian imperialists on that sunny soil.

And suddenly, after all those cruel acts and efforts to consolidate Russian strength in the Crimea, the Kremlin dictators decided that the Crimea should be annexed to Ukraine because of its territorial nearness and economic relations with the latter—that is, on grounds that have existed since the beginning of Ukrainian history.

What does it mean?

Expressing his gratitude for the annexation of the Crimea by the Ukrainian S.S.R., D. S. Korotchenko, head of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S.S.R., spoke of that act as "a friendly act which proves the infinite confidence and love of the Russian people towards the Ukrainians." The head of the Presidium of the Russian R.F.S.R., M. P. Tarasov, pointed out that the annexation of the Crimean Region was occurring at the time the nations of the U.S.S.R. were celebrating the 300th anniversary of the re-union of Ukraine and Russia (or, rather, we should say, the enslavement of Ukraine by Russia), and that this act not only strengthened the friendship between the nations of the Soviet Union, but furthered the establishment of fraternal relations between Ukraine and Russia. All the speakers on this gala performance in Moscow, headed by Voroshilov and Shvernik, referred to the 300th anniversary and to the friendship of nations.

The falsification of the meaning of the Pereyaslav treaty, the parades, radio, press and propaganda meetings, gifts of decorative vases, carpets and so on, do not mislead Ukrainians, who require concrete acts of high importance before they can believe any Russian words of friendship.

The Third World War is approaching and the Kremlin is anxious to prevent the Ukrainians from deserting in large numbers to the enemies of Russia and of communism as they did in the year 1941. It is necessary to create an illusion that it is worth while to fight on the side of the Russian "elder-brother", that there is something more of value to fight for and defend than was the case during the war with Germany. This "something" is the illusion that state rights have been gained. But reality has hitherto denied this. So Russia is now anxious to create mirages of statehood for Ukrainians. The inside view of these mirages may be summarised as follows:

1. The concealment of the act of subjugation of Ukraine by Red Russia, camouflaging it into Russian "general government" of a new type under the Ukrainian S.S.R. which is after all only a piece of paper.

2. The creation of a sense of autonomy by the help of menials and turncoats recruited among the native population, leading to an increase of all-Union patriotism.

3. The collective enslavement of the rest of the Ukrainian lands—Western and South-Western—under the pretext of their liberation by the Russians.

4. The falsification of the historic fight of Ukraine, replacing its true aims by individual mistakes in policy that have long been corrected.

It seems that those mirages were not convincing enough if Russia considered it necessary "out of its infinite confidence and love" for the Ukrainians "to make a present" of the Crimea to the Kyiv administration. Russia has, allegedly, resigned from its property in favour of the "younger brother." In reality, however, it has not resigned anything: neither has it made any present. The Crimea is full of Kremlin janissaries. What difference does it make whether Russia rules over them directly, or through its native and Russian "vicereigns" who live in Kyiv and enslave Ukraine for Russia?

Russia expects that by propaganda and constant repetition of slogans of friendship the historic processes of Ukrainian thought can be changed. From the time of Khmelnytsky and the Pereyaslav treaty betrayal there has been established through the centuries a tendency to keep away from Russia and all political ideas of the liberation of Ukraine have been based on this recognition.

By the Crimean "present" the Kremlin wants to change the very basis of Ukrainian thought. It wants to divert Ukrainian political attention from Russia, and direct it to the defence of the coast of the Black Sea as a matter of first-rate importance. The trend of the new political suggestions to Ukraine by Russia will be as follows: Turkey is an enemy of Ukraine; to the north, the rear is secured by Russia which, in friendship, has made a present of the Crimea. The enemy of Ukraine, insinuates Moscow, is not to the north, but in the south, as it was in the time of Kosynsky and Nalyvayko. Ukraine should finally submit herself to Russia and become an outpost of Russian imperialism on the southern front.

Thus the "bear's love", and the treacherous gifts of the Russian "elder brother."

KERSTEN COMMITTEE:

1. FEIGHAN CALLS SOVIET "PRISON OF NATIONS"

From *The Cleveland News*, Monday, July 12, 1954

Congressman Michael A. Feighan of the Cleveland and the 20th. District was sent to Munich as a member of the Kersten Committee to investigate Communist aggression. He gives his views on the subject in this letter.

Since I became a member of the House Committee investigating Communist aggression I have heard remarkable testimony on the methods and techniques of the Communists which add up to the greatest criminal conspiracy in the history of all mankind. This testimony has come from the people who have lived under and suffered the tortures of communist aggression.

On the basis of this first-hand testimony, I am all the more convinced that the policy of containment as advocated by the former diplomat George Kennan is not only amoral, but that it represents a sure formula for the defeat of human freedom everywhere in the world, and the establishment of world domination by the Russian Communists.

The Committee heard those who had been eye-witnesses of the most appalling crimes ever committed against mankind. These crimes of the Russian Communists ranged from the devilish torture of individuals to brutal and heartless mass-destruction of entire nations. Other witnesses testified to the way in which the Communists desecrate and destroy all those things for which mankind has laboured and died through the centuries. In particular, we heard descriptions of the methods used by the Communists to violate the integrity of the family and the sanctity of the home; to destroy all temples of God without regard to difference of belief; to sweep away all laws upon which the order of civilisation is based; grossly to distort historical truths and facts, and to provoke an atmosphere of fear by means of which the *elite* leaders of the conspiracy control the people.

All of these crimes, when put together, present a picture which is the blackest ever known to mankind.

I was particularly impressed with the evidence given by the spokesman for the enslaved people of non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. This testimony was supported by documents, hard facts, and eye-witness

accounts of the tactics used by the Bolsheviks during the years 1917-1921 and later, to destroy the national independence of some fifteen non-Russian nations. For a great many years, Communist propaganda has sought to cloud the issue with respect to the national aspiration of the people of these non-Russian nations. The testimony we have received will deal a death blow to this evil propaganda because it will expose the Soviet Union for what it is—the prison of nations, and the ruthless enslaver of all people in its power.

U.S must have a positive policy

It is my fervent hope that, from the testimony taken here in Munich and elsewhere, it will be possible for the United States to develop a positive policy, calling for the liberation of all nations and people enslaved by Communism, in the name of those moral and political principles upon which the American way of life is based. Those moral and political principles are far more powerful in the cause of freedom and justice than are all the armies and destructive weapons known to mankind.

I sincerely believe that our historic task will be made easier for us, as Americans, by the evidence our Committee has been receiving from witnesses who know only too well what Communism means, and what must be done to defeat it.

Self-determination—the prior aim

The policy of the United States, since the days of its inception, has been based upon the political belief that all nations, large and small, have not only the right, but also the duty, to separate themselves from any tyrannical oppressor. In more recent years we have expressed this policy by our unwavering support of the principles of national self-determination, and this principle should stand as a beacon of hope to all the enslaved nations of the Communist empire.

In speaking thus, I refer particularly to the people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkistan, Idel-Ural, Cossakia, North Caucasia and Russia.

2. SMALL PROLOGUE TO A GREAT ACT

On the occasion of the hearing of Ukrainian witnesses by the Commission of the American Congress in Munich about the Bolshevik terror and the fight of Ukraine for its independence.

The name of Congressman Kersten is familiar to the Ukrainian community because of his friendly attitude toward Ukraine and other nations enslaved by Russia; and by his speeches made at anti-Bolshevik public meetings of A.B.N. and conferences regarding the psychological war in U.S.A. Congressman Kersten pursues his policy which is aimed at giving moral support to the national-liberation fight and its ideology: the national and sovereign rights to democratic statehood of the nations enslaved by Russia. The well-known actions of Kersten aimed at the protection of the Baltic states have caused wide circles of the freedom-loving world to take up a favourable attitude towards him. Kersten has tried to protect the independence of those small nations and *Pravda* (Truth) has vigorously attacked him for his boldness. Now Kersten's Commission, as an official Commission of the Congress of U.S.A., has focused its attention on other nations enslaved by Bolshevism, including Ukraine. Kersten's Commission has not only stated the fact of the terrible genocide committed by the Soviets by means of famine organised according to a fixed plan, or by the murder of prisoners as at Vinnytsya, but has further proceeded to an analysis of the political background of those crimes. Attention was also given to the great agitation about the "celebrations" of Pereyaslav by Bolshevik Russia. On that occasion a just analysis of Soviet falseness was made by Congressman Feighan who stated that the deceit of both Tzarist and Bolshevik Russian imperialism was identical. The declarations by Congressman Feighan, who boldly declared his position as a protector of the idea of sovereign national statehood for all the nations enslaved by Russia, are worthy of the traditions of Washington and Lincoln. It is astonishing that the opinions of that champion of liberation have not been adopted as a basis for the policy of U.S.A. with regard to Bolshevism. Every declaration, every question of Congressman Feighan, as well as of Kersten himself, prove their objective knowledge of the problem and their just attitude towards the desires of nations. Kersten's Commission, Congressman Feighan's questions and his bold declarations that are heard so seldom in the West today hinted at new trends coming from over-seas.

If only they are not merely temporary trends!

The interest of the Congress of U.S.A. in the problems of Ukraine and the holding of a political objective investigation of its desires seems to prove that the problem of Ukraine is coming to the fore.

Wide scope of Committee's enquiries

It was primarily Vinnytsya that stood in the centre of attention, though there had been dozens, and maybe hundreds of such Vinnytsya-s. In Western Ukraine, hundreds of prisoners have been murdered in every town. Lviv, Lutsk, Dubno, Stryj and other towns were filled with corpses of prisoners in the summer of 1941. It would have been wrong if Kersten's Commission had thought that Poles could make depositions on those matters. Western Ukraine is an integral part of United Ukraine and any Polish claim to it would be abortive. The attention of our friends over-seas should be drawn to this point, too. The famine was a special subject and its political background was clear to the Congressmen.

The history of the enslavement of Ukraine in the national-state aspect as well as today's problems of the fight of Ukraine, its revolutionary-liberation organisation, its attitude towards the present policy of U.S.A., the estimation of the "Voice of America" all roused lively interest among members of the Congress Commission. It should be pointed out that every critical word, every critical opinion with regard to the wrong attitude, for example, of the "Voice of America" and other institutions, was taken into consideration. The Congressmen seemed to try to find out what the representatives of the enslaved nations thought about the policy of their government. It is characteristic that none of the Congressmen tried to conceal critical remarks; they did not try to justify anything; they wanted to find out the reasons for one or another attitude of the representatives of the enslaved nations towards one or the other act of American policy. We do not know if Kersten's Commission is able to use its information and experience for the forcing through of changes of today's policy in U.S.A., particularly that of the so-called "American Committee of Liberation from Bolshevism" headed by Admiral Stevens; nevertheless, we wish every success to the Commission that is carrying on its work without prejudice, seeking after truth. We know that great hidden forces oppose the idea of dismemberment of the Russian empire and the creation of national states; we know that Kennan's policy aiming at co-operation with Bolshevism

has not yet been forsaken. Kersten's Commission has undertaken the difficult task of telling the U.S.A. and the free world the truth about the position and desires of the nations behind the Iron Curtain. Slowly but surely, American statesmen themselves realise what has been the result of their policy of containment and appeasement. Congressman Feighan's opinion that it is not a strategy of peripheral wars, but a concentrated attack on the centre of evil, Moscow, that can solve the problem, contains new elements as well. The action of Kersten's Commission is, presumably, only the beginning. Two days spent on investigation of the complicated Ukrainian problem—the fight and martyrdom, resistance and heroism of a nation composed of over 40 million people; Bolshevik terror and genocide over the most stubborn nation which has not laid down its arms for thirty-five years, and is the only nation that has today the strongest political and armed underground organisation—is much too few. Baltic complexities will be investigated by the Commission for months; it will not inquire of only ten or twelve witnesses but will hear far more.

Two days are even not enough to enumerate those terrible victims of death, deportation, collectivisation and murder committed by Bolshevik Russia during the last thirty-five years, at a time when the Western World did nothing to help Ukraine and other nations enslaved by Bolshevism to carry on their fight.

We are of the opinion that the West should at least have time enough to comprehend the terrible realities of Ukraine, to honour its fight if only through a love of truth, and, by learning of its heroism and tragedy, to show respect to a firm nation which has never ceased to fight.

We express our wish to Kersten's Commission, to its political spokesman, Congressman Feighan, and to its head, Kersten, that those two days—so insignificant in the study of Ukraine—may become the small prologue to a great drama: **an American study of the grandeur of Ukraine and its heroism as a nation.**

Hitler was afraid of the Ukrainian sphinx; he preferred not to answer that riddle. He found his end in the steppes of Ukraine.

It would be tragic for the West if the successors of Washington and Lincoln should be afraid of continuing their work: to find out about Ukraine for themselves, to draw upon the experience of Ukraine gained in its fight against Bolshevism, and not to value lightly its partnership.

Cont-d at foot of Col. 3.

TSCHU-EN-LAI

Centre-forward for the Soviets

It cannot be doubted that the Soviets already have a military potential at their disposal which, given an equal level in atomic armament, would present an insurmountable obstacle to the West. Added to this is the tenacity of the Soviets in pursuing their imperialist aims and expanding their strong positions, a fact about which Senator Knowland recently gave some sensational information. He disclosed a plan by Mao-Tse-Tung, drawn up in the form of documents, according to which the "peaceful" Communist infiltration into the whole of Asia is to be effected by 1965, and the extension of Communism to Africa, Western Europe, and the rest of the world by 1973. According to this plan, the bolshevist annexation of Japan, for instance, is due to take place in the year 1960.

Exactly what this "peaceful infiltration" will be like has recently been demonstrated in Korea and Indo-China.

Tschu-En-Lai's hasty departure from Geneva for New Delhi was apparently connected with preparations for this action, and the purpose of his journey was to prevent India's President, Nehru, from joining an Asiatic anti-bolshevist bloc. The aim of a further trip to Burma, etc. is to incite even more countries to frustrate the South-east Asian Pact planned by the West and to use these countries as tools in the bolshevist war.

As far as the large-scale political and diplomatic plans of the Bolsheviks are concerned, the cards have been cleverly shuffled and the West must be on its guard.

Meanwhile, Senator Knowland has commented upon the determination of Mendès-France to end the war in Indo-China. He said the French Prime Minister's bet would solely serve the cause of the Communists. A policy, which after the lengthy war in Indo-China now advocated self-surrender in order to achieve a peace at any price, he added, would make it extremely difficult to hold South-east Asia. Mr. Tschu-En-Lai will no doubt be very pleased with this new ally, and Malenkov is sure to express his approval.

G. H.

Victory over Bolshevism lies only along the way which Ukraine travels, the way of realisation of Ukraine's political ideas and military-strategical conceptions. She sees clearly the enemy that lurks on the Muscovite territory.

Sooner or later, America and the entire West will comprehend the violence of that enemy, and see it as the embodiment of a threat to the whole world.

MOSCOW ATTACKS THE O. U. N.

at the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine

A regular conference of the Communist Party of Ukraine—K.P.U.—was held in Kyiv from March 23rd to 26th; its importance consists primarily in the fact that Kyrychenko, the first secretary of C.K. K.P.U. was compelled to deal with the Ukrainian revolutionary liberation underground organisation, and particularly the Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists—O.U.N.—warning the party delegates and members of the state machinery of the dangerous methods which that underground organisation employs in its fight.

Reading aloud the report of C.K. K.P.U., Kyrychenko in the course of his speech spoke as follows:

“... The party organisations of the western regions of Ukraine should be watchful also in their future fight against the O.U.N. survivors; they should prevent them from penetrating into collective farms, factories, educational institutions, and carrying on their subversive activity there. What we demand of all the party organisations is: a universal doubled watch...”

Broadcasting the text of this report on March 24th, Radio Moscow pointed out that this text had been translated from the Ukrainian language. That is something new in the addresses of the Russian-Bolshevik “federal commissioners” or “viceroys” in Ukraine: Melnikov, Khrushchov and Postyshev used to speak in Russian, and Stanislav Kossior, though he had promised that he would learn the Ukrainian language, did not keep his promise until his liquidation in 1937.

But also the international situation compels Bolshevik Russia to rely, tactically, upon the Ukrainian nation and to make formal concessions at least. The Ukrainian Kyrychenko at the head of K.P.U. and his report made in the Ukrainian language—this is one example. In the great game of international politics, it is very important to Bolshevik Russia whose side is being taken and, what is more important, whose side will be taken by the ethnic masses of the enslaved nations. Russia can easily count on them formally and tactically because the West has not yet realised the importance of the national-liberation fight of the Soviet nations. Russia, however, realised that importance long ago.

The language of Kyrychenko's speech is one thing, and its contents another. We do not know what the other delegates said in reply, or in their reports. There were 48 of them, some of them natives of the western regions of Ukraine, who had somehow to apologise and speak of their successful fight against O.U.N. survivors, and to emphasise the word “survivors” in order to prove their own vigilance.

Kyrychenko's speech suggests the following:

1. That the uncompromising fight against Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists continues in Ukraine. Constant appeals for irreconcilability prove that in Ukraine the regime is permanently and solely threatened by the Ukrainian liberation movement.

2. That according to Bolshevik interpretation, by the term “bourgeois ideology” one should understand democracy and the national content of a state. Bolshevik publicists and “scientists” always attempt to prove that “parliamentary democracy is a product of the bourgeoisie and is a tool for the enslavement and exploitation of the proletariat”.

3. That, just as formerly the Bolshevik press used to write frequently on the “nationalists” and “Fascist survivors” in Ukraine, so it is compelled to write articles on O.U.N. “survivors” even today. But are they mere “survivors” if they succeed in penetrating into “collective farms, factories, educational institutions”, and if party leaders must, at the party conference, call upon the whole party apparatus to be “watchful”. We have heard similar calls to fight Kossior, Postyshev, Khrushchov and to fight against “survivors” from Melnikov—and now it is the turn of Kyrychenko.

4. Finally, that Bolshevik propaganda is compelled to call the Ukrainian liberation movement by its proper name—O.U.N., Organisation of Ukrainian Nationalists. Abusive phrases like “Fascist survivors”, “German-Ukrainian nationalists”, or “American agents-saboteurs”, etc. have been unable to conceal from the Ukrainian nation the fact that the underground revolutionary fight is not a foreign or personal plot, but a cause directed by a political organisation whose name and whose aims are today known all over Ukraine.

TURMOIL ON THE VIRGIN SOIL OF KAZAKHSTAN

Ukrainsky Samostiinyk (Ukrainian Independent) has published figures on the tilling of the virgin soil of Kazakhstan which are grossly exaggerated. However, in other Soviet newspapers Soviet bureaucrats sound an alarm: it appears there are too many shortages of fuel, of machines, spare parts, etc. not to mention of books, newspapers, textiles, food—often even of such ordinary things as salt. But it seems that the urging on of plans and the pressure on the “voluntary” help of displaced persons who may not even receive the necessities of life, is steadily maintained.

An article in *Isvestia* on June 24, under the headline “Goods trains for the virgin soil delay too long at stations”, gives us a clear idea of how the work on the land is kept supplied by the state. We quote from that article, which was written by V. Byryukov:

“One may see the following picture at many field stations of the Karahanda railway: heaps of sections of movable houses, agricultural machines, travelling kitchens, etc. lie along the highways... Hundreds of waggons, sowing-machines, tractors, combines, tractor ploughs, waggons loaded with houses accumulate at the unloading platforms of stations. This intolerable situation has already lasted for three months.

“It appears that not only the railways stations, but also those who make use of them—trusts of state farms, M.T.S. units, departments of the agricultural bank, fuel stations—were unprepared for the delivery of such large quantities of industrial goods.

“As a rule the freight yards are not properly equipped, temporary platforms are not mechanised nor illuminated at night, there is no saving of labour. Even the big junctions cannot cope with the goods passing through them.

“Since locomotives are not well distributed, goods are often delivered for unloading after long delays. Some of the smaller stations have become big transport junctions, but the Board administering transport does not raise, as it should, the question of the technical equipment of these stations with the Ministry of Transport.

“In the meantime, alarming news about the lack of agricultural machinery and fuel comes from the M.T. Stations and state farms of Northern Kazakhstan. Movable houses are essential, yet only one-fifth of the hundreds delivered to the stations have been removed to sites.”

THE FIGHT OF THE UKRAINIAN UNDERGROUND CONTINUES

The New York daily paper *Svoboda* (Freedom) published on July 13, 1954 material from the local *World Telegraph and Sun* of July 9, 1954, and from bulletins of the "Associated Press" and the "United Press" Agencies, about the fight that is being tirelessly continued by the Ukrainian revolutionary movement in the motherland. The article in *Svoboda* says:

"The underground anti-communist movement that has agitated Ukraine since the time of World War II has spread to Malenkov's terrible slave camps at Vorkuta in Siberia. This is stated by a former British soldier, William Piddington, once a bold motorcyclist, and his British companion, Eric Pleasants. Both these men were recently released from Soviet camps. Crossing Berlin on his way home after spending years in prison on false charges of espionage, Piddington declared that he had joined the underground movement directed by Stepan Bandera from Munich. Though most of its members are Ukrainians, a large number of Russians belong to it, says Piddington. Despite the terror established by the Soviet guards in the camp, he added, there is now among the prisoners a greater opposition to Malenkov's regime there than is generally believed in the West. Reports by the allied intelligence service contain detailed information on the Ukrainian Bandera movement, which has accumulated arms from German ammunition depots seized after the war and Soviet military units it had surprised and attacked. Compelled to move to the West, Bandera had continued to send groups of people behind the Iron Curtain to blow up trains and undertake other forms of sabotage."

The New York Polish newspaper *Nowy Swiat* (New World) has also published an article on the fight of the Ukrainian underground organisation under the heading: "The ferment in Ukraine has reached Malenkov's Vorkuta." The paper states that:

"The Banderaites repeatedly harass the red tzarists. The permanent underground struggle continues to weary the supreme sanhedrin in the Kremlin."

"The Banderaites continue to blow up Soviet trains, bridges and rails; they organise groups of saboteurs in factories and the like. Piddington had remarked that one can hardly disregard the movement, because it is already not only a Ukrainian one, but an activity of many of the nations and tribes of the U.S.S.R."

N. Ekhadieli

The Russian church in the service of the regime

In connection with the recent visit to Moscow of a German Protestant ecclesiastical delegation, headed by the former Federal Minister, Heinemann, Mr. Alexander Korab, a regular contributor to the American newspaper in Germany *Neue Zeitung*, has written an informative article entitled "Moscow's Manoeuvres With The Orthodox Church" (published on June 24, 1954), in which he sheds light upon the ecclesiastical policy of the Soviet government.

The author points out that anti-religious propaganda in the Soviet Union, in particular among the Kom-somolzen (Young Communists) shows a marked increase, and stresses the fact that the ideological Party organ *The Communist* recently demanded "more attention to the questions of anti-religious propaganda" and, in an article thus entitled described all religious creeds, without exceptions, as "instruments of reaction". Mr. Korab adds that in the same article all agitators, propagandists, "cultural functionaries", and publishers were exhorted to "fight religion in the Soviet Union by every possible means."

On the fact that religion is tolerated and to some extent even furthered in the Soviet sphere of influence at present, Mr. Korab makes the following apt comment: "The Kremlin rulers regard the existence of the Orthodox Church exclusively from the point of view of the foreign political interests of the Soviet Union and of the work which this Church does in the secret organisations of world Communism, as for instance in the so-called World Peace Council."

Mr. Korab then adds, "Thanks to the Moscow Patriarchate, the Soviet government has gained an additional means of influence on the development of the ecclesiastical situation in the countries which have a people's democracy. In these countries, as for instance in Bulgaria (this country has detached itself from the Constantinople Patriarchate—Ed.), Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia, the apparently Autocephalous Orthodox Churches have been placed under the supervision of the Patriarchate in Moscow."

Mr. Korab points out that the Moscow Patriarchate is now endeavouring to exert its influence on the Orthodox Church of Finland, and mentions the fact that the Moscow Patriarch, Alexej, has requested the Constantinople Oecumenical Patriarch to sever "the non-canonical connec-

tions" (sic!) with the Orthodox Church of Finland. Mr. Korab then adds that a permanent representative of the Moscow Patriarchate (that is to say, an agent of the Soviet government—Ed.), namely Bishop Michael Tschub, has been sent to Finland "with the purpose of establishing close connections with the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch and thus gradually bringing about a change in the distribution of power, to the disadvantage of the Oecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople, so that, at a subsequent world conference of the Orthodox Churches, Moscow's key position would be recognised."

Mr. Korab stresses that the organ of the Moscow Patriarchate has reproached the World Church Council with supporting the Anglo-American bloc, and fittingly remarks: "In this respect, too, the Moscow Patriarchate is to render Soviet policy a valuable service, since, with the aid of various leading personalities of the Protestant and Anglican Church (as is now the case as regards the German Protestant delegation under Dr. Heinemann—Ed.), it is to set up a pro-U.S.S.R. group within the World Church Council." So much we are told in Mr. Korab's article in the *Neue Zeitung*.

To complete this convincing picture of the part played by the Russian Orthodox Church in the service of the Soviet regime we should like to add the following remarks:

From the reign of Peter the Great onwards, when the Patriarchate was abolished in Russia and the Church was placed under the administration of the Synod, the head of which was a secular procurator appointed by the Tzar, the Russian Church as far as foreign affairs were concerned was the instrument of Russia's imperialist policy, whilst in home affairs it was an instrument of the police state. Accordingly, the Church dignitaries were administrative officials rather than clergymen responsible for the spiritual welfare of a Christian community. The Russian "church administrators" appointed in the non-Russian countries by the Synod, as for example ecclesiastical heads like the Exarchs (in Georgia) and the Metropolitans (in Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, etc.), had definite civil and administrative functions, inasmuch as they had to carry out ministerial orders and above all keep a political check on the clergy in the countries in question. Just as the Russian Church in those days was the

Cont-d overpage Col. 1.

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

On June 6, 1954, the 7th Republican Congress of the "Consumers' Co-operative Societies" of the Ukrainian S.S.R. came to an end in Kyiv. The work of the board of administration of "Ukoopapilka" was voted a "success". Malikov was elected chairman. Korotchenko and the secretary of C.K. K.P.U., "comrade" Ivashchenko, participated in the work of the Congress. It seems that there are defects in the distribution of consumers' goods in several regions. On the whole, industrial units have recently delivered less saddlery, gas-lamps, lighters 'bat', window-glass and other products than formerly. There are also serious defects in the trade in kitchen utensils, footwear, textiles, clothes and confectionery. Country people see little of these things, and seldom buy them.

Cont'd from Page 15.

instrument of the Tzarist police, it is today the instrument of the Kremlin and once again serves the cause of Russian imperialism, this time under the Soviet banner.

As regards the Church of Finland in particular, it is maintained that there has never been any canonical connection between it and the Moscow Patriarchate and that it has never been under the administration of the latter. Exactly the opposite is the case: from the canonical point of view the head of the Church of Finland comes under the sole administration of the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, whilst autocephalous churches were, according to canon law, originally allowed to be established in those countries in which the apostles preached, as for instance in Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. Thus the Moscow Patriarchate, according to canon law, can least of all lay claim to any authority over the churches of other countries. These are merely dioceses of the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople, whose authority over them can never be contested by any of the newly established patriarchates in their countries.

In any case there is no canonical and no historical basis for the present endeavours of the Russian Church under the pro-Moscow Patriarch, Alexej, to force the rest of the Orthodox Churches to submit to its authority, and these aims are as presumptuous and unscrupulous as the policy of aggression pursued by the secular rulers in the Kremlin.

There are shortcomings in the trading of books and other cultural goods. Marketing of agricultural products on commission develops very slowly; in the Chernivtsi region, for example, only 4 districts out of 39 adopted trading on commission; in the Stalin region only 9 districts out of 29; in the Voroshylov region 9 districts out of 31.

Ukraine is one of the largest coal basins of the Soviet Union, says Kyiv Radio. Today it delivers almost one-third of all the coal that is being mined in the U.S.S.R. In the reconstructed and newly created coal pits of the Stalin and Voroshylovgrad region, as well as in the coal pits of the Kirovograd and Cherkassy regions opened during the post-war period, the coal output is greater by nearly 30% than it was in the U.S.S.R. in 1940, and 2 to 3 times greater than it was in the whole of tsarist Russia in the year 1913.

A textile factory is in production at Hlyniany, Lviv region, and one of its shops produces carpets with motifs from the Galician folk carpet designs. Moscow's *Isvestia*, April 29, published a fairly long article on the craft, writing that people in Moscow, Leningrad, Kaliningrad and Siberia are familiar with the Hlyniany carpets; especially they praise the designs dedicated to the Re-union, dated 1654-1954. Sydor S. Shchurko is the shop superintendent; A. Rudnytska and M. Zabolotska are shop foremen.

Industries of Donbas in the Donetz Basin are finally to be supplied with water. Near the village of Chervony Oskol in the Izyum district, on the Oskol at its outlet to the Donetz, a one kilometre concrete dam is to be built, which will raise the level of the river by 12 metres. By this means a large artificial Chervony-Oskol lake will be created to supply those towns of Donbas whose industry suffers from shortages of water. From the 100 km Chervony-Oskol lake—its area is 15,000 hectares—a 125 km canal, Donetz-Donbas, will be constructed. *Pravda. Isvestia.*

The collective body of Donetz coal scientific research institute has constructed a unit-station for selection and processing of samples of coal before it is shipped to the consumer. This arrangement considerably reduced expenditure in labour.

Kyiv Radio. July 16.

The 8th Congress of the surgeons of Ukraine, held to mark the anniversary of Pereyaslav, opened in Kyiv in a ceremonial atmosphere. More than 1000 surgeons came from Ukraine and other Soviet republics to take part in the Congress.

An editorial of *Pravda Ukrainy* in June reports that 275,000 students—including students taking correspondence courses—are attending higher educational institutions in Ukraine. From the universities of Ukraine about 43,000 young specialists will graduate this year.

Institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian S.S.R. have organised more than 100 research expeditions this year. The most important work is being carried on by geologists, who are investigating the rocks and minerals of Donbas, the Crimea, the Carpathian and other regions. Ukrainian scientists are also carrying on research-work in the Caucasus and Moldavia, though these regions do not formally belong to the Ukrainian S.S.R.

The Azerbaijan state theatre of Russian drama, the Moldavian choir "Doyna", and the Soviet Army's Alexandrov Ensemble of Song and Dance are on tour, and have arrived to perform at Lviv.

On June 27, Kyiv Radio broadcasting for Ukrainians abroad, reported that many families of workers and officials in the city were moving into new, well-furnished houses. More houses had been built this year, said the radio, than in many years past.

A month's course of training for cadres of propagandists, organised by the regional committee of K.P.U. in Carpathian Ukraine, began at Uzhorod in June. The course includes lectures on the decisive role of the masses in National History, Dialectical and Historical Materialism, and also on the September and February-March plenary sessions of C.K. K.P.S.S.

The propagandists will be sent to collective farms in the Uzhorod region to carry on anti-Ukrainian and anti-national propaganda. Their task will be to strengthen the rule of the bolshevik occupation of Carpathian Ukraine.

THE UKRAINIAN OBSERVER is published by the Ukrainian Information Service (U.I.S.), and printed by Ukrainian Publishers Ltd., 237, Liverpool Road, London. N.1. Tel. NORTH 1828.



UKRAINIAN OBSERVER

Vol. VI No. 1—2

LONDON, JANUARY—FEBRUARY 1954

Price 1 sh

CONTENTS:

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS? 1

A. Kaminskyj

NEW SOVIET "PROSPERITY" AND COLD WAR ... 2

P. Poltava

PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR AND THE TASKS OF UKRAINIAN NATION ... 3

Z. Poray

FIGHTING THE AMERICAN- RUSSOPHILS ... 8

RUSSIAN AGENTS AND SPIES 9

Jaroslav Z. Pelenskyj

AN OBJECTIVE PICTURE

(Review of the latest American
literature on East-European
problems) ... 10

NEW POLITICAL LINE OF THE SOVIET ACADEMY OF SCIENCE ... 11

300th ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREATY OF PEREYASLAV ... 12

"FRIENDSHIP AND COOPE- RATION," OR SUBJUGATION? 13

Prof. V. Derzhavyn

THE HUMANE STUDIES IN POST-WAR UKRAINE ... 14

UKRAINE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN ... 16

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS?

During the past month the tension in the international situation increased despite the fact that numerous attempts were made to overcome this difficulty. The leading politicians of the West sought an opportunity to negotiate with Moscow in a concrete and direct manner. At the instigation of British and above all French politicians the Bermuda Conference was held and people in Europe set their hopes on the discussion held there. Despite the fact that official reports stated that the three Western partners were in agreement, the actual contents of these reports and the various commentaries published were such, that the public in general came to quite a different conclusion.

Actually, Sir Winston Churchill would like to see current political problems solved on the "highest level" by certain governmental heads, whereby the threat of communist aggression is obscured by a desire to resume trade relations with China and with countries belonging to the Soviet block. Sir Winston is also of the opinion that all conflicts can be overcome by means of conferences of the type held at Yalta and Potsdam. He still seems to share the views held by Charles L. Bohlen, who, when he was appointed U.S. ambassador to Moscow, continued to defend the attitude expressed in the agreements made there, and merely criticized the Russians for not keeping these agreements.

France's attitude is even more confusing, since her politicians are resorting to means, which are becoming more and more dangerous, in their efforts to establish friendly relations with the Soviet Union. One of the most disastrous attempts to arbitrate with the Eastern bloc was undertaken by Daladier, who, in 1938 in Munich, surrendered to a totalitarian power, but

has now adopted an extremist attitude and is one of the most violent opponent of the E.D.C. General de Gaulle's obviously pro-Russian attitude, and the fact that France has no clearly defined official foreign policy, provide the politicians who are opposed to the E.D.C. and the idea of Europe re-arming, with some good arguments. Anti-German sentiments seem to outweigh the more reasonable views for the purpose of a military unification of Europe.

For this reason it was no mere coincidence that John Foster Dulles, in a statement he made on December 15th, 1953, said that there would be a fundamental change in America's foreign policy should the E.D.C. not be ratified, a statement, incidentally, which caused considerable concern in Paris. We are bound to agree with John Foster Dulles' opinion in this respect, for should the E.D.C. not be ratified it will upset all America's defence plans and force her to make special treaties with the Federal Republic of Germany, which represents an anti-bolshevist factor. This would, in fact, be the only way out since it would be disadvantageous to America's defence system, if she were to withdraw from the European continent completely.

It is highly probable that two other possibilities will be preferred to a complete withdrawal from Europe, and these would be: the setting up of a German national army and the retention of American air and naval bases on the European continent. In any case the French parliament will have to reach a decision, for Mr. Dulles has made a very plain and candid statement. France will be bound to admit that he is serious...

The results of the Bermuda Conference are very meagre. By agreeing to the proposal that a Four Power conference be held in Berlin, and indicating that the talks on Germany with the Soviets would be resumed, the statesmen at the Bermuda Conference fell into the same propaganda trap that the Russians set when the E.D.C. debate began in the French parliament. Those who allowed themselves to be deceived again by the Soviets were, however, not deceived by Vyshinsky, who, on December 9th, at the conclusion of the eighth regular assembly of the U.N. replied to President Eisenhower's suggestion that an International Atomic Energy Agency should be set up, for non-military purposes only, by reproaching him with having threatened war and pursuing a policy of terrorism! By this statement Vyshinsky gave his audience some idea of what will happen at the proposed Four Power conference to be held in Berlin. This conference, like all the others, will prove utterly futile, since the Soviets are not in the least interested in a peaceful settlement of international problems, but solely in strengthening their position in Europe, and are simply aiming to set up a favourable basis for further aggression.

The statements made by the Moscow commentator, Boris Leontjev, revealed the true intentions of the Russian rulers. He said, "The President of the United States is endeavouring to propagate a new variant of the old Baruch plan, which refused to acknowledge the necessity of prohibiting atomic weapons, and also, the necessity of enforcing a control, to ensure that this prohibition was complied with. It is obvious that the United States has no desire to reach an international understanding. This is plainly indicated by the agitational speech made by President Eisenhower and the attitude of the American delegation in the U.N."

After the Four Power conference in Berlin, Russian-bolshevist propaganda will not only talk about the imperialism of American policy, but will continue to supply new "proof" of the Soviet Union's "desire for peace". Unfortunately, President Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles are constantly having to yield to their undisciplined Western colleagues, whose own special interests seem to be of greater importance, than the necessity of setting up a firmly established and consolidated Western world.

The political balance-sheet for the year 1953 can only be regarded as a negative one, as far as the Western countries are concerned. The E.D.C. has not been ratified, the Soviets seem

New Soviet "Prosperity" and Cold War

By A. Kaminskyj

Moscow's New Course Internal Weakness

The new economic course steered by the U.S.S.R. since Stalin's death and as defined in the speeches of Malenkov, Khrushchov, and Mikoian, show a new and intensified development of agricultural production, as well as an increase in the production of light industries, with an emphasis on consumption goods, in an attempt to improve the standard of living of the Soviet population. It is described in many circles as one of the important events, not only during the past months, but also during the past years, in the history of the Soviet Union. As usual various interpretations of these measures have been given, and various forecasts as to their results have been made.

to have succeeded in surviving their own internal political crisis, whilst in Asia, bolshevism was able to strengthen its position without having to fear any serious challenge on the part of the Western world. James Burnham's idea of a liberation policy was not elaborated, but was dropped in its initial stage, despite the fact that conditions were most favourable for its further development.

The report on the Bermuda Conference only mentioned the nations of Eastern Europe in a casual way and did not give them much hope of their most important problem, liberation from Russian imperialism, being solved in the near future. Their liberation is no longer one of the fundamental aims of the free Western countries' magnanimous policy, it can be gathered from the election speeches of President Eisenhower, the late Senator Taft, and Harold E. Stassen. At present, the policy of the Western countries' is really too weak and inadequate to lead to a political offensive, such as James Burnham visualized. Undoubtedly, America is not to blame for this, with the exception, of course, of those circles in the United States, which, in an incomprehensible manner have adopted a Russophil attitude, and have caused considerable harm by their preference for Russian imperialist emigrant politicians.

The Sceptics

There are numerous sceptics who have serious doubt as to the chances of success of the new economic policy and set no great hopes on it. They point out that the realization of the Soviet Union's vast plans in which the poor population are promised so much, would mean an almost revolutionary re-adjustment of the entire Soviet economic system, by emphasis being transferred from the heavy to the light industries. According to the opinion of these sceptics, however, such a re-adjustment of the Soviet industries is not likely, since a closer examination of the new Soviet budget, undoubtedly reveals that Stalin's heirs are by no means inclined to stop the expansion of the basic industries of steel, power, and fuel production. The present production-level of the light industries, particularly consumption goods, is so low as a result of the preference shown for the heavy industries, that it cannot be brought up to the desired standard by purely administrative, propagandist, and internal measures.

The fundamental reasons for this are because, in the first place, the U.S.S.R. must keep to the industrial course already set, because of its expansion policy and in view of the present competitive rearmament in the world.

Secondly, there is a strong group of economists and politicians in the Kremlin who adhere to the fundamental principles of the old Stalin theory, which were defined in his last work, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.," as follows:

"If we were to follow the advice of these members (those who advocate a change of policy as regards industry—editor's note) then we should obviously have to abandon our conception of the supremacy of the manufacture of producers' goods in favour of the production of consumption goods. But what would that mean? It would mean that we should thereby render the uninterrupted growth of our national economy impossible, for such a development can only be furthered, if the primary importance of the manufacture of producers' goods is realized."

It is not surprising therefore that Malenkov's plans and aims differ in no way from the old conception, and that no attempt is made to undertake the

Continued on Page 16

Continued on Page 5

P. Poltava

PREPARATIONS FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR AND THE TASKS OF UKRAINIAN NATION

TRANSLATED FROM AN UNDERGROUND PUBLICATION IN UKRAINE, AND ISSUED BY THE INFORMATION BUREAU OF "UKRAINIAN LIBERATION COUNCIL" (U.H.V.R.)

EDITOR'S NOTE

This is a translation of the first part of a detailed study of the Ukrainian underground movement attitude towards the most important questions in world politics, by the leading Ukrainian underground writer, P. POLTAVA.

P. POLTAVA was killed in the autumn of 1951 in Ukraine in the fight against Russian bolshevism. He was one of the foremost representatives of the Ukrainian underground movement, and, as First Deputy Chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.) and Member of the Executive of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (O.U.N.), played an extremely important political part in the Ukrainian liberation movement.

This publication was written and circulated in Ukraine, and the topical nature of questions discussed, and the earnest desire of the author to elucidate the problem of the Ukrainian nation in its struggle against bolshevism and Russian imperialism, deserve special mention and credit.

The World is rapidly approaching a 3rd World War. This is shown distinctly by the development of international events during the last year: the outbreak of the war in Korea; the failure of all attempts to solve peacefully the Korean problem; the provocatively aggressive policy of Muscovite-bolshevik imperialists in all parts of the world; tremendous amassing of armaments of almost all powers, and the complete inefficiency of all diplomatic moves to alleviate the tensions of the present international situation.

In such a state of affairs, it is necessary for the Ukrainian nation to determine her own position with regard to the most important problems and events of the present international life. Ukraine is becoming fully conscious of her own tasks in the present period, as well as her position in the 3rd World War.

The Principal Ukrainian Attitude Towards the Peace and the War.

The preparations for the 3rd World War are accompanied by extremely vociferous propaganda for peace and against war. Every government concerned and all notable statesmen appear as the most determined adversary of war, and exhort for the peaceful co-existence and co-operation among the nations. The most vociferous efforts are made by the Russian-bolshevik block. Peace or War has become the central problem of the present political and spiritual life of the whole of mankind.

The Ukrainian nation face up to this problem in the ideology of their revolutionary liberation movement—a movement in which tens of millions of Ukrainians in all Ukrainian lands are taking part, either actively or sympathetically.

One of the main programmatical aims of the Ukrainian Supreme Liberation Council (U.H.V.R.), consists in the removal of all shades of imperialism from international life. Under imperialism, the Ukrainian liberation movement sees a policy which is directed towards the subjugation or an intentional subjection of the weaker nations, in order to secure territorial, strategical, economical, and other advantages. Also it is the main source of international complications, difficulties and armed conflicts, bringing to mankind during the past centuries, so many evils. Each imperialism, finally bringing only negative results—not only for the subjugated nations, but also for the conquerors. We feel that every nation should achieve, by peaceful means, the best possible internal social life for their countries. That they should aim at a high spiritual and material culture, and not seek to despoil other countries by imperialism. Only then will mankind have the much promised peace and prosperity.

The most vile and infamous manifestation of imperialism, has been and will continue to be the constant wars amongst the nations. These wars have been, and will continue to be of the greatest misfortune and calamity to the whole of humanity. They leave behind millions of victims, killed or injured; spiritual suffering, and unheard of ruins of material achievements, and untold misery for many more countless millions. As the result, mankind has not progressed one step forward. As thousands of years ago, so also today, international relations are ruled by the jungle law of brute physical force, the survival of the fittest. The Ukrainian revolutionary liberation movement regard the wars as the most vicious

remnant of barbarism, the darkest spot on the shield of culture, the greatest evil of contemporary mankind. It condemns therefore, and rejects wars as the means of the policy among the nations. All progressive forces of mankind should make a gigantic effort to finish with once and for all such a despicable, degrading and humiliating state of human affairs. We do and always will strive in the first ranks of fighters for the condemnation and the relegation of wars from international life. The prohibition and the suppression of wars, is regarded as the first, and the most important step in the direction of the suppression of imperialism as such.

We are, consequently, for the peaceful co-existence of all nations in the world, for their mutual, open, faithful and most sincere friendship, and for the most close co-operation under the conditions of general national and state independence, with respected sovereignty and full equality of rights. Durable peace and national state independence are—one and indivisible. Such a peace is the ultimate aim of the Ukrainian liberation movement.

This standpoint in the basic question of peace and war finds firm corroboration and support on the side of the broadest masses of the Ukrainian nation—a suppressed nation of peasants, workers and creative intelligentsia. The Ukrainian nation has good reasons for such an attitude. The centuries long subjugation of Ukraine, with its oppression, extortions and all kinds of torments suffered by her during the interminable historical ages, was the direct result of the imperialism of her neighbours: Russia, Poland, Austro-Hungary, Germany, Rumania, and others. In Europe, and perhaps throughout the whole world, there is no other nation which has suffered so much under the yoke of imperialisms. Especially, the Ukrainians suffered under the scourge of the imperialistic wars. Starting by the forced participation of Ukrainian Kozak regiments in the wars of the Russian Tsars in the second half of 17th century until now—the Ukrainians are killed and maimed by millions for the interests of their oppressors. Also, the havoc caused by these wars is beyond estimation. In the course of the last half century Ukraine was the main battle-field of two imperialistic World Wars: 1914-1920, and 1941-1945. From the wars, Ukraine emerged at last more plundered and ruined than any other nation in the world. To offset the ravages she suffered during the 2nd World War, it would necessitate many decades of undisturbed peace and prosperity. Yet a new war appears on the world's horizon. What a war really means, and its cost to a nation only the Ukrainian people know better than any

one else in the world. This is the reason why the Ukrainian nation rightly condemns wars, and is full of determination to fight for their condemnation and prohibition, until the full victory of this noble task is achieved.

The Ukrainian Nation and present day conditions

Just and unjust wars

Although the Ukrainian nation advocates the peaceful and friendly co-existence of nations, and is against imperialism, with the consequent wars, it is not blind to its own special present day circumstances.

International relations today are governed by two important factors. In the first place some Powers are still endeavouring to reach their imperialistic goals, although disguised under various forms of allegedly high and progressive ideals and propaganda phraseology. Secondly many nations are now enslaved in various forms. Large parts of Asia, and Eastern and south-eastern Europe have been overrun by Russo-bolshevik imperialists. From 1920 onwards, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Aserbaijan, parts of Central Asia and regions of the Volga have all suffered from the Bolsheviks, and from 1940 have been added the Baltic sea countries. As a result of the 2nd World War, more countries have been enslaved, including Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Eastern Germany. All these nations are being ruthlessly exterminated, by physical and economic means.

The situation is not being helped by the present imperialistic "peace", which has been brought about by the savage law of brute force and not by the high principles of international justice.

The Bolsheviks are fighting to keep this "peace" as it is, and most regrettably, the West have been satisfied that it shall be kept. This unjust and reactionary peace is only beneficial to the ruling nations and destroys all the high ideals held by the most progressive of mankind.

This peace is particularly unjust towards the Great Ukrainian nation of 40 millions. By it, the Russo-bolshevik imperialism not only continue their oppression but force the Ukrainians to live under a totalitarian terrorist regime without any hope of her social and human rights being restored by international diplomacy. Historical experience has shown that even by these efforts, the desired results are not always attained and certainly they would not be successful with the bolsheviks. If this peace continues, it will mean the annihilation of the Ukrainian nation and they will no longer be a separate national community. Under the cloak of this unjust peace the bolshevik imperialists are able to carry out

their criminal policy of extermination not only of Ukrainians, but of all the other countries under their domination.

Only a peace which would restore her sovereign rights and national liberty, together with that of other countries, would be supported by the Ukrainian nation, and this present peace of violence and atrocity will be condemned and fought for ever.

Under imperialism not all wars deserve to be condemned as some are righteous

It is obvious that the criminal imperialistic war that Hitler unleashed in 1939, was extremely unjust, and all freedom-loving people and leading powers of the world gave it the most severe condemnation. But the war of the Indonesian nation which started after the 2nd World War against Dutch domination, was quite different. The Indonesian nation desired and yearned for independence. It possessed the same right for independence as every other nation of the world. The imperialistic circles in the Netherlands were not inclined to satisfy the just demands of the Indonesians, voluntarily. All peaceable means proved to be of no avail, so for Indonesians, there remained only one possible way out of the dilemma: to answer the imperialistic policy of the Dutch overlords, which was based upon brute force, by the same kind of force—but only in the name of the rights and interests of the Indonesian nation, and for the purpose of the construction of a better and more just national and social order in this part of the World.

Such a war can hardly be called unjust. By this war, it was the only possible means for the destruction of the reactionary, and for the victory of progress, and of the ideals of liberty and justice.

The just war of the Ukrainian Nation

Just such a war, is also the liberating revolutionary underground war, led by the Ukrainian nation against the Russo-bolsheviks at the present time. Keeping in mind that in U.S.S.R. there exist no possibilities for a peaceable legal struggle, the Ukrainian nation can fight for her rights, for the cause of liberty and justice, only by means and ways of a revolutionary underground war. This war is the only way in which Ukrainian patriots can preserve and save themselves from annihilation in bolshevik prisons and concentration camps; it is their sole means of opposing the criminal, anti-national and anti-popular bolshevik policy. By it, they can prepare for the realization of their century-long dreams, yearning and efforts for their national and social liberty and freedom. Also it exerts a tremendous moral, ideological, regenerating, and revolutionary influence upon the other

nations subjugated of the Soviets, by appealing to the all-human ideals of liberty, international peace and justice, and progress of all mankind.

Under imperialism, each war should be judged according to its aims. War made for the purpose of the subjugation of nations is, of course, an unjust, criminal and vicious war. But war waged for national and social liberation, as waged by oppressed nations, after they have unsuccessfully exhausted all legal and peaceable means is a just war. All truly progressive powers of mankind greet such wars enthusiastically and support them.

Deprived of making war as a means for the struggle for liberation, the enslaved nations would never have a chance to get free from the chains of the brutal, cruel, and heavily armed imperialism. If this should happen imperialism would celebrate victory, as violence would always overcome justice, and progress in the world would be checked.

War of liberation—a rightful means of struggle

In present world conditions the Ukrainian nation condemns and discriminates only the unjust, imperialistic wars. But regards the wars of liberation and evaluates them as a thoroughly just and righteous means of defence of enslaved and subjugated people; a means of defence against the suppression and robbery of their national state independence, for the destruction of imperialism, and the construction of international order upon rightful and fair foundations.

The 40-million strong Ukrainian nation reject Tolstoy's philosophy of "non-resistance to evil", the philosophy which condemns all form of force. The Ukrainian nation is not inclined to wait for her death at the hands of her oppressors. They are of the opinion that the most successful means of defence of an oppressed nation against the covetous clutches of imperialists is, its own, hard, firmly clenched fist. When a bandit puts a knife to one's throat, the only way to save one's life is to knock the knife out of hands of the bandit. Whoever voluntarily resigns from such a mean of defence as armed struggle, only strengthens the domination of imperialism in the world.

The Ukrainian nation also rejects the tactics of Ghandi. Because such tactics are not at all applicable under the conditions of bolshevik imperialism in U.S.S.R.; there exist no democratic freedoms in this empire, and there are no possibilities of legal defence, or lawful struggle.

When throughout the whole world the principles of national state independence would be securely created, and all nations would enjoy the liberty and freedom they so dearly desire; when relations between the nations would be of mutual friend-

NEW SOVIET "PROSPERITY" AND COLD WAR

Continued from Page 2

reorganization of industry, so the final result of all this is, that the citizens of the Soviet Union will have to wait a long time before the new rulers keep their promises, if at all.

The Pessimists and the Optimists

Another group of people, on the other hand, is of the opinion that the new rulers in Moscow are well able to follow their new economic course, which, by the further expansion of the heavy industries, they will be able to guarantee the necessary priority of the light industries and chiefly the production of consumption goods. These people point out that the Soviet Union, during the years 1928 to 1953, has developed its basic industries to such an extent, that it has now become the second strongest industrial power of the world. The production-level of these industries, they add, which incidentally form the basic of Soviet national economy, is already so high at the present time that it is not only possible, but also imperative to develop the other industries accordingly. For this reason they maintain that there is every prospect of a market improvement in the supply-level, in view of the large natural resources of the Soviet Union, and also in the social status of the population

being effected. The conclusions drawn as to the future, of course, vary considerably.

One group is of the opinion that the purchasing power of the Soviet masses will increase as soon as the production-level of consumption goods, including industrial consumption goods, becomes adequate, and that this purchasing power will not only catch up with the purchasing power level of the most prosperous countries in the world, but will actually overtake it. Such a development would be of considerable significance, in view of the danger of a big economic crisis in the Western countries which is regarded as inevitable, by the Russians. Lippman has also been quoted to state that the conflict between East and West is becoming an economic conflict, to an ever-increasing degree. Therefore the defeat of the Western countries is regarded as a certainty, if the East, by expanding its industries succeed in becoming economically superior to the West.

Another group is more optimistic, however, and regards this problem not only from the purely economic but also from the psychological aspect. In their opinion an improvement in the standard of living of the Soviet population, would not only benefit the latter, but also the Western world. The citizens of the Soviet Union, once they have sufficient to eat and possess a certain amount of private property—whereby, to draw a comparison with every normal person, their appetite increases as they eat—will not only continue to yearn for such luxuries

ship, respect and equality, based on the foundations of justice and true culture. The Ukrainian nation only then would regard war as un'awful and criminal, as international war would become a hideous crime.

The Ukrainian Nation has no other choice

The Ukrainian nation would welcome a war which would liberate them and other subjugated nations from their present bondage, and help towards the destruction of the most sinister power the world has even known. They would gladly and eagerly join forces with such liberating progressive world powers, and would cooperate most loyally in an alliance.

But a war with any other aims against the Russo-bolsheviks would be ignored or denied—such a war the Ukrainian nation would regard as a fresh slaughtering and only in the interests of imperialistic powers. Such a war the Ukrainian nation would try to use for her own purpose in the way of developing and displaying her own powers, and would reserve her opinion of the adversaries of U.S.S.R.

depending on their attitude to the cause of Ukrainian independence.

The Ukrainian nation is fully aware of all the horrors of a new war. The guilt for this new tragedy to mankind falls entirely upon the Russo-bolshevik imperialists. But at the same time the conditions of the subjugation and enslavement of Ukraine by the Russo-bolshevik oppressors is itself a worse tragedy, by the continuous annihilation of hundreds of thousands of the best patriots of Ukraine in bolshevik prisons and concentration camps, and the dire poverty and half-starvation, which will bring about total national extinction. The Ukrainian nation has only the choice between the terror of the Russo-bolshevik slavery, or the horror of war. It is possible that the third world war will bring liberation. Until then there is not the slightest hope of any alleviation from the horror of Russo-bolshevik domination, and they would rather suffer from another war than exist under present conditions. Such is the hate for the Bolsheviks and the hope for the better future.

as refrigerators and cars but also for freedom... and herein lies the source of the gradual disintegration of the present regime.

Moscow's Political Aims

In our opinion it would be wrong to examine and consider the problem of the new economic course of the Soviet Union as a thing apart from Soviet policy in general. Any discussion of this problem must be primarily based on an examination of the political aims of the Kremlin, which are directed towards permanent expansion, and in principle, are not only based on the maintenance of its present property and its internal strength, but chiefly on the further expansion of its sphere of influence. It would be stupid to allow oneself to be deceived, as is so very often done in the West, by tactical fluctuations in the Soviets' foreign and home policy. For instance, in the Soviet Budget for 1954 the fact that the funds assigned for defence purposes amounting to 110.2 billion roubles are 3 per cent less, than those assigned for this purpose in 1952 (113.8 billion), does not by any means indicate that there really is a decrease in armaments. It must be borne in mind that this difference of 3 per cent, which in any case is only a very rough estimate, is balanced by the cut in prices for foodstuffs and consumption goods for the Soviet Army. Furthermore the fact must not be overlooked that Moscow has been rearming steadily since the end of the war, whereas the Western countries have lost a few years' time in this respect. This means that the demand in various branches of rearmament has already been met, whilst in other branches the development of new standardized models, is, probably, to be expected. In addition, there are also large capital reserves available in the form of "other expences", which have increased from 43. billion roubles in 1952 to 83.7 billion roubles in 1953, and which will no doubt be used for the armament industry. It is by no means a coincidence that Malenkov stated in his speech on August 8, 1953, that "the Soviet Union would produce 400 million metres of silk in the year 1953, which is more than five times the amount produced in the year 1940", whereas the production of cotton textiles has only increased by 34 per cent as compared to 1940 and woollen textiles by 70 per cent. It can be assumed that this enormous increase in silk production is directly connected with parachute operations, which during, and since the second World War, have increased very considerably in importance.

The Last Stage

The next few years are regarded by Moscow as being the last stage before the "final struggle" with the Western powers.

And during this last stage it is essential that the military and economic potential should not only be intensified, but also generally increased, and rounded off to form a co-ordinated and powerful entity. Emphasis must thus be placed on positive factors and as many negative factors as possible must be eliminated. It is therefore not only imperative that agricultural production should be increased in order to safeguard supplies for the Soviet Army now and in the future, but also that the social needs of the population be alleviated, a factor which is of equal importance to us in the struggle.

From 1928 to 1940 Moscow succeeded in building up a vast industry, and produced 166 million tons of coal, 31 million tons of petroleum, 18.3 million tons of crude steel, and 48 billion kilowatts of electric power. This achievement was only possible by untold sacrifices, such as have never before been made, in the course of history. Bearing out Stalin's theory and policy, of the primary importance of the production of producers' goods, 70 per cent of the entire capital reserves were invested in the heavy industry during the years 1929 to 1953, according to Malenkov's statements, and all the other branches of industry were entirely neglected or even sacrificed. The people who were neglected and sacrificed most, however, were the citizens of the Soviet Union who were forced to become slaves for this industrial system, and were deprived of all human and personal rights and privileges. Economic and political aims were co-ordinated, a fact which resulted in the genocide of the non-Russian people and vast compulsory labour system. During World War II, however, huge factories and combines alone, proved to be insufficient, and had Hitler not followed such an unreasonable policy in the occupied territories, as far as the non-Russian peoples were concerned (particularly the Ukrainians and Byelorussians) and had material help not been forthcoming from the Western powers, Russia's collapse would have been inevitable.

Internal Weakness

Two factors constitute the internal weakness of the Soviet monster. First, the contrast between the Russian element, which became the main support of the new empire and the non-Russian people in the U.S.S.R. and in the satellite states, and secondly, the material and social distress of the population. The first problem is found in catchwords such as "the friendship of the Soviet peoples", "the love of the younger brother (Ukrainians, Georgians, Poles, etc.) for the elder brother" (the Russians) "who are the bravest and the cleverest of all, who have invented practically everything, and

from whom all things can be learned", as opposed to catchwords such as, "bourgeois nationalism", "attempts to create strife between brother-nations", and "agents of Western imperialists", etc.

The second problem is camouflaged, as the "prosperity of the workers in the Soviet Union", which is increasing "from year to year", and already far surpasses the standard of living of workers in the Western countries. And, incidentally, these assertions are made despite the revelations on the part of Comrades Khrushchov and Mikojan, and the daily reports published in the Soviet press, which are in complete contrast.

Since the Russian chauvinist element in Kremlin can assert itself undisturbed, now that Beria has been removed from office, Stalin's successors are at present endeavouring to remedy this weakness, at least as far as one factor is concerned, by resorting to social and economic measures. They probably think that if the standard of living of the masses is improved to a certain extent, national tension will also be lessened, and the recent riots in the German Eastern Zone and in Czechoslovakia have strengthened their belief in this respect. They feel that any political concessions would undermine the enslaved states. For this reason they continue to adhere to their old policy, as far as questions of nationalities are concerned.

It is doubtful whether this reasoning on the part of Moscow is correct. Because we should like to stress that the so-called New Economic Policy (N.E.P.) in Ukraine during the twenties, furthered the cultural and political development of Ukraine and was definitely directed towards a split with Moscow. It was only by new terrorism, political persecution, and a systematically planned famine in 1933, that Moscow was able to prevent this from happening.

Mikojan's Promises

To judge from the main aspect of Soviet propaganda, and the zeal and frequency with which they are propounded, it would appear that the production of consumption goods, really is the foremost task and aim of the Soviet rulers. In addition to the statements made by Malenkov and Khrushchov, the Minister of Trade of the U.S.S.R., Mikojan, also made a significant speech on October 17, 1953, Comrade Mikojan, was mainly concerned with the elaboration of the details of the promises already made by Malenkov, which promised the citizens of the Soviet Union a great deal. He summed up the main theory of his speech as follows: "There can be no doubt that, after successfully solving the problem of the expansion of the heavy industries, we shall rapidly promote the expansion of the

production of consumption goods. Then, we will be the most prosperous country in the world since we shall ensure the highest possible standard of living for the people".

According to his statements, the highest possible standard of living will be reached as follows:

"The increase in the production of foodstuffs in 1955 as compared to 1950, will amount to 84.7 per cent, as compared to the increase of 71.4 per cent, provided by the Five Years' Plan in the programme of the XIX Party Congress. At the same time, higher figures have been fixed for the first year of the next Five Years' Plan, that is, for the year 1956".

"In 1955 the state-controlled industry for our country alone will turn out more than 2.5 million tons of meat, and in 1956, 3 million tons; in 1955 it will turn out 850,000 tons of sausage and in 1956 1 million tons. It will produce 560,000 tons of butter in 1955 and 650,000 tons in 1956."

"Within the next few years there will be a considerable increase in the production of chocolate and chocolate goods. In 1956 twelve times more chocolate will be manufactured than in 1940, and 3.5 times more biscuits."

"Production of industrial goods, to meet the needs of the population, will increase by approximately 50 per cent during the next three years."

In 1955, for example, 3,445,000 bicycles will be manufactured, 4,527,000 wireless and television sets, 330,000 electric refrigerators, 64,000 tons of aluminium utensils, and 16,500,000 metal beds.

"In 1956 the production of bicycles will amount to 3.8 million, that is to say fourteen times the production in 1940, whilst the number of watches manufactured in 1956 will amount to 23 million, which is practically nine times the number manufactured in 1940," and so forth.

Mikojan's speech also contained a number of other promises, as follows: improvement in the quality of mass consumption goods and a wider range of choice, and increased facilities for transporting such goods by rail; further erection of 372 bakeries within the next three years, the building of prefabricated houses, and the manufacture of glass for windows; during the years 1954 to 1956, 11,000 new restaurants to be opened as well as eating houses, snack-bars, and other types of public canteens; the manufacture of washing-machines, vacuum-cleaners, potato-peelers, washing-machines for crockery, and even electric pans and various other utensils used in the home, including the improvement of service in the shops and restaurants.

In order to accustom the citizens of the Soviet Union to this state of "prosp-

erity" as quickly as possible, the purchasing power of the masses has been raised by a cut in the retail prices of mass consumption goods, by a reduction in state loans, and in agrarian taxes, and in the field of agriculture by an increase in initial prices, and various other measures.

New Soviet "Prosperity"

Andre Pierre a Frenchman, went to the trouble of working out exactly what the "luxury" amounted to, as promised to the citizens of the Soviet Union by Mikoian. The results of his calculations appeared in an article in "Le Monde" of November 8, 1953. According to these calculations the "surplus" achieved per head of the population will amount to 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ ounces of meat, 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ounces of sausage, and 1 $\frac{7}{8}$ ounces of butter per week in 1956, provided the Kremlin is able to realize to the full extent its plans and aims.

The prospects are fairly hopeless for supplies of industrial consumption goods. According to official statements the amount of consumption goods available per head in the year 1955 as far as clothes and shoes are concerned will be as follows: cotton textiles 26.7 metres, woollen textiles 1.1 metres, shoes 1.5 pairs. The figures for 1950 in this connection were: 17.4 metre of cotton textiles, 0.7 metre of woollen textiles, and 1 pair of shoes. Anyone who saw how the Soviet citizens in the towns and in the country were attired in the year 1950 is hardly likely to be stirred to enthusiasm by the new statistics for the year 1955.

It is hardly worth mentioning articles like sewing-machines, bicycles, and wireless sets, which will continue to some extent to be luxury articles in the Soviet Union. And the same applies to an even greater extent to refrigerators, television-sets, motor-cycles, motor-cars and such like, which in any case are only destined for the ruling class of this "society without classes".

Moreover, it must not be overlooked that all these improvements are dependent on a very big "if". The Western countries, therefore, need hardly fear that the standard of living of the workers in the Soviet Union will be higher than their own in a few years' time. But, sceptically, it would be wrong to affirm that things will remain as they are.

"UKRAINIAN OBSERVER"

of the

UKRAINIAN INFORMATION
SERVICE (U.I.S.)

published by

Ukrainian Publishers Ltd.,

237, Liverpool Rd.,

London, N.1. Tel. NORTH 1828.

Double Dependence

It is obvious, in view of present production-level of the light industries, the increase in production of mass consumption goods of every kind, is dependent on two factors. Cuts in the production of heavy industries and an increase in agricultural production. The prospects are by no means very hopeful. Since the Soviet Union aims to keep peace with the Western countries and in particular with the U.S.A., it will, according to Mikoian's statements, "rapidly promote the expansion of the heavy industries in the future too." It is not surprising therefore, that so far there has been no indication of an increase in the production of light industries, in accordance with the plans announced, prior to Stalin's death. This also applies to those factories which are in the process of being erected or only on drawing boards. The prospects are even worse for the production-level of agriculture.

In fact Khrushchov himself described the situation as catastrophic. It is extremely doubtful that Mikoian's statement to the effect that a cook is "one of the co-workers in food provisioning with a great deal of responsibility, and whose profession is one of the most honourable and respected", will ensure that the foods, too, will be "honourable and respected." Food is needed more than fine phrases... And the same applies to Mikoian's statement regarding the reduction of prime production and circulation costs (during the years 1951 to 1955 the latter are to be reduced by 23 per cent), the importance of state-controlled trade inspections and social control by means of trades union, the improvement of service in shops, and so forth, all of which measures are to improve the standard of living. In addition to these material difficulties, we should also like to point out that various psychological problems are involved. The Soviet citizen is expected to re-adjust himself and to produce more and higher-quality work. The fact must not, however, be overlooked that he has become accustomed to the "methods" of the past twenty-five years.

As previously stated, it would, however, be wrong to assume that conditions will remain as they are. The average citizen is slightly better off now than he was previously. The bread-supply, at least, is practically adequate, in relation to Soviet conditions. A certain increase was already provided for in the Five Years' Plan, prior to Stalin's death, in the production of foodstuffs and of the light industries and this is now being partly effected.

Attempts are being made to solve the problems of the transition-period by resorting to available stocks and clearance sales, gold reserves, as well as to the im-

port of consumption goods. Malenkov paid great attention to world trade, in his speech on August 8, 1953.

In addition, there is to be an expansion in the production of certain articles, manufactured by the factories of the Ministries of Defence, Aviation, Engineering and Smelting. Moreover, it is probable that a small portion out of "other expenses" in the budget, will be allocated for this purpose.

All this will result in a certain improvement in the standard of living in the Soviet Union, as compared to previous years, but it will not be a standard which includes any luxuries or is anything like the normal average standard of living in the Western countries. As the Soviet citizen has been used to almost inhuman privations for many years, of which the Western countries still have no idea, he will, in spite of everything, come to the conclusion that conditions under Malenkov's rule are somewhat better than they were under Stalin's rule. In this way, too, many people will set their hopes on even better conditions in the future. This is precisely the aim of the Kremlin.

It is very obvious that preferential treatment is being given particularly to the Russian people in this plan. It is shown in the figures of the budget and by the sale in Moscow and Leningrad of a limited number of television-sets, vacuum-cleaners, and even prefabricated houses. Whereas in the Ukraine, according to Mikoian's statements, "the commercial network has not yet been completely re-established" as it has so far only reached about 88.3 per cent of its pre-war level. Mikoian's excuse, that wartime events are responsible will deceive no one who knows that national suppression and economic exploitation, go hand in hand as far as Russian policy is concerned.

Psychological Warfare

Present events in the Soviet Union are also of especial significance in the psychological war. The West, strange to say, in its strategy of the cold war, has so far made no use at all of the national tension which exists in the Soviet Union. It is the most important weakness of the Soviets, and by no making use of it, the West have followed a very pro-Russian policy. They have neglected the nations subjugated by Moscow and have often disheartened them in their struggle for independence and freedom. The psychological weapons of the West, according to the political and tendentious conception of Russian emigrants, were mainly directed against the material need which exists in the Soviet Union.

It is high time that the cold war strategy was revised, and concentrated to a greater degree, on the national problem of the U.S.S.R.

Z. Poray

FIGHTING THE AMERICAN-RUSSOPHILS

RUSSIAN EMIGRES AND THEIR FRIENDS IN THE U.S.A. CONTINUE TO DEFEND THEIR IMPERIALISTIC VIEWS

One of the most disquieting, or even dangerous, traits in American political thinking of today is, in our view, the continued pro-Russian attitude. American public opinion fortunately has lost its war-time feeling of "love the Soviets." The "Great Ally" with whom it was expected to build up a new millennium of peaceful and prosperous world-wide relations, proved to be the instigator of a diabolical "Cold War" that the history of mankind has ever known. One of the biggest shocks was the discovery that the "Great Ally" was aware of the innermost working and vital secrets of the U.S.A. In spite of this the pro-Russian feeling persisted in the U.S.A. American public opinion felt that, a "clear distinction" should be made between the Soviets. The communists and the bolsheviks were their real enemies, and the nice, friendly Russians, who are anti-communists and anti-bolsheviks, are therefore—"peaceful democrats." The prime aim of American policy has been to render to these "constructive Russian forces" the best possible aid and assistance.

Up till now the vast majority of Americans do not realise that all Russians, whatever their creed have the one object in mind which is the furtherance of their "Holy Empire." The Russian democrats are trying to penetrate American life in the same way as the Soviet agents.

It seems inconceivable that Americans would willingly and voluntarily assist at the preservation and the extension of Russian imperialism. On the contrary, the present American policy apparently is to check the spread of Russian world domination. Each American-Russophile is working against this policy by turning the war-time trend of "love the Soviets", into the post-war trend of "love the Russian democrats."

Mr. Alexander Kerensky wrote in 1943 in *Novy Zhurnal* (No. 5) an obituary for the late leader of the Russian party of constitutional-democrats, Mr. Milukov, the much publicized leader of the Russian exiled democrats in the U.S.A., and head of the short-lived Russian Provisional Government in 1917, as follows: "Russia is the geographical backbone of history, and should exist by her strength and power no matter who rules or how she is ruled. From this comes his (Milukov's) testament for us:

to be on watchful guard for Russia—no matter what her name is—absolutely, unconditionally and to the last breath."

We are unable to see a difference in essence between these words of Messrs. Kerensky and Milukov, and those published in "Pravda" upon Stalin's death: "The ardent, selfless support which the Soviet Government enjoyed in the difficult war years from all peoples of the U.S.S.R.—and especially the confidence displayed by the Great Russian people, the leaders amongst the peoples of our country—was the decisive force which ensured for our country the unbreakable unity and the historic victory over the first enemy of mankind,—fascism..."

And even George F. Kennan, one of the outstanding Russophiles, in an unguarded moment wrote: "... The Russians are always ready to sacrifice their personal freedom and dignity in order to dominate others, in order to call new areas Russian and to have other peoples as their slaves."

Being aware that the Russian bolshevik and the Russian democratic imperialistic aims and tendencies are identical the Ukrainians are continuing their almost desperate fight to help the Americans to see all brands of Russian imperialism in their true light.

This applies first of all to the pro-Russian policy of the "private" American Committee for the Liberation of Bolshevism, guided by Adm. Leslie C. Stevens (Ret). Nothing has changed on this front in the last three months. The A.C.L.B. still perseveres with its principle of "non-predetermination", which practically means that the Americans refuse to interfere with the decision of whether Russia should remain a compulsory empire, dominated by the Muscovites, or should be divided into self-determining sovereign national states, according to the will of those nations. As the Muscovites are holding their empire by brute force and show no sign of relaxation, Admiral Stevens' policy, of "non-predetermination" is tantamount, although maybe involuntary, tremendous help to Russian imperialism. The policy of "non-predetermination" is as if somebody seeing a robber plundering his victim, instead of rendering help, would declare his "non-intervention."

On October 9, 1953 Mr. Alexander Kerensky published a letter in the *New York Times* attacking the liberation, or

as he sees fit to denounce it, the "separatist" policy of non-Russians of the U.S.S.R. and also assailing Americans who are friendly to these liberating endeavours. Professor Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, replied in a letter to the *New York Times* on October 20, 1953 by revealing the workings of "American-Russophiles" in American society and public life. Calling for an investigation concerning these activities, Prof. Dobriansky wrote that—"this investigation would furnish an excellent opportunity for the American public to witness the extent to which pro-Russian interests in this country have captured not only this Committee (i. e. A.C.L.B.), but also many of our institutions. The Harvard Russian Research Centre, the Ford Foundation, the many Russian Institutes at our various universities, the Library of Congress and our Intelligence schools would be implicated for there is sufficient evidence to confirm the presence and dangerous influence in each of these. The fundamentals to which Mr. Kerensky alludes, and the processes and techniques by which the pro-Russians have established themselves would receive a wholesome and long overdue public airing."

Criticizing the A.C.L.B., Prof. Dobriansky continues in his letter: "The failure of the American Committee in uniting the Russians and non-Russians may be viewed as an unsuccessful laboratory test in our treatment of peoples and problems as related to the Soviet Union. In preparation for the future we might well begin to consider a formula in keeping with the moral principles underlying our own tradition. The uncorrupted formula of national self-determination insures for the Russian nation and its 92 million people, the right to determine for itself the desired ends of democracy, the basic freedoms, economic prosperity, and equal sovereignty of nations. It insures for the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. the equal right to determine their independent statehoods, their own governments, the utilization of their own resources, and their democratic freedoms... It is to our enlightened interest, not only for victory in war, but even now for the prevention of war, to support the aspirations of these "separatists" whose heroic patriotism parallels that of our early American "separatists" who founded a national state, free and independent of an empire."

Taking up the controversy "The Washington Post" of November 4, 1953, published an editorial—"Russians and Ukrainians", and simultaneously another letter of Prof. Lev Dobriansky—"Soviet minorities again." "The Washington

Post" agreed with Adm. Stevens and the A.C.L.B., endorsing the formula of "non-predetermination." It seems that "The Washington Post", too, is unaware of the fact that this formula, in practice, greatly aids the Russian imperialists.

The "Washington Post" editorial was the reason of Adm. Stevens' exultant "release" of November 20, 1953. It stated that "The emigrés from Soviet territories should be struck by the fact that when the issue, which divides the emigrés and blocks their getting together to work jointly in the anti-bolshevik struggle, was set forth in detail by the contending sides in independent American newspapers, the editors unhesitatingly adopted the point of view of the American Committee. There was no contact between the *Washington Post* and the Committee and the latter in no way influenced the editors in writing their editorial. Their views were the instinctive reaction of fair-minded, objective Americans, and this should serve as a warning to self-seeking elements amongst the emigrés. It tells them that the policy consistently adhered to by the American Committee of self-determination, with no pre-determination, is one which conforms strictly to traditional American concepts and which will command the general support of public circles in the United States".

Though indirect, this is, of course, American soil.

A session of the "National Conference of Freedom and Peace through Liberation" organized by Congressman O. K. Armstrong took place in Washington, on December 4th, 1953. Some 200 representatives of various American organizations were present, and especially, many experts in Russian and bolshevik affairs. Americans, of Ukrainian descent, were represented by the President of the "Ukrainian Congress Committee of America", Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, and the Messrs. M. Piznak, S. Yarema and Prof. N. Chubaty. Messrs. M. Lebed and S. Antonovych represented the "Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council"; Dr. N. Procyk and Dr. O. Sokolyshyn represented the "Antibolshevik Block of Nations"; V. Omelchenko and V. Koval represented the "Ukrainian Youth Association of America." There were also present such outstanding Americans as Admiral Mentz (Ret.), Congressman Fine, Ambassador Hornbeck, Eugene Lyons, and Professor Kendal from Yale University.

The theme at the conference was: "Where is the hard core and the sources of power of bolshevism and how to fight this world peril?" A very interesting discussion followed at which, obviously, such prominent pro-Russians as Mr. Eugene Lyons, and the Russian Jesuit,

Russian Agents and Spies

In our last month's issue of "Ukrainian Observer" (December 1953), appeared an article "Preparations for the next Russian Empire" in which we showed that bolshevik infiltration was working powerfully inside the "Nationalno-Trudovy Soyuz" (The National Laborite Union; one of the most powerful Russian political parties in exile), and in other Russian political emigré organizations.

The scarcity of space in this issue only allows to reveal some of the outstanding scandals.

The most sensational which became known, was the discovery that one of the most prominent leaders of the N.T.S., Mr. George Müller, alias Nikita Vladimirovich Khorunshy, was a highly placed bolshevik agent and spy. He penetrated deeply not only the N.T.S. but also won the confidence of decisive American and West-German authorities. His task, as ordered by high Soviet intelligence officers, was not only to collect valuable information in Western Germany, but also to persuade the Russian emigré organization and the American authorities to activities as desired by the Kremlin government. For almost 5 years Müller-Khorunshy was successful in his work. He directed the N.T.S. as he wished and also duped the American Counter Intelligence Corps and occupation authorities in Western Germany. He was a gladly accepted guest in some American and German homes. Finally he was caught and imprisoned; tried in Frankfurt/Main, Western Germany, on December

4, 1953, under charges of espionage and agents work. At the time of writing this article his trial has not yet finished. His German wife, Frau Elisabeth Müller-Khorunshy, was also put on trial.

Müller-Khorunshy arrived in Germany during 1948, working in a factory in an autopark, then in a typewriter factory in Frankfurt. He soon showed his Russian compatriots his political gifts and organizational ability. So began his rapid rise, which in 4 years led him to the commanding position in N.T.S. He was greatly helped by Georgy Klimov, a fugitive Soviet Army major, who organized the latest fugitives and deserters from the Soviet army into a vast political party. Müller-Khorunshy's position was further strengthened and protected by two other outstanding Russian emigré politicians, the President of the N.T.S., Mr. Victor Baydalakov, and its vice-President, Mr. Vladimir Poremsky. But N.T.S. was only the starting point for Müller-Khorunshy. He had close contacts with the C.I.C., and other U.S.A. military authorities. He also had close contacts with the Munich department of the "American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism". He co-operated with Mr. Manning H. William, the director of "Radio Liberation" in Munich, sponsored by the A.C.L.B.—and soon became in Western Germany one of the decisive authorities in the American field of psychological warfare against—bolshevism.

In the middle of 1952 Müller-Khorunshy became the lecturer at the "N.T.S. school of anti-bolshevik agents" at 57, Kaiser Friedrich Strasse, Bad Homburg; and also a scholar at the "Institute for Research of the Soviet Union", in Bad Homburg, under the guidance of Prof. R. N. Redlich. At the "N.T.S. school of agents" Müller-Khorunshy indoctrinated his victims, who, after they have finished their courses, were sent behind the Iron Curtain, and simultaneously, delivering them into the hands of the Soviet M.G.B. (the Soviet counter-intelligence). It is not known exactly and probably never will be known, how many people Müller-Khorunshy knowingly sent to their death, in this way. His most brilliant achievement, it is thought, was the death of four anti-communist agents who were parachuted, from an "unknown plane" into Ukraine, and then instantaneously caught by the Soviets and after a short trial—shot. A week later, Mr. Andrey Vyshinsky related

Rev. Urussoff, defended the idea that the Russian empire is a "voluntary association" of free nations and it would be "in defiance of American interests" to try to dismember this "historically grown national entity." How the Christian conscience of the Rev. Urussoff is saved by placing himself in the same imperialistic camp with Mr. Malenkov is for him to decide. Yet the general opinion of the rally rather preferred to place itself on the side of true liberty and freedom: against the Russian empire and for the liberation. It cannot be expected that the firmly entrenched American-Russophiles would quickly or easily abandon their positions. It will be a long and hard fight to induce the Americans to recognize that the really hard core of Russian world danger lies not only in bolshevism, but in Russian chauvinistic imperialism.

But the truth is gaining ground.

with obvious relish and satisfaction, the whole affair in New York, before the United Nations. This affair was exactly what the Kremlin needed, in order to be able to assail the U.S.A. of "warmongering", "interventionist" and other anti-Soviet activities. Müller-Khorunshy thought of the idea; the N.T.S., mobilized the men; the Americans, allegedly, evolved the methods and the Soviets—the gallows.

It is hard to say how many more "anti-Soviet" activities of this kind were instigated by Müller-Khorunshy and other Soviet agents, working inside the N.T.S., and other Russian emigré organizations, or how far the other leaders of the Russian emigré organizations are knowingly involved. For instance, at the trial in Munich, in 1952 of another Soviet spy, a Mr. Chirkovich, it became known that the leaders of N.T.S., Messrs. Baydalakov, Poremsky and Pirang, knew of Chirkovich's contacts with Korchakov, Yankovsky and Angorievich, high Soviet intelligence officials, but kept silent. It is known, that N.T.S. was sponsored by certain American "private circles", with unlimited financial backing and which imbued American "experts on psychological warfare" with the ideas and conception of the indivisibility of Russia. However absurd the idea is, the question remains now that the affair of Müller-Khorunshy has been brought to light, exactly how far the Kremlin is directing the "American" psychological warfare against bolshevism through its Russian agents in Western Germany.

No one knows the Russians better than they know themselves. Consequently it is interesting when they start to reveal their innermost secrets, by their internal party struggles and factional differences. The N.T.S.' mishap with Müller-Khorunshy brought many such revelations. Thus under the protection of N.T.S., a "Central Association of the Post-War Emigrants from U.S.S.R." was created, with headquarters in Munich. The leader of this C.O.P.E. (Russian capitals) is Georgy Klimov, the fugitive Soviet major. An "open letter" signed by five other Soviet officers and officials, was published recently, which has the stamp of veracity although written by fugitives. According to this, Major Klimov is not a post-war fugitive. As, in 1944 he was already in Stuttgart; in 1945 he repatriated voluntarily to the U.S.S.R.; worked for 2 years in Karlshorst with Russian Occupation High Command in Western Germany; was promoted to an inspector --and in 1947 emerged in Western Germany as a leader of —N.T.S. He wrote a book, "The Berlin Kremlin" which won for him the confidence of the German and American authorities. It is

An Objective Picture

REVIEW OF THE LATEST AMERICAN LITERATURE ON EAST-EUROPEAN PROBLEMS

Public opinion in the U.S.A. on the problems of Eastern European peoples has, up to now, been influenced by opinions expressed by various pro-Russian writers in America, as for instance, Eugene Lyons, and the second part of George F. Kennan's "American Diplomacy 1900 - 1950." Their case, however, cannot be sustained in a serious discussion or argument.

This was brought out when George F. Kennan refused to take part in a television discussion with Professor Lev Dobriansky on the theories he had advanced so far. Not only his refusal to take part in a discussion of this kind, which must appear extremely questionable to any democratic citizen, but also the publication of various objective works and articles on the Eastern European problems, points to the fact that there is probably a difference of public opinion in America on the subject of the present

conflict between Russian imperialist circles and the Ukrainians. A pro-Russian attitude is also reflected in Leslie C. Stevens' book, "Russian Assignment", published this year and from which extracts have been printed in "Atlantic." This author still adheres to the obsolete theory of the independence of Communism as an international concept, and tries most assiduously to draw a sharp dividing-line between bolshevism and the fundamental principles of Russian imperialism. His arguments are, for the most part, similar to George F. Kennan's views on this subject. He persists in the erroneous opinion that the Russian element is blameless, and is inclined to regard all that is Russian, as "good, free and easy, or, at worst, naive."

In a recent article entitled "Russians and Ukrainians," the "Washington Post" supported this author on his political activity as chairman of the A.C.L.B., and regarding the controversy between Mr. Alexander Kerensky and Prof. Lev Dobriansky expressed an obviously pro-Russian attitude to the relations between Russia and Ukraine. This we would rather have it as "Russians or Ukrainians"? That is the query which the American public, and in particular, American writers are called upon to answer at the present time.

Fortunately there is another section, which, does not adhere to the imperialist conception of a greater Russia. This section is all the more noteworthy, because although its supporters are not yet numerous and their views have not, as yet, been accepted for America's foreign policy, they do nevertheless include several well-known representatives of the academic world and some objective writers.

One of them is Professor Hans Kohn, who has just published a new work, entitled "Pan-Slavism; its history and ideology," (1953) in which he presents an objective contribution to the history of political theories in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century. American readers will learn from this book that democratic and liberal political ideas were then most strongly represented in Ukraine, whereas an authoritarian attitude and a clear tendency to totalitarianism are typical of Russian thought.

Hans Kohn has made notable contributions in his recent book-reviews. He severely criticizes Eugene Lyons' latest book, "Our Secret Allies", by objecting

a known bolshevik trait to allow their agents to publish such "revelations", to give them the needed security; for instance, Müller-Khorunshy was allowed to deliver to the American C.I.C. some minor Russian spies in Western Germany. Another fact is that Klimov in the meantime, succeeded in thoroughly desorganizing many Russian emigré organizations.

The "Open Letter" also reveals the activities of other Soviet agents in the N.T.S., such as J. Kronzas, F. Arnold-Kurbatov, N. Lilakevich.

There was another scandal concerning Mstyslav Volonsevich the Archimandrite of the Russian Orthodox Church, who headed a large parish community in Western Berlin. He became very interested in the life of his parishioners, collected detailed personal data, and was deeply involved in their emigré party politics, supported and instigated a whole series of right-wing activities—and one day vanished behind the Iron Curtain, with his lists, data and the parish cash (600.—Deutsche Mark). He was later in Karlshorst, the seat of the Soviet High Command for Eastern Germany.

Why it is that *only the Russians*, and rarely Balts, or Ukrainians, or Caucasians are doing intelligence or agent's work for the Kremlin? The answer is simple. The Russians are working for their common cause: the preservation of their empire. It is no difference whether they are doing it directly for the Kremlin, or indirectly, through their emigré political organizations.

to the subjective, one-sided, and tendentious expression, "Russian peoples." He gave a very favourable review of Professor Waldemar Gurian's latest book, "Soviet Imperialism and Its Origin and Tactics; Symposium 1953", which gives a thorough and academic examination of this subject, and in its unbiased attitude, might well serve as a text book.

A similar book was published in 1952, by Professor Waldemar Gurian, entitled "Bolshevism, An Introduction to Soviet Communism", which created a considerable stir in Russophil circles, by the assertion that Russian imperialism and present-day bolshevism could not be considered as two different things. Even unbiased circles in the U.S.A. are gradually admitting that the two ideologies are connected, and that the latter is actually based on Russian imperialism. The American public is slowly but surely gaining an objective impression of the quintessence of Russian imperialism, which in the shape of bolshevism, is now beginning to be regarded as a menace by the Western countries.

The report, by Perle Mesta, the American woman-diplomat, of her journey to Russia, has likewise had positive results and has definitely exposed the lie about the "equal status of all peoples in the U.S.S.R." American journalists and writers are, to an ever increasing degree, now beginning to have an open-minded view of the Russian problem and the position of the subjugated nations, particularly that of the Ukrainians. This can be seen from the lengthy article on Russia published by "Time" on November 30, 1953. This is the first time that the American press has given a clear picture of Nikita S. Khrushchev, a Russian, who has pursued an imperialist policy in Ukraine, and in his methods of cruelty and terrorism strongly resembles Russian despots like Ivan the Terrible.

It will be seen therefore that a new tendency is making itself felt in American political thought, which is led by well-known men of learning, and unbiased writers and journalists. It will give the American public an objective picture of Eastern European political problems. Fundamentally, this picture will agree with Ukrainian views. It will be objective, and that is what is urgently needed now.

Jaroslav Z. Pelenskyj

New Political Line of the Soviet Academy of Science

The results of the supplementary elections held on October 23, 1953, by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. were for the most part obvious, but some were surprising. It was to be expected from the outset that certain changes would be undertaken, as these were the first elections of their kind since Stalin's death, but it was not for foreseen to what extent. The number of newly "appointed persons" to hold office in the field of Soviet Russian learning is somewhat startling, —51 new "actual members" and about three times as many new "corresponding members"! Not even in the twenties when the former Petersburg Academy of Science was compulsorily incorporated into the so-called Moscow Communist Academy of Science was the number of personnel increased to such an extent. It is even more astonishing how the new academicians are grouped according to their subjects.

Compared to former Academy elections it was expected the lion's share of the distribution of academic titles would have gone to the representatives of the specifically "Marxist Leninist" sciences, to the disciples of Marxist philosophy and economy, or to the Leninist and Stalinist students of history, constitutions, and law. But this was by no means the case! At the bottom of the list is the Department of Literature and Philology which has not a single new "actual member" to show, despite the zeal which Soviet Russian philologists propagated Russian chauvinism and Moscow's pan-Slavonic hegemony during the war and after. Next is the faculty of economics, philosophy, and law, which is the most Marxist department of Academy. The Kremlin has indicated that propaganda of this kind is one of the primary duties of a Russian philologist and not worthy of any special reward. It is not surprising that the few literary men, V. Adrianova-Peretz, D. Blagoy, and D. Likhachow, who have undeniably rendered Russian philology a great service, are obliged to be satisfied with the more modest title of "corresponding member". Philology has been regarded in the Soviet Union since the twenties as one of those unpopular sciences which are at best merely suffered.

It is true, that the department of economics, philosophy, and law, has received two new "actual members" (as against 13, received by the department of technical sciences, and 15 by the department of physics and mathematics), but both these

new "actual members" have been corresponding members" for many years, and, thereby hangs a tale! One of them, Professor K. Ostrovityanov, is an expert in the field of the interrelation of production and consumption in Soviet economy, which is of the utmost practical importance to the "Party and the Government" but has little to do with theoretical Marxism and Leninism. The other, Professor P. Yudin, is regarded as an expert on Soviet constitution, but has so far only been engaged in the purely practical field in this connection. At the time of the Belgrade Cominform he was Zhdanov's agent in the Balkan countries, and even his failure in Yugoslavia (mentioned in Tito's memoirs) did not prevent him from being promoted to the high position of Soviet ambassador, to the so-called German Democratic Republic. It would, of course, be difficult to withhold the title of "actual member" of the Academy from a man of learning of such repute!

The rest of the "Marxist Leninist" candidates have had to be satisfied with the titles of "corresponding members." Many of them have not even been appointed, including several who paraded their "dialectical and materialist" erudition and "orthodoxy" at the ceremonial assembly held by the Academy a short time before the elections, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Russian Bolshevik Party. The "Party and the Government" only needs such talent, on special occasions.

As compared to Stalin, the "omniscient man of learning", who removed unwelcome Marxist and Leninist adherents from the Academy and sent them to Siberian concentration camps, although still insisting on the furtherance of Marxist and Leninist doctrines, the practical minded Malenkov to all outward appearances, does not want theories about "the leading role of the working class" or about the "outstanding qualities of the Russian nation" from the Academy of Sciences, but purely practical work in technical and economic fields. These are of the utmost importance to the Kremlin, and naturally atomic physics hold first place among the subjects of physics, mathematics, and technics at the Academy. Electro-technics, metallurgy, geology, and mechanics are, however, also well-represented. A new innovation is the inclusion in agriculture (including the important branches of biology, botany, and soil-research), of a relatively large number of experts on practical economy (on no account "Maxist and Leninist

300th Anniversary of the Treaty of Pereyaslav

MOSCOW ORDERS VAST CELEBRATION

The entire Soviet Union was ordered by the Kremlin to celebrate with great pomp and display the 300th anniversary of the conclusion of the *Treaty of Pereyaslav*, on January 18, 1954. This order was issued concurrently by the Council of Ministers, the Supreme Soviet, and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of U.S.S.R. and the day declared a state holiday. Important speeches were made at the decreed parades and public manifesting in Moscow, but chiefly in Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine.

The ordered celebrations were—as the Russians put it—in honour of the “brotherly, and everlasting reunion of Ukraine with Russia.” In reality they will be the Russian celebrations of the incorporation of the free Ukrainian Kozak State into the growing Russian empire. The Ukrainian nation will mourn this fatal anniversary, as the day of the loss of her liberty, whatever the outward appearances might be.

The Treaty of Pereyaslav, was concluded on January 18, 1654 between the rulers of two independent states, *Alexey Romanov*, the Tsar of Russia, and *Bohdan Khmelnytsky*, the Hetman of Ukraine. By this treaty Ukraine, weakened and exhausted by 6 years of war against Poland for her liberation, recognized the sovereignty of the Tsar over her country, although still an independent state. The union was bound only through the person of the Tsar.

adherents”!), as foreshadowed a few months ago in the orders issued regarding an increase in agricultural production, which is faced by a crisis. The agricultural research institute of the Academy was severely reprimanded by the “highest authorities” (as the ceremonial assembly on October 30, 1953) because it had not devoted sufficient research to the “economic problems of the collective system (kolkhoses), including the management of Soviet estates, and machine and tractor depots.” It can be assumed that the measures announced by the Kremlin to further the increase of Soviet agriculture was not merely a propaganda trick. Whether the defects of this state and police-controlled activity can be balanced by “scientific” rationalization and intensification of production is, of course, another matter!

V. D.

This treaty was the result of the generations long struggle of Ukraine against Polish domination. *Bohdan Khmelnytsky* thought of this treaty in terms only of a close political, diplomatic and military alliance. He was under formidable pressure from the Polish armies and under duress of his “ally”, the Tartar Khan of Crimea, who alternatively helped the Poles and the Ukrainians. Since his accession to power, after his overwhelming victories over Poland in the years 1648, 1649 and 1650, *Khmelnytsky* always desired to form a great anti-Polish alliance with Sweden, Brandenburg (Prussian), Moldavia, and Transylvania. He had been having friendly negotiations with all of them for years in an attempt to gain their support against Poland, without success. The Polish pressure, especially after *Khmelnytsky's* heavy military defeat in 1651 at *Berestechko*, grew ever stronger, therefore he had been forced to seek help in Moscow.

Muscovy was eager to take part in the Ukrainian wars against Poland in order to regain for herself the territory she had lost during the “Times of Troubles.” Moscow decided to justify her intervention on the old and customary grounds of the “defence and protection of the Orthodox faith and people”. But the true political reasons lay more deeply, as the Muscovite statesmen were afraid that if the Poles reconquered Ukraine, their next aim would be to turn the Kozaks and the Tartars against Muscovy. The Muscovite “Zemski Sobor” (Generals of States) which met in Moscow in the autumn of 1653 took the decision that the Tsar was entitled “to accept under his high hand Hetman *Bohdan Khmelnytsky* and the entire Zaporozhian Host, with its cities and lands”, and authorized him to take them by force from Poland.

The Muscovites sent a delegation to *Khmelnytsky* to assure him that the Tsar would take him under “his protection” and would send an army in the spring of 1654 to help him against Poland. *Khmelnytsky*, surrounded by his nobles and officers, met the Muscovite delegation in January 1654, in the Ukrainian town of Pereyaslav, for negotiations. The Muscovites at once requested him to call an assembly of the entire Kozak Host to give formal recognition to the sovereignty of Moscow. According to the report by the Muscovite envoy, *Buturlin*—one of the rare records of these happenings—*Khmelnytsky* placed before the Kozaks the question of submission to the Tsar,

and received their assent. Then was read a declaration from the Tsar promising to maintain friendly relations with the Ukrainians and “to defend them from all their enemies.”

This is how the leading Ukrainian historian *Mykhaylo Hrushevsky*, describes the proceedings:

“The Muscovite delegates proposed that the whole assembly should go to the Cathedral to swear allegiance to the Tsar, but a dispute arose when *Khmelnytsky* requested that the Tsar’s representatives should first take an oath, in the name of the Tsar, that their ruler would not surrender Ukraine to Poland, and would defend the land from its enemies, leaving intact Ukrainian rights and privileges—similar to the oath the Polish Kings were accustomed to make in their ‘pacta conventa’, upon assuming office. This proposal was refused, as their Tsar, they said, was an autocrat who ruled according to his own will and did not make pledges to his subjects. Although his reply caused great dissatisfaction amongst the Kozak officers, they finally swore unconditional allegiance in order to avoid breaking off negotiations. The envoys then sent agents to administer the oath of allegiance to all the inhabitants in the cities and villages of Ukraine under Kozak rule.” (M. Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941).

It is very interesting that hardly any documents have been preserved in Moscow shedding any clear light upon these happenings; Ukraine, repeatedly plundered and scorched, was not in the position to preserve her most important and valuable state documents. It is possible to conclude that the Muscovites did everything possible to hide the true circumstances of these negotiations, and especially the conditions under which the Kozaks were induced to take their oath of allegiance to the Tsar. It is an historical fact, however, that at Pereyaslav the basic rights and privileges of Ukraine had been negotiated and accepted bona fide by the Ukrainians as well as the Muscovites. These rights and privileges had been formulated in a solemn petition by the Kozak Host and sent to the Tsar by *Khmelnytsky's* special envoys. This petition was accepted and approved by the Tsar. The original of this highly important document, has also been lost to posterity, but its contents were evident, by the rights and liberties recognized and at first practised by Moscow, in Ukraine.

Accordingly—M. Hrushevsky writes—“all the Kozak judges and the elected city bailiffs were free to perform their functions without interference. The Kozaks were to elect their Hetman, but were to inform the Tsar of the result.

The Hetman and Zaporozhian Host were to be permitted to receive foreign envoys, but were to notify the Tsar's government of any circumstances which might lead to conflicts. And finally, the Kozak army was to number sixty thousand men."

These terms, which are admitted by the Muscovite historiography, evidently include all the basic elements to constitute an independent state, by the territory, the government (the Hetman), the ethnic and cultural life, the army, and the foreign policy. The Ukrainians believed all they had to endure was the sole person of the Tsar, and all they wanted was Moscow's aid in their struggle for independence from Poland. For the sake of this aid the Ukrainians were prepared to tolerate even some Muscovite infringements upon their guaranteed independence.

But very soon it became evident that Moscow looked upon the Treaty of Pereyaslav in a thoroughly different way, and the Muscovite opposition to Ukrainian independence became obvious. Instead of aid and assistance, Muscovy started to send her overlords and officials to take the places of the hated Poles. Some Muscovite governors had been sent to Kyiv at once; here they built a new fortress, stationed a garrison, and behaved like absolute masters. This was repeated in other cities. One of the first and most severe blows was Moscow's refusal to recognize and to honour the autonomy of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. They attempted to sever its ties with the Patriarch of Constantinople and instead, to subordinate the Kyivan Metropolitan and bishops to the authority of the Patriarch of Moscow. For the Tsar this was not an *alliance* but a new territorial *acquisition*.

The promised military help proved too, to be a dismal failure. Although, Moscow began to wage a war against Poland, it was not with the aim to aid Ukraine, but only of annexing Byelorussia, for which Moscow had long been greedy. Instead of helping Khmelnytsky, Moscow demanded help and services from Khmelnytsky: the Tsar demanded the dispatch of his army to Byelorussia to assist the Muscovites. Simultaneously the Russian contingents sent to Ukraine started to entrench themselves firmly instead of fighting the Poles, and made use of every ill-considered word and every careless act to gather the reins of Ukrainian life in their hands. The Russian "helping hand" led Ukraine not to liberation but to Muscovite domination.

Hetman Khmelnytsky, by concluding the Treaty of Pereyaslav had made the most terrible error of his whole life. He disentangled Ukraine from Poland but led her to Muscovite slavery. He lived

only three more years, but they all were devoted to frantic military and diplomatic activities with the sole purpose to get free from Moscow. He renewed his negotiations with Sweden, Prussia, Transylvania, Moldavia, and even the Khan of Crimea, but all to no avail. He died on January 27, 1657—a very sick and broken man.

So started for Ukraine 3 long centuries of national tragedy under Russian domination. Step by step, and act by act, Moscow broke her solemn pledges and guarantees, and with growing force and speed infringed upon her rights, cancelled her liberties, abrogated her privileges. The Muscovites were proud to be slaves of their mighty Tsar and they started to break Ukrainians into the same form of living. One by one all democratic forms of Ukrainian national life were broken. In 1764, during the reign of Catherine II, the Hetmancy was abolished, and in 1775 the Zaporozhian Sich, the military Kozak centre on the lower Dniepr was destroyed, extinguishing the last remnants of the autonomy of Ukraine. In 1863, Count Valuyev, the Russian Minister of the Interior, issued an Ukas by which the existence of the Ukrainian language was forbidden.

The Treaty of Pereyaslav was a classical example of what the Russians mean by the words "union", and "federation". By a miraculous renaissance, Ukraine was able, in the course of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century, to regain her national consciousness, her pride, her will for liberty and state sovereignty. Her national independence was reestablished in the years of the Great Revolution 1917 - 1919 by forming the sovereign Ukrainian National Republic.

The Russian bolsheviks, in the same way as the Russian Tsars, had to comply with these facts. And history once more repeated itself by Moscow utilizing the internal and external difficulties of the young Ukrainian state, extended her "helping hand." As once the Tsar Alexey, so now Lenin, and later Stalin, at first recognized the existence of Ukraine as an independent state, and became a member of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, even a member of the United Nations. But as 300 years ago, so everywhere the same Russian governors, the same Russian officials, garrisons, fortresses, the same uses and practices of the Russian master nation.

The bitter mockery of the situation is that Moscow is forcing the enslaved Ukrainian population to celebrate the 300th anniversary of the "liberating" Treaty of Pereyaslav. By tremendous pomp and display the whole world is blinded to the real situation in Ukraine, and especially, to the feelings, tendencies and inclinations of the Ukrainian nation. The Krem-

"FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION", OR SUBJUGATION?

The latest news and also official press reports from the Soviet Union indicate that the national problem has become one of the most vital. "Communist", the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party has also expressed an opinion on this question. An article by M. Kammari entitled, "*Socialist Nations of the U.S.S.R. in the Circumstances of Transition from Socialism to Communism*" appeared in the October 1953 edition (No. 16), and in the November edition (No. 17) an article by W. Lazis, entitled, "*The Great Power of the Friendship of nations*" was published. Both articles dealt with the question of the national relations which exist between the non-Russian peoples and the Russians within the U.S.S.R. and which have been a source of great anxiety to the Kremlin during the past months.

M. Kammari, in his article said, "The socialist nations which now find themselves for the first time within the orbit of the U.S.S.R., are fundamentally different to the bourgeois nations. New socialist nations are much more united than any bourgeois nations" (p. 12). By this "uniting" the author means "The foremost principle and basic political prerequisite in the formation of socialist nations is their conquest, and the strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat" (p. 13).

The nations in the U.S.S.R. thus differ from the "bourgeois nations" inasmuch as they are suppressed by a dictatorship. Kammari goes on to say, "The leaders of the socialist nations are the working class and its international party which, by reason of its power strengthens and guides these nations" (p. 12).

But to what nation does this "working class" and its party belong? Kammari gives the following answer to this question: "The Russian working class, under the guidance of the Communist Party, formerly helped the suppressed nations in our country to develop and strengthen the Soviet socialist conception of the state and to further the Soviet system of economy" . . . (p. 15).

The second author, W. Lazis, gives us figures showing the increase in production in the various republics of the U.S.S.R. by way of argument. "Taking the average

Continued on Page 14

lin wishes to convince the whole world that Ukraine, willingly and joyfully, associated herself with Moscow, "now and for eternity." But this is unbelievably false, as Ukraine deviously wants her full independence.

development of industrial production in the year 1951 as a basis, the production in the U.S.S.R. increased by 16 per cent as compared to 1950. In the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics it increased by 18 per cent, in Latvia by 19 per cent, in Esthonia by 24 per cent, and in the Moldau Soviet Socialist Republic by 41 per cent. Statistics for the year 1951 and for the first quarter of the year 1953 show that the nations of the U.S.S.R. have successfully achieved the program of the fifth Five Years' Plan" ("Communist", November 1953, p. 28).

From the difference in production figures one would assume that the non-Russian republics are in a much better position, but this is not the case because most of their production goes to Moscow. Despite the fact that the non-Russian republics are suppressed, the Kremlin propagandists still have audacity to maintain that the "assistance" given to the non-Russian nations is "outstanding". The farmers in the various republics, who are forced to hand over a large amount of their production, are in the best position to define this "assistance".

Culture Policy

M. Kammari severely criticizes "regional nationalism" and writes as follows regarding the development of national problems: "In the course of socialism there has been considerable development the processes of fusing small tribes with a similar language into nationalities, the consolidation of these nationalities into nations, and by changing their dialects, the formation of their languages into the national language of these consolidated socialist nations." (p. 24). In this way the author camouflages the process of Russification and assimilation which is put into practice in the entire Soviet block. He openly admits on page 23 that "the Russian language is becoming a means, to an ever-increasing degree, to further economic and cultural relations between the nations of the Soviet Union. According to Kammari's article there are at present 6 million children attending schools in Ukraine, whereas in the Russian federalist republic, which has double the population of Ukraine, there are 17 million children attending school, since "the national staff for all the Soviet republics is trained in the Russian republic."

It would be wrong to assume that such a policy is only pursued in the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. Kammari maintains in his article that the forming of "socialist nations" in countries with a people's democracy has nothing to do with his subject, but, "apart from some differences and some forms of independence in each country, this process is developing according to the general and object-

Prof. Volodymyr Derzhavyn

The Humane Studies in the Post-War Soviet Ukraine

IV. LITERATURE

Russian Soviet bolshevism acknowledges no fundamental or formal difference between literary criticism and the science of literature, as they are primarily regarded as a means of political propaganda. The scientific study of literature in Western European countries consists of research into literary sources; criticism of texts; editing; literary analysis as regards style, and from the cultural, historical, psychological, and biographical point of view. Only for reasons of prestige, and on condition that there is no deviation from the general political standard, is this allowed in the Soviet Union.

During the vast Russification movement from 1926 to 1938, directed allegedly against "remnants" of bourgeois nationalistic and counter-revolutionary elements, but in reality, aimed to achieve a mass-conversion of all the non-Russian

nations to Moscow, "Soviet patriotism," the entire science of literature was systematically abolished and extirpated by the terrorist measures of the Secret State-police. Because of the great fear the Kremlin had of an uprising of the whole nation and also on the part of the Ukrainian Communists, methods were applied in a most cruel and sinister manner in Soviet Ukraine, where in 1939 only three well-known literary research men were left. A. Krymsky and B. Yakubsky in Kyiv, had actually given up their literary activity at the end of the twenties (incidentally, they both died before the end of the war) whilst the third, Alexander Biletsky in Charkiv (not to be confused with the well-known Ukrainian historian, Leonid Biletsky, who emigrated in the twenties and is at present engaged in research work in Canada), was only saved by the fact that he had devoted

ive laws which govern the formation of socialist nations in the U.S.S.R." (p. 27).

In any case, Kammari states that it would be necessary to introduce a universal language, once dictatorship has become supreme throughout the whole world,—naturally this would be the Russian language. "It is the aim of Communism, in keeping with the doctrine of Marx and Lenin, not only to bring about friendly relations between the nations, but also to fuse them into one" (p. 26).

"National differences and languages are dying out and will be replaced by a universal language as soon as the socialist economic system has been strengthened sufficiently . . . National languages will, of course, still continue to exist for some time side by side with a universal language even after the victory of socialism all over the world" (p. 37).

Enemy Number One

Despite its policy of a dictatorship of the proletariat, the Kremlin is unable to eliminate the internal difficulties caused by various "bourgeois nationalists". Kammari comments as follows: "The Communist Party of the Soviet Union exposed all the nationalists and chauvinists, and still continues to wage a systematic war against all elements and remnants of nationalism" (p. 26).

No one, however, criticizes Russian nationalism; on the contrary, adherents are actually eulogized in public.

"The remnants of capitalism still play a most important part as far as national

problems are concerned" (p. 25). "The bourgeois nationalists play a treacherous and counter-revolutionary part by selling the interests of their nations and their native countries to foreign imperialists" (p. 18).

Kammari affirms that remnants of capitalism are still evident, by the enthusiasm shown for the "reactionary bourgeois culture" of the West, and in the negation of Soviet socialist culture (p. 26).

The author lists all the "phenomena of nationalism" and quotes examples of the elimination of class differences among the bourgeois nations and the glorification of reactionary elements in national culture. The most dangerous phenomenon of "bourgeois nationalism" is its ignorance of the powerful influence of "the leading Russian culture" and its influence on the national culture of other Soviet nations (p. 25).

What is the reaction in the West to the propaganda of the Moscow "Communist", which constantly maintains that "the American imperialists are seeking to liquidate the national sovereignty of the nations" ("Communist", October edition, No. 15 p. 25), and that the Americans "are violating the principle of national sovereignty, and, appealing to nations to forego their sovereign rights in favour of a world government, which would be dominated by America" ("Communist", November edition, No. 16 p. 32). What is the reaction of the West to all this?

O. Zaporozh

his attention almost exclusively to the history of Western European and Russian literature and was not an adherent of the national Ukrainian movement. His pupils were, however, not allowed to study any kind of literary research. All that remained was insipid and worthless Soviet Russian propaganda, a kind of literary criticism written in Ukrainian which already bore considerable traces of Russification.

Alleged "Liberalism" from 1939 to 1946

When the Soviets in the autumn 1939 occupied West Ukrainian territories, which previously had been under Polish rule, it was their intention to allow Ukrainian national culture to continue for a time at least, and so win over to the Soviet side, well-known national representatives including those in the spheres of literature and of the science of literature. In the first place the Kremlin permitted, and in fact unofficially recommended, belles-lettres and poetry to give expression to Ukrainian national sentiments and traditions in the fight against the "German Fascist aggressors", instead of expressing an alleged "Soviet patriotism" (which had proved to be completely ineffective in Ukraine during the first month of the war). It was inevitable that this "liberal course" should also effect literary criticism and the science of literature, but in this respect the science of literature did not gain much, as the "Party and Government" were merely interested in propagandist results and not in the promotion of scientific research in the field of literature. In addition there were very few possibilities of publishing works dealing with the study of literature, but a few well-known Ukrainian scholars of literature were brought back from Siberian concentration camps. Amongst them were two well-known professors, *O. Doroshkevych* and *A. Shamray* known mainly for their "bourgeois nationalist" textbooks on the history of literature which had been decried at the end of the twenties. Both of them died in Kyiv after the end of the war without having published anything of scientific interest and importance. Another was *Yuriy Mezhenko*, the well-known literary critic, who it was thought had been executed about the beginning of the thirties. Various works were also published. The large work on the history of ancient and mediaeval Ukrainian literature, which was compiled by the Institute of Science of Literature, a department of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, during the years 1939 to 1940, was, however, not published, because it was alleged there was a "shortage of material during the years of the war."

The book, "Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature" by *E. Kyrylyuk*

and *S. Maslov* (1945), destined for use in secondary and high schools, contained little that was scientific, but did at least oppose the Russification to a large extent and stressed the logical development of national sentiment in Ukrainian literature (it was censured as "bourgeois nationalist" in 1946 and banned). During the years 1944 to 1946 in articles published in the "Radyanska Literatura" ("The Soviet Literature") by writers such as *E. Kyrylyuk*, *I. Pilhuk*, and *F. Polishchuk*, on the subject of Ukrainian classical writers of the nineteenth century, we find a few scientific points of interest here and there, but expressed in a confused and empty "Marxist and Leninist" phraseology.

When for the second time in 1944 West Ukrainian territories, were occupied, further measures were enforced. Although at the beginning no attempt was made to prevent the outstanding men in the field of literary research, *V. Shchurat* (who died soon after the war), *M. Voznyak*, and *M. Derkach*, from continuing their specialised work, which did not menace the Soviet bolshevist 'ideology.' *M. Voznyak* actually succeeded in publishing in 1946 his scientific study on the Ukrainian classicism, *Kvitka Osnovyanenko* (1778 - 1843),—an unprecedented case in the Soviet Ukraine since the thirties. In 1947, a collection of the hitherto unknown poems of the Ukrainian poetess, *Lesya Ukrainka* (1871 - 1913), was published by *M. Derkach*.

But this "liberal" attitude on the part of the Soviets was, however, only of short duration.

New Reprisals

As early as the summer of 1946 a new wave of Soviet Russian persecution was directed against all anti-Russian ideas and has continued up to the present time. The "policy of leniency" had not proved very effective in Ukraine, and had not succeeded in eliminating the passive resistance of the masses or the armed resistance of the valiant Ukrainian Insurgent Army (U.P.A.). For this reason practically everything that had been published from 1939 onwards was now branded as "bourgeois nationalist aberrations", and either officially or semi-officially banned. This included books which might claim a certain scientific value, as for instance, *P. Volynsky's* "Literary and Theoretical Quotations from Ukrainian Writers of the First Quarter of the Nineteenth Century" (nothing more than a harmless work on literary sources), *I. Pilhuk's* "Shevchenko and Belinsky", and *F. Polishchuk's* "Maxim Gorky and Development of Ukrainian National Poetry." Although these works were pro-Russian, they were banned by the Soviet press, because the authors had not stressed

sufficiently the "beneficial influence that great Russian literature had on Ukrainian literature", shall thereby proving themselves to be secret Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists. As this type of accusation has no limits and can be applied to anything, it is not surprising therefore that the number of literary publications of any value are rapidly dwindling from year to year.

It is somewhat of a paradox that the "ideological" campaign which Zhdanov, Stalin's all-powerful favourite, began in 1947 and has intensified since against "cosmopolitans", "admirers of the West", and "homeless traitors to their native country", has lowered the standard of Ukrainian literary criticism and the science of literature, to an even lower level than was the case prior to 1939. As "native country" only meant *Soviet Russia*, the blow dealt by the Soviets in Ukraine was aimed at those literary men who, because of their Jewish origin, felt that they were in no danger of being accused as adherents of *Ukrainian* bourgeois nationalism and so ventured to evidence a certain interest for Western European and American literature. The well-known West Ukrainian literary critic, *Michael Rudnycky*, for example, who in 1945 was appointed university professor for literature because of his pro-Soviet attitude, but is now bitterly paying the price for having shown an interest in the West, in a manner typical of an intellectual Communist. Any mention now that there might possibly be intellectual ties between Ukrainian literature and the West is prohibited and scorned. Even a modest collection of historical facts, in Prof. *A. Shamray's* book, "Lesya Ukrainka and English Literature", is banned. Only one positive influence is permitted in Ukrainian literature, namely—Russian!

Conclusion

In Soviet Ukraine there are now professorships and even a research institute for the science of literature. There are also special journals and other publications which deal with literary matters. But there is no scientific treatment of literary questions, in metre, style, and research on literary sources, even in non-political subjects. The few literary men of former days, who were either spared by the Soviet government for reasons of prestige and propaganda or were pardoned during the "liberal" years of 1939 to 1946, are gradually dying out and there is no one to succeed them. *A. Biletsky*, the best representative of Soviet Ukrainian literature, will not even venture to train any of his pupils as a qualified literary expert, although he has nothing to fear, as he was wise enough to resist all the temptations of the former "liberal tendency" and published an irreproach-

Ukraine Behind the Iron Curtain

The Communists in the villages

In its leading article the "Radyanska Ukraina" of November 24, 1953, states that "Party organizations have now been established in practically all the kolkhoses in Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. More than 180,000 communists are now employed in agriculture and more than 130,000 party members work in the kolkhoses. The new tasks which agriculture have been set makes it imperative that party work should be intensified." The article stresses the point that fundamentally the questions are neither purely economic nor purely political, and that hypothesis must be applied in one's daily work.

"There are still many serious faults in the work of the Party organizations in the villages. There are too few communists among the technical personnel in the villages, or among the groups of persons assigned to work in orchards, fields, and tractor-driving, and among the cattle overseers... The communists are the leading force for the fulfilment of the tasks of the party and to carry out the decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

On reading this revealing article we come to the conclusion that Russian Communism is not, as yet, firmly established in the Ukraine. So far there is not a party organization in every kolkhoz, and where there is one, it cannot supervise the population completely. In addition, we also come to the conclusion that these party organizations are formed by higher authorities and consist mainly of urban elements and not of Ukrainian farmers. These 130,000 communists, many of whom are of Ukrainian extraction with unsavoury characters, represent a comparatively small proportion in view of the fact that more than 28 million Ukrainians are employed in the kolkhoses. The remaining 21 million Ukrainians are either employed in industry or live in towns. (According to Malenkov's statements about the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist

able, thought rather peculiar, work on the "Literary Style of Karl Marx" instead!

Those who wish to study the 'science of literature' in Soviet Ukraine nowadays know exactly what will be expected of them. They will have to practise a kind of higher propaganda journalism, which contains no scientific matter, but is directed only towards tracking down anything else that approaches science and promptly denouncing it. Those averse to this prospect will do better to choose as their subjects, Russian or Western European literature, and go to Russia where no one can accuse them directly of being supporters of "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism." Should they eventually become Russian literary experts, then paradoxically they will be able to discuss Ukrainian literature in a much freer and more objective manner than is possible in Soviet Ukraine.

The Research Institute for Literature at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences has for some years been working on a detailed study of the history of Ukrainian literature, organized in advance by the Research Institute for World Literature, a department of the Russian Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union. Surely no more striking example of "Soviet co-operation could be found!

Republic on August 8, 1953.) This includes 50,000 communists who are employed in important state departments or in other agricultural administrative positions.

The fact must be mentioned that, in the ethnographical territory of Russia proper, communist organizations were set up in practically all the villages twenty-five to thirty years ago. These organizations consisted of local elements, namely Russian farmers and kolkhoz workers.

The Kremlin is now endeavouring to strengthen its position in the rural areas of the Ukraine. Attempts are being made to achieve this aim by means of the "increase in the staff of specialized workers" in order to improve agricultural work, a measure resorted to on the strength of the decisions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union on September 7, 1953, which referred to "institutions for the purpose of promoting the development of agriculture in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic."

During the past months the telephone network and the broadcasting system in Ukraine and in Byelorussia have been expanded and increased very considerably. This has been done not only for technical reasons of course, but also in pursuit of certain political aims. In this way the rural population is to be influenced to an ever-increasing degree by official Soviet propaganda. The broadcasting system was enlarged by the setting up of new stations.

The telephone network is likewise being used by the Soviet administrative authorities in agricultural concerns to a much greater extent than was formerly the case, especially at night. The "Pravda" of November 22, 1953, reported that the party organization of one of the areas in the vicinity of Sumsk held a "meeting" with the heads of the kolkhoses, by means of the telephone and in this way listened to their reports and also admonished them. All other telephone calls were prohibited during the time. The kolkhoz functionaries, some of them party members, soon tired of this method, however, and went home. Thereupon the night-porters on duty answered the questions put by the Party headquarters...

* * *

The district of Poltava is one of the most prosperous in the Ukraine, but despite this fact it is one of the most "backward" districts of the country, not only in agriculture and industry, but also in new buildings. The contrast in prevailing conditions there is most usual. For this reason "Pravda" criticized the party leaders of this district and in particular the party secretaries, who change very often, for this state of affairs. The inefficient economic policy of the party is not criticized. In addition, the fact that half the vegetable and fruit produce from the Poltava district has to be sent to Moscow and Leningrad has resulted in a hostile attitude on the part of the kolkhoz farmers. They are disgruntled that such vast quantities of their produce are sent to Russia without their receiving any kind of reimbursement whatsoever.

* * *

During the past years, the seven years schooling system was established in Ukraine and attempts were made to provide more secondary schools training. A statement to this effect was made recently by Pinchuk the Minister for Education in Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. In the course of this year 28,854 schools were opened in Ukraine; of these 4,864 were secondary schools. There are now 831 secondary schools more than there were in the year 1940 and 2.3 times more than in 1946. A ten-years schooling system has now been established in 35 districts and industrial centres. The official Soviet authorities have promised to provide 226 million roubles for the erection of schools! ? ?

How much that money is needed shows that the number of schools is still not sufficient, as classes have to be held in three shifts.

* * *

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS?

Continued from Page 2

The statement made by John Foster Dulles to the effect that there might be a fundamental change in America's foreign policy, leads one to hope that there might also be a change in America's political attitude. If the E.D.C. should not be ratified and America therefore obliged to deal with her partners **individually**, the situation, in spite of the present setback as far as Western defence is concerned, would, however, not be entirely hopeless.

Freed of British and French colonial policy the United States would be able to support the national independence movements in Asia, and in this way deprive the Soviets of a dangerous weapon. Indeed, such a turn of events does not appear to represent a problem at all, if we take into consideration the fact that the U.S.A. have adopted a censorious attitude towards British and French views on the national aims of the Asiatic and African peoples, and, also, their political imperialism is neither in keeping with American principles nor with the political practices of this nation, so far.

This policy, must however, be the same as regards Eastern Europe. And, too, the **individual** Eastern European problems could form the basis of a positive liberation policy. In this connection attention could be devoted to the Ukrainian problem. A liberation policy, in which national problems are clearly defined and emphasized, would meet with a response in Ukraine and, above all, in the national underground movement. And the Soviets would be unable to offer any opposition.

But even if the E.D.C. should be ratified, the national problem in Asia and in Eastern Europe will continue to be of primary importance. Europe, without its eastern nations is not a united Europe. Europe must, however, be able to offer the Eastern European nations something positive, otherwise it will lose its power of attraction completely. The problem of the relations between Europe and the Ukraine will then have to be solved, either according to the European conception or otherwise...

Perhaps the year 1954 will show which trend predominates and what the political prospects are likely to be. The answer of Ukraine will depend upon whether these prospects are in accordance with Ukrainian nation interests.

Ukrainicus