# THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

Spring •1990

### THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko Editor

Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky Assistant Editor

Prof. Lev Shankovsky Assistant Editor

Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky Assistant Editor Volodymyr Bohdaniuk Associate Editor

Borys Potapenko Associate Editor

Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn Associate Editor Stephen Oleskiw Associate Editor

Price: £4.00 or \$8.00 a single copy, Annual Subscription: £16.00 or \$32.00

#### Editorial correspondence should be sent to:

The Editors, "The Ukrainian Review", 200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF.

#### Subscriptions should be sent to:

"The Ukrainian Review" (Administration), c/o Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd., 49 Linden Gardens, London, W2 4HG.

#### **Overseas representatives:**

USA: Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., 136 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003. Canada: Ucrainica Research Institute, 83-85 Christie Street, Toronto,Ont. M6G 3B1.

> Printed in Great Britain by the Ukrainian Publishers Limited 200 Liverpool Road, London, NI 1LF. Tel.: 01-607-6266/7

## THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

Vol. XXXVIII

A Quarterly Journal

Spring, 1990

#### Contents

Oleh Romanyshyn: THE CANADIAN LEAGUE FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE (Part 1) Nicholas L. Chirovsky: THE SOVIET ECONOMY AT THE TIME OF PERESTROIKA (Conclusion) Dr. Blanka Jerabek: BOOKS. PRINTING, AND THE FIRST PRINTING HOUSES IN UKRAINE (Part 2) Mykola Hlobenko: THE LITERATURE OF SOVIET UKRAINE (Conclusion)	13
*** NEWS FROM UKRAINE	
NEWS FROM UKRAINE	
- Church Brotherhood Formed At Kyiv Meeting Of UAOC Representatives	
— Ukrainian Orthodox Hold Sobor In Lviv	
- Independent Journalists' Association Formed In Ukraine	
<ul> <li>Historic Catholic-Orthodox Meeting In Moscow</li> <li>Hundreds of Thousands Join Human Chain Across Ukraine To Commemorate Ukrainian Independence</li> </ul>	
And Unity	
— Additional Information On Human Chain And Meetings In Ukraine, January 21	
<ul> <li>— Additional momanon on Fundan Chain And Meetings in Oktaine, January 21</li> <li>— Ukrainian Catholics Hold First Synod After Forced Liquidation In 1946</li> </ul>	
- Soviet Authorities Return Cathedral And Monastery To Ukrainian Catholics	
- Course Bublication Apparent In Livin Design Process Provide Campions	
<ul> <li>Church Publication Appears In Lviv: Registration Process Moves Slowly</li> <li>Father Petro Zeleniukh And Ivan Hel Beaten</li> </ul>	52
Aademic Conference In Latvia	
- 20.000 Attend An Assembly in Kyiv	
- Ukrainian Commists To Form Independent Party	
<ul> <li>Ukrainian Communists To Form Independent Party</li> <li>An Overview Of The Electoral Campaign In Ukraine</li> </ul>	
- Registration of Electoral Candidates Ends In Ukraine	50
Registration Of Electoral Candidates Ends In Ukraine     Democratic Bloc Candidates For Election To The Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet In The Lviv Province	
- Pre-Election Meetings In Ukraine	63
- KGB Tactics In Ukraine Elections	63
- Ukraine Elections In Jeonardy	64
- 200,000 Demonstrate In Moscow	65
- Lviv Residents Discuss Situation Of Ukrainian Churches And Future Of Shevchenko Monument	65
All-Ukrainian Trade Union "Unity" Formed In Kharkiv	66
- Ukrainians Demand Own Armed Forces	67
- 80.000 Gather For "Bukh" Pre-Election Meeting In Kviv, February 11	68
– 80.0001 Gather For "Rukh" Pre-Election Meeting In Kyiv. February 11     – "Rukh" Council Of Nations Holds Founding Conference. Kyiv. February 11	69
— "90 Million Believers In USSR" — Official	70
– "X) Million Believers In USSR" – Official – Ukrainian Student Association Holds Conference In Dniprodzerzhinsk	71
Memorial Service For UPA Soldiers	73
— UHU-North Founded	
- Ukrainian Popular Movement ("Rukh") Demonstrates For Unity	74
— "Rukh" Denies Rumours Of An Anti-Military Campaign	
- Kviv. February 25: 50,000 Agree - "Time For Unity. Not Hostility!"	
<ul> <li>"Rukh" Denies Rumours Of An Anti-Military Campaign</li></ul>	77
- Recent Events In Ukraine	78
- Vatican Members Of Mixed Catholic/Orthodox Commission Announced In Ukraine	
- UAOC Appeal To The Supreme Soviet Of The USSR	
- Appeal Of The UCDE To The Ukrainian People	82
<ul> <li>Liviv Intelligentsia Send Memorandum To Moscow-Vatican Meeting</li> <li>Ukrainian Čatholic Church Releases New Statistics On Churches. Congregations. Priests In Ukraine</li> </ul>	
- Ukrainian Čatholic Church Releases New Statistics On Churches, Čongregations, Priests In Ukraine	
<ul> <li>Open Letter To Gorbachev From Democratic Organizations</li> </ul>	
- Statement Of The Lviv Committee For The Defence Of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee)	
Statement Of The Lviv Committee For The Defence Of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee)     Appeal To The Supreme Soviet Of The USSR And The Peoples Of Azerbaijan And Armenia	
— Pre-Election Appeal Of The Ukrainian Helsinki Union	
— Ukrainian Helsinki Union Pre-Election Appeal	
- "Rukh" Denounces Anti-Semitism	95

#### Published by

#### The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Ltd. Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine Inc. (U.S.A.) Ucrainica Research Institute (Canada)

ISSN 0041-6029



Lviv, January 21: Scenes from the "human chain" to commemorate Ukrainian independence and sovereignty

#### Oleh ROMANYSHYN Ucrainica Research Institute Toronto

#### THE CANADIAN LEAGUE FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE

(Part 1)

The Second World War and its aftermath introduced a radically new political reality into Ukrainian life both in Ukraine and in the Ukrainian diaspora. To understand fully the emergence of such organizations as the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine (CLLU) and the Women's Association of the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine (WAofCLLU) reference to the recent history of Ukraine must be made.

For centuries Russia has been the main adversary of Ukraine. After the Battle of Poltava in 1709, in which the head of the Ukrainian state, Hetman Ivan Mazepa, together with his ally King Charles XII of Sweden, was defeated by the Russian Tsar Peter I, Russia restricted the rights of the Ukrainian people to an ever-increasing extent until eventually even Ukrainian was banned as a written language. The Ukrainian struggle for liberation continued until 1917-18, when Ukraine succeeded in restoring its independence for three years. As a people of western orientation, the Ukrainians constantly hoped for the support of the Western powers in their resistance to Russian expansion, all the more since they were convinced that with the restoration of the Ukrainian state, with its present population of over 50 million, Russia's pressure on Europe would be checked. On 14 March 1939 the Carpatho-Ukrainian state was proclaimed, which was overrun by Nazi Germany's Hungarian allies shortly afterwards.

The outbreak of the Soviet-German war on June 22, 1941, brought the Ukrainians a new chance in their struggle for independence. Thus, on June 23, 1941, in preparation for the coming German occupation of Ukraine, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN — a revolutionary organization dedicated to the liberation of Ukraine) under the leadership of Stepan Bandera served the Nazis with a warning stressing that a military occupation of Europe and a policy of violence and suppression of the national aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe will prove to be untenable.

With the outbreak of hostilities between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union, in many parts of Ukraine units of OUN insurgents staged armed uprisings against the Russian occupational forces while the population at large resorted to acts of self-defence. On their part, the Russian secret police, then known as the NKVD, murdered thousands of Ukrainian political prisoners. In the city of Lviv alone (capital of western Ukraine) between 5,000 and 7,000 people were executed by the retreating Russians, including women and children.

In 1942 various Ukrainian insurgent and popular self-defence groups merged with the paramilitary units of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists to form the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) under the command of General Roman Shukhevych, Deputy Minister of Defence in the Ukrainian Provisional Government and head of the OUN network in Ukraine. By 1944 the UPA grew into a fighting force over 200,000 strong, engaging in a twofront struggle against Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. That same year, on the initiative of the OUN-UPA leadership, the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (UHVR) was formed to direct the struggle.

After the Nazi defeat the armed struggle of the Ukrainians against Moscow and its satellite allies lasted well into the 1950s. According to N. Khrushchev, the Russians "lost thousands of men in a bitter struggle between the Ukrainian nationalists and the forces of Soviet Power. . . it took a large-scale military and police operation, with all the paraphenalia of tanks, aircraft and heavy artillery, to break up the rebel forces. . ."<sup>1</sup> while a German General, Ernst Koestring, reported that:

> Our conception that the West Ukraine (Galicia) was the birthplace of the Ukrainian nationalistic movement is proved by the fact that it was there that the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) was created, a political organization which succeeded in uniting all national parties of the Ukraine.

> The military organization known as the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), was also formed here aiming at the establishment of an independent Ukraine controlled neither by Moscow, nor Germany. . . When Galicia was recaptured by the Red Army the OUN and UPA called upon their followers to fight against the Bolshevists and the Great Russian enemy. German officers who fought their way back to us in 1945 reported that the plight of the Red Army was similar to ours: it controlled only the towns and the main communication routes, while the country itself remained in the hands of the resistance movement<sup>2</sup>.

Thus, the OUN-UPA created and upheld politically, militarily and socially what history has termed the Ukrainian Underground State, which, *de facto*, existed for a decade (1941-51). The Act of Proclamation of June 30, 1941.

4

<sup>1.</sup> Khrushchev Remembers (1971), p. 147.

<sup>2.</sup> World War II German Military Studies 19, p. 21.

laid the foundation for this latest period in the history of the struggle for Ukraine's independence and statehood<sup>3</sup>.

In the wake of this failed armed struggle for independence and the upheaval caused by World War Two, an unprecedented displacement — both forced and voluntary — of Ukrainians from their homeland took place. Among the displaced were tens of thousands of people who either supported or were active in the nationalist Ukrainian liberation movement of the OUN-UPA-UHVR, and most of whom had been victims of Nazi and Soviet repression. They constituted the backbone of the third wave of Ukrainian immigrants to reach the West after World War Two. They were the political immigrants fresh from the resistance frontlines of Ukraine and highly motivated.

About 40,000 of these political immigrants came to Canada, renewing and strengthening among the established Ukrainian-Canadian community the bond with the homeland, and exposing it directly to the new historical and political realities enveloping Ukraine. Moreover, the OUN-UPA-UHVR leadership in Ukraine issued *An Appeal from Embattled Ukraine to all Ukrainians Abroad* in October 1949. In this emotionally worded document, the resistance appealed to all Ukrainians in the emigration:

To convey the truth about Ukraine and its struggle to all nations and peoples beyond the borders of the USSR; to inform [them] of the need to partition the USSR into free national states of all its member nations; to promote the idea of building an international order founded on a system of free, independent states of all peoples; to explain that the Ukrainian people are struggling for the realization of the most progressive ideas of humanity — freedom for nations and individuals, true democracy and a just social order, where there will be neither exploiters nor exploited; to propagate the truth about Stalin's USSR to all the peoples of the world and to mobilize them actively to struggle against Russian-communist imperialism; to tell the people that the entire world now faces a problem: not how to avoid a new war. . . but how to preserve liberty, independence and culture, how to avoid the enslavement and ruin of mankind. . . The world's only hope is the ... destruction of Russian-communist imperialism where it exists today. And this can be done only through an organized effort by a single front of all peoples subjugated and threatened by Russian-communist imperialism. . . Ukrainians abroad must work as actively as possible among the peoples of the West to form an anti-communist front composed of all the freedom-loving people of the world. Forge ties with all national and international organizations that fight for human rights and freedom. Strive to create an international ogranization which would aim at struggling against imperialism

<sup>3.</sup> The Restoration of the Ukrainian State in World War II (London, 1987), pp. 7-15.

and totalitarianism and defending the rights of nations and individuals<sup>4</sup>.

This Appeal, coming directly from the Ukrainian resistance leadership behind the Iron Curtain, had an additional profound impact on Ukrainians abroad, particularly so on the post-World War Two wave of Ukrainian immigrants to the West.

Against this historical and political background a large number of Ukrainian newcomers to Canada considered it their life-long duty to carry this message to their fellow citizens in the new country. In order to do that, they decided to establish such new organizations as the Ukrainian Youth Association of Canada (UYAC), the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine and the Women's Association of the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine. Similar community organizations were founded in other countries of the free world under the generic name of Organizations of the Ukrainian Liberation Front (OULF), which eventually formed an umbrella body, the World Ukrainian Liberation Front (WULF). There are forty-four community, youth, women's, veterans' and cultural organizations belonging to WULF with hundreds of branches and tens of thousands of members and supporters in various countries of the free world.

At a public meeting in Toronto on 1 May 1949 called by Stanley Frolick, it was decided to form the League. On 4 May 1949 the Central Organizing Bureau (COB) was established with the following executive: Yakiv Nesterenko (chairman), Stanley Frolick and Yevhen Dudra (vice-chairmen), Dr. Mykhailo Sosnovskyi (secretary). Other members of the COB, who helped to lay the groundwork for the new organization were: Stepan Bihun, Ivan Boyko, Ivan Eliashevskyi, Lev Husyn, Olha Ivanchuk (women's representative), Dr. Yuriy Gerych, Stepan Laikish, Volodymyr Lyzanivskyi, Dr. Roman Malaschuk, Symon Matskevych, Dr. Roman Rakhmannyi (recording secretary at the meeting), Dr. Yuriy Russov, Yaroslav Spolskyi, Dr. Petro Shkurat, Stepan Stepa and Myroslav Velyhorskyi. The Ukrainian name for the new organization — Liga Vyzvolennia Ukrainy (League for the Liberation of Ukraine) - was decided on by three members of the COB, Dr. Roman Rakhmannyi, Dr. Yuriy Russov and Myroslav Velyhorskyi, and was accepted by the COB. Stanley Frolick was entrusted with the task of drafting the CLLU constitution, while Dr. Roman Rakhmannyi prepared the draft of the League Declaration, which was adopted at the meeting of the COB on 9 May 1949 and published in the newspaper, Homin Ukrainy (Ukrainian Echo), on 14 May 1949. The Declaration addressed itself to the purpose, aims and goals of the new organization. The first branch was organized in Toronto in July 1949.

<sup>4.</sup> Peter J. Potichnyj and Yevhen Shtendera, eds., *Political Thought of the Ukrainian Underground*, 1943-1951 (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1986), pp. 391-401.

The founding League conference took place on 25 December 1949 at which time the name, constitution, aims, goals and programme of activities for the new organization were ratified and adopted. The conference also elected its first national executive: Yakiv Nesterenko (president), Dr. Roman Malaschuk, Mykhailo Kravtsiv (vice-presidents), Mykhailo Sosnovskyi (secretary), Vasyl Bezkhlibnyk (director of community affairs), Petro Bashuk (director of organizational affairs), Iryna Demydchuk (women's representative and organizer of the Women's Association), Professor Omelian Kushnir and Stepan Stepa (members). After Yakiv Nesterenko resigned for personal reasons, Dr. Roman Malaschuk succeeded him as national president of the League. Along with him several other members of the national executive were also survivors of Nazi concentration camps.

The first conference was attended by delegates from several newly founded Ontario chapters: Toronto, Hamilton, Oshawa and St. Thomas.

The League Declaration, constitution, resolutions and programme of activities adopted at the first conference are remarkable documents inasmuch as they were formulated by people who had just arrived in Canada. These documents reflect an intuitively accurate insight into what Canada is all about: a country with a developing socio-political system conducive to unhindered political, social, cultural and economic activity and integration into Canadian society through the existing mosaic of ethnocultural communities, each free to preserve its own identity, heritage and ties with the homeland. The wartime experience and motivation of the nationalist-minded new immigrants encouraged by the *Appeal*, on the one hand, and Canadian realities, on the other, quickly coalesced into an organizational vision, which, in turn, was translated into swift growth and dynamic activity evident to this day. The resolutions of the first conference made sure to stress that the "League is a Canadian Ukrainian organization" with two main areas of activity — internal (community) and external (political activism).

Both the constitution of the League and the resolutions of the founding conference and all subsequent conferences and conventions have consistently emphasized and held on to the following set of principles and premises to guide the organization in its activities:

> To enlist the support of Ukrainian Canadians and Canadians in general for the idea of the liberation of Ukraine from Soviet Russian oppression and the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state with a democratic political system.

> To promote an international order based on the principle of independence and sovereignty for all nations and respect for national and human rights and freedoms.

> To promote the spirit of loyalty to Canada, good citizenship, and to defend its freedom and democratic institutions against enemies from

within or without — particularly communist propaganda and activities as inimical to Canada's interests.

To promote the spiritual well-being and educational development of its members based on Christian ethics and principles.

To foster and promote the cultural and community life of Ukrainian Canadians and other ethnocultural communities in the spirit of multiculturalism.

Regarding membership recruitment, the Central Organizing Bureau stated in its Declaration of May 1949 that as a new Ukrainian-Canadian organization:

> the League does not contravene in any way the goals of already existing Ukrainian organizations in Canada. On the contrary, it shall always support their activities provided they do not act against the interests of Embattled Ukraine (this image was used in the *Appeal*). Any member of such an organization can belong to the League without cutting ties with his/her own organization. The Central Organizing Bureau calls upon all Ukrainians in Canada regardless of their religious and political persuasion to join the League.

Clearly, it was intent on becoming a movement with a broad community base.

From the beginning, the League for the Liberation of Ukraine and its Women's Association supported the process of consolidation of all Ukrainian organizations as beneficial to the cause of Ukraine's liberation and the growth and development of Ukrainian community life in Canada and the rest of the diaspora. Regardless of the internal variety, differences and dynamics in the Ukrainian-Canadian community, as far as its tasks and duties *vis-à-vis* Canada and Ukraine were concerned, the League and the Women's Association have always viewed the community as a monolith. This analysis also applied to the Ukrainian diaspora as a whole.

After the organizing stage was over, and both became established organizations in Canada with their basic tenets accepted by the mainstream Ukrainian-Canadian community, the League and the Women's Association and the Ukrainian Canadian Women's Committee (UCWC) formally joined the Ukrainian Canadian Committee (UCC) on 8 May 1959. The UCC is the umbrella organization for Ukrainian Canadians established in 1940.

The process of consolidation of the Ukrainian diaspora continued. In 1967 the World Congress of Free Ukrainians (WCFU) was founded in New York, while in 1973 the Organizations of the Ukrainian Liberation Front (OULF), at their convention in Toronto, established their umbrella organization called the World Ukrainian Liberation Front (WULF) — itelf a member of the WCFU. The League prides itself on being one of the principal founding members of both these umbrella organizations of the Ukrainian diaspora, and on providing the WCFU with three consecutive secretaries-general, namely, Yuriy Shymko, Wasyl Bezkhlibnyk and Myron Barabash, as well as the founding president of WULF, Dr. Roman Malaschuk. The contribution of the League and the Women's Association to the Ukrainian-Canadian community and to the UCC and UCWC in terms of human resources (particularly at the branch level) and action-orientated initiatives has indeed been remarkable. In regard to this, one of UCC's executive directors reportedly remarked in the late 1960s:

> The League is a large, serious and dynamic organization, steadfast and uncompromising toward the enemy; and if suddenly the League disappeared from the fabric of the Ukrainian community, this would not leave a mere vacuum, but it would be a tragedy painfully felt by the Ukrainian community everywhere.

An aggressive membership drive and a dynamic programme of political, social, educational and cultural activities ensured a steady growth of the League and the Women's Association. According to A Historical Outline of the CLLU, from 1949 to the present it has organized 57 branches across Canada with 38 in Ontario, and some 10,000-12,000 members, supporters and sympathizers. The membership is representative of all age groups, professions and occupations. Fifteen branches of the League, with the participation of the Women's Association and the Ukrainian Youth Association of Canada, have built their own community centres. Smaller branches use the facilities of other local Ukrainian community and church organizations.

The following are the Ontario League branches listed in alphabetical order: Atikokan, Bradford, Brampton, Brantford, Cambridge (Preston), Chatham, Cooksville-Mississauga, Cornwall, Etobicoke, Fort West, Grimsby, Guelph, Hamilton, Kapuskasing, Kingston, Kirkland Lake, Kitchener-Waterloo, London, Niagara Falls, Nipigon, Oakville, Oshawa, Ottawa, Port Arthur, Rainy River, Red Lake, St. Catharines, St. Thomas, Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Timmins, Toronto, Waterford, Wawa, Welland, Windsor and Woodstock. Among other major Ontario CLLU branches which enjoy the facilities of their own community centres are Bradford, Etobicoke, Hamilton, Oshawa, Ottawa, St. Catharines, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Toronto, Welland and Windsor.

Spread across Canada are the other seventeen branches: Calgary East, Edmonton, Lethbridge (Alberta); Chemainus, New Westminster, Vancouver, Vernon, Victoria (British Columbia); Dauphin, Flin Flon, Portage-la-Prairie, Winnipeg (Manitoba); Montreal (Quebec); Moose Jaw, North Battleford, Regina, Saskatoon, Yorkton (Saskatchewan). Of these, the following major branches have their own community centres: Edmonton, Montreal, Saskatoon and Winnipeg. nian issues of a historical, political and cultural nature; organize and/or support annual celebrations and commemorations of important events and figures in Ukrainian history, culture and politics. Among such events which regularly bring the community together are the anniversaries of the restoration of Ukrainian statehood (22 January 1918, 14 March 1939 and 30 June 1941); Ukrainian Armed Forces Day (October 14); the commemoration of such national historical figures as Princess Olha, Prince Volodymyr the Great (10th century), Bohdan Khmelnytskyi (17th century), Ivan Mazepa (17th century), Symon Petlura, Yevhen Konovalets, General Roman Shukhevych, Stepan Bandera, Yaroslav Stetsko (20th century) and other personalities; great Ukrainian poets and writers such as Taras Shevchenko (19th century), Ivan Franko and Lesya Ukrainka (19th-20th century); anniversaries marking the founding of such national institutions as OUN (1929), UPA (1942) and UHVR (1944).

The single most important yearly event at which many of these historical and cultural aspects are highlighted is the Gathering of Ukrainians from Canada and the United States. Its formal programme always centres around certain historical, political and cultural events and/or figures being remembered or celebrated in a particular year. The informal part of the programme usually features various social activities, entertainment and sporting events. Thousands of people participate in such events sponsored jointly by the League, the Women's Association and the UYAC. These gatherings (usually well attended by politicians) have been known to draw between 12-15,000 people. They are day-long events usually held in early summer in Toronto or at UYAC summer camp, Veselka (The Rainbow), near Acton, Ontario.

In 1988, for example, the League was an active participant in the community's celebration of the Millennium of Ukrainian Christianity (988-1988), and the seventieth anniversary (1918-88) of the restoration of Ukraine's independence and the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. The promotion of such activities on a regular basis successfully keeps the "Ukrainian flame burning".

Publishing is another key aspect of League activities, which keeps the membership abreast of issues and events relevant to Ukrainian affairs. The national executive has issued to the branches and interested members copies of hundreds of specially prepared articles and papers on historical, political, ideological, cultural, literary, educational and biographical topics for local use in lectures, seminars, commemorative events, etc. The League also published or supported the publication of some ninety brochures and monographs (in Ukrainian and English) for use in its community and external political activities. These publications, which deal with Ukrainian history, politics and culture, have been included in the League's Political Library series.

From the outset, the League was fortunate because it enjoyed immediate access to a new community newspaper, *Homin Ukrainy* (Ukrainian Echo). This paper was, in fact, founded by the same group, which, barely five

The offices of the League national executive have always been in Toronto. To date the League has had four national presidents: Yakiv Nesterenko (1949), Dr. Roman Malaschuk (1949-75), Vasyl Bezkhlibnyk (1975-78) and Theodosiy Buyniak (1978-present). The success of their terms of office is reflected in the steady dynamism, variety and intensity of activities conducted by the organization. At the 1975 National Convention Dr. Roman Malaschuk was nominated honorary president of the League. Messrs. Malaschuk and Bezkhlibnyk, along with many other first-generation members of the CLLU, are survivors of Nazi concentration camps and Soviet repression which, undoubtedly, has been a contributing factor in the uncompromising dedication of the CLLU to the cause of an independent Ukraine and the idea of liberty.

#### Organizational aspects and community activities

The success story of the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine is due primarily to its monolithic nature, the internal organizational programme, community activities and external political activism. The organizational programme consists of several main types of internal activity designed to keep the organization in a state of proper functioning order, streamlined, in touch with itself and current community and external issues: 1) regular field trips by the president, organizers and other members of the national executive; 2) annual conferences held on a local, provincial and regional basis open to delegates and the grass-roots membership at large; 3) regular monthly membership meetings at the branch level; 4) internal communication on organization business through regular "Circular Letters" sent to the branches, the contents of which are then passed on to the membership — many branches issue their own "Circular Letters" to their local membership; 5) national conventions held every three years.

The internal conferences are normally planned together with the Women's Association and the UYAC, which, in turn, ensures the necessary mutual support and interaction on common issues among these three organizations. The League and the Women's Association support themselves through membership dues, collections and fund-raising events. From 1949-88 conventions have been held, while the number of local, provincial and regional conferences and other types of gatherings may easily reach 100.

The League's community-oriented activities are political, social educational, cultural, academic, etc. — all intended to preserve and qualitatively raise the level of Ukrainian consciousness on relevant issues among its membership, supporters, sympathizers and the community in general. To that end the League and the Women's Association have organized and/or supported private Ukrainian weekend schools for youth; helped to establish Studium Research Institute in 1961 and in 1971 the Association for the Advancement of Ukrainian Culture (ADUK) whose aim has been research and promotion of Ukrainian Statistical Stati

months later, organized the League for the Liberation of Ukraine. The founding fathers of *Homin Ukrainy* were Stanley Frolick, Dr. Roman Malaschuk, Ivan Boyko, Hryhoriy Dzhura, Antin Ivakhniuk, Ivan Eliashevskyi and Yakiv Nesterenko. The first two editors had been Dr. Mykhailo Sosnovskyi and Dr. Roman Rakhmannyi.

By March 1950 the Homin Ukrainy Publishing Company was firmly established under its first board of directors headed by Vasyl Bezkhlibnyk. The new weekly promoted the idea of a free and independent Ukraine and the political philosophy of the League; reported on the League, the Women's Association and UYAC activities and community affairs; reported on the liberation processes taking place in Ukraine and relevant East European and world affairs; and, last but not least, interpreted Canada for its newcomer readership, becoming for them a medium of integration into the emerging multicultural fabric of Canadian society. Forty years and two generations of readers later, *Homin Ukrainy* still maintains its basic thematic thrust. In 1977, with the support of the League, the Women's Association and the UYAC, the Homin Ukrainy Publishing Company began publication of a monthly English-language tabloid, the *Ukrainian Echo*, dealing with Ukrainian issues and related topics.

Among other mass media endeavours, seventeen branches (nine of them in Ontario) have had, at one time or another, their weekly Ukrainian-language radio programmes featuring news, political commentary, cultural themes, music etc.

(To be continued)

Nicholas L. CHIROVSKY

#### THE SOVIET ECONOMY AT THE TIME OF PERESTROIKA (Conclusion)

#### C. The Private Business Sector

The private sector of the Soviet economy has always existed and has been very active in the USSR. Prior to Perestroika, however, it operated illegally, as a black market, where the forces of supply and demand regulated distribution. Its mere existence proved that the Marxist-Leninist command economic model was not doing a satisfactory job. Finally, under Gorbachev's leadership, the private sector of the economy, working on an individual basis for individual profit, was legalized, albeit on a limited scale.' The legalization of small-family and cooperative enterprises, particularly in the area of consumer goods and services, appears to be a step in the right direction, according to the Perestroika restructuring process.

At first, the private sector was praised and encouraged. In 1985, the newspapers praised the self-managing restaurants in Georgia and in other republics, for making money and serving better quality food. Family-run livestock farming proved to be labour saving, and helped boost the ailing cattle raising industry<sup>64</sup>. Private gardening was also praised as an important supplement to the garden and orchard industry. Upon encouragement from the Council of Ministers in October 1987, the distribution of privately produced goods began to flow more freely. *Pravda* demanded that official circles give an all-out "go ahead" for private enterprising<sup>65</sup>. The newspaper complained that local Party and government officials were slowing the process down with too much red tape. They were criticized for doing a poor job of implementing the law and administration process. The private sector, according to the newspaper, was strengthening the very foundation of the economic restructuring process<sup>66</sup>. One month later, Izvestia reported that lucrative cooperatives were drawing the ire of officials. The cooperatives were being closed down because of huge profits. Friction was reported as developing between proponents of the new and old methods of doing business, and the bureaucracy was considered to be at fault<sup>67</sup>. High-level round-table discussions were held to help resolve the difficulties. In September 1988, Izvestia blamed the bureaucrats for obstructing the development of cooperatives in the private sector, while the Council

<sup>64.</sup> Izvestia, Jan. 23, 1985, p. 2; Komsomolskaia Pravda, February 6, 1985, p. 2.
65. Pravda, October 28, 1987.
66. Izvestia, September 9, 1987; also Pravda, November 25 and 26, 1987.
67. Izvestia, December 12, 1987, p. 5; also, December 29, 1987.

of Ministers resolved that state establishments should be reorganized and made to show evidence of profit-making. Those failing to do so, would face elimination<sup>68</sup>.

The struggle between the old and new business approaches produced several articles to this effect. Y. Yaremenko, in an article entitled "The Key to Perestroika", stated that the market cannot work alone; that a vigorous planning system was required<sup>69</sup>. Such articles indicated the lack of a clear-cut approach, on the part of officials, towards the issue of the private sector in the economy, while the public enthusiastically supported the growing sector. Cooperatives were sprouting up like mushrooms, and individual profits were increasing. Hence the government began to entertain the idea of an increased rate of income tax. At first, a 4% rate was considered, but soon rates of 35% or even 50% were being proposed. A new tax system was even being developed in 1988, but it was eventually rejected by the top state administration agencies<sup>70</sup>. The Council of Ministers continued to praise the cooperatives for their effective production and sale of goods and services. When the idea of an increased tax on the private sector was again discussed, it was met with open hostility from family enterprises and cooperatives. Some closed down; others threatened to close and move to the uncontrollable black market. Officials on various levels, meanwhile, continued to be confused as to what was a legal profit and what constituted illegal speculation in the underground economy<sup>71</sup>.

Government agencies, including those on the highest levels, appeared to be either confused, or too dogmatic, for they became unpredictable in their legal undertakings. In the May 26, 1989, issue of Radianska Ukraina, it was reported that in the Ukrainian SSR there were, at the time, 16,000 cooperatives, which involved 350,000 people in their business activities. A Union of Cooperatives was organized to defend their interests against the possible chicanery of official circles. Meanwhile, a new tax law was adopted by the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the USSR, which was to triple the rate of income tax. This made the existence of cooperatives rather problematic. L. Brovchenko and A. Andrivchuk, authors of the Radianska Ukraina article, state that: "The greed of the government to get more and more for its budgetary needs would actually result in its getting less. The people involved in the cooperative movement would simply disappear". Also, in the middle of 1989, the State Bank began to limit the withdrawals of money by cooperative members, money which they had earned in the cooperative business.

Here again state establishments stood in conflict with the private sector. A few details should be given to show the shortcomings of the official way of doing busines, i.e. conforming to the state economic planning system. An article appeared in Izvestia, in January 1985, entitled "Must a Good Manager Break the Law?". The answer to this question in the Soviet planned economic system appears to be "Yes". In order to meet planning targets and turn

<sup>68.</sup> Izvestia, October 13, 1988, p. 2.

Izvestia, August 25, 1988, p. 2.
 Izvestia, July, 15, 1988, p. 3; July 30, 1987, p. 3.
 Pravda, October 12, 1988; also earlier, Pravda June 14, 1986, p. 3.

over a profit, an effective manager must turn to illegal transactions through the black market to get supplies of raw materials, sell his product quickly, and make a profit<sup>72</sup>. A year later, *Pravda* reported serious violations of Party and Government regulations by officials from numerous ministries. Officials from the machine tool, electrical equipment, power and oil ministries were accused of not following the law, of not fulfilling their production quotas and of turning up products of inferior quality. The shortcomings of state establishments were again evident a year later, when they proved to be unprepared for winter. Among other problems, the neglect of power installations and the breakdown of heating systems contributed to the many difficulties encountered by state establishments<sup>73</sup>.

Pricing also proved to be a problem for the planned economy. High-level discussions were once again required to ensure a proper relationship between prices and productivity, for the usual solution of simply hiking up prices proved to be an unrealistic method of handling problems<sup>74</sup>.

These are but a few cases, which illustrate the problems of doing business in either the government or private sectors of the Soviet economy during the early stages of the restructuring process.

#### **D.** Transportation

The transportation sector also encountered all sorts of problems during this period of time. The rate of accidents ran excessively high. As observed in Sovietskaia Latvia, the safest place to be in a car is in the garage. In the small republic of Latvia, there were 4,638 accidents, 586 fatalities and 4,026 bodily injuries during 1984<sup>75</sup>. The Baku subway system, whose construction began several years ago, was still not operational in 1985<sup>76</sup>. Bus transportation was inadequate for buses seldom ran according to schedule. A wave of strikes resulted when bus drivers refused to drive their vehicles on roads in such poor condition<sup>77</sup>. The Railroad Ministry was guilty of autocratic decision making, poor performance, and cover-ups, instead of concentrating on improving their services78.

The Air Transportation was plagued with delays, wasted time, and irresponsible employee conduct. The employees often left the USSR in search of better working conditions abroad<sup>79</sup>.

Thus, even during Perestroika, the transportation industry continued to fail in its task.

<sup>72.</sup> Izvestia, January 24, 1985, p. 3.
73. Pravda, July 22, 1987, p. 1.
74. Pravda, February 4, 1989, pp. 1-2.
75. Sovietskaia Latvia, January 13, 1985, p. 4.
76. Pravda, February 18, 1985, p. 7.
77. Moskovskii izvestii, September 20, 1987, p. 9; Pravda, July 18, 1988, p. 4.
78. Pravda, December 11, 1988, p. 3.
79. Pravda, December 27, 1987, p. 3.

#### **E.** Agriculture

Stalin's policy of forced collectivization, which led to artificial famines in various parts of the USSR, left Soviet agriculture in complete ruin. The agricultural industry has yet to recover from the blows delivered to it by Stalin<sup>80</sup>. Farming currently costs the Soviet government more than 100 billion dollars a vears in subsidies. The 1988 harvest was the worst since 1985. The 1988 fruit harvest fell short of the 1987 level by 2.5 million tonnes. Grain imports for 1988 were 13.8 times higher than the 1970 level. Meat imports were 5.2 times higher, and fish imports were 12.4 times higher. Butter imports increased by 1,800% and the grape harvest fell in 1988 by 1.5 million tonnes from the previous year's level<sup>81</sup>.

Cotton, meat and milk production was unsatisfactory in 1985.

Agriculture was not properly mechanized, while continuous corruption plagued the farming industry in some areas<sup>82</sup>. In 1986, a grain yield, which did not meet the needs of the country, prompted the Central Committee of the CPSU to draw up a special resolution addressing the issue<sup>83</sup>. Livestock levels were too low, although favourable conditions persisted. Ignorance and carelessness on the part of many officials directly contributed to this situation. Literaturnaia Gazeta, in 1988, reported on the state of the frequently troubled cotton industry<sup>84</sup>. In August 1987, Pravda reported a state of chaos in the potato and vegetable production industry in almost every region in the USSR. The newspaper argued that every region should feed itself, and not waste time and transportation for long distance shipments. Inter-regional exchange under the guise of product specialization proved to be economically inefficient. A month later, Pravda blamed the weather for delays in the harvesting of potatoes and other vegetables. Losses and spoilages threatened the economy<sup>85</sup>. Agricultural research and the speedy implementation of findings was once again encouraged, in order to produce a greater quantity and better quality of agricultural products<sup>86</sup>.

In October 1988, in order to improve the situation in the farming industry, Gorbachev called for the wide-scale leasing of farmland, farm equipment and farm animals to individual peasants. In February 1988, the government was urged to grant peasants free choice of land, with the goal of rehabilitating them as a social class. It was a call to give the "land back to the farmers". Private gardening also began to be praised as early as 1987<sup>87</sup>.

<sup>80.</sup> The Collectivization: Gregory and Stuart, op. cit., pp. 99-110; Conquest, op. cit., pp. 117-188.
81. R. Rosenblatt, "The Altar of Broken Ideas", US News and World Report, April 3, 1989, p. 42.
82. Pravda Vostoka, March 3, 1985, pp. 1-3; Literaturnaia gazeta, July 30, 1986, p. 12.
83. Pravda, August 6, 1986, pp. 1-2.
84. Literaturnaia gazeta, July 30, 1986, p. 12.
85. Pravda, September 23, 1987, p. 1.
86. Pravda, September 23, 1987, p. 1.
87. Pravda, September 23, 1987, p. 1.

<sup>86.</sup> Pravda, August 13, 1987, pp. 1-4; also, October 29, 1987, p. 2; November 2, 1988, p. 2; *Izvestia*, July, 24, 1988, p. 4. 87. *Izvestia*, February 4, 1989, p. 2; also February 14, 1989, pp. 1-2; *Pravda*, March 16, 1989,

pp. 1-4.

While this limited privatization of land was occurring, Pravda, in 1987 and again in 1989, praised the collectivization of Soviet farms in the 1930s, and declared that the collective and state farms still formed the foundation of the USSR's agricultural industry<sup>88</sup>. The official Party organ clearly showed that there was a struggle between Party conservatives and liberals over this issue, and over the pace of the restructuring process in general. The average peasant, meanwhile, was uneasy for he did not know what direction the whole process will ultimately take. After a few years of experimentation with free farming, and the acquirement of wealth, he might once again be branded a "kulak" and sent into exile or prison. The collectivization of the 1930s had left a deep psychological scar on the peasantry. They have regarded the Party and government with complete mistrust for decades. Hence, even now, some peasants were reluctant to take land from the government.

As the reform process grew more and more popular, a system of agroindustrial integration was introduced, with the intent of significantly increasing productivity. With the development of the "privatization" of farming, however, the agro-industrial committees have been progressively eliminated since 1987<sup>89</sup>. In April 1989, *Pravda* printed an appeal urging the Party, government and all economic institutions to cooperate in developing family, cooperative and truck farming for the general benefit of the Soviet economy. Then, at the conference on agricultural problems held on June 16, 1989, two leading, albeit unorthodox, Soviet economists, V. Tikhonov and O. Bogomolov, called for a sweeping reform of the farming system in the USSR, including the return of all land to the peasants, in order to avoid large-scale famine in the Soviet Union. The shortage of foreign currency in the USSR would make a long-run dependence on foreign food imports impermissible. Thus, the policy of collectivization was further discredited<sup>90</sup>.

#### F. Labour

Since 1985, the Soviet press has continually printed complaints about poor work performance, poor distribution of manpower, the need to crack down on idlers, and the need for personal responsibility of management for work performance. Chernenko stressed the need for better work productivity, living conditions and health standards for workers, noting that these are all interrelated<sup>91</sup>. Substantial labour loss resulted when workers were constantly changing jobs in their search for better pay and working conditions. This caused interruptions in production processes and created much waste throughout the entire economy<sup>92</sup>.

Alcoholism and drug abuse continuously undermined the work ethic, as

- Pravda, January 15, 1989, pp. 1-2; August 9, 1987, p. 1.
   Pravda, August 13, 1987, pp. 1-4; Pravda, March 16, 1989, pp. 1-4.
   Pravda, August 18, 1989, p. 1; April 2, 1989, p. 2.; Svoboda, Jersey City, June 22, 1989, p. 2.
   Izvestia, February 23, 1985, pp. 1-2.
   Pravda, March 10, 1985, p. 2.

frequently reported by newspapers. A war on alcoholism was initiated under Andropov and continued under Gorbachev, with only limited success. The crusade against alcoholism significantly slowed down in 1988<sup>93</sup>.

Concerning labour conditions for women, Izvestia, in October 1988, reported on the gravity of the situation. Men were taking the easier jobs, leaving the heavy manual work, night shifts, irrigation and construction labour for women. All government resolutions regarding this problem were ignored<sup>94</sup>. In order to avoid exploitation, low pay and long working hours, many women turned to prostitution as a source of income. According to newspapers from all over the Soviet Union, prostitution was on the rise during Perestroika<sup>95</sup>. Venereal disease was also spreading<sup>96</sup>.

Also, strikes were erupting in various parts of the Union, as excessive worknorm assignments, low pay, withheld bonuses, and other abuses on the part of management began to take their toll, according to Pravda, Izvestia and other newspapers<sup>97</sup>. In an attempt to alleviate the situation, the regime granted permission to hold more than one job, including part-time work and participation in private family and cooperative enterprising<sup>98</sup>.

#### V. CONCLUSION

As the 12th Five-Year Plan, in the wake of the turmoil surrounding Perestroika, moves rapidly to its conclusion at the end of 1990, the leadership of the USSR has already made preparations for the next stage of their country's economic development. The issue at hand appears to be whether there should be a resolute turn in the direction of the Western free market or should the economy continue to function in the old mode of planning and bureaucratic decision making. After the Presidium of the Council of Ministers met and established the 13th Five-Year Plan, a certain A. Druzenko published an article in Izvestia, in July 1988, entitled "Thoughts after a Meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers". In it, he stated the following:

"In . . .a mere two years we must essentially complete the new and, let us hope, innovative management mechanism with which the country is to embark on the 13th Five-Year Plan. We must place all branches of the economy under the new regime in 1989, shift as quickly as possible to supplying needs through wholesale

<sup>93.</sup> Alcoholism and drugs: Izvestia, July 24, August 5 and 12, 1986; Literaturnaia gazeta, August 20, 1986, p. 11; Pravda, October 26, 1988, p. 1.
94. Izvestia, October 23, 1988, p. 6.
95. Zoria Vostoka, September 25, 1987, p. 4; Komsomolskaia pravda, September 19, 1987, p. 2.
96. Sovietskaia Kirgizia, May 16, 1987, p. 3, and September 23, 1987, p. 4; Pravda Ukrainy, 1987, p. 4; Pravd

March 29, 1987, p. 4.

<sup>97.</sup> Sovietskaia Rossia, December 1984, p. 2; Izvestia, November 28, 1987, p. 3; also March 10. 1989. p. 2; Crackdown on gypsies and parasites: Sotsialistichnaia industria, March 16, 1985, p. 4; Little progress in employing the jobless: *Izvestia*, February 4, 1985, p. 3.
 98. *Izvestia*, October 3, 1988.

outlets, put a new administrative structure in place, invigorate economic accountability principles on a regional basis, work out scientifically substantiated normative standards, and prepare a reform of the price setting system. We must, absolutely must, do all this before the beginning of the new Five-Year Plan<sup>"99</sup>.

It all sounds rather familiar and typical, without any substantial shift in a new direction. There seems to be no mention of individual initiative, market competition, the profit motive, putting more confidence in the market mechanism, or reworking the role of state plans into mere directives. State and collective farms appear to be the format in the agricultural industry, and commercial establishments, owned and run by the government, will dominate the economy. The small concession to "private enterprise" appears to be of rather little significance. Hence, Perestroika's future pace will continue to be too slow.

Furthermore, confusion appears to have arisen concerning what Perestroika really means, and what goals are being achieved. In her December 1988 article "Perestroika as a Social Revolution", Zaslavskaia writes the following:

"Restructuring means redistributing power from the centre outward, breaking up the Nomenklatura, allowing for the public to play a bigger role in investments. But it is also the curbing of anti-Soviet groups' goals, and moving faster towards Socialism"<sup>100</sup>.

Until clearcut definitions of Socialism, Glasnost, Perestroika, and private business are made, the restructuring process appears to be futile.

S. Blagorodin, amidst all the disarmament talks and agreements, made what can be considered an unorthodox demand, namely appealing for a deemphasis on the military in the USSR. He reasoned that the military has been an economic burden, and has contributed to the low standard of living in the Soviet Union<sup>101</sup>. Whenever the leadership of the Soviet Union changed hands, be it from Stalin to Khrushchev, or from Brezhnev to Gorbachev, promises of a reduced emphasis on the military and heavy industry and better days for the average consumer have never materialized<sup>102</sup>.

Meanwhile, the planning targets for the 13th Five-Year Plan have been announced:<sup>103</sup>

<sup>99.</sup> Izvestia, July 21, 1988, p. 2.

<sup>100.</sup> Izvestia, December 24, 1988, p. 3.
101. Izvestia, November 18, 1988, p. 8; Adm. William Crow, when in the USSR, commented on the Soviet "defence" doctrine, and pointed out that it is difficult for anybody to believe that the huge Soviet military machine is really required for defence purposes, and, looking at the enormous military superiority of the Soviet armed forces, that it is really oriented towards defence only. Svoboda, June 16, 1989, p. 1.

<sup>102.</sup> N.L. Chirovsky, Ukrainian Economy, New York, 1965, pp. 54-55; the emphasis on heavy industry continued throughout the entire Brezhnev era.

<sup>103.</sup> Pravda, October 29, 1988, p. 1.

	INCREASE (%)
National Income	4.5
Personal Income	3.8
Retail Trade	6.1
Labour Productivity	4.6
Capital Investments	2.3

The present economic situation in the Soviet Union must somehow be ameliorated. The process of this improvement, called Perestroika, has yet to deliver the promised goods. With the past serving as a grim reminder, the citizens of the Soviet Union apprehensively await the next few years, hoping that their economic plight will somehow improve.

#### BOOKS, PRINTING, AND THE FIRST PRINTING HOUSES IN UKRAINE

(Part 2)

#### **III.** The First Ukrainian Printed Books

The Lviv "Epistles", printed by Ivan Fedorovych in 1574, are regarded as the first Ukrainian printed book. They are essentially a copy of the "Epistles" printed in Moscow. The Lviv edition was printed in the same typeface, with many headpieces taken from the plates of the Moscow "Epistles". However, the Lviv "Epistles" differ from the Moscow edition in several ways. The publication is slightly larger and contains a foreword and epilogue, as well as more elaborate ornaments.

The second book printed by Fedorovych in Lviv is the "Primer" (1574). It is an original book and differs from previous editions. The only remaining copy can be found in the library of Harvard University. This is the most significant find of recent times. The discovery of the "Primer", an educational textbook, "to a marked degree changed all notions about the role, activity and personality of Ivan Fedorovych", wrote Prof. O. Sydorov. "Fedorovych, whom we knew as a printer and engraver, will now hold a place among the pedagogues-enlighteners". The "Primer" is of a small format, set in the same typeface as the Lviv "Epistles".

The Ostrih "Reader" of 1578 is the third Ukrainian book printed by Fedorovych and the first of the Ostrih publications. It also belongs to the important finds of recent times. Like the Lviv "Primer" of 1574, one copy of the book has survived and is on display in the town library of Gotha in East Germany. The "Reader" is a small book. Its pages are composed of two parallel columns of text (galleys), one in Greek and the other in Slavonic. The ornaments consist of a composite frame on the title sheet, the coat-of-arms of Prince Konstantyn Ostrozkyi, and a headpiece and the printer's mark from the Lviv "Primer".

Fedorovych's fourth Ukrainian publication is the Ostrih "Primer" of 1578-80. Two copies of this work are known to exist. One is preserved in Copenhagen and the other in Gotha, bound in a single volume with the Ostrih "Reader". It is a reprint of the Lviv "Primer" with an additional treatise by Bulgarian monk Khrabr on the creation of the Cyrillic alphabet. In his treatise, written in the 13th century, Khrabr underlines the fact that the Slavonic language and Cyrillic alphabet are equal to Latin and Greek. The Ostrih "Primer" is printed in the same typeface as the Lviv publications and the ornaments are identical to those of the Lviv "Primer".

The fifth Ukrainian printed work is "The New Testament and Psalter", published in Ostrih in 1580. Its print run exceeded even that of the "Epistles". The book is set in three typefaces: the Muscovite and two new ones, also used in the Ostrih "Reader". "The New Testament" is decorated with an engraved title sheet, 36 headpieces, six plates, numerous initials, 34 colophons and fine ornamental motifs.

It contains two engravings — a small original coat-of-arms of Prince Ostrozkyi and Ivan Fedorovych's new printer's mark at the end of the book. The composition and artistic and technical finish of "The New Testament" were an experiment, prior to the publication of the more extensive Ostrih "Bible" — the most famous of the books printed by Fedorovych.

The "Bible" (1581), like the "Epistles", was printed in sheets. It is set in six typefaces, two Greek and four Cyrillic, nearly all of which were used in previous books printed by Fedorovych. The title page of the Ostrih "Bible" was taken from the composite frame of the Lviv "Epistles". The verso contains the coat-of-arms of Prince Ostrozkyi, the same as in "The New Testament" only a little larger. The initial, unnumbered, sheets of the "Bible" contain two prefaces, the second of which concludes with a poem by Herasym Smotrytskyi. An epilogue and Ivan Fedorovych's printer's mark can be found at the end of the book. The "Bible" is richly decorated with 80 headpieces, seven or eight colophons and many intricate initials. It differs from Fedorovych's previous publications because it contains almost the entire alphabet, with several variants of the most frequent letters.

In 1581 Fedorovych also printed the "Chronology" of Andriy Rymsha, published in Ostrih. This is a two-page leaflet set in the Ostrih and Moscow typefaces and decorated with two composite colophons. The "Chronology" contains the names of the months in Russian, Ukrainian and Hebrew, and short poems about events, which supposedly occurred in each month.

Ivan Fedorovych learnt printing from the first Slavonic printers Fiol, Makariy, Skoryna, and the craftsmen who produced the anonymous Slavonic publications. He collected their books and changed their layout according to his own taste, concentrating on text layout and readability. Fedorovych's system of headings, ligatures, notes, marginal marks, and separations in the text also improved readability.

To separate text Ivan Fedorovych usually used a second colour. Such purely decorative elements as headpieces, initials and colophons were also used in the technical layout of books. In his Ukrainian publications, particularly those printed in Ostrih, Fedorovych introduced, for the first time, intricate cast ornaments. He paid particular attention to page layout, in which he progressed far beyond his predecessors.

Ivan Fedorovych strived to preserve a single principle in the layout, composition and form of his books. The fundamental graphic elements were the typeface and ornaments. The typeface created by Fedorovych was adopted by Ukrainian books not only because of its highly artistic and technically advanced form, but also because it shared many common features with the handwritten Ukrainian "semi-ustav", which was similar to other Slavonic "semi-ustav" writing. Fedorovych's merits lie in his extensive use of Ukrainian art, catering for the tastes of this customers.

#### IV. Ukrainian Printing Houses Of The 16th-17th Centuries: The Monastic Printing House in Lviv

Apart from Ivan Fedorovych, the most notable, talented and highly professional Ukrainian publisher-printer of the 16th-17th centuries, there were also other printers, many of them well versed in the various printing skills. After Fedorovych introduced printing in Lviv it rapidly spread around Halychyna. In 1579 his printing house was taken over by I. Yakubovych, and later by the Lviv Brotherhood. From 1591 it began to play a significant role in the development of Ukrainian printing.

The first monastic publications may already have appeared two or three years later. Some, dated 1591, have survived. These are two edicts issued by the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Kyivan Metropolitan Mykhailo Rohoza called "Prosphonima", and the most important of the first monastic publications the "Grammar" of the Slavonic language, a textbook for the monastic school.

In the first period of the monastic printing house production was negligible. Between 1591 and 1616 the monks published 16 books and leaflets. These were of a small format and usually of a non-liturgical nature. The printing house did not work on a regular basis. The first four books appeared in the years 1591-93, and a further eight in the years 1608-16. It had no fixed premises. Up to 1608 the printing house was situated by the Church of the Dormition. Later it was transferred to the Onufrius Monastery and set up in one of the cells, and in 1615 was again housed in a building by the Church of the Dormition.

The first books printed by the Brotherhood had very few ornaments. In these, particularly the "Grammar", the Brotherhood tried to improve the Church-Slavonic Cyrillic typeface. Although this attempt "was half-measured and not constant, it affected only the initials", its meaning was very significant. To simplify the composite letters and make them more readable the monks exchanged the Cyrillic initials for Greek letters with similar forms.

The books printed between 1593 and 1607 have not survived. However, there are no grounds to assume that the printing house did not function during this period. The establishment and the service it provided were there. Bibliographic records mention one publication from this period, the "Oktoyikh" (1601), whose present whereabouts are unknown. The books

published by the monks in the years 1608-16 were printed after the appearance of the very interesting and highly decorated "balabaniv" publications, which had a significant influence on the further development of Ukrainian book art. The "Vidozva bratstva" (1608), which has no artistic value, and two publications from 1609, the "Concise Book of Hours" and the "Besidy Ioanna Zlatoustoho o vospytanii chad", have survived.

In 1614, after a second interval in its work, the monastic printing house published a book called "Knyha o sviashchentsi". Pamvo Berynda, who came to Lviv from Striatyn, was responsible for this publication. Of particular interest is the illustrated "Psalter" published in 1615. After the publication of the book "Na Rozhdestvo Khrystove" there was a long break in the activity of the monastic printing house. Its next book did not appear until 1630.

All the same, as far as output is concerned, the contribution of the Lviv Brotherhood is significant. Up to 1708, when the Brotherhood accepted the Union with Rome, it printed 112 books. As regards the number of copies, from 1591, when the activity of the printing house began in earnest, to 1772, the Brotherhood printed 160,000 copies of 140 different books.

The Lviv Brotherhood regarded the printing of liturgical books and the "uchylyshche potrebnykh" as a very important part of its activity, and took great care to preserve its independence in the running of the printing house. After 1628, when it was almost totally destroyed by fire together with a year's work, great efforts were necessary to revive the printing house.

The sale of books brought in extensive profits. This money was used to maintain the printing house, the monastic school, the hospital and so on. The books were sold not only in Ukraine, but also far beyond its borders. They could be bought in Muscovy, Rumania, Wallachia, and many other countries, visited by representatives of the Brotherhood. To eliminate unwanted rivals the Brotherhood strived to acquire royal and other privileges to a monopoly on the printing of liturgical books for Ukrainian churches, as well as textbooks of the Slavonic language.

For almost a century Lviv's monastic printing house acted as a centre, which attracted notable Ukrainian cultural activists and professional printers. The number of rivals in this field greatly increased. Sometimes they were masters, who learnt their trade in the monastic printing house, some of whom occasionally printed books identical in content to those published by the Brotherhood.

Some of these printers converted from Orthodoxy to the Uniate rite. In general, however, the monks found ways of dealing with all those who aspired to become independent. They were invited to work for the Brotherhood. The organizational abilities of these printers made them particularly useful.

Such was the case with Mykhailo Slozka, a notable Lviv publisher and printer of the 17th century (died 1667), who arrived in Lviv from Lithuania around 1630 and became director of the monastic printing house. He printed

24

around 20 books in Church-Slavonic, as well as various books in Polish and Latin.

Of his 42 known titles the most important are the "Epistles" (1639), which contain his own foreword and numerous headpieces by master Illia and others; "Triod tsvitna" (1642); I. Galatovskyi's "Kliuch rozuminnia" (1663, 1665) and "Nebo novoye" (1665), books in Latin by S. Okolskyi about the bishops of Kyiv and Chernihiv, and others. Slozka was the first to publish miniature books: "Prayers and the Concise Book of Hours" (1642) and the "Psalter" (1667). Under his management, for the first time in Ukraine, the monastic printing house published an illustrated "Chetveroyevanhelie" (1636) using a special typeface, which imitated the handwritten "Testaments" printed in Lviv. Slozka's books were distinguished for their elaborate format and great artistic taste.

In the foreword to the 1639 "Epistles" Slozka writes that for him "typography is a holy matter" to which he was "accustomed since childhood". Not only was M. Slozka an energetic and able salesman, who sold his own and other books, but also a good craftsman, whose books were superior in quality to those printed by the Brotherhood. Although Slozka sometimes printed his books to the direct detriment of the monastic printing house, the Brotherhood, which often took him to court, was compelled to turn to him again and again.

Arseniy Andriy Zhelyborskyi (1618-1663), Bishop of Lviv from 1641-1663, who founded a printing house at the Cathedral of St. George in Lviv in 1646, Bishop Yu. Shumlianskyi and many others also played an important role in Ukrainian printing. During the siege of Lviv by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytskyi in 1648, Zhelyborskyi, together with his brother Atanasiy (Adam), Bishop of Lviv (1663-1666), acted as a royal envoy to the Kozaks, and in 1658 played an important role in the peace treaty with Hetman Ivan Vyhovskyi in Hadiach.

(To be continued)

Mykola HLOBENKO

#### THE LITERATURE OF SOVIET UKRAINE

(Conclusion)

However, given all these obstacles to the development of Ukrainian postrevolutionary literature, it developed nevertheless, being represented by a hitherto unprecedented number of authors.

Like symbolism, Ukrainian Futurism was also a latecomer, though without such distinguished poets. Begun by the collections of Mykhailo Semenko "Prelude" (1913), "Derzannia" (1914), "Kverofuturism" (1914), "Piero zadaietsia" and "Piero mertvoteplie" (1918-19), which was received by the majority of the reading public as a literary oddity, Futurism in Ukraine not only followed the slogans of literary revolution but also of the unscrupulous denial of all pre-revolutionary culture in the name of left-wing communist art - M. Semenko's "Kobzar" (1924), his "Poezofilmy", the first works of G. Shkurupiy, M. Bazhan and others. After numerous reorganizations and attempts to issue their organ ("Universalnyi Zhurnal" 1918, the group "Flamingo" 1919, the Association of Panfuturists, the Association of Communist Culture and others) the futurists united in the group "Nova Generatsia" (1927-31), renamed in 1930 The Union of Proletarian Writers of Ukraine with the journal "Nova Generatsia" (M. Semenko, Geo Shkurupiy, Oleksa Vlyzko, Dmytro Buzko, Hro Vakar, Mykola Bulatovych, Leonid Nedolia, Oleksa Poltoratskyi, Ivan Malovichko, Leonid Zymnyi and others).

Besides publicity declarations of necessity coloured in official tones, and besides the mass of often superficial experimentation, the "Nova Generatsia" was an interesting studio, which set itself the task of mastering the artistic word in the struggle against the previous tradition often still tied to ethnographism. The "Nova Generatsia" circle produced many more romantics than futurists, minstrels of wilful people, vivid experiences and perilous adventures: the poets Oleksa Vlyzko (the collections "Za vsikh skazhu" 1927, "Zhyvu, pratsiuiu" 1930, "Reis" 1939, "Knyha baliad" 1930, and others) and Geo Shkurupiy, more familiar as a prose writer.

Close to "Nova Generatsia", essentially, in terms of formal searchings, experimentation, declarative interest in technique and militant negation of former tradition, we find *the "constructivist" group "Avangard"* (1926-29, in 1928-29 it issued the journal "Avangard"). The group consisted of: Valerian Pidmohylnyi, Kost Bureviy, Leonid Chernov, Petro Holota, H. Koliada, O. Levada, R. Troiaskov and others. After disbanding, the group joined "Nova Generatsia" and shared its fortunes. These two groups, though they did not

on account of their "ultra-left" tendencies and clamorous experimentation,leave any appreciable legacy, did by virtue of their clear orientation to modern Western art play a certain positive role in the formation of modern Ukrainian literature.

Beginning with Futurism *Mykola Bazhan* gained notoriety by the poem "17 patrul" (1926) and the collection "Rizblena tin" (1927), which resembled the works of O. Vlyzko by their search for images of strong individuals and poignant situations "from far-fetched catastrophies" ("vyshukanykh katastrof"). The extraordinarily temperamental, philosophically profound expressionist poems "Hofmanova nich", "Sliptsi", "Trylohia prystrasty" and the book "Budivli" (1929) characterized by bold positing and treatment of historiosophic problems pushed Bazhan into the front ranks of Ukrainian poets. However, the catastrophe of 1933-34 forced Bazhan to go the way of Rylskyi.

In the 1920s an original representation of Ukrainian Expressionism in the person of *Teodosiy Osmachka* gained in prominence. His collections are entitled: "Krucha" (1922), "Skytski vohni" (1925) and "Klekit" (1929).

The very strong impressionist Yevhen Pluzhnyk in "Dni" (1926), "Rannia osin" (1927) displays moods of extreme weariness, despair and scepticism in the face of reality, which does not satisfy the poet. The poetry of Dmytro Falkivskyi is filled with bitter memories, sadness and gloom; his collections: "Obriy" (1927), "Na pozharyshchi" (1928) and "Polissia" (1931).

The vigorous and jovial poetry of *Maik Yohansen* combines Impressionism with Symbolism (with certain expressionist elements), moving from an interest in the revolution more and more to the natural world. His collections: "D'hori" (1921), "Krokoveie kolo" (1923), "Dorobok" (1924) and "Yasen" (1930). *Ivan Bahrianyi* combines elements of Romanticism (using folk poetry) and Symbolism in his lyric poetry and publicistic writings; his collections: the poem "Monolohia" (1927), "Do mezh zakazanykh" (1928), "Ave Maria" (1924), "Skelka" (1930) and others.

The superficial but extraordinarily lyrical *Volodymyr Sosiura* won considerable popularity especially among the youth in the first years of his writing. He is author of the poems "Chervona zyma", "Taras Triasylo", "Mazepa" and the collections "Misto", "Osinni zori", "Sohodni", "Yun" and others. He began as an impressionist, taking images from the NEP town alien to him and composed perennial romantic memoirs of the stormy revolutionary years. Under the onslaught of official criticism his creative talent ceased to develop and became set in a few favourite "revolutionary" stamps from which the official "proletarian" poets P. Usenko, S. Kryzhanisvkyi, S. Holovanivskyi and many others were never able to escape. The poetry of the talented Leonid Pervomaiskyi (Rabynovych), whose themes are orthodox in the Bolshevik mould is regarded as a romantic. Teren Masenko, Ivan Kaliannyk and Vasyk Mysyk were much more original and adventurous before their growth was stunted by official criticism. The prose of the 1920s evolved from the impressionist, so-called "ornamental" novella (short story) to the thematic novel and the realistic novel.

*Hryhoriy Kosynka* is an exponent of lyrical, ornamental prose in his novellas "V zhyttakh", "Holova Khodi", "Na zolotykh bohiv" and others, which were dedicated to the peasants who opposed the Bolshevik occupation, joined the partisans and wished to live according to their ancient order.

Mykola Khvylovyi in "Syni etiudy" sings of the heroism of the "stormy days" of the revolutionary struggle ("Legenda", "Kit u chobotakh"). The romantic pathos of the expected advent of the "commune beyond the mountains" combines in his works with an acknowledgement of the current conflicts as the continuation of the historic national tradition (hence "the shades of medieval knights", "the Swedish grave" and so forth). In these highly romantic struggles he discovers insoluble tragic conflicts (the novellas "Maty" and "Ya"). Presently, in depicting images of post-revolutionary reality, he sees the hopelessness of the situation and is more and more aware of the tragic error of those who believed in the advent of the expected "joyous Madonna" but were confronted with the domination of the "global riff-raff" ("Arabesky", "Redaktor Kark", "Sanatoriyna zona"). Not limiting himself to novellas and pamphlets, Khvylovyi turns first to the publicistic novel "Valdshepy", where through the lips of Aglaia he exposes the bankruptcy of the active Bolshevik revolutionaries Dmytro Karamazov and Hanna, and subsequently to the highly satirical novellas "Ivan Ivanovych", "Revizor" and others, which contain the ugly images of the new masters of Ukraine.

Commencing with impressionist novellas *Mykhailo Ivchenko* ("Shumy vesniani", "Imlysstoiu rikoiu" and "Zemli dzvoniat"), P. Panch ("Solomianyi dym" and "Tam de verby nad stavom"), A. Holovko (the collection "Mozhu") and others subsequently converted as most prosaists to thematic works, realistic or with certain impressionist elements. The themes of Ukrainian prose in this period were mostly events tied to the Revolution, the 1917 war and the following years and partly with the 1905 revolution and the world war, but particularly with the present NEP period in its various aspects.

One of the foremost accomplishments of this period was the prose of Yuriy Yanovskyi: the novella collection "Krov zemli" (1924-27), the experimental novel dedicated to the joy of creative work "Maister korablia" (1928) and in particular the novel "Chotyry shabli" (1930), which with masterful stylization highlights the national and deeply popular elements in the Ukrainian partisan movement "hryhoryivscnhyna" and other similar movement in 1918-1919. After the 1933-34 purges Yanovskyi returned to this subject-matter but gave it a decidedly orthodox treatment in the masterful collection of novellas "Vershnyky" (1935). Falling short of Yanovskyi's heights, Yulian Shpol (M. Yalovyi) attempted to recreate the romantic ardour of this period in the novel "Zoloti lyseniata" (1928).

The subtle novelist Arkadiy Liubchenko began likewise with romantic

expressions of the experiences of the revolutionary period in the collection "Buremna put" 1925; the sharply criticized story "Obraza" (1927) gives a satirical account of Soviet life in a big city. At the same time *Ivan Senchenko* produced acutely satirical pictures of the NEP period, "Chervonohradski portrety", "Iz zapysok kholuia" and the collection "Dubovi hriady" (1928). *Valerian Pidmohylnyi* began with psychological novellas (the collection "Problema khliba", which contains a good deal of "lyrical prose"). He then moved in the novel "Misto" (1928) to the problem of the "takeover" of the city by the young intelligentsia from the villages, and produced a number of brutal images from daily life under NEP (this is depicted also in his last novel before being exiled, "Nevelychka drama").

In numerous other works, partly naturalistic, the new Soviet way of life is depicted by a number of negative images of decay, deceit and moral degradation: for example, novels and stories about urban life: O. Kopylenko's "Vyzvolennia", H. Epik's "Nepia" and "Bez gruntu", H. Brasiuk's "Donna Anna", Ye. Pluzhnyk's "Neduha", V. Domontovych's "Divchyna z vedmedykom" and the tales of B. Teneta, D. Borziak and H. Brasiuk. Nor was life in the Soviet village in Ukraine any better as described in the works of A. Holovko (the novel "Burian", the collection "Mozhu" and P. Panch's "Bilyi vovk"), S. Zhyhalko's "Lypovyi tsvit" and others. The same applies to V. Gzhytskyi's novel about life in the Altai region "Chorne ozero", which openly exposes the colonizer role played by the Russian communists.

The story "Smert" by *Borys Antonenko-Davydovych* dealt with a topical theme, the attempt by people from the national camp to accept psychologically the Bolshevik revolution. Apart from Khvylovyi and Antonenko-Davydovych this theme was treated though much less successfully by Yu. Smolych ("Falshyva Melpomena" and "Po toy bik sertsia"), D. Buzko ("Chaika"), K. Kachur ("Chad"), A. Holovko (the collection "Mozhu") and P. Panch ("Holubi esholony"). Of course, the official critics opposed all these works since none of them solved satisfactorily the problem of the transition of the hero from the national camp to the Bolshevik side. They accused the authors of nationalism.

A special place in Ukrainian prose in the 1920s belongs to the attempts to write dynamic thematic works containing tense situations, by *O. Slisarenko* (the collection of stories "Pliantatsiyi", "Avenita", the novel "Chornyi anhel" and others; *Geo Shkurupiy* — the collection of stories "Peremozhets drakona", the novels "Dveri v den" and "Zhanna batalionerka"; the imaginary tales of Yu. Smolych "Hospodarstvo d-ra Galvanescu", "Ostanniy Eidzhevud" and others. (Later Smolych changed to belletristic memoirs: "Nashi tainy" and others). The prose of *Maik Yohansen* is experimental in nature — "Podorozh d-ra Leonardo", "Podorozh liudyny pid kepom" and others. They are an interesting combination of sketch, lyric prose, dialogue with the reader and other qualities.

Of course, due to constant fire from party critics and the threatened accusation of nationalist idealization of the Ukrainian past, historic prose did not develop. It was represented by V. Petrov's "Romany Kulisha" and "Alina ta Kostomarov", M. Horban's tales "Kozak i voevoda" and "Slovo i dilo hosudareve", the novels set in the 17th century of Z. Tulub ("Liudolovy"), I. Le ("Nalyvaiko"), O. Sokolovskyi ("Bohun"); and finally "Pomylka Honoré de Balzac" by N. Rybak. The remaining historic works contained themes exclusively from the so-called "Civil War", which were treated according to the official view (Panch, Skliarenko, Desniak and others).

The increased official control of the theatre by the authorities did not encourage widespread developments in drama. However, the Vaplite group produced one of the foremost Ukrainian dramatists Mykola Kulish, whose plays were produced by the spiritually related "Berezil" theatre directed by Les Kurbas. Commencing with the naturalistic drama "97" he then in the plays "Komuna v stepakh" and "Khuloy Khuryna" and the comedy "Myna Mazailo" (1929) boldly engages the topical and delicate matter of "Ukrainianization". In the expressionist play "Narodniy Malakhiy" (1929) he posits the most urgent problem, the internal hostility of the Bolshevik revolution to the Ukrainian. Kulish depicts Soviet reality as collective madness and the depracation of the dreams of the good-natured Ukrainian Don Quixote, Malakhiy. The highpoint of Kulish's creativity is the expressionist play "Patetychna sonata", which by a series of scenes filled with enormous tension reveals the deep tragedy of the period of the liberation struggle. Its performance in Ukraine was prohibited. Apart from Kulish the following writers composed plays: Yakiv Mamontov ("Respublika na kolesakh" and others), Ivan Dni-porvskyi ("Liubov i dym" and "Yablunevyi polon"), Yu. Yanovskyi ("Duma pro Brytanku"), A. Liubchenko ("Zemlia horyt"), M. Irchan ("Pliatsdarm") and I. Kocherha ("Maistry chasu", "Svichchyne vesillia", "Pidesh-ne verneshsia" and others).

The unfolding of literary work and the intensity of independent creative pursuits were accompanied inevitably as is evident by broader thematic scope. Writers either referring to the recent event of 1917-21 or depicting the present marked by the effects of the Bolshevik system, continually broached urgent problems. They thus evoked the interest and positive reaction of the Ukrainian reader and the unceasing dissatisfaction of the communist party. Directed by the Department of Culture and Propaganda of the CP(B)U the VUSPP critics V. Koriak, B. Kovalenko and S. Shchupak and also M. Novitskyi, Ye. Hirniak and H. Ovcharov and others specially sent to VUSPP from VUAMLIN (The All-Ukrainian Association of Marxist-Leninist Institutes) began to attack any literary works, which bore the stamp of independence.

The terror instigated by the critics forced writers to concentrate on certain officially defined themes and abandon artistic searches or limit them. Mean-

while, official protection began of weak and artistically even inept, though overtly propagandist, writings of authors from VUSPP and "Molodniak": I. Mykytenko, I. Kyrylenko, O. Korniychuk, I. Le, L. Pervomaiskyi, S. Holovanisvkyi and others. Alongside themes from the "Civil War" with the obligatory caricature of the adversary e.g. Mykytenko's "Ranok" and Korniychuk's "Zahybel eskadry"; the theme of "Bolshevik industrialization" is advocated ("Mizhhiria" and "Integral" by Le, "Kryla Kuzmycha" and "Depo" by Yu. Zoria, "Pereshykhtovka" by Kyrylenko and "Novi berehy" by H. Kotsiuba). Here the successes of industrialization were to be accompanied by "rebuilding" of the psyche of the older-generation heroes and demonstration of the feats of the young Soviet activists (Mykytenko's plays — "Sprava chesty", "Kadry" and "Divchata nashoyi krainy", Pervomaiskyi's "Rovesnyky piatyrichky" and Korniycuk's "Platon Krechet", "Bankir" and many others).

The critics demanded particular sharpness in the description of the Ukrainian village, which writers should show in conflict with old national tradition, folk customs and religion, praising the eradication of the powerful, wealthy and even middle peasantry. Attempts to satisfy these demands were particularly unsuccessful (Kyrylenko's "Avanposty" etc.,). When during the years of "dekulakization" and "collectivization" and now under direct government pressures, several writers began to depict these phenomena, the result was works, which received the critics' condemnation ("Persha vesna" by Epik, Gzhytskyi's "Zakhar Vovhura" and a number of others).

The signal for a particularly brutal onslaught by the communist party on writers of "non-proletarian" organizations, was the arrest in 1929 before the SVU trial of Mykhailo Ivchenko and the official censure of his novel "Robitni syly", which in a slightly veiled form posits the problem of young national cadres. The hitherto unprecedented sharpening of criticism primarily of members of Vaplite and the closely related Kyivan group was accompanied by communist party measures to force writers' organizations into "self-liquidation". Former members of Vaplite, "Nova Generatsia" and others, after several years struggle against VUSPP, began at the outset of 1931 to sign up in their masses for VUSPP. Before in the same year the plan of the People's Commissar for Education, M. Skrypnyk, to unite all writers' organizations in the Federation of the Unions of Revolutionary Writers of Ukraine was realized, there remained of the previously formed organizations only VUSPP, "Molodniak" and "Pluh" (and also the Literary Union of the Red Army and Fleet).

Given all the negative sides of such a forced union it nevertheless still seemed that these writers' organizations could exist independently. However, things were ruined completely by a new measure from Moscow. On 23April 1932 a decision of the CC AUCP(B) on "rebuilding the literary front" meant the liquidation of all writers' organizations in the USSR on the grounds that "involved in mutual conflict" they did not fulfil the tasks set before them, did not attract new writers and so forth. This decision marked the beginning of

the Union of Soviet Writers of the USSR. The appointed head of the union's Organizational Committee Maxim Gorkiy, noted for his great-power chauvinism (and particular hostility to Ukrainian aspirations), was a leading representative of Russian pre-revolutionary literature. He later became a close colleague of Stalin. Throughout the Soviet republics writers' union were formed as component parts of the All-Union Union. The liberal tone of official comments and satisfaction at the liquidation of VUSPP at first deceived some people. Soon, however, it became clear that the Union of Soviet Writers of Ukraine ruled by a communist fraction was tasked with fulfilling the plan to centralize ultimately literature as a tool of Soviet propaganda. At the first post-reform general meeting of Ukrainian writers the appearance in NKVD border guard uniform if I. Kulyk, head of the union's Organizational Committee, was symbolic. The Congress of the All-Union Writers' Union in Moscow in 1934 left no doubt as to the meaning of "rebuilding". Here for the first time in history writers were given "firm guidelines" on ideas and style. Member of the Politburo of the CC AUCP(B), Zhdanov, who delivered a policy speech, explained to writers how they were to interpret the government demand to write in the spirit of "socialist realism":

"Comrade Stalin has called our writers engineers of human souls. What does this mean? What duties does this task impose on you? Namely, first of all, to know life in order to be able to represent life faithfully in artistic works, not scholastically, dully, and not simply as "objective reality" but as reality in its revolutionary development. Here the truthfulness and historic concreteness of artistic portrayal should combine with the task of the ideological transformation and education of the worker masses in the spirit of socialism. This method of artistic literature and literary criticism we call the socialist realist method" (Pervyi Vsesoyuznyi Syezd Sovetskikh pisateley". Stenogr. otchet. 1934, p. 4).

This open imposition of demands has not changed since. In addition to numerous pronouncements on the appearance of any work whose "ideological consistency" was suspect, in newspapers, journals and also at writers' union meetings, which have an atmosphere of ordinary Soviet business with the obligatory signalling of "ideological danger", "by self-criticism", "reports", expulsion from the Union and on the other hand by the issuing of orders and awards and such like, from time to time there appear the obligatory resolutions of party institutions on literary matters. After the relatively liberal period of the war, in the following years of transition to peacetime, there was an immediate increase in demands for a clear propaganda line in the works of Soviet writers. This is evidenced by the decision of the CC AUCP(B) compulsory for the entire USSR, on the journal "Zvezda" and "Leningrad". From 1946 in the wake of the decision of the CC CP(B)U (24.8.1946) after

32

publication of "Narys istoriyi ukrainskoyi literatury", which accused the Writers' Union of "weakening the struggle on the ideological front", a number of Ukrainian wrters, mainly M. Rylskyi, Yu. Yanovskyi and I. Senchenko were rebuked continually for "fresh attempts to infiltrate nationalist ideas into Ukrainian Soviet literature" ("Radianska Ukraina" no. 257, 1947). Some time later a campaign was waged against acknowledgement of Western influences in old and new Ukrainian literature, interest in the West and against so-called "rootless cosmopolitanism". This resulted in expulsion from the Writers' Union and the rest.

Coinciding with an increase in pressure from official criticism and demands for the forced union of writers' groups, at the outset of 1930 a *terror campaign* was launched. For a number of years it wreaked terrible havoc among the writers of Soviet Ukraine.

The first arrests began in connection with preparations for the trial of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU) in 1929. At this, the only at the time public political trial in Ukraine, in the spring of 1930 there were sentenced amongst others the celebrated Serhiy Yefremov, the critic Andriy Nikovskyi, the writer Mykhailo Ivchenko and Liudmyla Starytska-Cherniakivska (after completing her sentence she fell foul of the Bolshevik terror in spring 1941). Presently, Maksym Rylskyi was arrested. On leaving prison he declared publicly his devotion to the regime and henceforth became together with Tychyna and Bazhan, an official poet of the Kremlin eulogizing Stalin and the "fraternal union" between Ukraine and Moscow.

The repression against Ukrainian writers took on mass proportions from 1933 onwards after the arrest of M. Yalovyi and the suicide of M. Khvylovyi (13.5.1933) lasting for a number of years. After the assassination in Leningrad of S. Kirov, member of the Bolshevik Central Committee, numerous executions by firing squad were carried out. Victims of these in December 1934 were H. Kosynka, O. Vlyzko, K. Bureviy, D. Falkivskyi and I. Krushelnytskyi (A. Krushelnytskyi and V. Mysyk were exiled). After slackening, though individual arrests continued, the terror intensified again in 1937-38 during the period known as "Yezhovshchyna".

In 1933-41 the following leading Ukrainian writers were victims of the Muscovite-Bolshevik government repressions (data incomplete):

B. Antonenko-Davydovych, V. Atamaniuk, I. Bahliuk. I. Bahraianyi, V. Bobynskyi, D. Borziak, H. Brasiuk, D. Buzko, M. Bulatovych, K. Bureviy (shot), O. Vedmytskyi, Ostap Vyshnia, O. Vlyzko (shot), Marko Voronyi, V. Vrazhlyvyi, Yu. Vukhnal (I. Kovtun), M. Hasko, V. Gzhytskyi, P. Holota, M. Horban, D. Hodienko, D. Hrudyna, O. Dosvitniy, M. Drai-Khmara (died in exile), M. Dykun, H. Epik, P. Zahoruiko, Zayets, M. Zerov, M. Ivchenko (died in exile), M. Irchan, M. Yohansen (died in prison), I. Kaliannyk (shot), M. Kachaniuk, M. Kichura, M. Kozoris, H. Kosynka (shot), Kost Kotko (M. Libchenko), H. Kostiuk, H. Kosiachenko, H. Kotsiuba, A. Krus-

helnytskyi, I. Krushelnytskyi (shot), M. Kulish, Yu. Lavrinenko, M. Lantsut-Striltsov, P. Lisovyi-Yevashenko, I. Malovichko, V. Mysyk, S. Pylypenko, H. Piddubnyi, V. Pidmohylnyi, L. Piontek, Ye. Pluzhnyk (died in exile), V. Polishchuk, K. Polishchuk, N. Romanovych-Tkachenko, Ya. Savchenko, V. Svidzinskyi (burnt alive by the Bolsheviks in October 1941), M. Semenko, O. Slisarenko, O. Soroka (killed while trying to escape in 1941), L. Starytska-Cherniakhivska, D. Tas-Mohylianskyi, B. Teneta (committed suicide in prison), I. Tkachuk, Z. Tulub, D. Falkivskyi (shot), P. Fylypovych, M. Filianskyi, H. Khotkevych, M. Cherniavskyi, V. Cherniakhivskyi, V. Chyhyryn, G. Shkurupiy, Yakovenko, M. Yalovyi and V. Yaroshenko (only very few were able to return from exile, their health ruined).

At the same time literary specialists were arrested (apart from Yefremov, Nikovskyi, Zerov, Drai-Khmara and Fylypovych) — O. Doroshkevych, A. Lebid, H. Maifet, A. Muzychka, B. Navrotskyi, P. Petrenko, M. Plevako (died in exile), P. Rulin, Yu. Savchenko, P. Khrystiuk, V. Shchepotiev, A. Shamray, F. Yakubovskyi and others.

The following comparison gives us an idea of the number of Ukrainian writers liquidated: above I quoted 100 repressed writers, while according to information from "Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya" in 1940 the Union of Soviet Writers of Ukraine had about 250 members.

The terror inflicted on writers and critics of Soviet Ukraine in 1937-38 struck down even party agents who in carrying out Moscow's orders, for over a decade waged war against new Ukrainian writers. They were: members of VUSPP — I. Kulyk, I. Mykytenko, I. Kyrylenko, V. Koriak, B. Kovalenko, S. Shchupak and the Bolshevik theoreticians specially unleashed on Ukrainian writers — Ye. Hirchak, P. Kolesnyk, M. Novitskyi, H. Ovcharov, S. Fedchyshyn, Ye. Shabliovskyi and others. Enemies of Ukrainian literature such as V. Zatonskyi, A. Khvylia, V. Chubar and F. Tara, did not escape the terror either.

Understandably, under government pressure and terror unprecedented in the history of other peoples literary creativity in the Ukrainian SSR cannot even reflect approximately the complexion of the enslaved nation. The writers terrorized by this government pressure at the very beginning of 1940 were often forced to *revise their work* according to official demands: P. Panch "Pravo na smert" and A. Holovko's "Burian" and "Maty" (a completely revised novel). The prevalent subject matter is set out clearly. The "Sun in the Kremlin" is eulogized as is Stalin in numerous songs and poems including those of Tychyna, Rylskyi and Bazhan. The "friendship of nations" is praised in the Stalinist interpretation, that is the achievements and personalities of Old Russia and the USSR. Emphasis is given to the "unity of Old Rus": Tychyna's "Chuttia yedynoyi rodyny" and "Stal i nizhnist"; Rylskyi's collections "Kyiv", "Ukraina", "Chasha druzhby" and others; Bazhan's "Bezsmertia", Kocherha's play "Yaroslav Mudryi", L. Dmyterko's play "Naviky razom", N. Rybak's novel "Pereyaslavska Rada" and many others.
"Worker achievements" at the factory and in the village inspired by the will of the Kremlin (Yanovskyi's "Zhyva voda", which was criticized severely for its original interpretation of this theme), must be depicted in a strictly regulated manner. Numerous works, which describe the events of the Second World War (Smolych, Honchar and many others) must without fail underline the infinite superiority of Soviet Moscow over the whole world.

Post-war criticism in Soviet Ukraine, while harshly criticizing as manifestations of "bourgeois nationalism" respect for Ukrainian past history, historical figures and denoting national independence, makes too primary demands: 1) displaying and advocating boundless dedication to Red Moscow and its dictatorship and 2) declaring one's rupture with the free West and its culture, which has opposed the entire development of Ukrainian spirituality for many centuries.

#### News from Ukraine

### CHURCH BROTHERHOOD FORMED AT KYIV MEETING OF UAOC REPRESENTATIVES

An All-Ukrainian Church Brotherhood was formed at a meeting of representatives of parishes of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) in Kyiv on December 9, 1989. In a statement, the participants said:

The decision to form the Brotherhood was based on the new political situation in Ukraine, in the course of which UAOC parishes have been spontaneously established and during which the movement from the Russian Orthodox Church to the womb of the Ukrainian Mother-Church has become more widespread and has elicited aggressive countermeasures by the ROC hierarchy and lay authorities.

It has become essential to form a lay-church structure of an all-Ukrainian form, which would be able to coordinate the actions of all Orthodox Ukrainians in their efforts to legalize the UAOC, defend it from enemy attacks.

We are convinced that this role can be carried out by the Church Brotherhood, a traditional institution for the Ukrainian people, and to this end we request the blessing and guardianship of Patriarch Demetrios I. (We beseech his Beatitude Metropolitan Mstyslav [Primate of the worldwide Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church — ed.] and Archbishop Ioan [the UAOC leader in Ukraine — ed.] for support in presenting our appeal to the Ecumenical Patriarch).

The Brotherhood's tasks and principles:

- 1. Proselytize the gospel among the Ukrainian people;
- a. establish higher, secondary and elementary spiritual-educational institutions,
- b. disseminate religious literature among the widest segments of the population,
- c. eliminate impediments to religious instruction for the population.
- 2. Attain the separation of Church and State.
- 3. Ecumenism Christian association with all faiths.
- 4. The Brotherhood is to be the standard of national awareness and high morality. It assumes the responsibility of becoming one of the centres for creating and defending the national culture.

<sup>\*</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service.

5. The Brotherhood considers it its Christian obligation to defend all persecuted, repressed and downtrodden people.

A 10-member editorial board was named at the meeting to develop a draft of the programme and by-laws of the All-Ukrainian Brotherhood.

#### UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX HOLD SOBOR IN LVIV

A Sobor of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) was held on December 14, 1989, in Lviv in the Church of Sts. Peter and Paul.

Present were clergy of the UAOC, representatives of the Lviv and Ternopil diocese and members of the Church Brotherhood, whose goal is to revive, rehabilitate and spread the UAOC in Ukraine, specifically in the cities of Dnipropetrovsk — Vasyl Herusov, Kyiv — Oleksander Pikachuk, one of the editors of the newspapers "Nasha Vira" (Our Faith), and Lviv — Bohdan Rozhyk.

At the beginning of the Sobor, Archbishop Ioan read his response to the ruling of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, in which he convincingly stated that the decision is not legal and canonically directed personally against Archbishop Ioan and other priests who seceed from the Russian Orthodox Church and firmly sided with the UAOC.

The Sobor analyzed the issue of information about the UAOC, its status and potential for development. In order to improve high-quality and operational information, a three-member information group was appointed.

The Rev. Volodymyr Yarema reported on the efforts to legalize the UAOC. It was noted that nearly 100 parishes with open churches, as well as church communities with no churches, have submitted applications to register as faithful of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. However, the authorities have not yet definitely responded to their petition.

They also filed an application for the construction of a UAOC cathedral in Lviv as well as for an office for the diocesan administration. No response has been forthcoming on this matter, as well.

It was reported that three churches in Lviv remain under the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church. Archbishop Ioan declared that only the people have the right to decide the fate of those churches.

The participants of the meeting also voiced their desire that the radio stations Voice of America and Radio Liberty report in detail about the life, development and activity of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

The matter of ordinations to the priesthood was hotly discussed. A great need for UAOC priests exists in the eastern regions of Ukraine.

The Sobor in Lviv was attended by parishioners from the village of Khorosno in the Pustomytiv district of the Lviv province, whose priest converted to the Ukrainian Catholic faith. They requested to be assigned a priest from the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

During the Sobor, Archbishop Ioan, on behalf of the UAOC community in the town of Lutsk, expressed his deep gratitude to the Rev. Stepan Zhyhalo for his missionary work in offering requiems in memory of the fallen fighters for Ukraine's freedom.

The participants of the Sobor enthusiastically welcomed the news that Metropolitan Mstyslav, Primate of the worldwide Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, named Archbishop Ioan the Archbishop of Halych and Volyn in Ukraine, and elevated the Rev. Volodymyr Yarema to the designation of protopresbyter.

## INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS' ASSOCIATION FORMED IN UKRAINE

An independent group of Ukrainian journalists has recently come into being. On January 9, 1990, the group, Ukrainian Independent Publishing and Information Association (UNVIS), an association of professional journalists and literateurs interested in the spread of true information and the objective coverage of today's diverse Ukrainian civic-political life, issued a statement announcing the creation of their new press association.

The founder-members of UNVIS are: Vasyl Barladianu (Odessa); Anatoliy Dotsenko (Moscow); Yaroslav Kendzior (Lviv); Serhiy Matsko (Moscow); Vyacheslav Chornovil (Lviv); Oles Shevchenko (Kyiv); and Volodymyr Yavorskyi (Lviv).

UNVIS succeeds the "Ukrainian Herald" group and the Press Service of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, whose activity included the publication in August 1987 of the first legal independent journal; information supplied to the Ukrainian listener through radio stations of democratic countries; the appearance in March 1989 of the first uncensored newspaper in Ukraine; the publication of the weekly all-Ukrainian information bulletin "Informator"; the publication in Moscow of the Russian-language journal "Ukrainskiy Vopros". The video group has filmed numerous events in Ukraine.

UNVIS has split away from the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), with the intention of creating a wider all-Ukrainian structure to end the many years of party monopoly of the press, radio, television, and publishing houses. Its founder-members have undertaken to report about the activity of all recently-established patriotic organizations (the Popular Movement of Ukraine, "Memorial", the Ukrainian Language Society, "Green World", the UHU and others). However, both they and part of the journalists who have offered to work with UNVIS remain members of the UHU.

In their Statement the founder-members regard the following as the most pressing goals of the Ukrainian Independent Publishing and Information Association:

— the regular publication from January 1990 of the journal "The Ukrainian Herald" and "Ukrainskiy Vopros", the newspaper "Holos Ukrainy", a weekly "Informator" as independent mass press organs;

- the creation of a "Library of the Ukrainian Herald", which would publish books and brochures of a civic-political nature;

— the publishing or reprinting of the publications of other informal groups and organizations, as well as UNVIS, both in Ukraine and in other countries;

- the creation of a network of correspondents and the supply of information to press agencies, radio stations and various publications in the USSR and other countries of the world.

The UNVIS statute, which will be published separately, stipulates different forms of membership in the Association or collaboration with it, both of informal organizations and their publications, and individual authors — from full-time employment in one of the UNVIS publications to other forms of creative or publicational work.

The founder-members of UNVIS hope eventually to establish the Association on a self-financing basis, and hope that representatives of the official press, particularly those who have joined the Free Association of Ukrainian Journalists, will work with UNVIS.

# HISTORIC CATHOLIC-ORTHODOX MEETING IN MOSCOW "Violence" charges negated

Official representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church held a formal meeting in Moscow on 16 January and arranged to continue negotiations and dialogue. This first meeting took place in the offices of the Moscow Patriarchate's Department of External Church Relations at the Danilov Monastery (which the Soviet Government returned to the Orthodox Church in 1983).

The meeting was arranged at one day's notice. On Friday 12 January, a Vatican delegation arrived in Moscow, expecting to meet the Russian Orthodox representatives for one day only and then go to Lviv, Ukraine, for separate meetings with the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic leaders. However, as talks in Moscow appeared to be making further progress, it was decided to invite the Ukrainian Greek-Catholics to come to Moscow so that the three parties could all meet together.

The Vatican delegation consisted of Cardinal Johannes Willebrands (President Emeritus of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity), Archbishop Edward Cassidy (newly-appointed President of the same Council), Bishop Pierre Duprey (Secretary of the same Council), Msgr. Salvatore Scribano (an official of the same Council), and Archbishop Myroslav Marusyn (Secretary of the Vatican's Congregation for the Eastern Catholic Churches).

On Sunday evening, 14 January (traditionally kept as New Year's Day in Ukraine), the Greek-Catholic Archbishop of Lviv Metropolitan Volodymyr (Sterniuk) was asked to assemble a suitable delegation to go to Moscow the following day. Unable to make the trip himself, Metropolitan Volodymyr appointed his senior Auxiliary Bishop Filemon (Kurchaba) head of the delegation. Other members were Bishop Sofron (Dmyterko) of Ivano-Frankivsk, Bishop Pavlo (Vasylyk) [Coadjutor of Ivano-Frankivsk with the right of succession], Auxiliary Bishop Ivan (Margitych) of Mukacheve and Uzhhorod, Auxiliary Bishop Yulian (Voronovskyi) of Lviv, Fr. Hryhoriy Simkailo, Fr. Volodymyr Vityshyn, Fr. Mykhailo Vashko, and Ivan Hel (Chairman of the Committee for the Defence of the Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine.

The Soviet Government Council for Religious Affairs provided air tickets for the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic delegation, which left Lviv on Monday 15 January, on the 10:00 p.m. flight for Moscow, where they arrived after midnight.

The following morning, Tuesday 16 January, the Greek-Catholic delegation first met privately with the Vatican delegation, and then both the Vatican delegation and the Greek-Catholic delegation met with the Russian Orthodox representatives, who were Metropolitan Yuvenaliy of Krutitsky and Kolomna (Vicar of the Archdiocese of Moscow), Metropolitan Filaret of Kyiv and Halych (Patriarchal Exarch of Ukraine), Archbishop Iryney of Lviv and Drohobych, and Archbishop Kiril of Smolensk and Kaliningrad (Chairman of the Moscow Patriarchate Department of External Church Relations).

The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic hierarchs also met informally with Russian Orthodox Archbishop Makariy of Ivano-Frankivsk and Kolomyia, who has abandoned his hunger strike.

The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic bishops emphatically denied the allegations of violence, which Russian Orthodox spokesmen have asserted in the press, and asked whether the Russian Orthodox hierarchs had any evidence to substantiate these allegations. The Moscow Patriarchate representatives did not dispute the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic denials of violence and attributed earlier statements to misinformation.

The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic and Russian Orthodox representatives agreed to continue regular bilateral meetings in Moscow and Lviv. The Vatican will be kept informed of the progress of these discussions and will send representatives for some of the sessions.

Keston College comments that this meeting brought together for the first time ever leading figures of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church. In the past Russian Orthodox church leaders have always refused to meet Ukrainian Catholic hierarchs.

Keston College

## HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS JOIN HUMAN CHAIN ACROSS UKRAINE TO COMMEMORATE UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE AND UNITY

KYIV, JANUARY 21, 1990 — Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians turned out for a day of national solidarity to commemorate the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence and Unity on January 22, 1919, in a human chain organized by the Popular Movement of Ukraine "Rukh". The chain, which stretched from the Ukrainian capital, Kyiv, through Zhytomyr and Rivne to Lviv, was a success, according to Ukrainian activists Serhiy Naboka and Anatoliy Dotsenko.

In Kyiv, reports Naboka, people began to gather in the square outside the Cathedral of St. Sophia at 9:00 a.m. The commemoration began at 11:00 a.m., when members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Brotherhood, formed at a meeting of representatives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) on December 9, 1989, arrived together with priests of the UAOC from Kyiv, Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk. Before the closed gates of St. Sophia they celebrated a *moleben* (a religious service) for Ukraine and in commemoration of the union, in 1919, of western and eastern Ukraine. During the service, the large crowd of people, who had gathered in the square with many Ukrainian flags and slogans, swelled in numbers.

When the human chain began to form, the people stood three and then five deep on St. Sophia Square. Thousands of Ukrainian flags lined the streets of Kyiv, from St. Sophia to the Cathedral of St. Volodymyr, along Shevchenko Boulevard, Peremoha (Victory) Prospect and on to the city limits, Naboka said.

The atmosphere in the Ukrainian capital was festive. The Kyivites, both participants of the action and observers, were in high spirits. Even the police were in a jubilant mood and made no attempt to break up the chain, allowing cars displaying Ukrainian flags and banners to pass through the crowds.

The majority of slogans explained the purpose of the chain. Others stated "Away with party dictatorship!", that there can only be an independent and sovereign Ukraine, that Ukraine has the highest rate of illness in the Soviet Union, called for the national, cultural and religious unity of Ukraine, or condemned the ecological destruction of Ukraine. One boy held a slogan which stated: "We are the people!", in reply to party leaders' claims that only certain individuals constitute the people.

The arrival of a car with youths dressed in the uniforms of the Sich Rifle Corps<sup>1</sup> shouting "Glory to Ukraine!", "Glory to the heroes!" made a great impression on the people of Kyiv.

In addition to the blue-and-yellow Ukrainian national flags, two red-andblack flags of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists were also raised. Naboka believes they were displayed by members of a group called "Diya" (Action).

Although it is difficult to give an accurate figure for the number of participants in the human chain, according to Naboka it was obvious that hundreds of thousands of people took part in the event in Kyiv alone.

According to Anatoliy Dotsenko, the human chain was solid throughout its entire route, from Kyiv to Lviv, where hundreds of thousands of people also took part in the chain with thousands of flags. Many blue-and-yellow Ukrainian flags were displayed on various buildings throughout the city. In Zhytomyr and Rivne tens of thousands of people came out into the streets in support of "Rukh's" national initiative. There were also meetings in Vilnius, Lithuania, and Moscow, by the monument to Taras Shevchenko, 19th century Ukrainian poet and political thinker.

\* \* \*

At noon several thousand people, who were unable to join the chain through a lack of transport, held a meeting in Zhytomyr. Although buses had been booked and paid for in advance, on Friday and Saturday certain transport companies pulled out on the grounds that they had no petrol, or that their buses had broken down. This, says Naboka, was a result of the "telephone law", according to which KGB officials telephone directors of transport companies and dissuade them from providing demonstrators with transportation. It is interesting, notes Naboka, that buses were available for all destinations other than Zhytomyr, which lay on the route of the human chain.

\* \* \*

At 4:00 p.m. a meeting to commemorate this historic anniversary was scheduled to take place in Kyiv on St. Sophia Square. The speakers included the leaders of the Popular Movement of Ukraine, Ivan Drach, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi and Mykhailo Horyn.

\* \* \*

<sup>1.</sup> Ukrainian military formation, which fought for Ukrainian independence in 1917-1921.

ZHYTOMYR — According to Valeriy Kolosivskyi, a representative of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), tens of thousands of Zhytomyr residents participated in this human chain to commemorate Ukrainian independence and unity. The atmosphere in the city was one of elation. The chain was fully intact throughout the entire route through the city, according to Kolosivskyi. An assembly took place at the "Spartacus" city stadium in conjunction with this commemoration. The city police behaved with restraint. The route of the chain went through the city, down Lenin Street, Karl Liebknecht Street and on to the city of Rivne. A national Ukrainian flag was placed every 30-40 metres along the route of the chain, which itself consisted of a solid wall of participants.

\* \* \*

RIVNE — According to Stepan Soroka, a member of the Popular Movement of Ukraine, thousands of people participated in the human chain in the city of Rivne. Hundreds of Ukrainian national flags were displayed throughout the route of the chain. Spontaneous discussions and meetings were held in various places on the route of the chain. The chain was completely intact in the city of Rivne, going through Liebknecht, Lenin and Paris Commune Streets. The people began chanting "Freedom for Ukraine" and other slogans. Eyewitnesses stated that the chain was fully intact from Zhytomyr to the city of Ternopil. At 3:00 p.m. a mass assembly was held at the city's "Slava" (Glory) Hill.

\* \* \*

TERNOPIL — According to Roman Ivanychuk, the chain was completely intact in the city of Ternopil and along its entire route from the city to Lviv. The chain's route through the city went along April 15, Lenin and Lviv Streets. Thousands of people participated in the chain, while many more looked on. There were many national, blue-and-yellow, Ukrainian flags strewn throughout the entire route of the chain. People were chanting: "Freedom for Ukraine" and other slogans. The commemoration was punctuated by an atmosphere of unity.

\* \* \*

LVIV — On January 21 the streets of Lviv were filled with people who came out to commemorate January 22 as Ukraine's historical and traditional day of independence and unity. By the Taras Shevchenko Stone, which has become a popular monument to Ukraine's national poet in the city of Lviv, a Greek-Catholic *moleben* was held, ending at noon. From that time on for an hour church bells rang out throughout the city. The chain began by the Stone of Shevchenko and stretched out towards the city of Ternopil, going through the *Rynok* (Market) Square, Rus' and Lenin Streets, and out of the city.

Tens of thousands of the residents of the city and many people from the surrounding provinces participated in this commemoration. Thousands of Lviv residents also travelled to other cities to join the chain, particularly in Zhyto-myr and Kyiv. Thousands of national Ukrainian flags were displayed through-out the route of the chain. Hundreds of automobiles also joined in the chain.

Prior to the start of the commemorative activities by the Stone of Shevchenko, Vyacheslav Chornovil, one of the leaders of the Ukrainian nationaldemocratic movement, addressed the people. He pointed out that the Act of Union of January 22, 1919, which united all Ukrainian territories into a single state — the Ukrainian National Republic — took place not in the days of bloody September, 1939, when the Soviet forces occupied western Ukraine, but already in 1919, seventy-one years ago. He also pointed out that January 22 is the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence in 1918. According to Taras Chornovil, Vyacheslav's son, the chain stretched out from Lviv to the west, towards the city of Ivano-Frankivsk. The chain between Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk was complete, being formed by many thousands of people from both cities and the surrounding countryside. This branch of the chain to Ivano-Frankivsk was a spontaneous initiative, that was not originally planned by the organizers of this national commemoration.

\* \* \*

MOSCOW — On January 21 an assembly was held in the centre of Moscow by the monument to Taras Shevchenko from 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. (Kyiv time) to commemorate Ukrainian independence and unity. This assembly was sanctioned by the local authorities and was organized by the Moscow branch of UHU, the Popular Movement, the Association of Ukrainians in Moscow "Slavutych", and the Ukrainian youth club.

\* \* \*

KYIV — The commemoration of Ukrainian independence and unity began on Sunday, January 21 at 12:00 noon with a *moleben* for Ukraine, which was led by Revs. Metodiy, Tadey, Ihor and Yuriy of the UAOC from Kyiv, Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk. At noon the human chain began from the Cathedral of St. Sophia and stretched out through this capital city. People from outside Kyiv began arriving by buses already at 8:00 a.m. making their way to the designated route of the chain. At 9:00 several buses with UHU members went to a point 108 km. outside the capital to take their place in the chain for 14 km.

Ivan Drach — the head of the Popular Movement — was the first to stand in the chain at St. Sophia Square with members of the leadership of the Movement following. Priests of the UAOC and members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Brotherhood took their places in the chain opposite the closed gates of the Cathedral. Next in line of the chain were members of the local "Rukh" branches and independent public organizations from Poltava, Odessa, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, the Crimea, Mykolayiv, Ivano-Frankivsk and Kharkiv.

According to Anatoliy Dotsenko, the organizers of this national commemoration estimate that over 400,000 people actively took part in the human chain, which remained intact from 12:00 noon until 1:00 p.m. Afterwards a public assembly took place in St. Sophia Square. Prior to the assembly, several thousand people marched from the Shevchenko monument in Kyiv down Khreshchatyk Boulevard (the main street of the capital) to the Square. They were carrying Ukrainian national flags and chanting: "Glory to the Heroes of the UPA<sup>2</sup> — who fought against the occupying forces of Nazi Germany and Bolshevik Russia!"

At 4:00 p.m. nearly 80,000 people had already gathered at the square, with many more people joining the crowds. Tens of thousands of Ukrainian national flags were being displayed. The assembly began with a speech by Dmytro Pavlychko — a poet and a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. He was followed by the Ukrainian writer Borys Tymoshenko, who read the Fourth Universal of the Central "Rada" (Government of Ukraine in 1918) of January 22, 1918, which proclaimed Ukrainian independence, the Act of Union of January 22, 1919, and the petition of the Western Ukrainian National Republic to join in union with eastern Ukraine. Thirty prominent Ukrainians addressed the assembly, including representatives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Churches, Oles Honchar, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi, Serhiy Konev, Volodymyr Shynkaruk - the head of the Institute of Philosophy - and Yuriy Badzio. The most striking speeches were delivered by Levko Lukianenko, the head of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), and by Oleh Vitovych — the head of the Lviv youth organization SNUM (Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth). Vitovych expressed the hope that if the need arose to fight for an independent Ukraine, the Ukrainian people would be led in battle by new Petluras and Shukhevyches<sup>3</sup>. He ended his address by stating that he believes that the Ukrainian nation will soon be commemorating an even greater event - the secession of Ukraine from the Soviet empire.

Lukianenko pointed out that one of the reasons for the destruction of the Ukrainian National Republic was due to the pacifist position taken by the Ukrainian leadership and its decision to demobilize the Ukrainian army. He underscored the harm of adopting socialist utopias and pointed out the tragic consequences for Ukraine of Russian occupation, and then proceeded to state

<sup>2.</sup> Ukrainian Insurgent Army. It fought for the independence of Ukraine against the Germans and then Soviet Russia up to the early 1950s.

<sup>3.</sup> Symon Petlura was Head of the Ukrainian Government in 1918 and Commanderin-Chief of the Ukrainian army. Roman Shukhevych was the Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

that the empire is now crumbling and that on its ruins an independent Ukrainian state will arise.

After the assembly, Petro Sichko of the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front addressed the participants, urging them to commemorate the fallen heroes of Ukraine by a moment's silence. This was followed by a choir singing Sich Riflemen songs. The assembled participants, which by that point numbered over 120,000 people, joined in the singing.

After the assembly most of the participants went to the Shevchenko monument. As they marched past the KGB headquarters in Kyiv, the people began whistling and shouting — "Shame!" Many people put up lit candles around the building and someone put up a placard reading — "For an independent Ukraine". From the monument, approximately 500 people marched to the building of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR shouting — "Away with Article 6", and expressing their lack of confidence in the "government" and particularly Valentyna Shevchenko — the chairman of the Presidium of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Some of the placards displayed throughout this commemoration read: "Kharkiv and Donetsk are Ukrainian cities", "For the rebirth of the Ukrainian National Republic", "Our strength lies in unity and independence", "1919 — voluntary union — 1939 — forced 'liberation'"; other placards dealt with ecological issues, while others condemned the Communist Party of Ukraine and the CPSU dictatorship.

In Lviv the chain was three columns deep. People were carrying placards which read: "Freedom for Ukraine" and others. Everyone held a national Ukrainian flag. According to eyewitness reports, close to 200,000 people gathered on the route from Ternopil to Lviv. At 5:00 p.m. an assembly took place in Lviv, which was attended by 50,000 people. Among those addressing the assembly were the following: Vyacheslav Chornovil of UHU, Vlokh — the head of the Lviv branch of "Rukh", the Ukrainian writer Roman Lubkivskyi, representatives of the regional branches of "Rukh", guests from Lithuania and heads of the Societies of Armenian and Jewish culture.

On January 21 similar assemblies were held in all the cities and towns along the entire length of the human chain and in every major city of Ukraine.

### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON HUMAN CHAIN AND MEETINGS IN UKRAINE, JANUARY 21

DONETSK — According to Valeriy Sardak, head of the Donetsk branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), at 11:00 a.m. activists of the Popular Movement ("Rukh"), the Association of Ukrainian Youth, the UHU and Ukrainian anarcho-syndicalists, holding Ukrainian national flags, gathered by the monument to Taras Shevchenko in the centre of the city for a public meeting to mark the proclamation of Ukrainian unity and independence on January 22, 1919. They were stopped by police, led by the head of the municipal department of internal affairs Colonel Varaka, who threatened the activists with criminal charges for displaying national symbols.

\* \* \*

IVANO-FRANKIVSK — According to Taras Chornovil from Lviv, thousands of residents of the Ivano-Frankivsk and Lviv provinces, on their own initiative, formed a human chain from Lviv to Ivano-Frankivsk. This branch of the chain was not originally planned. Later 17,000 people gathered for a public meeting to commemorate the historic anniversary.

\* \* \*

MOSCOW — In the centre of Moscow, at the site of the Taras Shevchenko monument, in the vicinity of the Ukrayina Hotel, representatives of "Rukh", the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, the Ukrainian youth organization of the local Komsomol and the "Slavutych" Society of Ukrainians in Moscow gathered at 4:00 p.m. (Kyiv time) for a commemorative assembly. Representatives of the Byelorussian, Lithuanian, Estonian and other communities also attended. Addresses were delivered in the Ukrainian, Russian and Byelorussian languages. Two dozen Ukrainian national blue-and-yellow flags were displayed in Moscow on that day. The crowd numbered about 500 people. A wreath was laid at the foot of the Shevchenko monument.

\* \* \*

MUKACHEVE (Transcarpathia) — On January 20 a meeting dedicated to the anniversary of Ukrainian sovereignty was held outside the city hall. The unsanctioned meeting, attended by some 1,000 people, was organized by "Rukh" the UHU and the Dmytrakh Society.

\* \* \*

ODESSA — The meeting in Odessa began at 3:00 p.m. (Kyiv time) in Sobor Square in the centre of the city. According to a report by UHU representatives Ihor Stolarov, dozens of activists of the Odessa branch of the Association of Ukrainian Youth "Pivdenna Hromada" (Southern Community), the UHU and the Ukrainian National-Democratic League gathered in the square to demonstrate their solidarity with the participants of the human chain. Many Ukrainian blue-and-yellow flags and a Russian national flag were displayed by the 300 or so participants of the meeting. Attempts by police to tear down a Ukrainian flag ended in failure due to popular resistance.

\* \* \*

RIVNE — More than 20,000 people participated in the public meeting in Rivne. Throughout the day, despite the cold and rain, about 50 members of the youth organization Plast marched with national flags through the city. The meeting began at 3:00 p.m. (Kyiv time) at Slava Hill. In the course of the assembly a Russian Orthodox *moleben* service for Ukrainian freedom was offered in the Ukrainian language. Ukrainian Catholic priests participated. The participants sang the religious hymn "Almighty God, protect our Ukraine". Members of the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth laid a wreath of flowers at the grave of Colonel Vasyl Tiutiunnyk of the Army of the Ukrainian National Republic. Assemblies were also held in Dubno, Korsh and Hosh, Rivne province. Attempts by local officials to disrupt the assemblies and requiems were unsuccessful.

\* \* \*

TERNOPIL — In Ternopil the meeting took place on Spivochyi Square. The more than 20,000 participants were addressed by representatives of the Popular Movement of Ukraine, the UHU, "Memorial" and other independent public organizations.

\* \* \*

VILNIUS (Lithuania) — A human chain and public meeting near Vilnius cathedral highlighted the day's activities.

At 11:30 a.m. Ukrainians from Vilnius and the surrounding towns, as well as Ukrainians from Lviv and representatives of the Byelorussian "Tsiabryna" Society, Moldavians and Lithuanians marched to the university, where a memorial plaque to Taras Shevchenko was erected. The chain began to form about 1:00 p.m. (Kyiv time) from the site of the plaque to the cathedral. The people held hands for 15 minutes. Many Ukrainian flags along with those of Lithuania, Byelorussia and Moldavia-Rumania were displayed during the chain. Many of the banners, written in Ukrainian, Lithuanian and English, read: "Independence for Ukraine", January 22 — Day of Ukrainian Sovereignty" and "Independent Lithuania — Indpendent Ukraine".

On this occasion, the "Rukh" office in Kyiv received a telegram from the legislative body of the Lithuanian organization Sajudis. Similar commemorations were organized by Ukrainians in other Lithuanian cities.

Cities and towns in Latvia also held January 22 observances. In Riga, Ukrainians marched with Ukrainian flags to the Freedom monument, where they sang patriotic songs and spoke about current events in Ukraine.

\* \* \*

VINNYTSIA — In Vinnytsia, the meeting began at 4:00 p.m. on Lenin Square. Prior to the meeting, police detained UHU activists Viktor Ivasiuk and Vasyl Pidpriahorshchuk, the representative of the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM) Chaplyhin, and Oleksander Kalisher, a passer-by not associated with the informal organizations. At the police station four Ukrainian flags were confiscated from the arrested persons. Major Kryvda, an official of the Lenin district department of internal affairs, was in charge of this unlawful police action with the tacit support of Procurator Bordeyko. The meeting, attended by up to 3,000 people, lasted two hours. The resolution adopted by the participants included a demand for the immediate dismissal of the officials of the provincial and city party committees, the provincial and municipal government, as well as the head of the provincial department of internal affairs Tiazhlov, the head of the provincial KGB Davydenko, the editor of the newspaper "Vinnytska Pravda" Bolkun, and the editor of the provincial radio station Fedoruk. The resolution also demanded that the new KGB building and the building of the district party committee should be handed over to different institutions. Other demands included a halt to the repression against the informal organizations, the renaming of Voroshilov Street after Vasyl Stus and the abolition of Article 6 of the Constitution.

\* \* \*

VOLCHANSK (Kharkiv province) — The commemorative assembly in Volchansk took place in the centre of the town. More than 500 people participated. The national blue-and-yellow flag was raised. Representatives of the local party issued an ultimatum to the people, saying: "Who is with us, remain with the red flag; those who are with them, go to the blue-and-yellow flag". Everyone sided with the blue-and-yellow flag, leaving a few party officials with the red flag. The meeting was described as a success.

\* \* \*

ZAPORIZHIA — Up to 3,000 Zaporizhia residents took part in a meeting in October Square, organized by the UHU. Four Ukrainian blue-and-yellow flags were displayed during the meeting. Representatives of the UHU, the Popular Movement and other informal organizations addressed the participants.

## UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS HOLD FIRST SYNOD AFTER FORCED LIQUIDATION IN 1946

On January 23, the first Synod of the Ukrainian Catholic Church since its forced liquidation in 1946 was convened in the Church of the Transfiguration in Lviv. Discussions centred around the nullification of the Lviv Synod of 1946, which was without canonical or legal effect. The participants included Metropolitan Volodymyr Sterniuk, Archbishop of Lviv; Bishops Yulian Voronovskyi, Vicar of the Lviv diocese; Sofron Dmyterko of the Ivano-Frankivsk diocese; Pavlo Vasylyk, Coadjutor of Ivano-Frankivsk; and Ivan Semediy from the Transcarpathian diocese. More than 200 priests, as well as lay representatives, including Ivan Hel, Chairman of the Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Ivan Hrechko from the Popular Movement of Ukraine, and Myroslav Soltys, head of the parish council of the Church of the Transfiguration, were also present.

The Synod passed a resolution condemning the pseudo-Synod of 1946, convoked by the NKVD, which purportedly dissolved the Ukrainian Catholic Church and incorporated it into the Russian Orthodox Church, and demanded the full rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the return of all properties, which belonged to the Church prior to 1939.

The resolution read:

- 1) The so-called "Lviv Synod" of 1946 is without canonical and legal effect.
- 2) The 1946 Synod was conducted under the threat of death to its participants.
- 3) The decision of the 1946 Synod were invalid from the beginning.
- 4) The Synod of January 23, 1990, is an act of the legalization of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.
- 5) Representatives of the lay authorities should rehabilitate the Ukrainian Catholic Church as a social institution, pay compensation and return all the churches and church properties, including the archive and library of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi.

The Synod concluded with a memorial service for Metropolitan Sheptytskyi and Patriarch Josyf Slipyj.

## SOVIET AUTHORITIES RETURN CATHEDRAL AND MONASTERY TO UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS

Rome, 31 January 1990 — Ukrainian Catholic Church officials in Rome have confirmed that Soviet authorities have returned to Ukrainian Catholics

in Ukraine the Cathedral of the Resurrection in Ivano-Frankivsk and the Monastery of the Transfiguration in Hoshiv. The two complexes had formerly been operating as Russian Orthodox.

The cathedral had recently been involved in controversy when its Ukrainian Catholic parishioners had asked that it become Ukrainian Catholic. The Russian Orthodox Archbishop of Ivano-Frankivsk, Makariy, began a hunger strike in protest. None of the allegations of violence on the part of Ukrainian Catholics made by Archbishop Makariy or the Russian Orthodox hierarchy in connection with the incident could be substantiated. No Russian Orthodox services have been held inside the cathedral since 20 December 1989. Ukrainian Catholics have been holding services in the complex's courtyard.

The Monastery of the Transfiguration in Hoshiv, which was founded in 1570, had been used by the Ukrainian Catholic monks of the Order of St. Basil the Great. The monastery had been closed with the liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine and had remained unused. Reportedly, Ukrainian Catholic faithful in Ukraine had been calling for its opening in recent years. To thwart these requests, the Soviet government in September 1988 gave the monastery to the Russian Orthodox Church. Recent reports from Ukraine indicate that Ukrainian Catholics have in recent months again pressed for the monastery to be opened as Ukrainian Catholic.

Press Office of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Rome

## CHURCH PUBLICATION APPEARS IN LVIV: REGISTRATION PROCESS MOVES SLOWLY

Church sources in Ukraine report that of the 700 congregations, which have applied for formal registration with Soviet authorities since 1 December 1989, only 20 applications have been reviewed and granted. These are applications from congregations, which wish to be formally recognized as Ukrainian Catholic and wish to have their churches functioning as Ukrainian Catholic. It is estimated, however, that most of the congregations, which already have churches, are already functioning as Ukrainian Catholic.

In related news, Father Yaroslav Chukhniy, pastor of the Transfiguration Church in Lviv reports that the first edition of a bi-weekly Church newsletter, "Vira Batkiv" (Faith of Our Fathers) has been published. The newsletter's first printing was 5,000 copies and it is currently available at the Transfiguration Church. The publication will soon be made available through all Ukrainian Catholic priests and functioning churches. The first issue included a pastoral letter from Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk, the Lviv representative of the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi, as well as information on feasts, spiritual articles and announcements.

Press Office of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Rome

#### FATHER PETRO ZELENIUKH AND IVAN HEL BEATEN

Rome, 2 February 1990 — Ukrainian Catholic Church officials in Rome have learned that on Wednesday, 31 January 1990, Father Petro Zeleniukh, a priest of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine, Ivan Hel, head of the Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine, and Alexander Kuras, a member of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, were beaten by a group of an estimated 70-100 Russian Orthodox believers. The incident took place in the village of Staryava, Mostyska district.

As recounted in a telephone call with Hel, the incident took place in this way: Hel was travelling to the village to attend a meeting of Ukrainian Catholics and Russian Orthodox at the formerly Ukrainian Catholic church in the village. The church is now functioning as a Russian Orthodox church. The meeting was being held to improve relations between the two groups, which were strained as a result of recent developments in Ukraine. Father Zeleniukh was riding along with Hel with the purpose of administering last rites to two gravely ill Ukrainian Catholics in the village. He planned to visit them while Mr. Hel attended the meeting. Kuras was acting as a driver for Hel and Father Zeleniukh.

Upon arriving in the church area, the trio was met by a crowd, which started to shout at them and began surrounding the car. Kuras left the area, but the road was blocked by two cars. The car with Father Zeleniukh, Hel and Kuras skidded into a ditch. The mob dragged the three from the car and beat them. Father Zeleniukh was beaten unconscious and was carried to a muddy area where the assailants trampled on him and threatened to drown him in the mud.

Hel said that the persons were parishioners of the Russian Orthodox church in Staryava. He also noted that the tense situation between the Orthodox and Catholics in the village was being fuelled by the Russian Orthodox pastor in the village, a Father Petrushak, who reportedly has been making personal attacks against Hel during his sermons. Hel commented: "In all my years in the prison camps I have never been witness to such brutal treatment". Hel spent 19 years in the camps for his efforts on behalf of the legalization of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, made the following statement, regarding the incident:

"My prayers are with Father Zeleniukh and Ivan Hel and I ask all our

faithful throughout the world to pray for their speedy recovery. I also ask our faithful to pray and to remain peaceful through such provocations. They must remember the humble manner in which Our Lord suffered for us all. We, too, must suffer humbly for our faith. Let us respond with Christian love to those who would use violence against us.

Ukrainian Catholics in Ukraine have remained loyal to their Church through terrible suffering. No provocations will sway us from the peaceful road we have chosen to legalize our Church. Each day it becomes more evident that certain elements in the USSR are attempting to provoke our faithful and lead us further from our Orthodox brethren. We will not permit this. We will continue to peacefully request our churches and all the rights, which are accorded our faithful under the Soviet constitution.

To my flock in Ukraine I say: Stand firmly on the path you have chosen and continue to show the world that we are a people who live by the teachings of Jesus Christ. To those who attempt to provoke my flock I say: We have suffered far greater maladies than you now attempt to inflict upon us. We shall not be moved from either our faith or from the teachings of our Church. We shall follow in the footsteps of our Lord, Jesus Christ, who suffered and died for us".

Press Office of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Rome

### ACADEMIC CONFERENCE IN LATVIA Participants discuss ways to establish Ukrainian Independence and Statehood

On January 27-28 an academic conference on the theme "Problems of the independent Ukrainian state, ways of achieving it" was held in the town of Jurmala, Latvia. The conference was organized by the Popular Front of Latvia, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), the Ukrainian youth club and the Ukrainian National Party (UNP).

Representatives of the Ukrainian National-Democratic League (UNDL), the Association of National-Cultural Societies of Latvia, the "Lev" Society, and the Ukrainian youth club of Riga were also present. Oles Tsaruk (Ukrainian youth club), Serhiy Holovatyi (Institute of State and Law, Kyiv) and Halyna Panerniak ("Lev" Society) presided over the conference.

Huzhynskyi, a former soldier of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), opened the conference with the reading of the words to the march of the Ukrainian nationalists ("We were born of a great hour").

The speakers included V. Maksymovych, who has written books on the history of the UPA; Inat Tsolitis of the Latvian Popular Front; Holovatyi, an

official of the Popular Movement of Ukraine; Vasyl Barladianu, involved with the independent journals "Visnyk" and "Kaphedra"; Ivan Kandyba; Volodymyr Stroy from the Cultural Society of Latvia "Dnipro"; Rev. Bohdan Mykhailechko, who has recently returned from a visit to West Germany and spoke about the Ukrainian diaspora's support for the national revival in Ukraine; Hryhoriy Miniailo and Hryhoriy Prykhodko of the UNP; various representatives of the UHU; Popov, who greeted the participants on behalf of the Ukrainian society of Moscow "Slavutych", the Ukrainian youth club, the Popular Movement and Ukrainians from the Russian republic; as well as many other Ukrainian activists.

The participants of the conference adopted the following resolution:

At the present stage of the revival of national statehood, the goal of selfdetermination is not an issue for Ukrainians, for the process of self-determination of the Ukrainian nation was completed in 1918 with the proclamation of the independent Ukrainian National Republic (UNR) and the declaration of Ukrainian sovereignty on January 22, 1919. As a consequence of the liquidation of the UNR, through aggression of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian people continue to live in a colonial state, without an independent state, and there are forces in Ukraine and beyond its borders, which to this day continue to strive for the preservation of this political legal status.

Having listened to speeches and taking into consideration a series of propositions the conference has approved the following:

The present political legal status of Ukraine does not secure conditions for the free development of the Ukrainian people, does not correspond to the fundamental principles of international law, particularly the right of nations to self-determination.

Only a sovereign Ukrainian state can guarantee freedom and an equal place among the free nations of the world for the Ukrainian people. In the conditions created by the heightened political tension in Ukraine, and in light of the danger of the use of force by the authorities, we regard the achievement of an independent Ukrainian state as the only acceptable democratic and peaceful solution. In view of the existence of various political organizations and movements in the political life of Ukraine and also the lack of a common approach to the future of the Ukrainian state, the conference regards as expedient:

a) In the near future to hold a conference of representatives of the Popular Movement, the UHU, the UNDL, the UNP and other civic political organizations to discuss the problem of the perspective of Ukrainian statehood.

b) To propose that the conference review the question of the creation of a public committee, whose task it would be to develop a strategy for the achievement of an independent Ukrainian state.

The conference appeals to all civic organizations to express their thoughts

54

regarding its propositions and to send them to the following address: 252074, Kyiv-74, Borovytskyi Street, 1a, Apt. 22, Miniailo Hryhoriy Tymofiyovych (Tel.: 430 15 81) no later than March 15 of this year.

Jurmala, Latvia 1990

## 20,000 ATTEND AN ASSEMBLY IN KYIV Demand that Ukrainian Soldiers be allowed to carry out their Military Service in Ukraine

On February 4, a public asembly of informal organizations took place in Kyiv, organized by the Kyiv branch of the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM). The assembly demanded that the authorities allow Ukrainian youths to carry out their military service on the territory of Ukraine. This demand is particularly pertinent at the present time, when in many regions of the USSR crisis situations are leading to human casualties.

The organizers of this assembly planned to hold this protest action outside the bulding of the Supreme Soviet. The police, however, did not permit it to be held there and the columns of demonstrators, carrying Ukrainian national flags, marched to the centre of the city to October Revolution Square. Members of SNUM, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, and other organizations, as well as parents, whose sons are serving in the military in the Transcaucasian republics, addressed the participants. The authorities made no attempt to disrupt the proceedings.

The participants of the meeting adopted the following resolution:

1) To ban militarization in schools and in the educational system;

2) To liquidate military and Marxist-Leninist training in the higher educational institutions of Ukraine;

3) To recall all servicemen, residents of Ukraine, from other regions of the empire, particularly Azerbaijan and Armenia, and to recall those servicemen from Ukraine, who are not citizens of Ukraine;

4) To recognize that the fundamental function of military units on the territory of Ukraine is the defence of Ukraine's territory.

### UKRAINIAN COMMUNISTS TO FORM INDEPENDENT PARTY

The factionalism within the Communist Party of Ukraine is continuing to spread. Communist clubs and other informal communist organizations are openly being formed. On February 3 these clubs held a conference in Kyiv University.

Although no agreement was reached, the participants of the conference decided to hold a congress of informal organizations of the CPU in March, whose aim would be to create an independent Communist Party on the Latvian model.

Initiative groups for the creation of an independent Communist Party in Ukraine are functioning in Chernihiv, Lviv, Kharkiv, Mykolayiv and Rivne.

Recently an organizational committee has been set up to make preparations for the establishment of an independent Ukrainian Communist Party. This committee has issued the following appeal to Ukrainian communists:

#### APPEAL TO THE COMMUNISTS OF UKRAINE

We, Ukrainian communists, are of the opinion that a party, whose leadership is situated outside Ukraine, cannot please the people. The local CPSU puppet [Communist Party of Ukraine - UCIS], an obedient servant of the "centre", has always implemented and will continue to implement anti-national policies towards Ukraine, including the colonial exploitation of Ukraine and the ecological destruction of its lands. It would be expediennt to interpret the present abbreviation of the CPSU branch as Colonial-Partocratic Administration [CPU in Ukrainian - UCIS]. This CPU exploits the Ukrainian people on the instructions of its superiors in Moscow, destroys our land, which has to a large degree become unsuitable for the biological existence of anv life-form. The CPU has turned our land - Ukraine - into a "rag" on which various imperialist ministers-colonizers can wipe their "boots". Throughout all the years of the one-party colonial dictatorship of the CPSU in the Soviet Union, the CPU has waged and continues to wage civil war against its own people, leading to the death of millions of Ukrainians. How long are we going to live like animals forced to fight for survival in the conditions created by the civil war between the CPU and its own people, so as not to suffocate in a queue for nitrate-radioactive food or paupers' rags. not to be crushed on public transport, to wait for years for a roof over our heads, live in the conditions of the ecological threat of our extinction as a nation?

We, Ukrainian communists, who are continuing to steadfastly stand on a Marxist political platform, who remain, or who were members of the CPSU, urge all communists, who are Ukrainian patriots, to do everything necessary so that in the near future an independent Ukrainian Communist Party (UCP) will be founded, a party, which would represent the interests of our people, which could defend and protect the Ukrainian people, to whom we, the people, could turn for help, without waiting for a superior's favours from Moscow, in the terrible situation, which has arisen through the fault of the CPSU's branch in Ukraine and its unprincipled policies.

We will form our own independent Ukrainian Communist Party, independent of the imperial control of the CPSU! We will stop contributing towards the support of traitors of our people, janissaries and mercenaries, whose pay is being raised so that they could mock crucified Ukraine and its subjugated long-suffering people with even greater zeal, invigorated by calorific privileges.

Organizational Committee to establish the UCP

#### AN OVERVIEW OF THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN IN UKRAINE

Ukraine, the largest non-Russian republic in the USSR, will hold its March 4 elections amid controversy. The "republic", which has a population of over 50 million, is of vital economic and political importance to Mikhail Gorbachev.

The elections to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, constitutionally the country's highest legislative body, were initially seen as a test of communist authority. The Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh") and other opposition groups moved to field a Democratic Bloc of candidates with a platform of democratic reform and political and economic sovereignty for Ukraine.

However, the election campaign was quickly marred by procedural tampering on the part of the communist authorities, who control local electoral committees. Many prospective Democratic Bloc candidates were not allowed to officially register their candidacy. Communist candidates were forwarded without the popular mandate required by the standing law on elections. Fictitious electoral districts were created.

In the end, Democratic Bloc candidates will be running in only 25% of all the electoral districts in Ukraine. Three prominent opposition candidates, who are also previously elected members of the all-Union Congress of People's Deputies, withdrew their candidacies as an act of protest against the regime's tactics.

"Opposition candidates will easily win in western Ukraine. But we have no illusions. Because of communist dictatorship in eastern Ukraine and tampering with electoral procedures, the opposition will not be in the majority", said Lubomyr Senyk, vice-president of the Lviv regional branch of "Rukh".

"The opposition has already begun to look beyond the elections. The main issue will be protesting the authorities' machinations during the elections", said Serhiy Naboka, a spokesman for the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), another leading national-democratic group.

"We will use the Supreme Soviet as a forum from which to spread democratic ideas", said Senyk.

The communist authorities also attempted to discredit the national-democratic opposition by charging it with "extreme nationalism" and "anti-Semitism". The opposition responded by officially denouncing anti-Semitism, securing statements of support from Jewish and other ethnic minority organizations, and holding mass "unity" rallies in Kyiv and elsewhere. The opposition accused the regime of illicitly sponsoring a propaganda campaign aimed at creating conflict among the many ethnic groups residing in Ukraine.

Rumours circulating in Ukraine that a Baku-style crackdown was being planned to preempt the elections brought tensions to a feverish pitch. The situation dissipated after peaceful demonstrations took place without police interference.

The national-democratic opposition also experienced internal problems during the elections, including communication and coordination shortcomings. In several instances, three or four Democratic Bloc candidates were forwarded for the same position and none were forwarded elsewhere.

"The Democratic Bloc did not work had enough. Not enough effort was put into the elections. The power of the communist authorities was underestimated", said Naboka.

From the outset of the election campaign, some of the more radical opposition groups called for a complete boycott of the elections and condemned the leaders of the Democratic Bloc, specifically "Rukh", as "collaborators".

There can be no elections while Ukraine is still an occupied territory. Elections not held under the slogan "independent statehood for Ukraine!" are a crime against Ukraine. Those who take part in them will be judged by history, a December statement by the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front said.

### **UPCOMING ELECTIONS IN UKRAINE**

Nationalist activists in Ukraine are preparing to contest republic-wide elections in March. The elections, the first to be contested in 70 years of Soviet rule, are a major test of the Kremlin's control over the largest non-Russian republic in the USSR.

Joint opposition groups are forwarding a Democratic Bloc in the elections to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, the country's highest legislative ruling body, which until now has been little more than a rubber-stamp institution. Many former political prisoners and prominent nationalists are Democratic Bloc candidates. They have been nominated by open public meetings in workplaces and residential neighbourhoods throughout Ukraine. The electoral manifesto of the Democratic Bloc calls for:

• the political and economic sovereignty of Ukraine;

58

- the abolition of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution that guarantees the leading role of the Communist Party;
- the creation of a mixed-market economy;

 religious freedom, including the legalization of the Ukrainian Catholic and Autocephalous Orthodox Churches.

Taras Paholiuk, chairman of the electoral committee of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (the leading opposition group), said that Soviet authorities are interfering with the process of registering Democratic Bloc candidates.

"The authorities are not going to simply give up their power. They are looking for every possible technicality with which to disqualify pro-democratic nationalist candidates. The authorities realize it is impossible for them to compete democratically", he said.

Paholiuk further reported that existing strike committees in Ukraine are ready to call a nation-wide general strike if the elections are not contested in a fair and equitable manner.

## REGISTRATION OF ELECTORAL CANDIDATES ENDS IN UKRAINE

February 4 marked the end of the most recent stage in the pre-election campaign — the registration of candidates standing for election to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR and local councils by regional electoral commissions.

Although the proceedings were continuously covered by the official mass media agencies, the coverage on the whole was bias, particularly in the republican press. Unfortunately, despite the people's growing interest in the electoral process, the numerous cases of groundless rejection of candidates, who represent independent civic organizations, did not receive adequate coverage. Realizing that it was impossible to ignore the subject completely, the head of the central electoral commission, Boyko, stated in an interview: ". . .questions regarding the competence of nominating, and thus registration of candidates, nominated by certain organizations, the Ukrainian Language Society of Shevchenko, are arising. There are cases of nomination of candidates for registration from inadequately established, in actual fact non-established, civic organizations, associations and so on. These and other violations of the law on elections are a basis for the regional commissions' decision not to register candidates as deputies".

It is possible that talking about ". . .inadequately established, in actual fact non-established civic organizations", the head of the central electoral commission had in mind not only the Popular Movement of Ukraine, which numbers tens of thousands of activists, but also a whole series of other independent civic groups, which are pressing their demands to be registered. The head of the central electoral commission had to know that after many months of rejections and delays regarding the registration of numerous branches of the Ukrainian Language Society and the Green movement, the local authorities found many juridical reasons to reject progressive candidates seeking election as Council deputies on all levels. Taking into account the fact that regional electoral commissions, like the central commission, are under the continuous control of the party-state apparatus, its tactics of depriving the independent organizations of the possibility of official participation in the political life of the republic, particularly in the elections, become understandable.

Recently, using these tactics the members of the electoral commission rejected the candidacy of the head of the provincial branch of the Ukrainian Language Society, Volodymyr Zaremba, standing for election to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet in the Novomoskovskyi constituency of Dnipropetrovsk province. According to Ivan Sokulskyi of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union in Dnipropetrovsk, the fact that the district branch of the Ukrainian Language Society is unregistered served as the basis for rejections, although on the provincial level the Society has been registered for a long time.

According to Ihor Nesterchuk, a representative of the Chernivtsi branch of "Rukh", the head of the provincial electoral commission — Karol Yanosh (a lawyer) — in letters forwarded to the district electoral commissions well before the registration process had begun recommended that electoral officials follow the set of directives, which were printed in the newspaper "Radianska Ukraina" on December 19 of last year, instead of abiding by the law on elections. At the same time, in an attempt to disallow candidates from the Green movement to participate in the elections, the head of the provincial electoral commission declared the conference of this independent civic organization ineffective, as a consequence of which the electoral commissions did not accept the documents of a number of candidates from electoral districts 72 and 107, and, consequently, electoral officials refused to register the candidates to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Tovstiuk, Halin and Bakis. Yanosh also convinced the electoral commissions that, supposedly, the leader of the Green movement, USSR Deputy Leonid Sandulak, does not belong to this independent civic group. It should also be mentioned that although certain electoral commissions disregarded instructions "from above", the provincial electoral commission negated all the decisions regarding the registration of independent candidates.

The apparatus is also using force in suppressing the political activities of the people during the pre-election campaign.

UHU representative Vasyl Pidpryhorshchuk reports that in the second half of January in Vinnytsia uniformed policemen and persons in civilian dress brutally dispersed a demonstration of nearly 500 electors of the city's Zamostianskyi district, organized in protest against the authorities' refusal to register the Democratic Bloc candidate — Major Brovchenko. The police tore away Ukrainian national flags and slogans from the protesters, scolded the people and threatened to use force against the demonstrators. Many people were brutally beaten. The conflict did not end there. On February 3, more than 3,000 Vinnytsia residents took part in an unsanctioned protest outside the building of the municipal authorities. Protests against the violation of the law on elections by electoral commissions also took place last month in Kharkiv, Ternopil, Odessa, Rivne, Poltava and a number of other places.

A series of incidents, which occurred during the registration process, are an indication that the authorities and the security services do not respect those who are seeking election as deputies.

On January 21, in Kyiv, after the end of the meeting to mark the Day of Ukrainian Statehood and Sovereignty, the police detained and beat a candidate for deputy of the Ukrainian SSR — Anatoliy Zubkov, a candidate to the Kyiv city council — Yuriy Murashov, as well as Ihor Markusyk and Yuriy Beztsinnyi. The police from the Minsk district of the Ukrainian capital beat the detained persons with rubber truncheons and confiscated a Ukrainian national flag they were carrying. At the police station Sergeant Ternovyi cynically stated to the candidates: "I will hang you on your blue-and-yellow flag!", after which he struck Zubkov twice, knocking him to the ground.

Unfortunately, there are numerous other examples of such direct and indirect violations of the law on elections by electoral commissions, as well as other instances of dubious practices in the registration of candidates. However, despite the numerous obstructions, activists of "Rukh", the UHU, the Ukrainian Language Society, the association "Green World" and a number of other independent organizations, which belong to the Democratic Bloc of electors in Ukraine, managed to secure the registration of a large number of progressive candidates in the registration process.

Among these are: Ivan Drach, "Rukh" chairman; Mykhailo Horyn, chairman of the "Rukh" Secretariat; Levko Lukianenko, head of the UHU; Vyacheslav Chornovil, head of the Ukrainian National Publishing and Information Association and the press service of the UHU; Ivan Hel, chairman of the Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church; Stepan Khmara, one of the leaders of the Lviv Committee to Defend Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee); Bohdan Horyn, head of the Lviv branch of the UHU; Orest Vlokh, the leader of the Lviv regional branch of "Rukh"; Yevhen Proniuk, head of the All-Ukrainian Society of the Repressed; Les Taniuk, one of the leaders of "Memorial"; Oles Shevchenko, head of the Kyiv branch of the UHU, as well as dozens of other notable civic activists, who head the democratic opposition.

The results of the registration indicate that candidates to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR from the Democratic Bloc are standing for election in 20-25 per cent of electoral districts of the republic. Nearly half of all candidates; activists of independent civic organizations, are registered in western Ukraine, where a majority of electoral districts have candidates from the Democratic Bloc.

## DEMOCRATIC BLOC CANDIDATES FOR ELECTION TO THE UKRAINIAN SSR SUPREME SOVIET IN THE LVIV PROVINCE

According to the Press Service of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) and the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh"), Democratic Bloc candidates are standing for election in all 24 constituencies of the Lviv province. The list of candidates is in constituency order.

#### Lviv city constituencies:

Lenin district (No. 258): **Orest Vlokh** — head of the Lviv regional branch of "Rukh";

Artemiv district (No. 259): Ivan Drach — chairman of "Rukh";

Zaliznytsia district (No. 260): Mykhailo Horyn — chairman of the "Rukh" Secretariat;

Industrial district (No. 261): Stepan Khmara — representative of the Lviv Committee for the Defence of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee);

Radianskyi district (No. 262): Bohdan Kotyk — Democratic Bloc representative, Mayor of Lviv;

Chervonoarmiysk district (No. 263): Ihor Yukhnovskyi — "Rukh" representative;

Shevchenko district (No. 264): Vyacheslav Chornovil — head of the Ukrainian National Publishing and Information Association and the UHU Press Service;

#### Other constituencies:

Drohobych (No. 265): Roman Ivanychuk --- writer;

Sambir (No. 266): Ihor Derkach — UHU representative;

Stryi (No. 267): Volodymyr Haletko — Democratic Bloc candidate;

Chervonohrad (No. 268): Bohdan Koziarskyi — Democratic Bloc representative;

Brody (No. 269): Dmytro Chobit — Democratic Bloc representative;

Busk (No. 270): Ihor Kolushko — Democratic Bloc representative;

Drohobych (No. 271): Yevhen Hryniv — head of the "Memorial" Society;

Zhydachiv (No. 272): Bohdan Horyn — head of the Lviv branch of the UHU;

Zolochiv (No. 273): Mykhailo Shvaika — Democratic Bloc representative;

Mykolayiv (No. 274): Iryna Kalynets — activist of the Marian Society of "Mercy";

Mostyska (No. 275): Ivan Hel — chairman of the Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church;

Nesterov (No. 276): Ihor Hryniv — Democratic Bloc representative;

Pustomytiv (No. 277): Mykhailo Kosiv — "Rukh" representative;

Sokal (No. 278): Yaroslav Kendzior - UHU activist;

Staryi Sambir (No. 279): Ivan Makar — activist of the Ukrainian nationaldemocratic movement;

Turka (No. 280): Taras Pakholiuk — "Rukh" representative;

#### **PRE-ELECTION MEETINGS IN UKRAINE**

Pre-election public assemblies are being held in dozens of regional and district centres of Ukraine, as well as many cities and villages, particularly in Mykolayiv, Odessa, Donetsk, Chernivtsi, Kharkiv, Poltava, Rivne, Zhytomyr, Dnipropetrovsk, and Vinnytsia.

#### DONETSK

After the broadcast of a television programme, which showed a warehouse full of imported goods, particularly shoes, worth 1 million karbovantsi (roubles), a public assembly was held here on February 7. Approximately 5,000 residents of the city of Donetsk gathered on the square outside the provincial committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine. A series of demands were formulated and in the event of their non-implementation, the people decided to hold a general political strike in the city. Similar assemblies were held in other towns throughout the Donetsk region.

For the most part these assemblies were dedicated to the pre-election campaign. Some of the demands put forwards at these assemblies call for major long-term changes. In Poltava, for example, the people demanded not only the dismissal of the regional and municipal party-state leadership, but also a reform of the electoral commissions, because they failed to register democratic candidates and because these commissions are under the complete control of the party-state apparatus. In this regard, the electorate of Poltava is demanding the postponement of the elections.

It should be mentioned that public assemblies are being held not only in major metropolitan centres, but also in the towns and villages of practically all of Ukraine, including the eastern regions.

## KGB TACTICS IN UKRAINE ELECTIONS

Soviet authorities in Ukraine are creating the impression of inter-ethnic conflict as a justification for a possible Azerbaijan-style military intervention, a leading opposition group has stated. The tactic is part of an "underhanded, KGB-style" propaganda campaign being conducted by the authorities in the lead-up to scheduled March 4 elections in the USSR's largest non-Russian republic, claims the Ukrainian Helsinki Union in a February 20 statement.

"The leading circles want to discredit the Democratic Bloc of candidates in the upcoming elections by creating inter-ethnic strife in Ukraine. This underhanded, KGB-style tactic seeks to divert the attention of citizens from political activity and by default guarantee the electoral victory of representatives of the totalitarian regime", said the released document, directed to Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Poles and Hungarians in Ukraine.

"No democratic opposition organization, which stands for the national revival of Ukraine was, is or ever will be a supporter of the use of force. . . We will not let Azerbaijan be repeated here", the statement continued.

The Ukrainian Helsinki Union traces its history to the mid-1970s, when it was formed to monitor the USSR's compliancy with the Helsinki Accords

human rights treaty. Many of its members were incarcerated in the late 1970s and early 1980s for their advocacy of human rights and Ukraine's national independence.

The election campaign to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, the republic's highest ruling body, is the first to be contested in 72 years of Soviet rule. It has been marred by improprieties on the part of the authorities, such as the failure to register popular candidates and the creation of false electoral zones. Key democratic leaders have withdrawn their candidacies in protest.

#### UKRAINE ELECTIONS IN JEOPARDY

Republican elections scheduled for March 4 in Ukraine, the USSR's largest non-Russian republic, will take place amid electoral tampering on the part of the Soviet regime and rumours of military intervention, said Anatoliy Dotsenko of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union Press Service last night.

Two leading opposition candidates, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi, a previously elected member of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, and Dmytro Pavlychko, president of the Ukrainian Language Society, have withdrawn their candidacies in protest against the Soviet regime's handling of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, the republic's highest ruling body.

"Yavorivskyi and Pavlychko are protesting the fact that local electoral commissions — controlled by the regime — have refused to officially register the candidates of scores of members of opposition groups", said Dotsenko. Previously, he has reported that in many instances authorities have created false electoral zones, as well as forwarded communist candidates without the popular mandate required by the standing election law.

The elections may not take place at all if rumours currently circulating in Kyiv prove true, according to Dotsenko. The leading amongst these allegations is that the police are preparing a Baku-style crackdown. The claims are fuelled by comments of highly-placed police officers at recent meetings.

"The students are creating military formations. Everywhere, attacks on the military are being planned", alleged General Smirnov, Chief of Staff of the police in Ukraine and Moldavia, at a meeting this week of police officers in Kyiv.

Through independent eyewitnesses, Dotsenko reports that policemen have been issued machine-guns and additional ammunition and that the families of police officers are preparing for evacuation.

An unnamed member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, an opposition group, claims that on February 23 an order of "combat readiness" will be issued to local police units. On February 25, this is to be followed, so it is claimed, by the proclamation of a "state of emergency".

The election, the first to be contested in 72 years of Soviet rule and considered a major opportunity for pro-democracy, pro-independence forces in Ukraine, has been marred with many incidents of electoral fraud and a propaganda campaign on the part of the authorities to depict the national-democratic opposition as "extremist", "chauvinist" and "anti-Semitic".

### 200,000 DEMONSTRATE IN MOSCOW

On Sunday, February 4, the first trully populous demonstration, which attracted over 20,000 people, was held in Moscow. The participants demanded the implementation of immediate reforms. The demonstration, organized by the democratic community to protest against the chauvinistic activities of the Russian organization "Pamyat", acquired greater political significance in connection with the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the 28th Congress of the Communist Party.

Over 150,000 people took part in the demonstration, which began at 12:30 p.m.on Crimea Square, marching through the centre of the city to Manezhna Square near the Kremlin, where a sanctioned public assembly was held.

More than 200,000 people, including representatives of most of the independent organizations of Moscow gathered for the meeting.

The protesters demanded immediate socio-political reforms, the dismissal of the "conservative wing" of the party and state apparatus, and the abolition of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution, which guarantees the leading role of the CPSU.

Among the protesters were hundreds of Ukrainians, who marched in a separate column with Ukrainian national flags and a placard with "Rukh" written on it. They chanted: "Freedom for Ukraine!", "The Union is an empire!", "Shame on the empire!", "Freedom for the republics!", and "Good-bye to the federation!".

## LVIV RESIDENTS DISCUSS SITUATION OF UKRAINIAN CHURCHES AND FUTURE OF SHEVCHENKO MONUMENT

On February 11, at a public assembly, thousands of Lviv residents discussed the future of the Taras Shevchenko monument, which they are planning to erect in the city. The situation of the Ukrainian Catholic and Autocephalous Orthodox Churches was also discussed.

A statement of the Initiative Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces, composed of the "Heritage" Society, the Ukrainian National Party, the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, the Social-Democratic Union and the radical association "For Peace and Freedom", was read to the participants of the assembly. The statement included a series of demands, as well as an appeal urging the people of Lviv to gather for a public assembly (at 6:00 p.m.) on February 23 — Soviet Army Day — followed by a picket of the provincial military conscription office.

The meeting adopted three resolutions, which included propositions from various civic organizations and groups.

#### ALL-UKRAINIAN TRADE UNION "UNITY" FORMED IN KHARKIV

According to the Press Service of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh"), a founding conference of independent Ukrainian trade unions was held in Kharkiv on February 10-11.

Representatives from all regions of Ukraine gathered in this eastern Ukrainian city to attend the conference, which announced the establishment of the All-Ukrainian Trade Union — "Unity". Its Coordinating Committee is composed of: representatives of the Strike Committees of Chernihiv, Lviv, Makiyivka, Ternopil, Plavyansk, Ivano-Frankivsk, Poltava, Rivne, Chervonohrad, Khmelnytske, Zhytomyr, Kaniv, independent trade unions of Kharkiv, Zaporizhia, Kyiv, the Horliv Workers' Association, the Kharkiv Association of Unemployed, and other similar organizations.

The Coordinating Committee consists of 35 members, of which an executive board composed of seven Coordinators was elected: Oleksander Dobovyk (Horliv Workers' Association); Stepan Khmara (Lviv Strike Committee); Ivan Honcharenko (Independent Union of Writers); Stepan Isyk (Association of Unemployed); Rostyslav Lutskyi (Ivano-Frankivsk Strike Committee); and Valeriy Semyvolos (Kharkiv Independent Trade Union), who is chairman of the new "Unity".

Delegates to the Conference ratified a "Unity" statute and a series of resolutions. The Coordinating Committee was authorized to prepare a second "Unity" Conference.

The resolutions included a demand that the repression of citizens for political beliefs be terminated. The Conference also demanded the full rehabilitation of all political prisoners in camp No. 35 in the Urals: Bohdan Klymchak, Leonid Lubman, Mykhailo Kazachkov, and Valeriy Smyrnov.

Apart from that, the Conference adopted an appeal to the International Labour Organization (ILO), informing it of the creation of this new organization and requesting to be registered in the ILO. The Conference also issued an appeal to the workers of Ukraine.

The fundamental goal of the All-Ukrainian Trade Union "Unity" is to

build a lawful state in a politically and economically independent republic. The Conference, at which members of the press were present, was conducted in a constructive manner.

On February 11, during a several-hour break in the proceedings, the participants of the Conference laid flowers at the foot of the monument to Taras Shevchenko, 19th century Ukrainian poet and political thinker, and attended a public assembly organized by the Kharkiv branch of "Rukh". The speakers included the branch joint chairman — Henrikh Avtunian, members of the "Rukh" Supreme Council — Stepan Sapelak, Radiy Polonskyi and Mykola Starunov, and representatives of the Jewish community — Abram Katsnelson, Moysey Hotlits, and others, as well as representatives of the Communist Party apparatus.

The assembly adopted a resolution, which categorically denounced the activity of the Russian chauvinist organization "Pamyat", the recent pogrom in the central building of the writers of the RSFSR, the anti-Semitic speeches at the Plenum of the Writers' Union of the Russian Federation, and all other events, which fuel international hostility.

#### **UKRAINIANS DEMAND OWN ARMED FORCES**

#### STRYI (Lviv province)

On February 5 and 6 the Stryi branch of the Independent Association of Ukrainian Youth (SNUM) organized the picketing of the district conscription office and the district authorities. As a result of this picket, the district conscription officer issued a written guarantee to the protesters that youths from the city and district of Stryi will not serve in radioactive zones and that Ukrainians serving in the Transcaucasus will be recalled to Ukraine. The conscription office also promised to seek further guarantees to the effect that Stryi youths would carry out their military service only on the territory of Ukraine. Upon receipt of the guarantee, the 5,000 protesters formed a column and marched to the building of the district authorities to demand the registration of two Ukrainian Catholic churches.

#### LVIV

On February 7 an Initiative Committee for the Creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces was formed in this western Ukrainian city. It is composed of representatives of various groups and political organizations. The Committee is to forward its demand to legislators and electoral candidates in the Ukrainian SSR requesting the creation of republican military units, as a first stage in the creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces. The Committee is also demanding that separate military divisions — strictly republican military formations — be assigned to the territory of Ukraine. At its founding meeting, the Committee adopted the following resolution: The Ukrainian National Republic was occupied by forces of the RSFSR in 1919. Since then, Ukraine has remained a colony. This is the cause of the destructive crisis, which is leading to the complete destruction of our people.

Although the Ukrainian SSR is a member of the United Nations, and as such has the right to its own armed forces, it does not exercise this right.

In order to guarantee the integrity of the Ukrainian people, its parliament, and the preservation of stability in Europe, the Initiative Committee is making the following demands:

1) Temporary military service for residents of Ukraine, with the right to use the Ukrainian language, in Soviet forces on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR, as a transitionary stage in the formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces.

2) A halt to military service on the territory of Ukraine of residents of other republics.

3) The opportunity for alternative military service on the territory of Ukraine.

4) Access to the armed forces by the press, clergy and representatives of civic organizations.

5) The replacement of the oath of allegiance to the Government of the USSR by an oath of allegiance to the Ukrainian people. The Ukrainian Army should defend the territorial integrity of the republic against any aggression.

6) The establishment of a Ukrainian Defence Ministry.

7) The deployment of the armed forces against their own people or other peoples, as well as the occupation of foreign territory should be condemned and declared impermissable.

Our aim is the formation of professional Ukrainian Armed Forces on the territory of Ukraine as a guarantee of universal demilitarization in the future and the establishment of peace throughout the whole world.

#### 80,000 GATHER FOR "RUKH" PRE-ELECTION MEETING IN KYIV, FEBRUARY 11

On February 11 a public assembly was held in Kyiv, organized by the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh") and dedicated to the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR and local councils. Like the February 4 meeting, this assembly was held in the centre of the city on October Revolution Square. Although the assembly of February 4 was unsanctioned and was held on the square only because the authorities did not permit it to be held outside the Supreme Soviet building, the most recent assembly was officially sanctioned and several Soviet officials tried to participate in it. Fifteen minutes before the beginning of the assembly, a bus with twenty officials with four blue-and-red flags of the Ukrainian SSR arrived. The square was already full and they observed the assembly from the periphery.

After the meeting a 24-hour picketing of the government buildings in Kyiv was to take place, if the following demands of "Rukh" were not met by that time: an official registration of "Rukh"; permission to publish an official newspaper; and permission for people to gather for daily assemblies at the square nicknamed "Hyde Park" by the main post ofice. After a long series of discussions, "Rukh" was recognized as an official organization, and, consequently, the picket action was postponed for five days, until the rest of the demands were met.

The speakers included Deputies Yavorivskyi and Cherniak, electoral candidates Svitlana Synkova, Ivan Saliy, Soldatenko, Shyriayev, Larysa Skoryk, Viktor Teren, Serhiy Holovatyi, Ludmyla Panova, Ivan Zayets, Viktor Cherinko and others. Many of the speakers made reference to points in their electoral programmes regarding Ukrainian sovereignty. Volodymyr Yavorivskyi presided at the meeting. There were two busses with loudspeakers, which allowed not ony the 70-80,000 participants to hear the proceedings, but also listeners on near-by streets and on the opposite side of the Khreshchatyk. The meeting lasted from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. In the draft resolution of the meeting, which was read by Deputy Konev, a point that was particularly underscored was that the government of Ukraine has lost the confidence of its people and that obstructions in the electoral process, designed to prevent a victory of democratic forces, may lead to complete collapse and unforeseen consequences. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, provincial committees and district committees of the party, which continue to maintain a monopoly over power, are completely to blame for this state of affairs. Only a democratic government can save the situation, a government, which will be formed after genuinely democratic elections are held. It was also pointed out that Ukraine can be saved only by parliamentary democracy and a market economy.

## "RUKH" COUNCIL OF NATIONS HOLDS FOUNDING CONFERENCE, KYIV, FEBRUARY 11

The founding conference of the Council of Nations of the Popular Movement of Ukraine was held on February 11. It was opened by V. Kulynych. The Ukrainian poet Dmytro Pavlychko was the first to speak, greeting the

participants. He stated his belief that the convening of this conference also marks the beginning of probably the most important work of "Rukh", and greeted the participants with the registration of the Popular Movement in the Council of Ministers of Ukraine. "Rukh" is now an officially registered organization. The next to speak was the head of the organizational committee Josyf Zisils. He informed the participants about the work carried out by the organizational committee, the composition of the committee, and the nationality of the members of the Council of Nations. It was announced that the Council of Nations is a part of "Rukh", that the position of the Council was worked out on the basis of the "Rukh" statute, and that the decisions of the Council of Nations are to be ratified by the Supreme Council of "Rukh". A mandate commission was elected consisting of three persons: Svitlana Lee, Fedir (?) and Andriy Kulynov. An accounts commission was elected, composed of guest-members of "Rukh": Volodymyr Konfederatenko, Ola Borysenko and Vadym Dykhtych. The conference also established the work of the leading organs of the Council of Nations and elected a chairman (the position of chairman will be filled on a rotational basis). Dmytro Pavlychko was elected chairman. Vice-chairmen are Josyf Zisils, Mykola Serheyev and Oleksander Burakivskyi.

The following resolution was aproved during the conference:

1) To create the Council of Nations of the Popular Movement of Ukraine as a composite part of the Supreme Council.

2) To appeal to the Supreme Council with the proposition to ratify the documents of the founding conference.

3) To appeal to the Secretariat of "Rukh" with the proposition to assign one of its members, or a new person, to direct the affairs of the Council of Nations.

#### **"90 MILLION BELIEVERS IN USSR" — OFFICIAL**

A survey conducted recently in the Soviet Union has concluded that there are "up to 90 million worshippers of various religions" in the country. This is out of a total population of 290 million, reports Keston College. The figures are based on an opinion poll conducted in advance of parliamentary debates on the new "Law on Freedom of Conscience". The new law — which has been long delayed — is set to govern future relations between the Soviet state and the Churches.

The Soviet authorities, once dedicated to the eradication of religion, have never before given figures for the number of believers in the country. The government's Council for Religious Affairs, which controls religious groups, always denied that it kept statistics on the number of believers. The former

70
chairman of the Council, Konstantin Kharchev, once gave an estimate of 70 million believers.

The new opinion poll also revealed that a majority of respondents favoured giving more rights to religious congregations allowing them to publish their own periodicals and set up Sunday schools. Both are still technically illegal under the 1929 legislation on religion, which is still in force.

Keston College

# UKRAINIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION HOLDS CONFERENCE IN DNIPRODZERZHINSK

A conference of the south-eastern organization — the Ukrainian Student Association (USS) — took place on February 10 in Dniprodzerzhinsk.

The Ukrainian Student Association is an independent student organization, which unites in its ranks all the student organizations of central and southeastern Ukraine. It was created on December 8-10, 1989, in Kyiv. Its goal is to defend the rights of student groups by leading a political campaign in the form of a separate trade union.

The Conference was organized by the Coordinating Council of the USS and was dedicated to three pressing problems, which lie before the USS: first — the need to establish a better system of coordination between Ukrainian students, with a view towards establishing a common platform of action based on the general experience of Ukrainian students; second — the formulation of a common position of the USS for the Congress of Ukrainian Students, which is scheduled to take place on February 23-25, 1990, in Lviv; third the formulation of a resolution regarding the first all-Ukrainian student strike on February 20-21.

The Conference was attended by six members of the Coordinating Council of the USS and representatives of regional branches of the USS from Kyiv, Dniprodzerzhinsk, Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, a representative of the Dniprodzerzhinsk branch of the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh"), V. Chornomaz, and the secretary of the city council of the Komsomol (Communist Youth League) — O. Semenko.

The Conference was opened by its chairman — O. Barkov of the Dniprodzerzhinsk branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union. He stated that it is necessary to consolidate Ukrainian student groups from southern and eastern Ukraine, taking into account that the majority of the Ukrainian technical institutes are situated in southern and eastern Ukraine. It was, therefore, necessary to seek to engage in the USS on fully active students, thereby boosting the prestige of the USS. He underscored the basic student needs (grants), which are soon to be resolved by the trade union organization, resulting in support rendered to the political demands of the USS. It is necessary to become more resolute in developing a national policy of rebirth in this area of Ukraine, incorporating into it the specific aspects of the region.

The second speaker to address the Conference was Vyacheslav Kyrylenko, a Coordinating Council member and a representative of the Kyiv branch of the USS. In his speech he talked about the situation in other regional branches of the USS. Kyrylenko pointed out that the problems raised by the USS have been continously ignored by the official structure of higher educational institutions. He proposed to the representatives of the south-eastern region to support the initiative of the Kyiv branch of the USS regarding the staging of an all-Ukrainian student warning strike, scheduled to take place on February 20-21.

The representative of the Dnipropetrovsk branch of the USS — Oleksander Urban, spoke about the activity of the student anarchist organization — "The Left Front of Independent Students of Ukraine of Sakharov", and the active counter-action to this activity by party and Komsomol committees, and also about future USS activities in the Donetsk-Prydniprianskyi region.

Vyacheslav Pikhovshek - a member of the Coordinating Council of the USS, also addressed the participants. He pointed out that the USS is a link between fairly developed forms of the student movement in Halychyna (western Ukraine - specifically with regard to the present situation of the Lvivbased "Student Brotherhood") and the movement in central and south-eastern Ukraine. He had in mind to help the radical student groups of eastern Ukraine, which work towards the revival of consciousness among the wide masses of students. He stressed that the officially unrecognized status of the student groups can only be resolved through a strike, a decisive action, which will help the students become conscious of themselves as a social force and will give them a clear vision to unite around. It is also of great significance that the trade union demands of the strikers (grants at a minimum standard of living, halls of residence, the abolition of military training, the acceptance and effectuation of democratic statutes in the higher educational institutes) have to be clearly united with the political demands, i.e., the liquidation of party committees of the CPSU in the institues, the elimination of the reigning communist and atheist ideology.

In a separate address, Oleksander Abruzov — a member of the Coordinating Council and a representative of the Donetsk branch of the USS, spoke about several particular aspects of the student movement in Donbas (Donets Basin), where the workers' movement is again beginning to revive itself after last year's strikes. Abruzov emphasized that the student movement should not only fight for its specific rights, but that it should also defend general democratic principles everywhere and stand in solidarity with such social groups. What is a particularly pressing concern is the need to create a structure, within which all problems can be resolved, those of the students and those of other strata of society. After the speeches, a series of resolutions were adopted regarding the position that the USS was to take at the Conference of the Students of Ukraine, with particular emphasis laid on the USS's union demands.

The organizations represented at this conference unanimously supported the propositions of the Kyiv and Kharkiv branches of the USS and the Lviv "Student Brotherhood" about a strike. The Ukrainian Ministry of Higher Education ignored the propositions of the students, expressed at the founding conference of the USS, broke their promises, made at the meeting between the leadership of the Ministry of Higher Education and USS leaders, and again demonstrated their vassal dependence on Moscow.

A decision was made to begin organizing pre-strike meetings and assemblies and to take immediate steps towards preparing the strike itself.

With a view towards better operational coordination of actions, a Donetsk-Prydniprianskyi bloc of the USS was established. The conference also adopted a series of resolutions.

### MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR UPA SOLDIERS

On February 11 some 5,000 residents of the village of Dorohiv (Halych district, Ivano-Frankivsk province) convened a memorial service to pay their respects to soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (who died in battle with the Nazi German and Soviet Russian forces in Ukraine during and after WW2). Bishop Iryney, hieromonks Nykodym and Makariy, and the village priest Rev. Viktor Slobodian officiated at the religious ceremony.

At a public meeting after the service the following speakers addressed the participants: Maria Samostayko, a Popular Movement member from Kalush; Petro and Vasyl Sichko of the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front; Ukrainian Helsinki Union member Lesia Taran from Lviv; "Lev" Society member from Lviv Daria Tkach, and others. The commemoration ended with the singing of the Ukrainian national anthem.

# UHU-NORTH FOUNDED Branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union established in the RSFSR

On January 31, the founding meeting of the Northern branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) was held in the town of Novyi Urengoy in the Yamalo-Nenetskyi national region of the RSFSR. Drill workers and employees from support services, as well as representatives of other workshops and city residents participated. Representatives of the municipal committee of the CPSU, trade unions, and independent civic groups also attended. Twenty-four UHU members attended the meeting, which ended with a confrontation between party officials and UHU members.

Essentially, the meeting approved the UHU "Declaration of Principles" and resolved to ask the Lviv Coordinating Council to inform the democratic press and Western radio stations, including Radio "Liberty", of the creation of the Northern branch of the UHU. The founding of UHU-North should accelerate the formation of other UHU branches in the east and north, and throughout the whole of Siberia.

The Northern branch is subordinate to the Lviv Coordinating Council of the UHU.

Geologist I. Vynnyk-Zyrianov was elected chairman of the branch by an absolute majority, and V. Buda, a foreman from the sawmill plant, as vice-chairman. A treasurer and liaison officials were also elected. Additional vice-chairmen from various other enterprises are to be elected at their respective meetings.

\* \* \*

On January 30 on the initiative of UHU-North a branch of the Ukrainian Language Society of Shevchenko was also founded. A Council and chairman (V. Tymchyshyn) were elected.

The northern branch of the UHU will distribute information to the democratic press, in as far as this will help in the establishment of other Ukrainian societies and branches throughout all of Siberia.

# UKRAINIAN POPULAR MOVEMENT ("RUKH") DEMONSTRATES FOR UNITY

Kyiv — On Sunday, February 18, 1990, over 5,000 citizens of Kyiv, the Ukrainian capital, gathered in October Revolution Square to demonstrate for unity and reform in Ukraine. The non-sanctioned demonstration, which was organized by the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh"), was called to dispel rumours circulating in the capital that "Rukh" was organizing anti-Russian and anti-Jewish pogroms. The keynote address at the demonstration was given by a representative of the Kyivan Jewish community. Representatives of the Russian, Czech, German, Tartar and Armenian communities were also present and spoke to the participants of this demonstration. An array of national flags further underscored the multi-national nature of the

assembly: thirty Ukrainian, blue-and-yellow flags, two Israeli flags, and the national flag of Poland. A "Rukh" representative stated that the demonstration "categorically and unequivocally proved the untruth of rumours being circulated by agitators".

On Saturday, February 17, the police came to the "Rukh" offices to force them not to proceed with the unsanctioned rally. Viktor Linchevskyi, the "Rukh" Secretariat information officer, stated: "the people want this rally and the people will have it". The police officer in charge admitted that he had orders from the government to stop the demonstration. Later he also conceded that he was caught between "a rock and a hard place", i.e., "Between the people and the government". The rally, nonetheless, proceeded peacefully and without incident.

# "RUKH" DENIES RUMOURS OF AN "ANTI-MILITARY CAMPAIGN"

Kyiv — Rumours of anti-Russian and anti-Jewish pogroms, presently circulating in this capital city of Ukraine, have recently taken a new twist. The newest provocation, designed to undermine the position of the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh"), alleges that "Rukh" is preparing a campaign against the Soviet military. In recent days a number of people have come to the "Rukh" offices inquiring whether it is true that "Rukh" is preparing an "anti-military campaign". Representatives of "Rukh" have officially denied being involved in any such activity. Apparently, these rumours are an attempt to discredit "Rukh" and the Ukrainian national-democratic movement in general on the eve of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, which are scheduled to take place on March 4.

A young soldier came to the "Rukh" offices inquiring whether there was any basis to the rumour that he heard in the barracks that "Rukh" plans to "take action" against the military on February 24. On Saturday, February 17, General Fedorov addressed his soldiers in Kyiv and told them to be cautious, because the military received information that in the coming weeks "Rukh" is planning attacks on military personnel and their families. "Rukh" has unequivocally denied all these rumours and "Rukh" representatives have suggested that elements within the Communist Party opposed to reform are the actual source of these baseless rumours.

# KYIV, FEBRUARY 25: 50,000 AGREE — "TIME FOR UNITY, NOT HOSTILITY!"

On February 25 around 50,000 Kyivites gathered on the city's Troitskyi Square, by the central stadium, to take part in a public meeting, whose theme was: "Time for unity, not hostility", reports Kyiv-based activist Viktor Khomenko.

Several thousand people had already gathered on the square an hour ahead of time to sell samvydav newspapers and conduct pre-election agitation. Riot police were nowhere in sight, and the security organs maintained only a token presence with two police busses.

The meeting began at 2:00 p.m. with an opening address delivered by electoral candidate Vitaliy Karpenko, editor of "Vechirka". He was followed by representatives of the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh"), the Ukrainian Student Association, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), and other electoral candidates, all of whom denounced the anti-democratic provocatory rumours presently circulating around Kyiv, linking their origin to the Party, the KGB and the police. The speakers also included Oles Shevchenko, chairman of the Kyiv branch of the UHU, and Yuriy Badzio. Individual apologists of the Party and state organs were whistled down by the crowds. The meeting ended peacefully.

\* \* \*

#### RESOLUTION OF THE "TIME FOR UNITY, NOT HOSTILITY" MEETING

Basing ourselves on the political situation in the republic, which is characterized by the differentiation of social forces against the background of the restructuring processes, the participants of the meeting state the following:

1) We unanimously agree that in the present situation the consolidation of all democratic forces is indispensable.

2) Solidarity between people of all nationalities is the guarantee of the success of restructuring. The meeting condemns all manifestations of chauvinism and anti-Sovietism.

3) The participants of the meeting denounce provocatory rumours about conflict on national grounds and also between the population and the military. Those who spread these rumours do so under the guise of "Rukh" and other civic organizations. Those who want to disrupt the first democratic elections through the destabilization of civic life find it convenient. A decisive struggle is necessary against those, who are halting restructuring, disrupting its creative rhythm, and threatening the realization of political and economic reforms. We demand that the security services employ decisive measures to curb the provocations and punish those responsible.

4) The participants of the "Time for unity, not hostility" meeting, organized on the initiative of the newspaper "Vechirniy Kyiv" and the Secretariat of the Popular Movement of Ukraine, have reached unanimous agreement on the importance of continuous converging dialogue between the social forces and concrete action geared towards the stabilization of the socio-political situation in Kyiv and throughout Ukraine. We appeal to all Kyivites, to all those who hold dear the ideals of freedom and democracy, to show their tenacity at the crucial time and decisively oppose the provocateurs, and on the day of the elections — March 4 — to go to their electoral districts in an organized fashion to cast their vote, to pass the examination of political and civic maturity.

\* \* \*

#### LVIV

On February 25 100,000 people attended a public meeting in this western Ukrainian city, which ended with the mass burning of Party membership cards.

# VICTIMS OF STALIN TERROR REINTERRED IN BYKIVNIA, NEAR KYIV

On February 17, the remains of victims of Stalinist repressions, which had been removed for examination by a special commission, were reinterred near the village of Bykivnia, near Kyiv. The remains were discovered in mass graves located in a forest outside the village.

For a long time the authorities denied the very fact that there were any victims of the communist regime, and the official version was that these were remains of victims of the German occupation from 1941-43. It was only after numerous public meetings and much hard work on the part of the "Memorial" Society that the authorities were compelled to appoint a commission. The commission worked for almost a year and finally concluded that the mass graves in Bykivnia contained the remains of victims of NKVD terror. The authorities then had no choice, but to give official approval to a competition to design a monument dedicated to the memory of these victims. The competition is being held in the republican artists' building.

The reinterment took place at that site, where the monument is to be erected. Presently, a solitary granite rock with the inscription "Eternal Memory" overlooks the graves. Until recently, it also bore an inscription about German atrocities during their occupation of Ukraine and the massive losses sustained by the Soviet people during that period.

A public assembly preceded the reinterment. Members of "Memorial", WW2 veterans, representatives of various Jewish organizations, and electoral candidates Taniuk and Teren addressed the 3-4,000 participants. Teren pointed out that Ukraine will not be able to give a firm guarantee to its people that the genocide of the Stalin era will never again be repeated, until the Ukrainian people establish an independent and sovereign state of their own.

The meeting was followed by a short memorial service, at which priests of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (formerly the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church) officiated.

\* \* \*

#### Kyiv

At the same time some 2-3,000 people gathered by the October Palace of Culture in Kyiv, which housed the headquarters of the NKVD in the 1930s, to remember the victims of Stalinist terror. At the end of the assembly an urn containing the remains of some of the victims was interred beside the building.

# **RECENT EVENTS IN UKRAINE**

#### Odessa

On February 25 the Party apparatus organized a rally at the municipal stadium. Some 10,000 workers, who were promised free time for their attendance, were driven to the stadium in special buses.

Despite an earlier agreement, representatives of the Democratic Bloc were not permitted to speak, causing their supporters to leave the stadium. Carrying Ukrainian, Russian and Israeli flags, the 5,000 people made their way to the municipal council, where they staged their own rally.

#### Kyiv

On February 23 seventeen members of the Ukrainian Student Association (USS) were arrested. The students were picketing the municipal council in protest against the 15-day imprisonment of Popular Movement activist Volodymyr Chemeris for addressing a student meeting. Eleven members of the USS, including Oles Doniy, who is standing for election to the municipal council, and two close associates of former political prisoner Yuriy Badzio, were imprisoned for 10-15 days.

#### Poltava

On February 25 the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh") and the local branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) oraganized a rally at the city's "Kolos" stadium. The municipal council threatened the organizers with arrest since the rally was not sanctioned by the authorities.

The 12,000 participants of the rally, numbering over 12,000 people, adopted a resolution demanding the dismissal of the provincial and municipal Party committees and governments. The rally was followed by a procession to the Shevchenko monument. The participants held Ukrainian national flags and sang the 19th century Ukrainian poet's "Testament" and the Ukrainian national anthem. The authorities made no attempt to interfere with the proceedings.

# VATICAN MEMBERS OF MIXED CATHOLIC/ORTHODOX COMMISSION ANNOUNCED IN UKRAINE

# Ukrainian Catholic Commission Members Announced

Rome, 28 February 1990 — Ukrainian Catholic Church officials in Rome have confirmed that the Vatican members of the mixed Catholic/Orthodox Commission, which is to meet and resolve the practical problems connected with the normalization of the Ukrainian (Greek) Catholic Church in the Soviet Union, have been announced in Ukraine by Soviet officials.

Yuriy Reshetylo, chairman of the Lviv Council for Religious Affairs announced to both Catholic and Orthodox leaders in Ukraine that the Vatican representatives on the commission will be Archbishop Myroslav Marusyn, secretary of the Congregation for Eastern Churches and Archbishop Stephen Sulyk of the Ukrainian Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Metropolitan of Ukrainian Catholics in the United States.

Reshetylo said that the two are expected to arrive in Moscow on 5 March 1990 for brief meetings with the Moscow Patriarchate and then are to travel to Lviv on 7 March for meetings with local Catholic and Orthodox representatives. He added that the Vatican delegation is scheduled to stay in Ukraine until 15 March and plans to visit the areas of Ivano-Frankivsk, Uzhhorod and Mukacheve.

Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi, head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, has appointed Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk of the Ukrainian Catholic Archeparchy of Lviv and Bishop Sofron Dmyterko of the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of Ivano-Frankivsk to represent the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine on the commission.

As was earlier announced by the Moscow Patriarchate, it will be represented by Metropolitan Mefodiy of Voronezh. Representatives of what is now known as the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine are: Archbishop Iryney Serednyi of Lviv and Drohobych and Archpriest Oleksander Shvets, Orthodox dean of the Lviv region. (Note: At the last Synod of the Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, it was decided that the name of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine would be changed to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The new Church is still subject to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. This Church is not to be confused with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which is independent of the Moscow Patriarchate).

Father Yaroslav Chukhniy, pastor of the Transfiguration Church in Lviv, reported that Mr. Reshetylo had called representatives of the two local churches to a meeting in his office on 27 February 1990. Archbishop Sterniuk delegated Bishop Filemon Kurchaba, auxiliary of the Archeparchy of Lviv, Father Stepan Hrynkiv, pastor of the town of Shchyrets, and Father Chukhniy to represent him at the meeting. The group from the Ukrainian Orthodox Church includes the above mentioned clergy, who will represent the Church on the commission.

Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi made the following statement regarding the announcement:

"I thank the Lord that concrete steps are being taken towards normalization and the legalization of the Ukrainian (Greek) Catholic Church in the USSR. My prayers and thoughts will be particularly with the delegation of the Holy Father and with my fellow bishops in Ukraine. I pray that the talks will proceed in the spirit of justice, reconciliation and Christian love".

Press Office of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Rome

#### Documents and Reports

# UAOC APPEAL TO THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE USSR

Leading activists of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church have begun circulating an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, requesting that the Church's status be reviewed and that it be legally reestablished in Ukraine. According to Mykhailo Osadchyi, a former Ukrainian political prisoner, writer and cultural activist, on December 23, 1989, over 1,300 individuals, members of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church's parish of Saints Peter and Paul in Lviv, signed their names to this appeal.

The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was prohibitied from any open activity and has been subjected to brutal suppression since its forced liquidation in the 1930s.

Below is the full text of this Appeal.

We, the undersigned, request of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to register the communities of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and to return those churches that were illegally taken from it, particularly the oldest shrine of Ukrainian spirituality, the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kyiv.

Our ancient Ukrainian Church was established in 988; it was destroyed by the tsarist regime in 1686 and forcibly made subservient to the Russian Patriarchate. Following the All-Ukrainian Church Council in 1921, it again arose by the will of its faithful and clergy. In the 1930s, however, the total destruction of the Ukrainian intellectal élite and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church was begun. Twenty-seven bishops, over ten thousand priests and millions of faithful were murdered. This campaign was begun on the basis of fabricated documents in conjunction with the so-called "SVU case", which has now been officially acknowledged.

One of the primary rights of all individuals is freedom of conscience and religion. No government can ignore or violate this right. The non-recognition of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church has no juridical or moral basis. Presently, millions of faithful are demanding the reinstitution of our traditional Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church; tomorrow this demand will be taken up by many more millions of faithful and sympathizers.

We are forwarding this request to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and demand that this question be resolved in a legal manner".

\* \* \*

According to M. Osadchyi, the parish of Saints Peter and Paul, a church of

<sup>\*</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all materials have been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service.

the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Lviv, received the following telegram:

"We would like to inform you that on December 17, 1989, the religious community of the holy Church of the Assumption in the city of Horodenko of the Ivano-Frankivsk province decided to pull out from the Russian Orthodox Church. We await your suggestions and directives.

Horodenko Rev. Mykhailo Zavaiskyi"

\* \* \*

M. Osadchyi also stated that a priest of the Russian Orthodox Church from Verkhovyny (Ivano-Frankivsk province) informed him that he will soon proclaim that his parish has passed under the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church.

# APPEAL OF THE UCDF TO THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE

The Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front (UCDF), a major unofficial organization in Ukraine, issued the following appeal on the eve of the upcoming elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, which are to take place on March 4, 1990.

A decisive period is drawing near. The dissolution of the empire is upon us. On the eve of its downfall the empire is grasping every opportunity to save itself, to galvanize and sustain its existence. In the mind of the imperialists, one such opportunity is the illusion of elections.

All the "republics" of the USSR were once independent states. They were all captured, occupied and annexed by Bolshevism through the use of military means and terror. All these "republics", including Ukraine, were illegally occupied against the will of the people. Presently, the imperialists want to use the upcoming elections to create a red parliament, ostensibly chosen by the people, but a parliament, which in the name of the people will sign a new federative agreement and will endorse a new federative constitution.

Ukrainians! Let us be careful! We cannot allow those who seek to become red deputies to again sell out Ukraine on our behalf. We cannot allow the occupation of Ukraine to be legalized in our name, in the name of the people.

No genuine elections can take place as long as Ukraine is occupied territory. Those, who are of different mind, let them run for election, let them vote — this will be on their conscience.

Genuine elections cannot take place as long as the infamous Article 6 on the leading role of the Communist Party has not been rescinded; in other words, all the deputies elected to this occupational parliament will automatically be the instruments of the will of the communists, which is the case in the imperialist parliament, in which 87% of the deputies are Party members and an additional 5% are Komsomol [Communist youth organization — UCIS] members.

The Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front was the only organization in Ukraine, which from the beginning boycotted the elections last spring for political reasons, and our decision in this regard has been proven correct. As long as this Article is in effect, any kind of election is amoral and servile in its essence.

The Article of the legal code of the Ukrainian SSR, which prohibits any appeals to boycott elections, clearly indicates that these elections are important for the imperialists. We cannot call for a boycott of the elections, and for that reason this matter is subject to the conscience of every individual, is a decision that he or she must make alone.

We, the UCDF, refuse to nominate our members as candidates to the occupational parliament. To participate in elections, similar to these or in similar conditions, we feel would be tantamout to betraying the interests of the Ukrainian nation.

Elections, which do not adhere to a plaftorm of Ukrainian independence and statehood, are a crime against Ukraine and the Ukrainian nation. A time will come when history will judge these "elections" and all those who participated in them. We view any present pre-election campaigns based on a collaborationist platform of "a sovereign Ukraine within a new federation" as absurd and dangerous, since they are purposefully designed to deceive the people.

Every individual must decide for him/herself whether to participate in these elections. We emphasize again, however: Ukrainians! Be careful! At a time when other nations in Eastern Europe are striving for liberty, we are being led to the market to be sold! We are a great nation and our liberty is our ultimate goal! We must not allow the red deputies to sell out Ukraine!

# LVIV INTELLIGENTSIA SEND MEMORANDUM TO MOSCOW-VATICAN MEETING

To:

The Representatives to the Moscow Meeting between the Vatican and the Moscow Patriarchate concerning the Question of the Legalization and Rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church

The Secretary of the Papal Congregation for Eastern Churches, His Excellency Archbishop Myroslav Marusyn, a Participant of the Meeting

From:

The Delegates to the Conference of the Lviv Intelligentsia Concerning the Question of Present Ecumenical Relations in the Western Ukrainian Region

#### **MEMORANDUM**

The Conference was convened on the initiative of the Lviv Council of the national organization "Rukh" and the national organization "Memorial", and took place on 10 January 1990, with the participation of delegates from various creative unions, societies and associations.

The Conference goal — the formulation of documents, which represent the true situation, for the participants of the Moscow Meeting and the Ukrainian public.

The most fundamental and most painful question for the western Ukrainian region is the question of the legalization and rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, which was decimated and driven underground by the Stalinist regime. The postponement of the resolution of this question by the government of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR attests to the fictitious and unfounded nature of restructuring and democratization, to the extent that Articles 1, 2, 7, 9, 18 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights as well as relevant articles of the Constitutions of the USSR and the Ukrainian SSR concerning freedom of conscience remain essentially violated.

News about the arrival in Moscow during mid-January of a delegation from the Vatican to continue the heretofore moratoriumed negotiations on the status of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, initiated during the meeting of Pope John Paul II and M. S. Gorbachev, has awakened great expectations and, at the same time, deep worry among the population of western Ukraine. which is mainly of the Greek-Catholic faith. The expectations are tied to the hope that the meeting will finally lead to the full legalizaton and rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church as a national part of the Universal Church. Worry stems from the fact that the negotiations between the Vatican, the Government of the USSR and the Moscow Patriarchate concerning matters of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, for inexplicable reasons, have been conducted and are being conducted in secret and without the participation of representatives of the Ukrainian National Church in Ukraine. Having preserved throughout the times of great trial a devotion to the Universal Church and the will to recognize the faith of our forefathers, which is confirmed by the constant struggle for the recognition of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, including last year's majestic church services, manifestations and processions, we regard such an attitude towards the Greek-Catholics in Ukraine on the part of both contractual parties as unjust, all the more so since the faithfulness of Ukrainian Greek-Catholics to the Apostolic See not only testifies to the living faith, which is so essential during our age of anti-spirituality, but also strengthens the foundation of the Universal Church in the eyes of the world.

Based on the foregoing, we regard it necessary to bring to your attention those questions, which require immediate resolution, especially in the light of complex socio-political relations and processes of restructuring in the western Ukrainian region, in order to stop the radicalization of attitudes among the population brought on by the propagation of the anti-Catholic and anti-Greek-Catholic propaganda on the governmental level and through all official forms of mass media, including the defamation and the spread of lies about Greek-Catholics, besmirching the honour of prominent activists of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and Ukrainian culture, especially by representatives of the highest organs of the Russian Orthodox Church. These include:

a) The condemnation and invalidation of, without exception, all decisions concerning the so-called "Lviv Sobor of 1946", as non-canocial and repressive with regard to the western branch of the Ukrainian nation. Archive documents as well as current objective publications in the democratic Russian press, based on these documents, attest that this "sobor" was a political act and was conducted by the then Government of the USSR with the assistance of the NKVD and with the active participation of the loyal Stalinist Moscow Patriarchate.

b) The granting to the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church of the status of a juridical entity.

c) The recognition of the hierarchical structure of the Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine headed by Archbishop Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi in Lviv and creating real opportunities for carrying out the pastoral duties in service to the spiritual needs of the Greek-Catholic faith.

d) The immediate and unconditional return of the greatest shrine for all Ukrainian Greek-Catholics in Ukraine and in the diaspora — the Cathedral of St. George in Lviv, including the metropolitans' palace and other buildings, which comprise the St. George architectural ensemble. To the extent that the Cathedral of St. George not only is a Ukrainian shrine, but also the resting place of Greek-Catholic metropolitans, especially Metropolitan Andrey Shep-tytskyi, beloved by wide circles of Ukrainians and regarded as a saint by Greek-Catholic circles.

The provision of moral and material compensation by the Government of the USSR to the persecuted representatives of the clergy and the faithful, especially the return to them of all their shrines and church property, which were expropriated by the Government of the USSR for the benefit of the Russian Orthodox Church after 1946.

e) The opening of middle and higher parochial schools, the restoration of the monasteries, permisson for the normal missionary work of the Church, the religious and lay-religious brotherhoods and associations, the unconditional right to ties with Rome and with other Catholic centres, as well as the Ukrainian Catholic diaspora.

We are informing you only of those most fundamental items, which are a priority in the resolution of the status of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church, the postponement of which is undesirable, to the extent that only the immediate resolution of the aforementioned problems could stem the religious fervour of the deeply wronged Greek-Catholics and turn their energies towards the ecological and social tasks of the region. The Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church is ready to engage in brotherly cooperation with all other faiths, which respect the historical, territorial and material rights, and which respect the right to freedom of conscience and the right of each citizen to choose his own faith.

The rehabilitation and legalization of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in the context of the aforementioned question would become an act of triumph of Christian truth for all the faithful of the Universal Church and an act of triumph for historical justice - in the spirit of the Helsinki and Vienna Accords, which were signed and ratified by the Government of the USSR for the people of the whole world, as well as restore the trust and respect of Ukrainian Greek-Catholics towards the Russian Orthodox Church.

This act would also facilitate the process of restructuring and democratization in the Soviet state, as well as spiritual ecumenism and Christian brotherhood, which is preached by the Russian Orthodox Church.

In turning to you, the participants of the Vatican-Moscow Meeting, we request that you remember that the positive and timely resolution of the matters raised in this Memorandum, questions concerning the rehabilitation and legalization of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church in Ukraine is your most important contribution to the struggle against totalitarian-coercive regimes, and for genuine peace and brotherhood among people in a world of Christian morality, for safeguarding the truly great changes, which would guarantee stability, mutual understanding and mutual respect of peoples, nations and states.

Appended to this document is "The Declaration of the Conference of Representatives of the Intelligentsia of Lviv to the Ukrainian People".

Signed:

Prof. O. Vlokh - Chairman, Lviv Regional Council of "Rukh"

Prof. M. Holuben - Vice-chairman, Lviv Regional Council of "Rukh"

I. Yukhnovskyi - Chairman, Lviv Regional Branch of "Memorial"

Ye. Hryniv — Head of the "Memorial" Society

Poet R. Lubkivskyi - Chairman, Lviv Branch of the Ukrainian Writers' Union

E. Mysko - Chairman, Lviv Branch of the Ukrainian Cultural Front

V. Patyk — Lviv Branch of the Artists' Union of Ukraine

Poet I. Kalvnets - Association of Independent Creative Intelligentsia

Artist S. Shabatura - The Student Brotherhood

Iryna Kalynets - The Womens' Christian Association - Marian Society

Prof. R. Bilynskyi - The Lviv Foundation of the Health of Mercy

B. Horyn, S. Khmara - Lviv Branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union

R. Ivanychuk, M. Kosiv – Lviv Branch of the Ukrainian Language Society of Taras Shevchenko

I. Derkach - Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth

T. Stetskiv - "Lev" Society Council

1. Hel - Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church

I. Hrechko - Chairman, Commission on Freedom of Conscience, Lviv Regional Branch of "Rukh"

People's Deputy R. Bratun, People's Deputy R. Fedoriv

Lviv, January 10, 1990

# UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC CHURCH RELEASES NEW STATISTICS ON CHURCHES, CONGREGATIONS, PRIESTS IN UKRAINE

Ukrainian Catholic Church officials in Rome have received updated statistics from Ukrainian Catholic Church sources in Ukraine regarding the number of parishes, which are currently functioning as Ukrainian Catholic and the number of priests who formerly served in the Russian Orthodox Church and have now asked to join the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

In a 16 January telephone conversation with Ukrainian Catholic bishops, who were in Moscow for meetings with representatives of the Holy See and the Moscow Patriarchate, it was reported that an estimated 600 churches in Ukraine are currently functioning as Ukrainian Catholic. 700 congregations have applied for registration with Soviet officials and an estimated 350 priests, who formerly served in the Russian Orthodox Church, have asked to be accepted as priests in the Ukrainian Catholic Church and have been accepted by a Ukrainian Catholic bishop. These statistics are representative of larger cities and towns. Figures for smaller towns and villages are still being compiled.

The above reported activity has ocurred since the Council for Religious Affairs of Ukraine announced on 1 December 1989 that Eastern Rite Catholics in Ukraine had been granted the right to officially register their congregations. In some areas (i.e. the city of Ivano-Frankivsk), there are no longer any functioning Russian Orthodox churches. Those which are not open and functioning as Ukrainian Catholic are closed (including the cathedral in Ivano-Frankivsk). This is also the case with the Cathedral of St. George in Lviv.

Press Office of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Rome

## **OPEN LETTER**

To the Head of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev

We appeal to you as Head of State, on whose position the fate of restructuring, the natural process of the affirmation of democratic reconstruction, the institution of social and national justice, to a large extent depends. The peoples of the Soviet Union expect fundamental changes in international relations from restructuring, the full realization of the principles of national sovereignty, introduced consistently into all spheres of political, economic and cultural-spiritual life. We would like to stress the urgency with which you should regard this problem, as international conflicts, particularly in the Transcaucasian republics, can escalate into civil war. The reasons for the conflict were created by the flawed nationality policy of the period of stagnation. The all-union government and the Central Committee of the Party have so far not employed decisive measures for the just resolution of the nationality question. Delay in its resolution brings unforeseen consequences. It can be resolved not with the aid of military force, which leads to the escalation of oppression, but only through negotiations, and by taking into consideration the just aspirations and demands of the people. Great power attitudes in government and party policy regarding the "peripheral" nations is the burden of old stereotypes, formed in the conditions of the totalitarian Stalin-Brezhnev political system, which even today obstructs the establishment of new and just international relations, the realization of the national state sovereignty of the republics.

Taking into consideration the urgent resolution of this question and the dramatic conflict in the Transcaucasus, we regard the following steps as indispensable:

1) The central and republican governments should focus their attention on creating the most favourable conditions for negotiations between representatives of the democratic forces of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

2) Institute the constitutional principle of the self-determination of nations, granting them the right to resolve their own fate, and to determine administrative control over territories and provinces, in the spirit of international laws adopted by the United Nations, including the Declaration of Human Rights.

3) Halt the redeployment of divisions from Ukraine to "hot spots", which gives rise to popular indignation and creates preconditions for the intensification of international conflicts. The deployment of reservists and soldiers of the Soviet army in the role of repressive organs to suppress hostile areas is impermissible. In extreme cases, only units of the MVD and KGB should be used for such purposes.

4) Secure for the peoples the right to national self-determination in political, economic and cultural-spiritual life, with the right to national armed forces as a guarantee of sovereignty.

5) Bring to the attention of the Soviet government the expedience of deploying UN observers in Iran and Turkey, on the border between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

6) Create effective conditions for the temporary evacuation of the Armenian and other non-Muslim population from Azerbaijan to places where they can live in safety.

7) Provide full and objective coverage of events in Transcaucasia, thereby putting an end to popular indignation regarding disinformation or lack of information.

8) Regard as impermissible national hostility between Armenians and

88

Azerbaijanis and acts of oppression in Ukraine. Deprive all hostile individuals of the right of residence in Ukraine.

9) Propose that leaders of the Azerbaijani and Armenian fronts conduct negotiations through the mediation of a neutral organization, "Rukh" [Popular Movement of Ukraine], if relations between both fronts make direct negotiations impossible.

Lviv Regional Council of "Rukh" "Memorial" Ukrainian Language Society of Taras Shevchenko "Lev" Society Ukrainian Helsinki Union Armenian Society "Akhpiur" Jewish Society of Sholom Aleykhem Pushkin Society of Friends of Ukrainian and Russian Culture Committee for the Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church

Lviv, January 25, 1990

# STATEMENT

# OF THE LVIV COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENCE OF CITIZENS' RIGHTS (STRIKE COMMITTEE)

Blood has again been spilt. This time in Baku.

The latest tragic events in Azerbaijan again demonstrate that the imperialist Moscow leadership is incapable of resolving the bitter conflict situation by peaceful means.

The events in Azerbaijan and other nearby areas is a regional manifestation of the unresolved imperialist nationality problem.

Moscow's decision not to provide a timely and just resolution to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh provoked terrible bloodshed.

Now the reactionary imperialist forces want to use the conflict to strike a blow against the democratic organizations of the peoples of Transcaucasia and the whole empire, and to suppress the popular movements for self-determination.

The desire for freedom is inherent in human nature and can be achieved through guarantees of basic human rights, which are impossible without the implementation of the right of nations to self-determination.

The Moscow leaders should realize that the time has come to dismantle the world's last empire. This process is objective and irreversible.

Attempts to preserve the empire through harsh oppression can provoke an undesired "Rumanian variant" with terrible consequences.

The only true, civilized way to resolve the problem is political dialogue between the leadership and representatives of the democratic community.

Reviewing the current situation in Azerbaijan we cannot remain indifferent to the events, which occurred there. We express our distress and anxiety concerning the international hostility and bloodletting.

At the same time we are convinced that the security of citizens can be guaranteed without the introduction of martial law.

In solidarity with the democratic forces of the peoples of Transcaucasia and genuine internationalism, the Lviv Committee for the Defence of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee) regards it as its duty to state the following:

1) We demand that the Supreme Soviet of the USSR end the martial law in Baku and other areas of Azerbaijan and Armenia and begin immediate negotiations with representatives of the republican government and the National Front of Azerbaijan.

We demand that it support the appeal of the Council of the Authorized Representatives of Nagorno-Karabakh on the admission of United Nations troops onto the territory of Nagorno-Karabakh.

2) We urge the National Front of Azerbaijan and the democratic organizations of Armenia to sit down behind the negotiating table and do everything possible to bring an end to the national-level hostilities and oppression, which only benefit the enemies of the freedom and independence of the Azerbaijani, Armenian and all the peoples of the empire.

3) We express our protest against the deployment of Ukrainians in the shameful imperialist action in Azerbaijan, and demand an immediate halt to the mobilization of reservists for service in Transcaucasia, and beyond the borders of Ukraine in general.

4) We urge all those involved in military service to refuse to serve outside Ukraine, particularly not to carry out the present criminal imperialist police duties in Azerbaijan.

5) We appeal to all citizens of Ukraine, especially to mothers, wives and girl friends to begin a wide scale campaign (meetings, demonstrations, picketing, collective petitions) to protest against the posting of our countrymen for service outside Ukraine, and their deployment to suppress national independence movements.

The Lviv Strike Committee is making preparations for a general political strike if the authorities ignore the voice of the people.

#### January 24, 1990

This statement was adopted as a resolution by the 10,000 participants of a public meeting in Lviv on January 25, 1990.

# APPEAL To the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia

We are extremely disturbed by the tragic events in Azerbaijan and other nearby areas. We believe that they are the consequence of the flawed nationality policy in the Transcaucasian republics, an imperialist approach to the resolution of the international conflict, which came to light in the attempt to use the difficult situation to deal with the national-democratic movements, which defend the right of nations to self-determination.

The introduction of martial law has led to increased tension and unwarranted bloodshed, and places us before the perspective of a "new Afghanistan". We demand an end to the state of emergency in Azerbaijan and Armenia, the resolution of the fratricidal conflict by security forces and troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. We share the pain of the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia, express our deepest sympathies and urge them to do everything possible to end the hostility and violence. A meaningful resolution of the conflict is possible only on the basis of the freedom of the peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia.

January 24, 1990

Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union

# PRE-ELECTION APPEAL OF THE UKRAINIAN HELSINKI UNION Appeal

#### **Citizens of Ukraine!**

We are standing before an iron curtain, which separates dark from light. Behind us is the darkness of communist highhandedness; before us lies freedom, democracy, prosperity. There is one step towards light: the victory of democratic forces in the elections, and the iron curtain will collapse like the Berlin wall.

The Stalinist system in Eastern Europe is crumbling before your eyes. Albania and the Soviet Union are the last islands of the archipelago of the undivided rule of party augurs, who alone, supposedly, know the way towards the communist mirage.

Seventy years of totalitarianism in Ukraine have reduced the birth rate of the Ukrainian nation, brought famine, the present lack in culture, the revely of violence, the lack of perspective, and have made us lag behind the colonies of yesterday.

Who is preventing THEM from fulfilling THEIR promises to build a wealthy foremost state? What has Ukraine acquired instead of golden wheat-fields under a blue sky?

- Collectivization, chemical pollution, radiation, russification, ideologization. . .

Enough!

#### Ukrainian people!

Let us put an end to the destruction of our land, our people!

Vote AGAINST the party nomenclature and those who nominate them. CROSS OUT the names of secretaries of the provincial committees, district committees and party committees, union bosses, directors of factories, trusts, and societies. . . Be alert and stand by the principle "WE WILL NOT PER-MIT THE CONCENTRATION OF LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE POWER IN ONE HANDS". Those who hold party or economic power should be subject to the control of PEOPLE'S deputies, and should not grab more power and another spoon.

Vote only for candidates, who have not shamed themselves by serving the party dictators and THEIR well-fed, drunken and carefree lives.

RANK-AND-FILE party members! The lessons of history should prompt you to take your place among the opposition. Take a decisive and principled step. Whom are you with?

ELECTORS! Support candidates who stand for

- Ukrainian independence; superiority of republican over union laws.

- The right of citizens to organize themselves into peaceful political parties, associations, unions; the right to hold free meetings, demonstrations, strikes.

— The equality of ownership.

- The equality of state and citizen before the law.

#### **Fellow countrymen!**

Let us make an effort to convince the people of the need to build a free, democratic, lawful society, a state without national, class, or party privileges.

Ukrainian Helsinki Union

# UKRAINIAN HELSINKI UNION PRE-ELECTION APPEAL

#### People of Ukraine!

The time of freedom is drawing near! Communist ideology — the ideology of violence and state terror — has suffered its world-historical crash. One

after another, the peoples of Eastern Europe are freeing themselves from the despotic fetters of their totalitarian regimes and are taking the first steps on the path of democratization and respect for human rights.

The Moscow partocracy and its puppets in Kyiv, have caused the Ukrainian people to suffer a serious decline of traditional morals and are responsible for the serious economic crisis and near ecological devastation, which has presently beset Ukraine. Refusing to forfeit their privileged status, the old partocracy does not wish (and does not know how) to restructure the economy; it has, indeed, sabotaged all changes and has pursued a deliberate policy of austerity, leading to shortages of food and other consumer goods, resulting in an exacerbation of social tensions. The colonial policy of union ministries has turned Ukraine into a polluted waste-dump and helped cause the Chornobyl catastrophe, subjecting hundreds of thousands of people to misfortune and misery.

The anti-democratic ideology of Russian chauvinism and state atheism has led to the assimilation of many Ukrainians.

#### **Fellow countrymen!**

The Russian communist regime destroyed the democratic, multi-party Ukrainian National Republic, established by our people during the revolution of 1917, destroyed all Ukrainian political parties and our Churches, forced the peasantry into collective farms, brought famine and destruction to Ukraine in 1932-33, collaborated in the outbreak of the Second World War, and from 1939 brought all these misfortunes to western Ukraine. In 1947 it brought famine to eastern Ukraine, deported around 2 million people from western Ukraine to the snows of foreign lands, and has continuously dispersed Ukrainians throughout the Union and the whole world. In recent decades, the anti-Ukrainian regime has carried out a policy of brutal russification and, under the pretext of all-Union interests, has continued to destroy our people and its environment.

#### Workers!

Only 5% of Ukraine's industry is under the control of the Government of the Ukrainian SSR, and 95% — is controlled by Moscow. The Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) demands the return of Ukrainian industry to the people.

Ukraine is capable of providing its people with food and all other consumer necessities. The lack of independent statehood is the only reason why we have not been able to pursue and realize our common weal.

#### **Peasants!**

Four years of restructuring have not altered your servile status — you remain enslaved in the chains of the partocracy. The UHU stands for the

immediate transfer of land to you — only this can revive the love for the land and save us all from ultimate ruin.

#### Ukrainian intelligentsia!

The totalitarian communist regime has disfigured your soul the most. Rise up now to unite the whole nation around the idea of a free, democratic Ukrainian republic.

#### Young Ukrainians!

Twice a year from your midst young men are drafted into the army to defend despotic foreign regimes and the partocracy. The UHU opposes employing the army to interfere in peaceful political struggles. The UHU stands for the creation of a small republican army, which would defend its country with a sense of dignity.

## **VOTE FOR UKRAINIAN HELSINKI UNION CANDIDATES!**

If you vote for the UHU, you vote for:

- the abolition of Article 6 of the Ukrainian SSR Constitution and political pluralism;
- a sovereign democratic Ukraine;
- equality of ownership;
- a new democratic Ukrainian constitution, which would abide by the norms of international law regarding human and national rights;
- the spiritual revival of the Ukrainian and other peoples, that inhabit the Ukrainian SSR;
- raising the welfare of the population on the basis of economic independence and freedom of economic activity.

Citizens of Ukraine! This is a critical time. The reactionary wing of the Communist Party of Ukraine is striving, through disruption of supplies, to provoke anti-deficit revolts, in order to again launch a military assault against the people and again establish its total dictatorship. With the help of the Orthodox Church hierarchy, the partocracy is stirring up hostility between the Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox believers of the Ukrainian Autocephalous and Russian Orthodox Churches. It is striving to sow mistrust between Ukrainians of western and eastern provinces. Do not be taken in by these provocations! Manifest your consciousness and organization. Unite in a peaceful political struggle against the partocracy! Do not elect a single representative of the partocracy to the new Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR!

# ALL POWER TO DEMOCRATIC COUNCILS! VOTE FOR THE UHU! VOTE FOR OTHER CANDIDATES FROM THE NATIONAL-DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT! THE FATE OF UKRAINE LIES IN OUR HANDS!

# **"RUKH" DENOUNCES ANTI-SEMITISM**

#### Statement of the Popular Movement of Ukraine

The tears of Chornobyl had not yet dried, when a new evil entered into our home — Sumgait. We had not finished mourning the victims of the Armenian earthquake, when we were presented with a new set of misfortunes — the tragedy in Tbilisi, Fergana. The events in Karabakh, in Baku, resound with equal pain in our hearts. We are aware of the social differences between these tragic events, and understand that one should search for the concealed causes of international conflicts not on the borders with our sister republics, but elsewhere.

We also harbour no illusions about those who find it convenient to sow national hostility, who fear our unity, the unity of peoples, which would guarantee the democratic transformation of society.

At a time when political "black hundreds" [a Russian anti-Semitic movement in the 19th century — UCIS] "in civilian dress" are posting anti-Semitic, anti-Armenian and anti-Azerbaijani leaflets around the cities of Ukraine, spreading rumours that "Rukh" is supposedly preparing pogroms, the police remove Transcaucasian merchants from Kyivan markets, and the ideologists of these actions use the media to frighten the trusting citizen with the "extremism" and "nationalism" of "Rukh", which they hate so much.

We do not conceal the fact that "Rukh" is an opponent of those forces, which today control the political situation in the country, forces, which strive to live according to yesterday's laws.

But we stand for open parliamentary struggle without manipulations, insinuations and provocations.

We categorically state that "RUKH" IS NOT IMPLICATED IN ANY ACTIONS, WHICH SOW INTERNATIONAL MISTRUST.

In this dramatic period of our existence "Rukh" repeatedly condemns actions, which are directed towards the creation of international tension. Our programmatic documents attest to this fact, which is further brought out in our practical activity.

We, together with our tired, exhausted people, are for stability, for international cooperation, for peace and unity! There is no other way.

Chairman of "Rukh" Ivan Drach Deputy Chairman of "Rukh" People's Deputy Volodymyr Yavorivskyi Chairman of the "Rukh" Secretariat Mykhailo Horyn

\* \* \*

#### Let Us Fight Against Anti-Semitic Provocateurs!

The executive of the Popular Movement of Ukraine ("Rukh") expresses its indignation and sense of outrage with regard to the anti-Semitic actions and statements of "Pamyat" and similar chauvinistic associations. The provocatory articles, which recently appeared in "Nash Sovremennyk", "Molodaya Gvardia", "Literaturnaya Rossiya" and "Sovetskaya Rossiya", the chauvinistic plenum of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, the meeting of the "Black Hundreds" in Red Square, and finally the recent appeals of emissaries from "Pamyat" calling for an anti-Semitic action on May 5, 1990 — these are all links in the same vile chain. . .

The provocateurs operate on the basis of the chauvinistic concept of "one and indivisible" imperialist Russia, refusing to recognize the right of tens and hundreds of nations and peoples in the USSR to self-determination up to separation; they call for anti-Semitic actions, while forging prison shackles and chains for all of us, including the Russian people. The words and deeds of these followers of Puryshkevych and Shulgin, of Stalin and Beria disgrace our country before all of civilized humankind. These words and actions cast a shadow of Hitler's national-socialism over our country.

On behalf of thousands of its members and on behalf of many millions of honest citizens of Ukraine — "Rukh" sympathizers —, the "Rukh" leadership categorically and resolutely states its unequivocal support for the Jewish population and its readiness to defend its dignity, peace and life. "Rukh" will not allow these provocateurs to violate the unity, friendship and spirit of brotherhood of the peoples of Ukraine.

"Rukh" demands that the Party, legislative and executive organs of the Republic take effective measures in terms of immediately stopping and denouncing anti-Semitic and other forms of anti-national propaganda (including the so-called "struggle with Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism", or "the struggle against Zionism"). The security services should immediately begin a common action with "Rukh" to guarantee a normal and secure way of life for the citizens of Ukraine. People that engage in anti-Semitic propaganda must be made accountable before the courts and must be punished as the most vile enemies of democracy.

Our Jewish brothers and sisters! "Rukh" is with you! Any type of provocation against you is an insult to our nation of many peoples! Let us be one! Let us strive for your and our dignity and freedom!

"Rukh" Secretariat

# THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

Summer • 1990

# THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

# EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko Editor

Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky Assistant Editor

> Prof. Lev Shankovsky Assistant Editor

Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky Assistant Editor Volodymyr Bohdaniuk Associate Editor

> Borys Potapenko Associate Editor

Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn Associate Editor

> Stephen Oleskiw Associate Editor

Price: £4.50 or \$9.00 a single copy, Annual Subscription: £18.00 or \$36.00

Editorial correspondence should be sent to:

The Editors, "The Ukrainian Review", 200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF.

#### Subscriptions should be sent to:

"The Ukrainian Review" (Administration), c/o Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd., 49 Linden Gardens, London, W2 4HG.

#### **Overseas representatives:**

USA: Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., 136 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003. Canada: Ucrainica Research Institute, 83-85 Christie Street, Toronto,Ont. M6G 3B1.

> Printed in Great Britain by the Ukrainian Publishers Limited 200 Liverpool Road, London, NI 1LF. Tel.: 01-607-6266/7

# THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

# Vol. XXVIII

A Quarterly Journal

Summer, 1990

# CONTENTS

Editorial: RUSSIAN CHAUVINISM REARS ITS UGLY HEAD	2
Roman Zwarycz: GLASNOST REVISITED: A Critical Reexamination of Gorbachev's Reform Programme	
from the Perspective of the National-Liberation Struggle	3
Oleh Romanyshyn: THE CANADIAN LEAGUE FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE (Conclusion)	16
Dr. Blanka Jerabek: BOOKS, PRINTING, AND THE FIRST PRINTING HOUSES IN UKRAINE (Conclusion)	26

#### NEWS FROM UKRAINE

Elections in Ukraine	33
Election Highlights	34
Ukrainian National Rights Activists Elected	35
Election Irregularities in Ukraine.	
Election Results: First Round • March 4, 1990	
Democratic Bloc Scores Great Successes in Run-Off Elections	41
Report on the Elections in Ukraine	42
UKRAINE IN SUPPORT OF LITHUANIA	
Mass Rally in Lviv Voices its Solidarity with Lithuanian Republic	
Meeting in Kryvyi Rih	
Ukrainian Deputies Urge Recognition of Lithuanian Independence	
Mass Rallies Throughout Ukraine in Support of Lithuanian Independence	49
Post-Electoral Rally Held in Kyiv: Attended by 50,000 People	
UKRAINIAN STUDENT ACTIONS	
Lviv Students Hold a Strike	56
Protest Action in Kyiv and Lviv: Demand Release of Arrested Students	57
GEN. SHUKHEVYCH AND UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY HONOURED IN BILOHORSHCHA, LVIV PROVINCE	
UKRAINIANS MOURN VICTIMS OF COMMUNIST TERROR: Demand Outlawing of CPSU and KGB	59
UKRAINIANS AGAINST CREATION OF SOVIET PRESIDENCY	60
UKRAINIAN HELSINKI UNION HOLDS CONFERENCE IN KYIV	61
UKRAINIANS REFUSING TO SERVE IN SOVIET ARMY OUTSIDE UKRAINE	65
FOURTH SESSION OF RUKH SUPREME COUNCIL HELD IN KHUST	66
UKRAINIAN NATIONAL FLAG RAISED OVER LVIV CITY HALL	
"UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE AND STATEHOOD" NEW ALL-UKRAINIAN POLITICAL ASSOCIATION FORMED	
SECOND (EXTRAORDINARY) CONGRESS OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL PARTY HELD IN LVIV	79
"EARTH DAY" COMMEMORATED IN UKRAINE: Kyiv Rally Held in Atmosphere of Solemnity	
in Commemoration of Chomobyl Tragedy.	
UNDL Holds Theoretical Conference: Reject Cooperation with CPU	84
UKRAINIAN CHRISTIAN-DEMOCRATIC FRONT HOLDS SECOND CONGRESS	
NEW PARTY FORMED IN UKRAINE: Ukrainian Republican Party Based on Independence Platform	85

#### DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

RUKH POST-ELECTORAL APPEAL: Calls for Pluralist, Multi-Party System in an Independent Ukraine	
OPEN LETTER TO MIKHAIL SERGEYEVICH GORBACHEV	
UHU LVIV PROVINCIAL BRANCH HOLDS & CONFERENCE: Decides on Tactics for Run-Off Election Campaign;	
Rejects Legitimacy of Expanded Presidential Powers	
UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC DEPUTY PROTESTS AGAINST VATICAN'S NEGOTIATIONS WITH RUSSIAN PATRIARCH	
MINERS IN UKRAINE DEMAND BETTER WORKING CONDITIONS	
Ukrainians are Resisting the Soviet Military Draft	

## Published by

The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Ltd. Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine Inc. (U.S.A.) Ucrainica Research Institute (Canada)

## ISSN 0041-6029

#### EDITORIAL

# **Russian Chauvinism Rears its Ugly Head**

The one historical constant bridging the tsarist and Soviet periods was Russian imperialist policy, by which the various subjugated peoples were subjected to systematic colonial oppression, economic exploitation and brutal Russification. The ruling elites of the USSR were able to refine and pursue the same basic policies of their tsarist predecessors not only because of their military might, the secret police network or the Party apparatus, but also because the Russian people over the ages have apparently given their tacit and at times open endorsement of such an unabashedly imperialist course.

Previously, despite the eminently imperialist nature of Moscow's policy of Russification in the non-Russian "republics" of the USSR, the position that the Russian people support the Kremlin's colonial policies was difficult to substantiate, since this policy was always cloaked in Marxist-Leninist "internationalist" phraseology. Recent events, particularly in the Baltic countries and in Ukraine, are a clear indication, however, that Russian chauvinism may be on the rise.

Following proclamations of independence in the three Baltic states, a series of antiindependence rallies were held and attended almost exclusively by ethnic Russians. These rallies were organized by Interfront, a predominantly Russian organization whose primary goal is to prevent the dissolution of the Soviet Russian empire. Substantial Russian minorities exist not only in the Baltic countries, particularly Latvia and Estonia, but in the other non-Russian Soviet "republics" as well. The reason for this potentially volatile situation is that Moscow, in its attempt to further "Sovietize", i.e., Russify, the non-Russian peoples in the USSR, urged ethnic Russians to resettle in these areas. This colonial resettlement was even indirectly subsidized by Moscow through various attractive incentive programmes. Now, as the Soviet Russian empire is crumbling, the Russian ethnic minorities apparently loathe the prospect of having to actually learn the language of the indigenous national population.

Recent reports from the southern regions of Ukraine are also very alarming. Moscow has apparently intensified its efforts to colonize Ukraine, by sending Russian migrant workers and their families into Odessa and surrounding areas. Moreover, it is curious to note that in his attempt to create a new base of political legitimacy in the USSR outside the CPSU, M. Gorbachev decided to include two leading Russian chauvinists and anti-Semites in his newly-created Presidential Council.

It is becoming clear that the Russian empire in its present Soviet form could not have survived for as long as it has without at least the tacit support of the Russian people. Many in the West have raised the haunting spectre of infra-"ethnic" strife accompanying the collapse of the Soviet Russian imperialist system. In almost all cases, any incidence of such tension is and will continue to be a function of the Russian people's unwillingness to let go of Moscow's colonial appendages. If the Russian people, however, truly want to live in their own democratic state, if they are genuine in their desire to see this transference to democracy occur peacefully, then they must also recognize the legitimate rights to national independence, sovereignty and statehood of the subjugated peoples. Democracy and colonialism are incompatible! Roman ZWARYCZ

# **GLASNOST REVISITED**

# A Critical Reexamination of Gorbachev's Reform Programme from the Perspective of the National-Liberation Struggle

Five years have passed since Mikhail Gorbachev inaugurated and gave his ideological blessings to a programme of far-reaching reform of the severely ossified totalitarian structure of the USSR. *Glasnost* and its sibling—*perestroika*—were ushered onto the stage in the Soviet Union with all the requisite political and ideological fanfare appropriate to a society where mass mobilization, as opposed to genuine democratic, political participation, was the fundamental *modus operandi* of politics. The prevalent atmosphere at the time was officially described in the Soviet press as one of "stagnation", i.e. a residual ossification of all avenues of sociopolitical and economic activity from the Brezhnev years and a defeatist sense of moral nihilism with regard to the normative value system of Marxism-Leninism, which was the Soviet system's sole source of legitimacy.

On the surface and in retrospect, the pace and scope of the reform campaign is rather remarkable, given the traditional xenophobic conservatism and skepticism towards change of Soviet power elites. What is perhaps even more remarkable is how quickly the various peoples of Eastern Europe and in (*sic.*—not *of*) the Soviet Union viewed Gorbachev's policy statements endorsing reform as a *carte blanche* of sorts to challenge and even begin tearing down the walls of this historically anachronistic citadel of repression, given the fact that the Soviet Russian essentially imperialistic and totalitarian system was designed to discourage and immediately squelch any type of extra-curricular initiative on all levels.

This rising tide of hope and anticipation, however, perhaps is not so remarkable. The recent groundswell of feverish political activity in the Soviet Union, which at times manifested itself with a relentless, unleashed fury, may, indeed, be an indication of the extent to which the Soviet Union was in a state of systemic disrepair at the time that Gorbachev ascended to power. In this light, Gorbachev's reforms may be viewed as less of an initiative and more of a reaction to the increasingly polarizing systemic, political, social and economic contradictions that threatened to tear asunder the very fabric of Soviet society at its core; a last-gap attempt to salvage a crumbling empire. To metaphorically describe Brezhnev's stewardship over the USSR in the 1970s as "trying to keep the lid on a simmering pot" would not be altogether inappropriate. As the fires smouldering beneath the surface under the pot grew hotter, feeding off each new KGB-inspired attempt at repression, the proverbial lid may have been ready to blow at about the time that

Gorbachev assumed the reins of power in the Kremlin. Realizing that the forces of change could not be restrained much longer, and in light of the serious systemic, socio-economic crisis which threatened to leave the Soviet economy trampled underfoot by the dialectically-driven forces of capitalist progress, the new Soviet leader may have decided "to uncover the pot", but to channel the built-up pressure for change along new structural avenues. These new structures, viz., perestroika, were to be built on a completely new and "democratic" set of legitimating values collectively referred to as glasnost. By erecting new structures of authority and political participation, Gorbachev and his advisors may have operated with a twofold set of aims: a) to establish a clear institutional break with the not-so-distant tyrannical past, by adopting a high-profiled position of democracy, which would also dismantle the wall of nihilism and moral decay that was at the core of the deep-set malaise of the "years of stagnation"; b) to ensure the future integrity of an altered, but still intact, Soviet Russian imperialist system, reintegrated in, at worst, a confederative or federative infrastructure. The hope was that this unleashed, but properly channelled energy would propel the Soviet Union onto a higher plane of a post-modern society, as the newly opened avenues of political participation began to disengage the Soviet economy from its over-bureaucratized constrictions. The danger, of course, was that the release of this pressure would destroy the newly formed, untested structures in a blast of freedom's furious ecstasy, leaving the USSR bereft of any base of legitimacy or chances for longevity into the future. This danger, however, was mitigated by an acute awareness that this was a risk that the present Soviet technocratic/managerial power elite could not avoid or even postpone, since the alternative was facing the prospect of total dissolution of an ossified totalitarian, imperialist system of repression.

# **Glasnost and National Liberation**

For many of the non-Russian peoples in the USSR, Gorbachev's projected and as of yet only partially effectuated reforms represented the only semblance of hope that they allowed themselves to indulge in after having all but lost hope that they would one day be allowed to breathe freely in their own sovereign and independent nation-states. After languishing in Soviet Russian colonial tyranny for many long decades, the subjugated nations viewed the "union" with their Russian Big Brother as a vulgar euphemism for the *de facto* servile status of their nations within what essentially was (and remains) a Russian empire. They never lost sight of that everfainter dream of living in their own sovereign national homeland one day. For many, *glasnost* and its agenda for change were a sign that, perhaps, the dream may become reality sometime soon; that, perhaps, here was a Soviet leader who truly understood and respected these peoples' legitimate claims to national sovereignty and independence. When Gorbachev spoke of change, it was only natural for popular sentiment in the subjugated nations to associate the Soviet leader's vague utterances in this regard with the peoples' own independence aspirations.

Five years later, on the cusp of a new decade, one that holds many promises, but many more uncertainties as well, it is becoming increasingly clear that these hopes of freedom and national independence, although not yet completely dashed, are, in fact, more discordant with the letter and spirit of Gorbachev's reform programme than was initially perceived. Today it is clear to the leading political activists from the subjugated nations and to most political observers that the reform programme is designed to strengthen the Soviet system and to preclude its dissolution. Instead of being perceived as the primary catalyst of change in the Soviet Union, an image that Gorbachev and his advisors have adroitly erected in the West, the present Soviet Russian leader is being increasingly perceived, particularly by the subjugated peoples, as a moderate Soviet leader, desperately clinging to a "middleof-the-road" course of stability in an essentially revolutionary situation that cannot accommodate such moderation. On the one hand, the more conservative circles within the Soviet power elites and among the chauvinistic elements of the Russian people hold Gorbachev responsible for opening the floodgates of freedom, which may lead to the final, irretrievable dissolution of the Russian empire. On the other hand, by eschewing radical change in his own programmatic statements, Gorbachev has increasingly alienated the more progressive elements as well.

The manner in which the debate on the issue of the office of the presidency has proceeded is a clear indication of Gorbachev's vulnerability. After the election to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR took place last year, many of the reform-minded deputies considered drafting legislation, designed to strengthen the executive powers of the office of the president, on the premise that Gorbachev's position would be solidified in the event of a "conservative" backlash. In the course of a few months the situation has qualitatively changed to the degree that many deputies are wary of giving Gorbachev increased executive powers, particularly in light of the highhanded fashion that the Soviet leader has oftentimes curtailed debate in the Supreme Soviet. The televised image of Gorbachev brandishing and wagging his authoritarian finger from the podium of a "democratically elected" Soviet parliament at Andrei Sakharov, trying to vocally browbeat into submission a man that had become for many a symbol of freedom a few days prior to Sakharov's death, is an image that will not easily fade.

With regard to the question of independence for the non-Russian "republics", in Gorbachev's mind glasnost clearly is not at all concomitant with the most fundamental aspirations of the subjugated peoples. In fact, from his most recent policy statements in this regard, particularly with respect to the no longer simply vocalized, but already partially implemented programme of national sovereignty in the Baltic countries, it is clear that Gorbachev will not tolerate any further movement towards independence, particularly in the more critical "republics" of the USSR, i.e., Ukraine or some of the Moslem "republics". The only question which remains is when will he move, and—more significantly—how.

# Lithuania—a Precedent in the Making

It is also clear at this point that Gorbachev has been unsuccessful in his attempt to placate and deflect the national-liberation aspirations of the subjugated peoples, particularly the Balts, by pleading with them to tone down their demands, to desist from seeking to "separate" from (as if they voluntarily "united" with) the "Union", on the premise that such "irresponsible" behaviour only threatens the general agenda of glasnost throughout all of the Soviet Union. Recently, the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet declared its independence. The other two Baltic states may also make a similar declaration soon. Although Gorbachev, his closest advisors, and even "hard-line" Politburo members like Yegor Ligachev have all categorically rejected the use of force as a means of resolving the "Lithuanian question", they have been much firmer in refusing to recognize Lithuanian independence. In a speech before the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on March 13, Gorbachev categorically ruled out any kind of negotiations with the new, democratically elected government of the renamed Lithuanian Republic on the issue of independence, stating that the Lithuanian declaration was "illegal". In this same statement, the Soviet leader carefully omitted any reference as to the "legality" of the military takeover by the Red Army of the sovereign Lithuanian state in 1940. This policy statement followed a period of some vacillation, since originally Gorbachev hinted that he may be willing to consider pursuing a negotiated settlement with the democratic Lithuanian leadership. In his earlier policy statements on this issue, however, Gorbachev placed severe constrictions on any future negotiations, demanding that Lithuania "repay" \$34 billion (!), which the USSR "invested" in Lithuania, and questioned the legitimacy of Lithuania's present borders. Gorbachev is, of course, fully aware that the Lithuanians do not have that kind of capital to ransom their freedom. No mention, of course, was made by the Soviet leader of the astronomical, incalculable costs the Soviet Russian colonial policy had on the Lithuanian culture, of the many lives that were lost in defending Lithuanian independence during and after World War II, of the countless years of internment that Lithuanian national and human rights activists spent in Soviet Russian prisons, psychiatric asylums and concentration camps.

Clearly, the Soviet leadership is at a loss in devising a creative strategy to effectively deal with this serious rift in "Soviet unity". When the Lithuanian problem is viewed in isolation, it would seem that Moscow can certainly afford to rid itself of this thorny issue by allowing the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their right to national self-determination. The population and industrial base of Lithuania certainly are not critical to the Soviet economy. Everyone in Lithuania, the Soviet Union and, more importantly, the Kremlin, however, understands that the Lithuanian question cannot be viewed in isolation, since it sets a groundbreaking historic precedent that may be repeated in other, much more critical, nonRussian "Soviet republics", such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, or the religiously and ethnically volatile Moslem "republics" of the USSR. Ironically enough, after supporting and financing numerous Marxist-Leninist "wars of national liberation" within the West's geopolitical spheres of influence throughout Africa, South America and South-East Asia, with the expressed purpose of undermining the USA's position in these areas, the present Soviet leadership is facing the ominous prospect of a disintegrative "domino effect" scenario unfolding within its own borders. The manner in which the Kremlin decides to finally deal with the Lithuanian threat will be viewed as a barometer by the popular front movements in other non-Russian "republics" as to what they can expect in the future; whether a legal, "parliamentary" course towards independence is at all viable, and what kind of retributions may be expected in the event that these "republics" should also decide to proclaim their independence.

The Kremlin's options in dealing with the thorny Lithuanian problem are, indeed, limited. Although Gorbachev and other Soviet Russian leaders have publicly ruled out the use of force, a military suppression of this Lithuanian rebellion, similar to the bloody Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 following the "Prague Spring", still remains a conceivable, albeit remote, option. Moscow can ill afford to resolve the matter by using Soviet troops, some 30,000 of which are stationed in Lithuania, since such an inevitably violent and bloody suppression of Lithuanian aspirations will in one fell swoop destroy all that Gorbachev has so painstakingly erected over the past five years of *glasnost*, both in terms of Soviet foreign policy and—more significantly—in trying to revitalize the Soviet economy through a policy of liberalization of Soviet socio-political institutions.

Another option would be to, in effect, leave the matter unresolved for now by entering into protracted negotiations with the new Lithuanian leadership, while presenting a set of complex preconditions and demands that the Lithuanian government must meet in order for Moscow to accept in fact Lithuania's de jure sovereign status. By playing out this scenario, Moscow would essentially be recognizing the Lithuanian people's legitimate right to sovereignty, which would allow Gorbachev to maintain his progressive image in the world and to preempt any movement on the part of the global diplomatic community to recognize the Lithuanian republic. In the meantime the negotiations will drag on, since the Lithuanian government will not be able to meet Moscow's ostensibly quid pro quo ransom demands, such as the extravagant amount of \$34 billion that Gorbachev claims the Soviet Union has invested in Lithuania as capital allocations over the past five decades of Soviet rule there. The longer Moscow can keep this issue unresolved, the less of a chance that the Lithuanian initiative may snowball into other non-Russian "republics", triggering similar independence declarations. Although the Lithuanian Republic would be a de jure sovereign state, de facto Moscow will still be fully capable of maintaining control through the 30,000 Soviet troops stationed in the country, through its still omnipresent KGB network and by its direct supervisory and executive jurisdiction over the entire governmental and economic administrative infrastructure (e.g., customs offices, import/export agencies, firms and enterprises that depend on Soviet raw materials), which will remain directly linked to the central governmental agencies in Moscow.

A third, and perhaps more viable, option would be a variant of the second option and would essentially amount to doing nothing. After all, although the Lithuanian declaration of independence represents a major unprecedented challenge to Moscow's colonial authority, it remains a paper declaration as long as Soviet troops remain in the country. A government cannot effectively exercise its moral and legitimate right to rule in a power vacuum. Governmental authority becomes meaningful in practical political terms only when that government can exercise its sovereignty through an armed force completely and unilaterally loyal to it and only when it can effectively claim a monopoly of power within its country's borders. As long as Soviet troops remain on Lithuanian soil, Lithuania remains an occupied colony of Moscow. By refusing to recognize the "legality" of the Lithuanian declaration of independence, Moscow need not enter into any public or secret negotiations with the present Lithuanian leadership, while maintaining effective control. Gorbachev has already stated that the USSR can enter into negotiations only with a foreign power, and certainly not with a government that it regards as "illegitimate".

Through the centralized command structure of the governmental and economic administrative infrastructure, Moscow can covertly begin implementing a policy of isolation, if not even strangulation of the Lithuanian economy, hoping that the Lithuanian people will begin to have second thoughts about the feasibility and desirability of "secession". Furthermore, the rather substantial Russian minority in Lithuania can serve Moscow's interests as a disruptive "fifth column", agitating for reintegration into the Soviet Union. Ethnic tensions may rise, leading to violence and bloodshed, which then may become a pretext for Moscow to send additional troops to quell the unrest in a Baku-style invasion. In fact, the continued maintenance of the Soviet army on Lithuanian soil will become an ever more painful eyesore to the Lithuanian people, which may at one point provoke violent acts against the troops, creating yet another pretext for invading. The use of force, however, will not necessarily be perceived by the world as an act of aggression in such a scenario, but rather as an attempt by a responsible superpower to protect "its citizens" and to reestablish stability, peace and security in an geopolitical area that is clearly within Moscow's own sphere of influence. Gorbachev will then be able to gain invaluable political/diplomatic mileage, since he can portray the Lithuanian "secessionists" and the national(ist) movements in the other non-Russian republics
as fanatical, disruptive forces whose "petty squabbles" may catapult humankind into yet another global catastrophe, if left unchecked.

In this context, Washington's reluctance to recognize the Lithuanian Republic is a telling point, particularly in light of the fact that the USA never recognized the forced military takeover of Lithuania and the other Baltic states by Soviet Russia in 1940. Although the US State Department issued a statement immediately after the Lithuanian declaration, in which it urged the Soviet government to respect the wishes of the Lithuanian people. Washington also stated that it will recognize the government of the Lithuanian Republic only when that government clearly manifests its ability to control and exercise sovereignty over its own territory. The State Department statement, however, was pointedly mute on the subject of how the Lithuanian government was to begin "exercising sovereignty" in conditions where a foreign government maintains a substantial armed force on its territory. This non-committal position of the State Department in effect amounts to placing the Lithuanian Republic in a diplomatic "Catch 22" situation: on the one hand, Washington is reluctant to place pressure on Moscow to pull Soviet troops out of Lithuania, although paying rhetorical lip service to legitimate Lithuanian claims, while on the other hand it has in effect told the government of the Lithuanian Republic that US recognition is a factor of whether Moscow ultimately will pull its troops out of Lithuania.

It is clear by now that the Bush administration will do nothing that may be perceived or even misconstrued as an affront to Gorbachev. The US President recently stated in a conference of American business executives that he feels there is no reason to fear the wide-ranging executive powers that the USSR Supreme Soviet has given "President" Gorbachev, since the Soviet leader's aims are completely laudable and consistent with US foreign policy objectives. In other words, the US President is basically saying that President Gorbachev is "a good guy"; or, by inference, he may also have been telling the subjugated peoples in the USSR that the US government will *not* support their independence aspirations, which are contrary to the "Great Restructurer's" reform initiative and may lead to a dissolution of the USSR.

In his acceptance speech before the USSR Supreme Soviet on March 15 (see: *New York Times*, March 16, pps. A1 & A6), Gorbachev gave a vague indication of the future thrust of his "nationality policy". While he recognized the need "to strengthen the sovereignty of the union republics and their economic and political independence", Gorbachev reaffirmed his "commitment to the country's (i.e., the Soviet Russian empire's—RZ) integrity". Without entering into specifics, Gorbachev expressed his belief that a "new union treaty" must be elaborated, which will be based on a recognition of "a differentiation of federation ties with due account for specific conditions and each republic's potentials". Reading into

these vague policy utterances, one may conclude that the primary criteria on how tightly each Soviet "republic" is to be "federated" into the union will depend on how critical their individual economy is to the Soviet Russian empire. So that Lithuania, for example, whose economic and industrial input to the general welfare of the Soviet economy is relatively miniscule, may be allowed to exercise its "right to self-determination, including secession", albeit only after a "lawful mechanism for secession" is ratified by the Supreme Soviet (i.e., after Lithuania pays the \$34 billion ransom), while Ukraine's vast and critical agricultural and industrial base will preclude any possibility of its "secession". By "differentiating federation ties" for each of the "republics", Gorbachev may also avoid having Lithuania become a legal precedent, to be utilized in constitutional, legal depositions by the popular front movements of the subjugated peoples.

#### "Democratic" Elections in Ukraine

In Ukraine national and local elections were held on March 4. The Ukrainian Popular Movement (Rukh) and other unofficial organizations and associations, which participated in the elections in a broad, united coalition known as the Democratic Bloc, can expect to control approximately 30-35% of the seats of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR after run-off elections are held on March 18. Although the Democratic Bloc will be in a minority in the Ukrainian SSR's "parliament", the fact that it received as many votes as it did is a considerable achievement in light of the various obstructions and irregularities of local Communist Party officials in control of the electoral process. Despite the fact that the elections took place in Ukraine without any major incidents, observers from the Democratic Bloc and the West reported several alarming instances of irregularities prior to and during the elections: campaign workers were threatened, physically assaulted and arrested; electoral officials were gerrymandering electoral districts up to the last days of the electoral campaign, so that Democratic Bloc candidates were not always sure where to campaign; candidates were not allowed to register on the basis of minor legal technicalities; about 25,000 Soviet soldiers presently stationed in Czechoslovakia were given ballots and told how to vote in the Ukrainian elections, despite the fact that most of these soldiers are probably not residents of the Ukrainian SSR; on election day electoral officials began incorrectly informing (or rather-disinforming) voters that some prominent Democratic Bloc candidates, e.g., Mykhailo Horyn-Chairman of the Rukh Secretariat-withdrew their candidacy; Communist Party members were given multiple ballots and expressly told whom to vote for by electoral officials in full view of the voting public. Apparently, the colonial authorities in Ukraine decided to implement a series of legal and extra-legal stop-gap measures to ensure themselves of a majority in the Supreme Soviet and to prevent a re-occurrence of the "Lithuanian problem".

Esther Fein, a correspondent for *The New York Times*, in a special dispatch dated Feb. 26 ("Apathy Called Greatest Foe in Ukrainian Elections", *New York Times*, March 1, 1990), wrote that the Rukh leaders that were interviewed said the prevalent attitude of the Ukrainian electorate was one of apathy, which the. Democratic Bloc found difficult to overcome. "They say that people have stopped believing that their votes will make a difference in their lives", wrote Fein. Prior to the election, the official position of the Rukh leadership regarding the question of Ukraine's independence was non-committal, or—at best—equivocal. Such vacillation on an issue dear to the hearts of most Ukrainians probably cost the Democratic Bloc a considerable number of seats in the election and may also have been at the roots of the sense of apathy with which most Ukrainian voters approached these elections.

The human chain organized by Rukh and other unofficial organizations in commemoration of "Ukrainian Unity Day" on January 21 of this year was a clear indication of how potentially volatile the issue of Ukrainian independence is. Nearly a million people participated in this event, forming a human chain which stretched from the capital city of Kyiv to the western Ukrainian city of Lviv and beyond. The event was officially billed by Rukh as "Ukrainian Unity Day" to commemorate the Act of Union of January 22, 1919, which united the territories of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Western Ukrainian National Republic into one, integrated state. Every nationally-conscious Ukrainian history—*Ukrainian Independence Day,* since on January 22, *1918*, the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR) issued and proclaimed its "Fourth Universal" which established the UNR as an independent and sovereign nation-state. This nation-wide commemoration served to raise the political awareness of the Ukrainian people regarding the issue of independence, whether by accident or by covert design on the part of its organizers.

Despite such an overwhelming mass demonstration of support for Ukrainian independence, the Democratic Bloc did not incorporate an independence plank into its electoral platform. Many prominent Rukh leaders argued that it would be premature and irresponsible to promote independence at this particular juncture, that such appeals may only provoke the more hard-line members of the Communist Party leadership, giving them a pretext to topple the "Great Restructurer" himself—Gorbachev. Volodymyr Yavorivskyi—the vice-chairman of Rukh and a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR stated at a press conference in Washington, D.C. during his visit to the USA, that it would be unwise and economically unfeasible for Ukraine to "secede" from the Union at this time, since the quality of industrial and consumer goods produced in Ukraine today is so poor that the Ukrainian economy cannot compete anywhere outside the USSR. The best that Ukraine can hope to achieve at this time, Yavorivskyi argued, was a degree of cultural autonomy, establishing Ukrainian as the official language of the "republic".

Other, more radical, "informal" Ukrainian organizations, such as the Ukrainian National Party (UNP) and the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front (UCDF), either called for a boycott of the elections or else they refused to participate in the electoral process, arguing that all officially sanctioned and implemented political processes and structures are essentially colonial in character and to participate in them is tantamount to lending the colonial regime an element of much needed moral and political legitimacy. From the perspective of Ukrainian independence and statehood, the UNP and UCDF positions were—as a matter of strategic principle-completely correct. One cannot simultaneously regard the government of the Ukrainian SSR, all of its institutions, even its rubber-stamp parliament, as a colonial regime, entirely subject to imperial policy dictated from Moscow, and yet run for office in that same governmental structure. Assuming that many if not all of the Democratic Bloc candidates genuinely yearn for Ukrainian sovereignty and statehood, the decision to run a slate of candidates for office in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR must have been dictated by tactical, not strategic, concerns and exigencies. In other words, the decision to participate in the elections was an attempt to raise the stakes in the rapidly changing political milieu of Ukraine; to use the avenues of legal opposition open to the oppositional forces in Ukraine to push the developing political processes to a higher level, beyond the control of the forces seeking to maintain the empire's integrity. Furthermore, the elections were viewed as an opportunity to raise the national awareness of the Ukrainian people, particularly in eastern Ukraine; to mobilize the population, in whose minds the debilitating and terrifying images of terror are still quite fresh.

The decision to participate in the elections was not by any means viewed by the leading national activists in Ukraine as a *de jure* recognition of the legitimacy of the colonial regime in Ukraine. On the contrary, the intent was to give the Ukrainian people a sense of power, as a preparatory stage to a future reappropriation of the nation's authority, i.e., its right to rule. The Democratic Bloc's deputies, although not possessing the legal mandate to proclaim independence in a manner similar to the Lithuanian parliament, which is almost completely under the control of the popular front organization—*Sajudis*, will still be able to form a vociferous, and not altogether loyal opposition in the Ukrainian "parliament".

Such an opposition can quickly resolve the strategic dilemma of principle (viz., to participate in the elections is tantamount to recognition of the colonial regime) by drafting a programme centred around the demand that Ukrainian independence, sovereignty and statehood, proclaimed in 1918, 1939 (Carpatho-Ukraine) and 1941 (Act of June 30), be recstablished. Although the chances that such an independence programme will pass as a legislative bill before the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet are remote, given the disadvantageous constellation of political forces resulting from the recent elections, the long-term moral, mobilizing effect on the Ukrainian

population at large of such a platform will be considerable. Even among old, "tried and true", card-carrying Party members, it has almost become fashionable to shed one's outer Marxist-Leninist cloak and to reveal a hidden nationalist cloak underneath. Some of the leaders of the popular movement in Ukraine are or were members of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU), most notably Ivan Drach-the head of Rukh. Up until very recently, these individuals found it difficult to voice their support of national rights issues in Ukraine and many wrote derogatory articles in the Soviet Ukrainian press condemning Ukrainian nationalism. In a political about-face, however, Drach, in a recent interview conducted by Radio Liberty, has unequivocally endorsed the reestablishment of an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state. There are probably many more hidden Drachs among the newly elected deputies to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, who still cower before Moscow's colonial terror apparatus, but who will vocalize their desire to see this apparatus dismantled as the push towards Ukrainian statehood acquires more steam in the upcoming "legislative" debates. Moreover, the cathartic execution of Nicolae Ceausescu and his communist cronies in Rumania will hauntingly loom larger in the mind of every Party member in Ukraine and the other non-Russian republics, as the question of independence and sovereignty acquire greater urgency.

### **Prospects for the Future**

At no time in recent memory have the prospects for national independence, sovereignty and statehood for the non-Russian peoples subjugated in the USSR been brighter in recent memory than now. The road towards liberation, however, remains strewn with many potential pitfalls for the subjugated nations. The most dangerous of these is the ever more prominent notion that statehood can now be achieved strictly through legal, parliamentary means, avoiding any and all manifestations of violence and bloodshed. One need not even look towards Lithuania to find objective grounds for this notion. The countries of Eastern Europe are presently on a course towards establishing their political sovercignty, as independent nation-states, without having had to resort to violence as of yet, with the exception of Rumania. Moscow's former satellites in Eastern Europe were in a much more advantageous position than the various non-Russian "republics" in the USSR. Although both the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet "republics" were titularly "independent states", the manner in which they were effectually colonized by Moscow was very much different. First of all, the Eastern European "satellites" were bound to Moscow only through the political and military treaty mechanisms of the Warsaw Pact and through the centripetally integrative economic programmes and agreements of COMECON. Although COMECON was originally conceived by Moscow as an institutional tool to economically colonize the "satellite" countries of Eastern Europe and a means to exploit the economic

resources of these formally independent "paper-states", in recent years Moscow's "satellites" were becoming more of an economic burden than a source of much needed revenue. By allowing the Eastern European countries to basically decide their own fate, Moscow has rid itself of a considerable financial burden, not to mention the substantial political capital that it gained for itself in the world.

In any event, the non-Russian Soviet "republics" cannot hope for a transition to independent statehood in a manner similar to the East European "satellites", if only because Gorbachev endorsed a greater degree of autonomy for these countries, while concurrently condemning any move towards disintegrative autonomy for the non-Russian "republics" in the USSR, without even feeling compelled to explain the evident inconsistency of this policy. Nonetheless, a parliamentary/legal route towards independence is acquiring greater prominence in the minds of most popular front leaders in the non-Russian "republics", particularly in Ukraine and particularly in light of the unprecedented, trail-blazing events occurring in Lithuania.

While most of the prominent Ukrainian national rights activists and even some maverick communists now recognize the incongruency between their political agenda of independence and Gorbachev's programme of reform, they continue to believe that in present-day circumstances the only way to achieve any form of constructive change in Ukraine with a view towards one day reestablishing Ukrainian independence and statehood is through the existing political processes and structures. There is a two-fold, hidden, implicit inconsistency, however, in this position, First, up until recently these same political structures were completely inaccessible to the popular front leaders and many of them spent many long years in Soviet Russian concentration camps for refusing to recognize the system's legitimacy. Gorbachev's glasnost has injected new political meaning into these same structures, allowing former dissidents to become "People's Deputies" in legislative bodies, that once were nothing more than rubber-stamp carnivals. Yet, the programmatic aims of these independence-minded deputies undermine Gorbachev's position and his programme of reform, which allowed these deputies to participate in the new processes and structures in the first place. Second, and more significantly, the dilemma of principle must again be addressed: by participating in the newly invigorated political structures, the popular front leaders are tacitly recognizing the legitimacy of the Soviet system, while their political platform aims to effectuate its immediate dissolution.

#### **Reform or Revolution?**

The need to address these apparent inconsistencies in the platform and policies of the popular front organizations in the non-Russian Soviet "republics" has not been altogether that pressing, as strategic principles took a back seat to hard-nosed, "realistic" tactical possibilities and opportunities. Yet, if national independence, sovereignty and statehood remain the goal, as a matter of principle, then sooner or later the central question of independence must be addressed, as the Lithuanians are attempting to do now. All these tactical, parliamentary and legalistic manoeuvrings will come to a critical crossroads, where one of three scenarios may unfold: 1) Moscow will voluntarily decide to pull out completely and recognize the sovereignty of the independent states that have "seceded" from its "Union", which is highly unlikely; 2) Moscow will refuse to negotiate and after a protracted period of leniency will militarily move to crush the nationalist movements in the non-Russian "republics" by force; 3) a negotiated compromise will be struck, whereby the non-Russian "republics" will be granted a variable degree of autonomy within a new confederative Soviet structure, which would amount to a betrayal of the popular front's principles. In any event, the prospects for full national independence and sovereignty for the non-Russian "republics" look dim, if their national movements remain strictly committed to a parliamentary course of action.

There is a fourth possibility, however: to treat this parliamentary struggle as only one stage in an ongoing revolutionary process of liberation, primarily designed to mobilize the people of the subjugated nations and to prepare them for a future clash with their colonial oppressors in Moscow, which—if successful—will result in the forced exit of all Soviet troops, KGB personnel and the entire administrative colonial apparatus from the territories of independent republics. This fourth possibility may very well entail an armed struggle for which the subjugated peoples in the Soviet Russian empire may not be ready at this particular juncture.

If the popular front leaders remain genuinely committed to national independence and sovereignty for their nations, as a matter of principle, then they must first recognize that their aims are completely incompatible with Gorbachev's projected reforms, collectively grouped under the heading-glasnost and perestroika. Consequently, all future policy statements must be formulated and action undertaken with this basic premise in mind. *Glasnost* is designed to re-integrate the Soviet population, that has become completely cynical, into newly erected, quasidemocratic socio-political processes and structures, on the assumption that such a heightened level of political participation will eventually cascade down into the economic sectors and reinvigorate the lethargic Soviet economy. Gorbachev is resolutely and energetically pursuing his reform programme not to liberate the subjugated peoples, but to reconsolidate the Soviet system with its concomitant imperialist structures, by using the cement of liberal democracy and even capitalism. The independence aims of the popular front leaders stand in polar opposition to glasnost. For the nationalists of the non-Russian nations in the USSR to pursue reform, or even a "restructuring" of the Soviet system, instead of calling for its revolutionary overhaul, its dissolution, would be completely inconsistent with their aims of national independence and statehood. As a matter of principle, the revolutionary option remains the only alternative.

Oleh ROMANYSHYN Ucrainica Research Institute Toronto

# THE CANADIAN LEAGUE FOR THE LIBERATION OF UKRAINE

(Conclusion)

### **External Affairs and Political Activism**

The basis for the League's conduct of its external affairs and political activism has been the *Appeal from Embattled Ukraine to all Ukrainians Abroad*. Faithful to the spirit of this remarkable document, the Declaration and its constitution, the League, from the outset in 1952-56, developed the basic guidelines for its political actions, which, in turn, at all succeeding conventions and policy conferences were streamlined, updated and adjusted to current needs, situations and changing realities.

These guidelines called for: a) the creation of a strong centre for political action; b) the establishment of working relations with Canadian political parties, politicians and government officials on all three levels, as well as the media; c) the establishment of working relations with other Canadian institutions and organizations of a cultural, social, professional, academic, business and charitable nature; d) the establishment of an Information Office in Ottawa; e) the publication in English and French of topical literature and information for wide distribution; f) the establishment of working relations with other national minority groups whose countries of origin are under communist and/or Soviet Russian domination.

Concurrent with these guidelines for public relations and political lobbying promoting national independence for Ukraine and human rights for the Ukrainian people, and advancing the interests of the Ukrainian-Canadian community within the framework of multiculturalism in Canada, the guidelines also called for public action: rallies, demonstrations, political mass meetings, seminars, conferences, public lectures, signing of petitions and mass mailings. The purpose of such mass action has been to sensitize the general public to Ukrainian issues. The above description of aims, goals and means apply equally to both the League and the Women's Association.

As remarked earlier, neither group have been "ghetto-oriented" organizations. The League guidelines clearly promoted integration (as opposed to assimilation) into the fabric of Canada's society. "We must actively partake in Canada's civic, political, community, professional and business life", stated several of the earlier "Circular Letters" issued by the national executive. The result was a working combination of two vital elements: full participation in all walks of life in Canadian society with an equally intense retention of Ukrainianism and active concern for the plight of Ukraine and the aspirations of its people. In fact, the post-World War II politically motivated Ukrainian immigrant who joined the ranks of the League and the Women's Association in a very short time became the ideal citizen of a multicultural Canada.

These external affairs and political action guidelines were put into effect by the national executives of the League and the Women's Association and all their major branches with varying degrees of success, but which, nevertheless, over a period of almost forty years amount to an impressive record.

A report of the External Affairs Section presented at the Sixteenth National Convention held in Toronto, 13-15 April 1984, states that during the preceding three-year term (January 1981-December 1983), "the League for the Liberation of Ukraine organized or actively supported 46 political action initiatives" in Canada. Maintaining a steady level of activism from their inception, the League and Women's Association have initiated and/or supported to date over 500 major political actions on a national scale directed at sensitizing the Canadian public to the plight of Ukraine under Soviet control and the potential threat that the USSR poses to Canada and the free world in general.

This number, however, does not include community and political action projects on the local branch level. One of the smaller branches, the Kitchener-Waterloo branch, can well illustrate this point. In one of the most detailed branch reports published in *A Historical Outline of the CLLU*, and with a "membership roster never higher than 37 individuals", this particular branch (with the participation of the Cambridge-Preston and Guelph groups) initiated some seventy local and regional community and political action projects from 1952-88. With forty-four branches currently active on a continuous basis, the League and the Women's Association on both national and branch levels have engaged in 3,000-3,500 community and political action projects since 1950.

Among the very first successful initiatives on the Canadian scene undertaken by both groups, and supported by the entire community, was a 1951 lobbying effort to induce the government to introduce Ukrainian-language radio programming to the "Voice of Canada". Reportedly, tens of thousands of people across Canada signed petitions supporting this initiative which helped the authorities to make a positive decision.

Beginning in 1964 with the submission of a brief to the Royal Commission on Biculturalism, the League effectively became a participant in the national debate about the nature of our society, supporting a policy of multiculturalism for Canada. Federal, provincial and municipal elections constitute another area of civic endeavour for the League and Women's Association membership. Their participation in the democratic process of the country and support, in many instances, was very important for electing good candidates for public office. Moreover, some leading League members successfully ran for public office themselves, i.e., former MP and Ontario MPP Yuriy Shymko.

Among major political action initiatives in which the League and the Women's Association played a leading role, the following can be mentioned: the setting up of an Information Office in Ottawa (May 1967) and the publishing of an English-Language newsletter, *Our Viewpoint*; Ukrainian Week at Expo '67 (August 1967); a series of rallies and demonstrations from 1950 on, demanding from the Soviets national independence and human rights for Ukrainians.

Mention should be made of some of the major initiatives. One of the earliest mass demonstrations that took place (Toronto, June 1953) marked the twentieth anniversary of the man-made famine in Ukraine (1932-33) and was attended by over 10,000 people. (Similar demonstrations took place in 1983 marking the fiftieth anniversary of the famine, with some 10,000 marching in Toronto and as many as 20,000 across the province. The Toronto rally was organized under the sponsorship of the local branch of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee and fully supported by the League, the Women's Association and the UYAC). On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution, a mass anti-Soviet demonstration was staged in Ottawa near the Soviet embassy (November 1967). Another successful initiative in which the League played a leading role was the documentary exhibit, "Lenin Without Makeup" (November 1970), on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of his birth. The exhibit—which portrayed the gruesome reality of the totalitarian system he created—was successfully shown in other Ontario centres, and even drew an angry comment from Pravda. When Soviet leader Alexey Kosygin visited Canada in October 1971, mass protests broke out against his visit. The largest took place in Toronto with 15,000 demonstrators, including thousands of Ukrainians and members of the OULF.

The 1970s and 1980s have been particularly marked by political action demanding the release of Ukrainian political prisoners in the USSR. In the 1970s the League for the Liberation of Ukraine sponsored the Canadian tours of Avraam Shifrin and Arie Vudka (Jewish activists and former Soviet political prisoners now living in Israel) who spoke to Canadian audiences in defence of national and human rights for Ukrainians and in defence of Ukrainian political prisoners.

Of particular international renown was the protracted hunger strike by a group of young people in front of the Soviet embassy in Ottawa (July-August 1974), and large-scale demonstrations at the same time, focusing on the plight of incarcerated Ukrainian historian, Valentyn Moroz, and other Ukrainian political prisoners in the USSR. The action was under the auspices of the Moroz Defense Committee (MDC), with key support and input from the League. The Committee was chaired by Mykola Lypovetskyi (the Canadian representative of the Government of the Ukrainian National Republic-in-Exile). The hunger strike action was initiated by national executive member, Andriy Bandera, and MDC chairman, Mykola Lypovetskyi. With the release of Valentyn Moroz in 1979, 20,000 people came out to greet him and demand the release of other Ukrainian political prisoners, namely, Yuriy Shukhevych, Vyacheslav Chornovil, Lev Lukianenko, Kateryna Zarytska and others. The rally was attended by numerous politicians, including former Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. The rally was organized by the MDC under the auspices of the UCC.

The plight of Yuriy Shukhevych (arrested in 1948 at the age of fourteen for being the son of UPA commander-in-chief, General Roman Shukhevych) has always been on the League's political agenda. The three-week picketing action at the Soviet embassy in Ottawa (March 1980) by the UYAC and the younger members of the League and the Women's Association attest to that.

The Council for the Release of Ukrainian Political Prisoners in the USSR (formed in December 1980 by the League, the Women's Association and the UYAC for that specific purpose), under the able chairmanship of the Women's Association national president, Olha Zaverukha, planned and put into effect a systematic campaign in defence of Yuriv Shukhevych and other prisoners. Among its most visible actions were a Council Appeal in defence of Yuriy Shukhevych published in the Globe and Mail (29 June 1981) with the signatures of 200 Canadian politicians. This publicity aspect of the defence campaign was followed by a protracted "once-a-week-every-week" picketing campaign of the Soviet embassy in Ottawa which lasted from June-October 1981. In 1982 the Council carried out a successful sponsorship action for immigration to Canada for the following Ukrainian political prisoners: Yuriy Shukhevych, Lev Lukianenko, Oksana Popovych, Rev. Vasyl Romaniuk, Ivan Hel, Mykola Rudenko and Ivan Kandyba. During the same year, the Council put a series of defence actions into effect under a "political prisoner of the month" plan. These political actions in defence of political prisoners have been accompanied by an effective public relations and lobbying campaign and contributed significantly to the eventual release of Valentyn Moroz (and family), Leonid Pliushch (and family), General Petro Hryhorenko, Sviatoslav Karavanskyi and his wife Nina Strokata, Nadia Svitlychna, Danylo Shumuk, Josyf Terelia (and family), Mykola and Raisa Rudenko and Oksana Meshko.

In May 1985 the Council chairman, Olha Zaverukha, presented a documented brief on national and human rights violations in Ukraine at the CSCE Hearings in Ottawa. Another similar brief, but with updated information, was submitted to the CSCE Hearings on Human Rights held in Ottawa in August 1986. In recent years, the League and the Women's Association have lent support to the Civil Liberties Commission of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee in its efforts to assist the Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals headed by Mr. Justice Jules Deschenes and the Canadian government in reaching a balanced decision to bring alleged war criminals (Nazi and Soviet) who may be living in Canada to justice under the Canadian criminal code.

When the Chornobyl nuclear disaster occurred in Ukraine in April 1986, the League and the Women's Association took part in all community actions, demanding a full investigation of the accident and disclosure of the results, as well as in persistent attempts to channel help to the victims.

On November 6, 1957, a delegation of the League's national executive met with the Secretary of State for External Affairs to convey its position on Canada's foreign policy, particularly with respect to the Soviet Union. On that occasion, the delegation submitted a memorandum to the minister entitled, "The Policy of Liberation as an Aspect of Canadian Foreign Policy". This memorandum called for Canada's active political support for the aspirations of the nations under Soviet control to regain their independence and sovereignty. The authors of the memorandum advocated not merely a policy of "containment" vis-a-vis Soviet expansionism, but a policy of "roll-back" which, in effect, means the dissolution of the Soviet Union into its constituent nations. The logic behind this position is that a partnership between the free world and a totalitarian and expansionist superpower like the USSR is both immoral and untenable in the long run and poses a deadly threat to humanity.

Such an ambitious political goal is based on the premise that, in the ultimate analysis, freedom is (or should be) indivisible, and that lasting peace and security in the world can be achieved and a nuclear holocaust averted, if the West were willing to conclude a working political partnership with and provide support for the nations struggling to free themselves from Moscow's hegemony. This, in turn, would lead to the weakening and eventual collapse from within of the Soviet Union under the rising tide of nationalist pressure stemming from the subject peoples. The Soviet inability to conquer Afghanistan, the recent events in Poland, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, the Baltic states and Armenia (and the entire history of resistance to Soviet rule in Eurasia for the past seventy years) underscore the feasibility of this daring strategy.

As an anti-Soviet and anti-communist organization, the League (along with other organizations of the WULF) is a member of two international umbrella organizations—the Antibolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN)<sup>5</sup> and the World Anti-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>ABN was founded at the First Congress of the Subjugated Peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia, held in a liberated area of Ukraine (November 1943). The conference was convened by the OUN-UPA liberation movement to coordinate resistance efforts against the Nazis and Soviets. This conference was reactivated in 1946 as ABN to coordinate political action

Communist League (WACL)<sup>6</sup>. As members of the Ukrainian section of ABN, the League and the Women's Association contributed significantly to the success of three International ABN Conferences held in Toronto in March 1953, November 1981 and November 1986.

#### The Women's Association of the League

The Women's Association began at the same time as the League and shared its political aims and goals, but added community responsibilities in terms of cultural, educational, charitable and social tasks and activities. Both organizations developed simultaneously and separately, but on the basis of close cooperation and coordination of activities on the national, branch and grass-roots level.

At the first meetings of the Central Organizing Bureau (COB) (1 May 1949, 4 May 1949, etc.), Olha Ivanchuk represented women who wanted to become organized. At the founding League Conference on 25 December 1949, Iryna Demydchuk was elected to the national executive as the organizer for women. At the Second Conference on 24 December 1950, Maria Tsmots was elected to the League's national executive as chairman of the Women's Section of the League. Thus, the Second Conference became the founding event of the Women's Association, known at that time as the Women's Section of the League for the Liberation of Ukraine. Immediately following the conference, Women's Association branches began appearing across Ontario and the rest of the country. The first branch was organized in Winnipeg (February 1951) and the second in Toronto (October 1951).

At the Third League Conference (22-23 December 1952), Maria Solonynka and Oleksandra Palienko were elected to the national executive to lay the groundwork for the formation of an autonomous women's organization within the framework of the League. At the Sixth National Conference (24-25 December 1955) the Women's Section of the League became the Women's Association of the League with its own by-laws and a central executive. The first central executive of the Women's Association was elected at the Sixth League Conference: Maria Solonynka (chairman), Olena Kutova (secretary), Marta Kravtsiv-Barabash (director of cultural affairs), Maria Spolska (treasurer), Iryna Kryvyniuk (director of external affairs).

At its Seventh Jubilee National Convention (21-23 March 1975) marking the

against the Soviet occupation of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Its founding president and long-time leader was Yaroslav Stetsko (1912-86). The current president is Slava Stetsko.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>WACL was formed in 1957 to which some 150 national and international organizations belong that are opposed to Soviet expansionism and communism. The CLLU is a regular participant in its international conferences and other political activities.

twenty-fifth anniversary of its existence, the Women's Association adopted its own constitution and became an independent women's organization within the framework of the World Ukrainian Liberation Front (WULF). The Women's Association with its new independent status elected the following national executive: Olha Zaverukha (president), Maria Solonynka (honorary president), Lina Antonovych, Yaroslava Ivanchuk, Tetiana Fedoriv, Stefania Khomyshyn, Iryna Kovalchuk and Yaroslava Bryniavska (provincial vice-presidents), Iryna Kryvyniuk (secretary), Anna Fedak (treasurer) Iryna Bezkhlibnyk, Stefania Bilyk, Leonida Vertyporokh, Stefania Horlach, Maria Odnorih, Ivanna Ostafiychuk, Oksana Romanyshyn, Maria Kolodiy, Tetiana Stakhiv and Maria Shkambara (members). Supervisory committee: Maria Negrych (chairman), Olha Kushnir, Kateryna Shuliha (members). Arbitration committee: Anna Pityk (chairman), Kateryna Kobyletska and Stefania Savytska (members).

In its thirty-eight years of existence, the Women's Association has effectively been led by the following national executive presidents: Maria Solonynka (1952-75), Olha Zaverukha (1975-81), Maria Shkambara (1981-87) and Lesia Shust (1987-present). Since its founding the Association has developed a network of twenty-one branches, fourteen of them in Ontario: Bradford, Etobicoke, Hamilton, Kingston, Kirkland Lake, London, Oshawa, St. Catharines, St. Thomas, Sudbury, Thunder Bay, Toronto, Welland and Windsor. The rest of the branches are located in Calgary, Edmonton, Montreal, Regina, Saskatoon, Vancouver and Winnipeg. The Women's Association today has close to 1,000 members and thousands of supporters and sympathizers.

The first regional convention of the Women's Association as an autonomous women's organization was held in Toronto (18-19 May 1957). It was an important event in the development of the Women's Association since it reviewed the activities of the organization in the first six years of its existence and laid the groundwork and tone for the future. The thrust of the convention is reflected in three key position papers that were presented at the meeting: "The Tasks of the WAofCLLU", "Women's Role in Family and Community Life" and "Have We Proven Ourselves as a Political Community?". These titles suggest the main areas of endeavour of the Women's Association in the decades to come: political, community and social activism. They, in turn, have been defined in the Association's constitution as its aims and goals: a) to promote the concept of an independent and sovereign Ukraine; b) to foster the spirit of loyalty to Canada, to take part in its political life and to defend its freedom and democracy; c) to engage women in beneficial work and service for the community; d) through education to raise the cultural and intellectual level of its membership and to foster and promote Ukrainian culture and heritage; e) to provide aid and advice to women left without family and help female youth in planning their future; f) to provide child and youth care for the needy in our community; g) to engage in charitable work within the Ukrainian community and to cooperate with other charitable organizations.

The Women's Association has proven to be a close-knit and streamlined organization, having achieved its level of effectiveness through intense internal organizational work. Eleven national conventions, numerous annual conferences on the national, regional and branch level, specialized workshops and a wellplanned programme of field trips by organizers and other members of the national executive have turned the Women's Association into one of the most dynamic women's organizations in the Ukrainian-Canadian community and the Canadian mosaic in general.

The histories of the League and the Women's Association show that the latter has served the community as a full-fledged partner of the League in political activism and general community work on both organizational and participatory levels. But as a women's organization, it had to undertake added specialized tasks and projects of immediate concern to Ukrainian women in the diaspora. These tasks and projects are of crucial importance to the Ukrainian community.

## **Community Activism**

On the community level, the Women's Association has initiated, developed and sustained a whole range of specific activities in the cultural, educational, social and charitable areas. In order to promote the vast Ukrainian cultural heritage within Canada's multicultural framework, the Association has frequently broadcast on radio and television and organized numerous cultural exhibits and boutiques at libraries, museums, ethnocultural events such as Toronto's Caravan and various annual "folkloramas" in other Canadian centres, at the Canadian National Exhibition, etc. An accomplishment of particular importance to the community has been the permanent Ukrainian Heritage Exhibit at Casa Loma in Toronto, and the erection of the statue of the greatest Ukrainian poetess, Lesia Ukrainka, which was unveiled in Toronto's High Park in 1975. To the success of either of these projects, the Women's Association made a crucial contribution in effort and dedication. The driving force behind the Lesia Ukrainka project was one of the leading members of the Women's Association, Leonida Vertyporokh. The Association regularly organizes public events to commemorate Ukrainian women who left their indelible mark on Ukraine's history, culture, literature, politics, learning and society in general.

Among other cultural activities worth noting is its programme of book donation to libraries, the organization of women's choirs and workshops to teach Ukrainian arts and crafts to the younger generation and the interested public. Numerous Association branches are members of local folk arts councils. To "keep in touch" with its branches and their membership, the national executive issues regular "Circular Letters" and, since December 1954, has published a monthly "Women's page" in the Ukrainian weekly, *Homin Ukrainy*.

In the field of education and the raising of children, the Women's Association has played a formidable role by setting up and staffing kindergartens, day-care centres, Sunday schools, organizing social events for Ukrainian children both in the cities and in rural areas, counselling young mothers and assisting the Ukrainian Youth Association of Canada (UYAC) by providing counsellors and support staff for its activities such as summer camps and other large-scale projects.

Through its branches across Ontario (and elsewhere in Canada), the Women's Association provides a range of social and charitable services: visiting senior citizens homes, nursing homes, hospitals; care for the elderly and the sick; and helping the needy (particularly children) in Latin America, Europe and Eastern Bloc countries including Ukraine. In the past thirty-eight years of its existence, the Association has provided at least \$280,000 worth of direct charitable assistance to people in need.

As a member of the Ukrainian Canadian Women's Committee (UCWC)—which it joined on 8 May 1959—the Women's Association has made a noteworthy contribution to the Ukrainian-Canadian women's movement. It has brought initiatives, human resources and leadership to UCWC action. Two of the Women's Association's leading members became national presidents of the UCWC—Leonida Vertyporokh (several terms) and, currently, Maria Shkambara (past president of the WAofCLLU).

### **External Affairs**

As part of the women's movement, the Women's Association of the Canadian League for the Liberation of Ukraine's primary aim in the area of political activism is to promote the right of Ukraine to be a free and independent country and to intercede on behalf of Ukrainian women in Ukraine who, as wives and mothers, are subject to persecution for refusing to renounce their arrested husbands and children, for opposing the policy of Russification, atheism, colonialism and police control of family and public life, and who themselves frequently become prisoners of conscience.

In order to sensitize other women in Canada and abroad to the plight of Ukrainian women, the Women's Association works on the national as well as local level with various women's church groups, women's groups active in Canadian political parties, women in public life, women's councils, etc. The Women's Association (with other Ukrainian women's organizations) successfully raised the plight of Ukrainian women who are prisoners of conscience and the status of Ukrainian women in the USSR at such forums as Expo '67, where Ukrainian women organized a Hospitality Week with a cultural programme and other activities aimed at public awareness of Ukrainian political issues; the International Women's Conference (Mexico City, June-July 1975) where they staged a demonstration and hunger strike; the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements "Habitat" (Vancouver, June 1976); the Conference of the International Women's Council (Vancouver, June-July 1976); UN Decade for Women Conference (Nairobi, Kenya, July 1985); etc.

The Women's Association constantly appeals to the Canadian government, the International Red Cross, the International Association of Jurists and Amnesty International to intercede on behalf of Ukrainian women prisoners of conscience. To dramatize their plight, the Women's Association, for example, has frequently staged effective demonstrations of women and children on Mother's Day near the Soviet embassy in Ottawa. After the nuclear disaster struck in Chornobyl in April 1986, the Women's Association worked closely with the Ukrainian Canadian Social Welfare Service, and on its own, to bring relief to the victims and to press for a full investigation of the disaster by international agencies. It also cooperates with the Canadian Ukrainian Immigrant Aid Society to help resettle Ukrainian refugees from the Eastern Bloc and Ukrainian immigrants from other parts of the world.

The Women's Association is an active member of the National Council of Women of Canada, the Ukrainian Canadian Women's Committee, the World Ukrainian Liberation Front, the World Federation of Ukrainian Women's Organizations and the World Congress of Free Ukrainians.

#### Sources

- Kordan, Bohdan and Luciuk, Lubomyr, eds. A Delicate and Difficult Question: Documents in the History of Ukrainians in Canada 1899-1962. Kingston: The Limestone Press, 1986. In English.
- Marunchak, Michael H. The Ukrainian Canadians: A History. Winnipeg, Ottawa: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences (UVAN), 1982. In English.
- Proceedings of the CLLU and the WAofCLLU—National Conferences and National Conventions. In Ukrainian.
- Rakhmannyi, Roman. Ukraine of the Atomic Age. Toronto: Ukrainian Echo, 1988. Vol. II. In Ukrainian.
- Solonynka, Maria, ed. On the Path to Our Goal. Toronto: National Executive of the WAofCLLU, 1978. In Ukrainian.
- Solonynka, Vasyl, ed. A Historical Outline of the CLLU. Toronto: National Executive of the CLLU, 1984. In Ukrainian.

(Reprinted from "Polyphony", Toronto, Vol. 10, 1988)

Dr. Blanka JERABEK

# BOOKS, PRINTING, AND THE FIRST PRINTING HOUSES IN UKRAINE

(Conclusion)

### Ukrainian Printing Houses in the 16th-17th Centuries: Lviv, Kyiv, Ostrih

As the printing profession was at that time still not clearly defined, many printers were also typesetters, which enabled them to produce books independently. Thus, from the end of the 16th century to the mid-17th century, numerous "travelling" printing houses emerged in Ukraine, which was also typical of the first decades of Western European printing.

Such "travelling" printing houses included that of notable 17th century writer Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovetskyi, who printed books in the village of Rokhmaniv (Volyn), in Pochayiv, and later founded a printing house in the Yeletskyi Monastery in Chernihiv, which ceased to function after his death. The title of his "Didactic Gospel", published in 1619, notes that the book was produced in Rokhmaniv by hieromonk Kyrylo Trankvilion, by his own efforts, at his own cost, under the patronage of Princess Vyshnevetska-Mykhailova.

Relatively speaking, Ukrainian books of this period were printed in many places. The title sheets contain the names of various cities, towns, and monasteries, such as Striatyn, Univ, Pochayiv, Kremenets, Chernihiv, Novhorod Siverskyi and others. In general, however, such printing houses soon ceased to exist following the death of their patron, or because the monk-printer had to move on. However, the number of notable titles, printed in western Ukrainian printing houses, outside Lviv, is small, amounting to less than forty. For a short period of time the town of Ostrih in Volyn, scat of the great Ukrainian patron Prince Konstantyn Ostrozkyi, was a well-known centre of printing in Ukraine.

Ostrih became particularly significant in the work of Ivan Fedorovych. The printing house there functioned for approximately forty years. Its most famous publication is the "Ostrih Bible" (1580-81), Fedorovych's swan song. The Ostrih printing house, the property of Prince Ostrozkyi founded with the help of Ivan Fedorovych, ceased to function in 1612. It renewed its activity after the departure of Ivan Fedorovych around 1583. This is the approximate date of the first Ostrih publications of the post-Fedorovych period, a small polemical brochure entitled "The Epistle of the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah", and the polemical work of Herasym Smotrytskyi "Kalendar Rymski Novy".

The printing house was most active at the end of the 16th century (1594-99),

releasing close to 30 publications, seven of which were printed in 1598. The last well-known publication of the Ostrih printing house was the "Concise Book of Hours", dated 1612. From 1583 to 1612, 32 publications were printed in Ostrih. Two-thirds of these, 21 books and leaflets, have survived. The content and purpose of the Ostrih publications dictated the particular manner in which they were decorated. Nearly half of these works are examples of contemporary polemical literature.

During the lull in the activity of the Lviv monastic printing house, two new printing houses, in Striatyn (1603-06), and later in Krylos (1606) were established in Halychyna. The founder of the so-called "balabaniv" printing house was Lviv Bishop Gideon Balaban, who owned the Krylos printing house. The printing house in Striatyn belonged to his relative Fedir Balaban. The printer and engraver Pamvo Berynda was responsible for technical and artistic production at the Striatyn printing house.

Prior to the establishment of these printing houses, various literary and artistic materials were acquired and the necessary technical preparations were made. In the long run, such preparations proved to be of great importance. The best artistically produced books after Fedorovych, which are particularly significant in the history of early Ukrainian book publishing, were printed here. The number of works printed by the "balabaniv" printing houses is unknown. Only two Striatyn publications have survived, the "Sluzhebnyk" (1604) and the "Trebnyk" (1606), and one Krylos publication, the "Didactic Gospel" (1606). Preparations were also being made to publish other books, particularly the "Gospel". Plates were made, portraying the four evangelists, from which some of the first Ukrainian prints were later produced.

The fame of the Striatyn publications can be attributed primarily to their highly artistic ornaments and not their typefaces, or polygraphic finish. The second Striatyn publication is the "Trebnyk" (1606). After its publication, the Striatyn printing house most probably ceased to exist. It was later acquired by the founders of the Pecherska Lavra (Monastery of the Caves) printing house in Kyiv, which developed into one of the greatest and most influential printing houses in Ukraine.

The Krylos printing house published only one book, the "Didactic Gospel" (1606). This is a large (423 sheets), richly decorated and meticulously produced book. Its format is the "in folio" design, and its galleys are better proportioned than in both of the Striatyn publications. The "Didactic Gospel" was the last "balabaniv" publication. The founder of the Striatyn and Krylos printing houses, Gideon Balaban, died in 1607. The fate of the Krylos printing house is unknown. It may have been incorporated into the Lviv printing house, as its materials later appeared in the Lviv publications, particularly xylographic plates with illustrations and various headpieces, and composite cast lines.

So far, we have centered our attention on the publications of the four most notable Ukrainian printing houses in Lviv, Ostrih (post Fedorovych), Striatyn and Krylos. At the beginning of the 17th century, three of them ceased to function. But the work of the printing house of the Lviv Brotherhood, which existed for several centuries, was only just beginning.

Their contribution towards the development of the artistic design of Ukrainian publications is varied. The "balabaniv" printing houses are the most significant in this respect. Artistically speaking, however, the other printing houses produced little that is worthy of attention. Characteristic of all these printing houses is their development of the Fedorovych tradition. The first publications of the Ostrih (post-Fedorovych) and Lviv printing houses contain Fedorovych's Ostrih typefaces and prints from his original xylographic plates. Variants of his ornaments were used by the Ostrih and Krylos printers. Their headpieces are notable works of decorative art.

In Kyiv printing developed along different lines than in Lviv and Ostrih. In Lviv the Brotherhood attempted to preserve its monopoly on printing and selling books, which in itself is an indication of the importance contemporary Ukrainians placed on the printed word. In Ostrih the success of the printing house was totally dependent on a patron. The Ostrih printing house declined and shortly thereafter, following the death of Prince Konstantyn Ostrozkyi, a patron of the Ukrainian book, it ceased to exist altogether. In Kyiv, where printing developed later than in the western Ukrainian regions, the situation was more complex. There was a direct connection between western Ukrainian printing and the establishment of the printing house in Kyiv.

The first printing house in the Kyiv area was set up in Fastov (c. 1597). But printing began to develop in earnest only with the founding of the Pecherska Lavra printing house (1616), the largest in Ukraine up to the middle of the 18th century. It is difficult to establish the exact publication date of the first book printed in Kyiv. Although various hypotheses have been made, the only conclusions that can be drawn with any certainty are that the beginning of printing in Kyiv is connected with the activity of the largest and most influential monastery in Ukraine, the Pecherska Lavra.

The Lavra acquired the equipment of one, or possibly even several, western Ukrainian printing houses. The first dated publication of the Lavra printing house was the "Concise Book of Hours", printed in 1616 on the instructions of Yelysey Pletenetskyi, who perceived the subsequent role that this book was to play in education. Schools in Muscovy, Byelorussia and Ukraine used the "Concise Book of Hours" in prayers which were set according to the time of day at which they were to be read.

Following its "first fruit", the Lavra printed one book after another. The Kyiv printing house shortly developed into a great, well-equipped establishment, in the service of Archimandrite Yelysey Pletenetskyi (d. 1624). Pletenetskyi placed great

importance on the printed book and aspired to transform the printing house into a great literary centre. He bought Balaban's Striatyn printing house, acquired several typefaces from the Ostrih printing house, and invited experienced printers to work for him. He also believed that good editorial preparation was critical.

The Lavra printing house soon became a centre, which encouraged such notable scholars as P. Berynda, T. Zemka and others. Thanks to them the Lavra publications were distinguished for their high-quality translations, diligent editorial preparation and precision. In the first 15 years of its existence, the Lavra printing house published more than 30 titles, which included a series of monumental works. In the following years, the number of publications increased. Up to the beginning of the 18th century over 180 titles were printed in Kyiv, including a number of reprints. The educational and liturgical works printed in Kyiv were also very popular outside Ukraine.

Two other printing houses functioned in Kyiv: those of T. Verbytskyi and S. Sobol (1625-30). Later, in 1787, the printing house of the Kyiv Academy was founded, and in 1799 a government printing house. There is also mention of a printing house in Berdychiv (from 1760) and other towns. In Chernihiv the first printing house was founded by K. T. Stavrovetskyi (1626), in which he printed his own works, and which declined following his death in 1646. Later, Archbishop L. Baranovych, who transferred his printing house in Novhorod Siverskyi (founded in 1671) to Chernihiv in 1679, began to print in the Chernihiv region. From the second half of the 18th century, printing spread to other Ukrainian towns: Yelysavethrad (1764), Kremenchuk (1765), Bendery (1791), Katerynoslav and Kharkiv (1793), Kamianets Podilskyi and Mykolayiv (1798), and other towns. Printing houses also existed in Derman (1602-05), Konstantyniv, Pochayiv (with intervals from 1618-1918), Rakhmaniv (1619), Chetverten (1625), Lutsk (1624), the village of Chorna (1629), Kremianets (1628), and later in Zhytomyr (from 1783). In the second half of the 17th century a printing house was also established in the Hrushiv Monastery in Transcarpathia.

On October 5, 1720, a decree of Tsar Peter I brought the Kyiv and Chernihiv printing houses under the jurisdiction of the Russian Patriarch and banned the printing of all books, excluding old church books, which could only be published after they were censored in St. Petersburg. In 1721 a Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church issued an edict on strict censorship and control over the two printing houses. These measures completely eradicated the Ukrainian character of printing in Kyiv, Chernihiv, and other Ukrainian towns under Russian rule.

Secular printing houses, whose number greatly increased from the second half of the 18th century, were not well established and printed primarily the directives of the Russian occupational administration, and sometimes Russian books of mediocre significance. At the beginning of the 19th century, when the printing machine replaced the hand press, printing was transformed from a craft into a separate industry in its own right.

### Ukrainian Printed Books and their Illustrations

Printed and handwritten Ukrainian books can be divided into the following categories:

- a) Liturgical books. Liturgical books were very numerous. The demand for the "Gospel", the "Epistles", missals, and so on was always extensive, particularly on the part of the churches and monasteries.
- b) *Theological books*. There were also large numbers of theological books containing various treatises in which authors attempted to resolve canonical disputes. Many of these works are a testimony to the multi-faceted erudition of their authors, who were well acquainted both with the works of the Fathers of the Church and also the numerous works of scholars of famous Western European universities.
- c) *Polemical works*. These are excluded from theological literature. Many polemical works, which became more widespread after the Union of Brest (1596), were not printed.
- d) *Educational books*. Because education and the spread of elementary schooling was very important, the printing of educational literature for schools acquired considerable significance. Many educational textbooks, particularly the "Primer" and the "Grammar", were also copied by hand.
- e) *Belletristic works*. It should be noted that in the 16th and 17th centuries, there were many belletristic books published, together with various liturgical, educational and polemical books.
- f) Others. These include a large number of published poems and poetic collections, written by one or more authors. Although their themes are varied, the authors generally wrote on religious themes.

One of the first examples of printed works in Ukraine is Andriy Rymsha's "Chronology" (Ostrih, 1581), printed in leaflet form. This is a calendar, which gives the names of the months in Ukrainian, Latin and Hebrew, together with various poems on Biblical themes, connected with particular months.

Ukrainian books from the 17th century are particularly noteworthy for their engravings, which were on a high artistic level. In the history of Slavonic publishing, Ukrainian books were the first to include such engravings, which represent the most characteristic feature of the early Ukrainian book. With regard to the incorporation of illustrations in Ukrainian publications, the Krylos printing house, which was the first to illustrate its prints with engravings, as well as the craftsmen of the Lviv monastic printing house, who developed and perfected this art, have an established place in the history of Ukrainian publishing. In this period, many talented craftsmen worked in the field of Ukrainian printing. Unfortunately, they did not sign their works. We know only of Pamvo Berynda. Who produced the monastic publications, who, apart from Berynda, worked in Striatyn and Krylos, who, other than Mstyslavets, illustrated books in Ostrih after Ivan Fedorovych—these are all questions, which require further research.

The appearance of printing in Ukraine was an event of momentous historical significance. As a consequence of the substantial upheaval, which occurred in the political, civic, economic and cultural life of Ukraine in the second half of the 16th century, it helped to raise the self-awareness of the Ukrainian people, to develop its culture, language and literature. The printed book also played a marked role in the national struggle of the Ukrainian people throughout the centuries.

Printing began a new era in the history of Ukrainian art. The printed book inherited all the best artistic features of the handwritten book—form, internal structure, artistic-technical finish, and typeface, but was not its mechanical copy. This was a completely new art form. Typefaces, headpieces, colophons, artistic initials, titular ornaments, and illustrations appealed to people with their vibrant form, and beautiful illustrations and filigrees.

The printing technique gave books a completely new appearance. Whereas the handwritten book was a work of fine art, the printed book was the synthesis of graphic art and polygraphic technique. Many notable craftsmen, printers, artists, engravers from the history of Ukrainian culture and art were involved with early Ukrainian book printing. As an enduring memorial to art, it has always attracted the attention of researchers.

This study is by no means exhaustive and can do no more than give a brief introduction to the history of early Ukrainian book printing. I hope to stimulate the reader's interest in the abundant literature available on this fascinating subject.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) Barge, H.: Geschichte der Buchdruckkunst von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. 1940.

- 2) Брайчевський, М.Ю.: Коли і як виник Київ, Київ, 1963.
- 3) Брайчевський, М.Ю.: Походження Русі, Київ, 1968.
- 4) Der große Brockhaus. 5. Band F. O. Brockhaus. Wiesbaden, 1954.
- 5) Haebler, K.: Die deutshcen Buchdrucker des 15. Jahrh. im Auslande. 1924.
- 6) Грушевський, М: Історія Руси-України, Т. І-ІІІ, Київ, 1913-1925.
- 7) Кубійович, В.: Енциклопедія українознавства. Словникова частина. Париж-Ню Йорк. Т. 1-9, 1955-1980.
- Jerabek, Blanka: "Church Slavonic Documents and Early Relations Between Bohemia-Moravia and Kievan Rus'-Ukraine", Ukrainian Quarterly, Nos. 3-4, New York, 1986.
- Jerabkova, Blanka: "Po duchovnim prouvdu Sazavy do Kijeva", Democracie v exilu (DVE), 4/1988.
- 10) Jerabkova, Blanka: "Tisic let krestanstvi na Ukrajine", DVE, 1/1988.

- 11) Запаско, Яким, Ісаєвич, Ярослав: Пам'ятки книжкового мистецтва. Каталог стародруків, виданих на Україні. Книга Перша (1574-1700), Львівський державний університет, Львів, 1981.
- 12) Запаско, Я. П.: Мистецтво книги на Україні в XVI-XVIII ст., Львівський державний університет, Львів, 1971.
- 13) Зданевич, Б.: Каталог Інкунабул, Київ, 1974.
- 14) Ісаєвич, Я. Д.: Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI-XVIII ст., Київ, 1966.
- 15) ісаєвич, Я. Д.: Київська Русь, культура традиції, Київ, 1982.
- 16) Каланов, І. Я.: Українська книга XVI-XVIII століть, Харків, 1959.
- 17) Карамазин-Каковський, В.: "Першодрукар Святополк Фіола", Дукля, Ч. 3, Пряшів, 1969, ст. 74-75.
- 18) Косар, Микола: Хрещення Київської Руси 988 року.
- 19) Koschatzky, Walter: Die Kunst der Graphik. DTV. München, 1977.
- 20) Купчинський, О. А., Ружицький, Е. Й.: Каталог пергаментних документів Центрального державного історичного архіву УРСР у Львові. 1233-1799, Київ, 1972.
- 21) Марченко, М. І.: Історія української культури, Київ, 1961.
- 22) Маслов, С. І.: Українська друкована книга в XVI-XVIII століттях, Київ, 1925.
- 23) Мацюк, О. Я.: Папір і філіграні на українських землях (XVI-поч. XX ст.), Київ, 1974.
- 24) Мединський, Е. М.: Братські школи України і Білорусії в XVI-XVII століттях, Київ, 1958.
- 25) Полонська-Василенко, Наталія: Історія України. Т. І-ІІ, Мюнхен, 1972, 1976.
- 26) Попов, П. М.: Книга і друкарство на Україні, Київ, 1965.
- 27) Попов, П. М.: Початок книгодрукування у слов'ян (XV-XVI ст.), Київ, 1965.
- 28) Різник, М. Г.: Письмо і шрифт, Київ, 1978.
- 29) Ruppel, J.: Johannes Gutenberg, 1947.
- 30) Сірополко, Степан: Історія освіти на Україні, Львів, 1937.
- 31) Тітов, Хв.: Матеріяли для історії книжкової справи на Вкраїні в XVI-XVIII вв., Київ, 1924.
- 32) Ужевич, Іван: Граматика слов'янська (Париж, 1643), Київ, 1970.
- 33) Український Радянський енциклопедичний словник. Том І, Київ, 1966.
- 34) Tschizewskij, Dmitrij: Russische Geistesgeschichte, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München, 1974.
- 35) Чубатий, Микола: *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні*. Том I, Рим-Ню Йорк, 1965.
- 36) Schmidt-Künsemüller: Die Erfindung des Buches als technischen Phönomen, 1951.
- 37) Федоров, Іван (Федорович): Буквар (Львів, 1574), Київ, 1975.

# NEWS FROM UKRAINE

## **ELECTIONS IN UKRAINE**

MARCH 4, LVIV—The local elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR took place in this western Ukrainian city without any major incident and in general without any obstructions on the part of local authorities. In the Zaliznytsia electoral district of the city of Lviv the authorities tried to discredit the Democratic Bloc candidate—Mykhailo Horyn—who is a major figure in the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) and the chairman of the Secretariat of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh). Members of the electoral commission from this district were urging voters not to vote for Horyn, claiming that he is much too old, does not work anywhere and, hence, cannot do anything constructive for the people. Near noon statements to the effect that Horyn had withdrawn his candidacy appeared on his campaign posters to confuse the voters.

In the Lenin district of the city several irregularities were reported. Members of the electoral commission began handing out several ballots to various individuals, instructing them how they should vote. The normal procedure is to give only one ballot to each person after that individual presents the officials with the proper identity documents.

In many of the districts, observers from workers' collectives and independent organizations were monitoring the electoral process. In the districts where these observers were present, no irregularities occurred. There were no observers present in the Lenin district.

Bohdan Horyn—the head of the Lviv branch of the UHU—was running for election in the Zhydachiv district of the Lviv province. Horyn's associates were present in all the villages of this electoral district to monitor the electoral process.

In the city of Sambir, the Democratic Bloc candidate was Ihor Derkach, who represented the UHU and the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM). According to UHU spokesmen from Lviv, about 35% of the servicemen from the Carpathian Military District cast their votes for Derkach. The soldiers voted between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. local time. In the Shevchenko district of Lviv soldiers also reportedly voted for Democratic Bloc candidate Vyacheslav Chornovil.

The ballots from the villages and towns are tallied and then sent to the district centre, where they are again counted. From there the ballots are sent to the provincial centre, where another tally is taken.

Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

# **Election Highlights**

KYIV—Activists holding placards and loudspeakers stood on Saturday, March 3, in the most crowded parts of the Ukrainian capital, surrounded by small groups of interested passers-by.

In general, however, people walked by without paying any attention. Local activist Viktor Khomenko said that he stopped various passers-by and asked them what they expected from the elections. "Nothing" was the most frequent reply.

The building of the Popular Movement of Ukraine was more crowded than anywhere else. All the walls were donned with campaign leaflets. Rukh officials were making the final preparations for the next day's elections. Organizational problems were being discussed. Rukh intended its candidates to contest the elections at the maximum possible number of constituencies. Rukh activists Mykhailo Horyn, Ivan Drach, Cherniak and Konev were holding a press conference with Western correspondents. In his statement, Rukh chairman Ivan Drach mentioned some interesting facts. He pointed out that communists were putting forward even more radical demands than the Democratic Bloc candidates in order to retain their seat. In his electoral programme, for instance, the deputy police chief of Lviv demanded not only the dismissal of the party leadership, but also full sovereignty for Ukraine and a Ukrainian national army.

While the press conference was in progress, more and more people gathered on the ground floor, one thing on their mind---for whom to vote.

*Election Day, March 4.* At Khomenko's constituency, larger numbers than usual turned up to vote for the more than 20 candidates to the Supreme Soviet. Poet Pavlo Movchan represented the Democratic Bloc. The remainder were company directors, communists. Reportedly, only CPSU members challenged the elections to the municipal councils.

When asked, the voters generally did not know for whom to vote. They only became acquainted with the list when it was presented to them by Khomenko, who said it is difficult to know where to lay the blame—on an inadequate pre-election campaign or popular apathy.

Khomenko visited several other constituencies, where the picture appeared much the same.

The Rukh building was not as busy as the previous day. Many Rukh members were out in the constituencies monitoring the electoral process. Those who remained behind manned the telephones, gathering information about violations of the electoral process. Reports from four constituencies claimed that violations of the law on elections were being made. Communists were filling in ballot cards for old people and cronies and trying to submit them before the elections had even begun.

# Ukrainian National Rights Activists Elected

KYIV—The Electoral Centre of the Rukh Secretariat reported that the following prominent Democratic Bloc candidates—leading members of Rukh and the Ukrainian Helsinki Union— running for election to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, received the required 50% of the ballots cast to be elected: Ivan Drach, Mykhailo Horyn, Bohdan Horyn, Levko Lukianenko, Stepan Khmara, Vyacheslav Chornovil and Iryna Kalynets.

With one known exception—Vitaliy Karpenko, editor of "Vechirniy Kyiv", who won—none of the candidates from the electoral districts in and around this capital city received the required 50% of the votes cast in their constituencies to win the seat. Those candidates that received the most votes participated in a run-off election, took place on March 18 according to the iaw on elections. Soviet electoral laws stipulate that a candidate must receive at least 50% of the votes cast to be elected. In the event that no candidate receives the required 50%, the top two votegetters then participate in a run-off election.

In the second round, many Democratic Bloc candidates will be directly running against candidates from the Communist Party apparatus. The First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Volodymyr Ivashko, failed to receive enough votes to be elected in this round. He ran against democratic candidate—Kvas.

Of the Democratic Bloc candidates, seeking election as People's Deputies to the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet from the Kyiv electoral districts, the following received the required number of votes to stand for election again in the run-off: Poyizd, Movchan, Taniuk, Zbitniev, Hnatkevych, Proniuk, Ivasiuk, Kryzhanivskyi, Skoryk, Teren, Shevchenko, Serhiyenko, Kyslyi, Zayets, Holovatyi, Palamar, Shovkoshytnyi, Musienko, Kyrychenko, Kotsiuba, Mokrousov, Solopenko, and Kotsenko.

In the Lviv electoral districts the following Democratic Bloc candidates received enough votes to stand for election in the March 18 run-off: Pohrebniak and Ivan Hel. According to reports from Lviv, I. Hryniv, Lubkivskyi, Vlokh and Yukhnovskyi were elected as People's Deputies from the Lviv constituencies. The following Democratic Bloc candidates were elected in other cities of Ukraine: Ivanychuk (Drohobych), Kendzior (Chervonohrad), and Derkach (Sambir).

In addition to Levko Lukianenko, the chairman of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), who was elected from an electoral district in the western Ukrainian city of Ivano-Frankivsk, Bohdan Rebryk was also elected as a Democratic Bloc candidate.

According to Svitlana Raboshapka of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union Press Service in Kyiv, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi, a leading Popular Movement activist, ran and apparently won a seat from an electoral district in the city of Kirovohrad. Kravchuk, the Party's ideological secretary, won with 69% of the votes. Despite the Party apparatus' strength in Odessa, Donetsk, Dniprodzerzhinsk and Kharkiv, many Party candidates did not receive enough votes to be elected in the first round and had to run again in the March 18 run-off

"The Democratic Bloc didn't do all it could", said Raboshapka. "We could have had a much higher percentage in the Supreme Soviet, perhaps 40-45%, instead of the 25% or so that we optimistically expect. The problem is that we have no experience with democracy here".

# **Election Irregularities in Ukraine**

According to Adolph Kutovyi, head of the Rukh branch at the Okhtyrsk factory—"Silhospmash", Mykola Nosenko and Petro Rikalo—two Rukh activists—were sent to a psychiatric hospital situated in the village of Vysoke (Okhtyrsk district, Sumy province) immediately prior to the elections, which were held throughout all of Ukraine on March 4. The reason that Nosenko and Rikalo were "hospitalized" was that they were preparing leaflets and vocally campaigning for candidates of the Democratic Bloc.

On March 4 the police and KGB organized a hunt for an automobile containing activists of informal organizations of Cherkasy—Anatoliy Lupynis and Oleksiy Shevaldin, who were carrying 1,000 copies of the newspaper of the Ukrainian Independent Press Agency (UNPA)—"Shlakhy". They were apprehended in the Cherkasy province and the newspaper was confiscated on the grounds that the publication contained "calls to boycott the elections".

# Election Results First Round • March 4, 1990

According to reports of the press agencies of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) and the Ukrainian Popular Movement (Rukh) in Moscow, in only 120 of the 450 electoral districts the candidates running for office as People's Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR received the required 50% of the votes cast to be elected in the first round of elections, held on March 4, 1990. In the remaining 330 electoral districts of the Ukrainian SSR, run-offs were held on March 18, in which the two candidates that received the most votes in the first round ran for election. Candidates of the Democratic Bloc—a broad coalition of representatives of Rukh and other "informal" public organizations and associations—ran for election in 103 of the 330 electoral districts in which run-offs took place.

Of the 120 deputies, elected in the March 4 elections, 36 were elected as Democratic Bloc candidates. 71 of the elected deputies represented the Communist

Party bureaucracy. The remaining 13 deputies elected were candidates that officially were not running on the Democratic Bloc's slate, but which were supported by Rukh. In the March 4 general elections, Rukh candidates ran in 130 of the 450 electoral districts throughout the Ukrainian SSR. In another 70 electoral districts. Rukh endorsed candidates that officially were not registered as Democratic Bloc candidates. According to a report published in "Radianska Ukrayina" on March 6, approximately 3,000 candidates ran in the elections on March 4, with each seat being contested, on the average, by 6-7 candidates. Of the 71 elected deputies running on the Communist Party's slate, 11 are first secretaries of regional and municipal party organizations, 13 are secretaries or party workers on the higher provincial level, 13 are chairmen or vice-chairmen of executive party committees, 4 are secretaries of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (Kravchuk, Kochur, Yelchenko and Hurenko), 5 are executive committee workers, 5 are heads of collective farms, 10 are general directors or directors, 4 are from the Soviet Army, and 6 are ministers or vice-ministers in the Ukrainian SSR's government. In a mild surprise, the First Secretary of the CPU-Volodymyr Ivashko-did not manage to receive the required 50% of the vote and had to run again in the March 18 run-off in a Kyiv municipal electoral district against the Democratic Bloc candidate—Kvas.

Most of the Democratic Bloc deputies that were elected in this first round ran in the Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk provinces. In Kyiv—the capital of the Ukrainian SSR—one candidate from the Democratic Bloc was elected in the first round, while another 22 candidates managed to receive enough votes to run in the second round on March 18.

On Saturday and Sunday, March 10 and 11, pre-electoral rallies took place in many of the cities of Ukraine in support of candidates from the Democratic Bloc who were running again in the March 18 run-off. In most cases, Democratic Bloc candidates ran directly against candidates of the CPU.

Spokesmen for the UHU and Rukh press services in Moscow reported that the Ukrainian republican press has yet to publish the complete results of the March 4 elections. The results presented below were prepared by Anatoliy Dotsenko—the official spokesman for the UHU and Rukh press agencies in Moscow from information that he managed to gather from UHU and Rukh members throughout the various provinces of Ukraine.

# ELECTION RESULTS by province

### LVIV

The following Democratic Bloc candidates were elected in the first round on March 4:

Ivan Drach-Rukh Chairman Mykhailo Horyn-Chairman of the Rukh Secretariat, UHU member Vyacheslav Chornovil-Director of the Ukrainian Independent Publishing-Information Association and the UHU Press Service Bohdan Horyn—Chairman of the Lviv UHU branch Stepan Khmara—Vice-chairman of the Lviv Committee in Defence of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee), UHU activist and the vice-chairman of the Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church **Ihor Yukhnovskvi**—a scholar from the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR and a Rukh activist Roman Ivanvchuk-a writer Ihor Derkach-a UHU activist Iryna Kalynets-a leading activist of "Myloserdia" (Society of the Blessed Virgin Mary) Mykhailo Kosiv—a scholar and the vice-president of the Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Language Society Yaroslav Kendzior-a UHU activist Orest Vlokh—chairman of the Lviv Rukh branch Mykhailo Shvaika—a member of the Rukh Supreme Council Viktor Romaniuk—a Rukh representative Dmytro Chobit-a Rukh representative Ivan Makar—a national and democratic rights activist Bohdan Kozarskyi-a national and democratic rights activist Ihor Hryniv—the secretary of the Lviv provincial branch of the Komsomol, a member of the Rukh's Supreme Council

The following Democratic Bloc candidates ran for election in the March 18 run-off:

- Ivan Hel—the Chairman of the Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church
- Yevhen Hryniv-a Rukh leader

Bohdan Kotyk-the Lviv mayor

Mykhailo Batih-the editor-in-chief of "Leninskaya Molod"

Stepan Pavliuk—the Chairman of the Rukh's External Affairs Committee—ran against Yakiv Pohrebniak, the first secretary of the Lviv Provincial Committee of the CPU

Roman Lubkivskyi-a writer

Fisher—a representative of the "Lev" Society and the Ukrainian Language Society

### **IVANO-FRANKIVSK**

The following Democratic Bloc candidates were elected in the first round on March 4:

Levko Lukianenko—the Chairman of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union Bohdan Rebryk—the Chairman of the Ivano-Frankivsk UHU branch Markian Chechuk—the Chairman of the Cultural-Scientific Society "Rukh" Mykola Holubets—an academic of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, a Rukh activist

Stepan Pushets—a poet, the Chairman of the provincial branch of the Ukrainian Language Society

Stepan Volkovetskyi-a scholar, a Rukh activist

Dmytro Zakharuk-the editor-in-chief of "Ahr"

Zenoviy Duma-the Chairman of the local "Memorial" branch

The following Democratic Bloc candidates ran for election in the March 18 run-off:

Volodymyr Shlemko—the Director of the Drama Theatre, a Rukh activist Petro Osadchyi—a Rukh activist

### KYIV

Vitaliy Karpenko—the editor-in-chief of "Vechirnyi Dzvin"—elected in the first round as a Democratic Bloc candidate

The following Democratic Bloc candidates ran for election in the March 18 run-off:

Dmytro Poyizd, Larysa Skoryk, Pavlo Movchan, Les Taniuk, Viktor Teren, Zbigniev, Oles Shevchenko, Kvas, Yevhen Proniuk, Hnatkevych, Ivasiuk, Kryzhanivskyi, Oles Serhiyenko, Musiyenko, Kyslyi, Zayets, Holovatyi, Palamar, Shovkoshytyi, Solopenko, Kostenko.

City or Province	Α	В	С
Kyiv	22	1	22
Vinnytsia Province	17	-	3
Volyn Province	9	-	2
Voroshylovhrad Province	25	-	-
Dnipropetrovsk Province	34	1	10
Donets Province	45	-	3
Zhytomyr Province	14	-	3
Transcarpathian Province	11	1	2
Zaporizhia Province	18	-	7
Ivano-Frankivsk Province	12	8	2
Kyiv Province	17	-	9
Kirovohrad Province	11	1	2
Sevastopol	4	-?-	-?-
Crimea Province	18	_	1
Lviv Province	24	18	7
Mykolayiv Province	11	-	2
Odessa Province	23		5
Poltava Province	16	-?-	-?-
Rivne Province	10		3
Sumy Province	13	-	
Ternopil Province	10	3	3 3
Kharkiv Province	28		9
Kherson Province	10	-?-	-?-
Khmelnytskyi Province	13		1
Cherkasy Province	14	1	2
Chernivtsi Province	8	-?-	-?-
Chernihiv Province	13	2	2
TOTAL	450	36	103

# **ELECTION RESULTS** First Round • March 4, 1990

### **LEGEND KEY:**

- A Total Electoral Districts
- B --- # of Elected Democratic Bloc Candidates

C --- # of Democratic Bloc Candidates in Second Round of Elections

# Democratic Bloc Scores Great Successes in Run-Off Elections

According to information from Ukraine, the Democratic Bloc candidates in Ukraine achieved many victories in the run-off elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, which took place on March 18, 1990. In particular, the Democratic Bloc scored significant gains in the elections in Kyiv—the capital of Ukraine—and in the Lviv region of western Ukraine.

The Democratic Bloc candidates were victorious in 15 of the 21 electoral districts in Kyiv in which run-offs were held. The following Democratic Bloc candidates were elected People's Deputies from Kyiv: Larysa Skoryk, Pavlo Movchan, Les Taniuk, Oles Shevchenko—the chairman of the Kyiv branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), Yuriy Zbitnev, Yuriy Hnatkevych, Valeriy Ivasiuk, Volodymyr Kryzhanivskyi, Pavlo Kyslyi, Oleksander Kotsiuba, Ivan Zayets, Serhiy Holovatyi, Volodymyr Shovkoshytnyi, and Yuriy Kostenko. All these individuals are either members of the Great Assembly of the Ukrainian Popular Movement (Rukh), or Rukh activists.

Representatives of the party and state apparatus were victorious in only three of the electoral districts of Kyiv. The First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU)—Volodymyr Ivashko—"won" in his campaign against Oleksiy Kvas, a Rukh activist. This "victory", however, is somewhat tainted, since, according to Rukh representatives, 12,000 Soviet soldiers, that were participating in army manoeuvres at the time around the city of Kyiv, were allowed to vote in the elections in the electoral district where Ivashko was running.

The Democratic Bloc's victory in Kyiv was further underscored by the fact that its candidates gained control of a majority of the seats of the Kyiv city council. As of Tuesday, March 20, results were available in 120 of the 300 electoral districts to the Kyiv city council. In 70 of these 120 districts the Democratic Bloc candidates won in their bid to become members of the city council. Among those elected were the following well-known national and democratic rights activists: Mykola Horbal, Oles Serhiyenko and Yevhen Proniuk.

The Democratic Bloc scored resounding victories in all six of the electoral districts of the Lviv region where run-offs took place. The following democratic candidates were elected: Bohdan Kotyk—the mayor of Lviv, Yevhen Hryniv—the local leader of "Memorial", Roman Lubkivskyi, Stepan Pavliuk—a Rukh representative, who defeated the first secretary of the Lviv regional party committee—Yakiv Pohrebniak, Mykhailo Batih—the editor of "Leninska Molod", and Taras Stetsiv.

In what can be considered a major victory for the Ukrainian independence movement, the Democratic Bloc won seats in all 24 electoral districts to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR in the Lviv region. In the Volyn region, the following Democratic Bloc or Rukh-endorsed candidates won: Yaroslav Dmytryshyn—a Rukh activist, Oleksander Hudyma—the regional Rukh leader, Andriy Mostynskyi—a Rukh activist, Fedir Sviderskyi—a Rukh branch chairman, Bondarchuk—a correspondent for "Pravda Ukrayiny", who is known for his progressive viewpoints, in spite of the fact that he works in an official press organ.

According to election results made available in Volyn, the Democratic Bloc gained control of six of the nine deputy seats. Additionally, Democratic Bloc representatives hoped to control 50% of the seats of the city council of Lutsk and 20-30% of the seats in the Volyn regional council.

In the Sumy region two Democratic Bloc candidates—Oleksander Piskun (a lecturer at the Polytechnic) and Oleksander Vorobyov, were elected to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

On March 13, prior to the run-off elections, the official press and mass media released the results from the first round of elections in Ukraine, which were held on March 4. According to this official release, 112 deputies were elected in this first round, of which three newly-elected deputies are women. 87 deputies (77.7%) are members of the Communist Party, 25 are not members of any party, 48 deputies (42.9%) are representatives of the party and state apparatus, 38 deputies (33.9%) are representatives of the Democratic Bloc.

# **Report on the Elections in Ukraine** March 4, 1990

The Ukrainian Central Information Service (UCIS) sent several of its representatives to Ukraine during the first round of elections held on March 4, 1990. Their purpose was to assist the various organizations, groups and individuals in Ukraine to monitor the electoral process. Below is the report of three of these representatives—Askold Lozynskyj, Roksolana Stojko-Lozynskyj and Borys Potapenko—who also represented the Free Congress Foundation, which is based in Washington, D.C.

#### I. Background:

From February 25, 1990, to March 9, 1990, Askold Lozynskyj, Roksolana Stojko-Lozynskyj and Borys Potapenko travelled to the Ukrainian SSR, specifically the cities of Lviv and Kyiv, and several smaller towns and villages throughout western Ukraine. The purpose of the trip was to monitor the elections of March 4, 1990, in the Ukrainian SSR including pre-election campaigning and the electoral process on election day. Additional assistance was furnished by other Americans travelling in the Ukrainian SSR at that time. Approximately thirty

questionnaires were completed by candidates and supporters of the democratic opposition. This report is a compilation of the observations made and opinions given not only by the three UCIS representatives, but by their American colleagues and those responding to the aforementioned questionnaire.

### II. The Electoral Law of the Ukrainian SSR:

In October 1989, the election law of the Ukrainian SSR was enacted dealing specifically with the upcoming republican elections. The law contains a number of flaws making it inherently unfair and allowing for abuses and violations of electoral norms in a democratic society.

1. The law states that all citizens of the Ukrainian SSR may vote in the Ukrainian SSR elections, but does not prescribe any residence requirements. Inasmuch as there is no Ukrainian SSR citizenship (Soviet citizens carry USSR passports, not republican passports) theoretically, residents of any Soviet republic should be enabled to vote in the Ukrainian SSR election. In fact, three days prior to the elections, some 27,000 Soviet troops in transit from Czechoslovakia were given ballots for the purpose of voting in the Ukrainian SSR. These troops may have been Soviet citizens, however, certainly they were not citizens of the Ukrainian SSR.

2. The nomination of candidates is reserved to officially registered organizations with one exception, to wit: 200 eligible voters may nominate their own candidate at a meeting. However, that meeting must be sanctioned by the authorities.

3. The highest authority is vested in the Central Electoral Commission which is formed by the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and the district electoral commissions formed by officially registered organizations, collectives and city councils. These commissions exclusively are entrusted with the registration of candidates. Thus, there were many cases where Democratic Bloc candidates were not registered. Therefore, the Democratic Bloc ran candidates in only 45% of the electoral districts for the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

#### **III. Pre-Election Abuses:**

#### 1. No equal access to media

Inasmuch as the Communist Party controls the newspapers as well as the television stations, very few newspapers and television stations carried opposition platforms or permitted appearances by the opposition candidates.

2. Unequal spending power and access to printing and duplicating

The electoral law allocates only a very limited quantity of leaflets to each candidate. Communist Party candidates had access to Party finances and printing and duplicating facilities, while informal organizations, comprising the majority of the Democratic Bloc, are forbidden from possessing printing and duplicating facilities.

### **IV. Electoral Process Violations at Local Polling Stations:**

The violations listed here are not an indictment of the electoral process alleging that fraud had been perpetrated. Rather, these violations suggest that there was ample opportunity for fraud.

1. No accounting of ballot distribution

This was a glaring violation in that it was witnessed by the representatives in a number of polling stations. Furthermore, this violation was reported by official poll watchers as well. The chairman of the local polling electoral commission would simply hand an undetermined quantity of ballots to the officials who were verifying voters' credentials and distributing ballots. At least one such chairman acknowledged in an interview that no exact accounting was made, but since he had only received a few hundred more ballots than the number of voters in his community, the potential for outrageous fraud was minimal. Upon further questioning, he did admit that total voter turnout was only about 60%, therefore the potential for massive fraud was greater than he anticipated.

In a video interview agreed to by a local commission chairman, an official poll watcher reported a number of personally witnessed violations among the aforementioned unaccounted ballots. The interview was abruptly terminated by an individual apparently from the KGB, who stated that he was above the electoral commission and who threatened the UCIS representatives with arrest. After a 15-minute detention, the representatives were released.

2. Voters receiving ballots in districts other than their own

As reported by an official poll watcher in the Red Army district of Kyiv, at least two voters not residing in that district received ballots from electoral officials. Upon objection by an official observer, they surrendered the ballots. However, one may assume that other cases went undetected as the electoral officials did not scrutinize residency. Aside from the obvious impropriety, such misfeasance would enable voters to receive ballots in more than one district, since the polling station would not be able to determine whether a voter had received a ballot elsewhere.

3. Sealing of ballot box without the presence of official poll watchers

Official poll watchers were directed to appear at local polling stations at 6:30 a.m. on election day. In many polling stations ballot boxes had been sealed the previous evening.

4. Local electoral officials deferring authority

Under the election law, the highest authority in any local polling station is the chairman of the local electoral commission. In conducting an interview with one such chairman and videotaping the polling station, itself pursuant to the consent of that chairman, the UCIS representatives requested permission to videotape the ballot box. The chairman excused himself, walked over to two men sitting in the
rear of the hall, spoke with them for a few minutes, then returned and permitted the videotaping. When questioned regarding the two men, he responded that they were local government functionaries.

#### 5. Subliminal intimidation

In several polling stations visited by the UCIS representatives, they witnessed the presence of individuals there for no apparent purpose. These individuals were neither officials entrusted with the duty of distributing ballots or assisting in the electoral process nor were they official poll watchers. They remained at the polling stations after the UCIS representatives had left. In at least one instance, one flashed a card signifying apparent authority "higher than that of the local electoral commission". In another instance, they were described as local government functionaries. These individuals may have been unknown to the UCIS representatives but their presence was duly noted. Although no direct evidence exists that they were at the polling stations for purposes of intimidation, no other explanation is plausible.

6. Denial of access to official poll watchers

Reports were received by the UCIS representatives from official poll watchers that they had been denied access to the polling stations. It was only after considerable insistence and persuasion on the part of the candidates they represented that access was belatedly provided.

On military bases situated throughout Ukraine, polling stations were closed to all official observers or poll watchers.

7. Campaign posters of Communist Party candidates in voting area

Despite electoral law requirements that the polling station be cleared of any campaign material, that law was applied selectively and, seemingly, only to non-Communist Party candidates. In fact, it was visible that a number of campaign posters or leaflets had been removed from the official polling stations since pieces of tape, tacks and staples remained. However, the campaign material of certain candidates also remained. In four polling stations visited by the UCIS representatives, the campaign material that remained was that of a Communist Party candidate. When questioned, the head of the local electoral commission described the situation as an oversight.

8. Undue influence of local electoral commissioners

At many polling stations local electoral commissioners suggested to voters for whom they should cast their ballot. Very often this occurred at the request of the voters. However, in some cases the commissioners themselves initiated the conversation.

9. Secret ballot violated

In a majority of the larger polling stations an inadequate quantity of voting booths forced voters to complete their ballots in public. This was reported by several observers as well as by the coordinating centre of the Democratic Bloc.

### V. Conclusion

Despite the aforesaid abuses and violations, the Democratic Bloc was satisfied with the outcome of the elections. The Bloc overcame tremendous obstacles and achieved a formidable opposition bloc of approximately 30% in the newly constituted Ukrainian Parliament. This is significant because the remaining 70% is not a communist monolith and includes a large number of wavering centrists. Furthermore, the Democratic Bloc was successful in achieving a majority in city councils of such major cities in Ukraine as Lviv and Kyiv.

# UKRAINE IN SUPPORT OF LITHUANIA Mass Rally in Lviv Voices its Solidarity with Lithuanian Republic

On March 21, the Committee in Defence of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee) organized a public rally in Lviv in solidarity with the independent Lithuanian Republic. The 10,000 participants of the rally endorsed an appeal to the Ukrainian people and a resolution in solidarity with the Government and people of the Republic of Lithuania. The text of both documents follows below:

## To the Ukrainian People

The time has come for a decisive struggle for the freedom and independence of the subjugated peoples of the world's last empire—the USSR.

The establishment of independent states has become the main precondition not only for securing better living conditions and for the development for all nations, but statehood is also an indispensable condition for their biological survival. Ukraine is not an exception; the threat of total destruction hangs over Ukraine, unless it frees itself from the colonial yoke within the next few years.

Lithuania is the first swallow to break free from the imperialist prison cage. The courageous people of this small country have shown high political maturity and solidarity. Lithuania is today demonstrating to all the peoples of the empire how an independent state is to be established.

The collapse of the empire is inevitable. But how it will be implemented, through civilized, peaceful means, or whether it will be accompanied by violence and chaos, will depend on whether all of us together will be capable of defending the Lithuanian people from the violence of imperialist forces. We are fighting for our freedom in solidarity with the Lithuanian people.

#### **People of Ukraine!**

Remember that freedom is indivisible. Today, the front line of the struggle for your freedom is in Lithuania. So let us not permit the Russian imperialists to crush the young independent Lithuanian state.

We urge workers' collectives and all residents of Ukraine to consciously stand in solidarity with Lithuania.

In the event of military intervention and force against Lithuania, we will reply with organized political protest strikes.

Imperialist hands off Lithuania!

Long live the independent Lithuanian Republic!

Lviv Committee in Defence of Citizens' Rights (Strike Committee)

March 19, 1990

### Resolution of the March 21, 1990, Rally of the People of Lviv in Solidarity with Independent Lithuania

Exercising the legitimate right of every people to independence, the Supreme organ of power of the Lithuanian republic, implementing the will of the Lithuanian people, declared the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian state. Thus, historical justice was reestablished and the decrees of unlawful organs of the occupational administration on the annexation of the Lithuanian state following its occupation by the Red Army were abolished.

The present imperialist government in Moscow does not wish to come to terms with the will of the Lithuanian people. In response to the Lithuanian people and parliament, Moscow has used blackmail and threatened to institute an economic blockade of Lithuania.

The participants of the rally declare the following:

- 1) We fully support the decision of the government and people of Lithuania to secede from the prison of nations—the USSR.
- 2) We voice our indignation at the shameful imperialist decree of the third Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR regarding Lithuania.
- 3) In the event of the implementation of repressive measures against the independent Lithuanian Republic, we are prepared to wage a campaign of political protest strikes.
- 4) We urge all Ukrainians, who live on the territory of Lithuania, to obey only the laws and directives of the organs of power of the Lithuanian Republic and not to be a blind tool in the hands of the Russian imperialists.

## **Meeting in Kryvyi Rih**

On March 25 close to 500 people gathered in Kryvyi Rih for an unsanctioned preelection rally. The participants expressed their lack of confidence in the CPSU and the city officials. Several issues of the independent press, particularly the publication of the UHU—"Holos Vidrodzhennia", as well as newspapers and journals from the Baltic republics were distributed during the rally. In Kryvyi Rih a new round of elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR was held in May.

## Ukrainian Deputies Urge Recognition of Lithuanian Independence

Rostyslav Bratun and Ivan Vakarchuk, both of whom are People's Deputies, issued an appeal to the deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR regarding the recognition of the independent state of the Lithuanian republic. The text of the appeal follows:

## Appeal to the Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR

We, People's Deputies of the USSR from Ukraine, realizing the importance of our decision, appeal to you to demand at the first meeting of the newly-elected Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR the adoption of:

- -a decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR on the recognition of the independent state of the Lithuanian republic, in compliance with established international norms and laws.
- -a decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, declaring that the Ukrainian SSR is not making any monetary demands on the Lithuanian republic.
- —An appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR to the Supreme Soviets of other union republics with the proposition that they ratify similar documents.

March 25, 1990

People's Deputies of the USSR Rostyslav Bratun Ivan Vakarchuk

## Mass Rallies Throughout Ukraine in Support of Lithuanian Independence

Mass rallies took place in all the major cities and metropolitan centres of Ukraine in support of the Lithuanian people's aspirations towards independence, national sovereignty and statehood. According to the latest reports of the Information Centre of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), over one-quarter million people participated in various rallies, demonstrations, picket actions and the like throughout Ukraine.

In most of the cities where such actions took place, the rallies were unsanctioned by the communist authorities. Nonetheless, for the most part the leading organs of the Communist Party, the militia and the special divisions of the security forces did not interfere in these rallies.

## Kyiv, March 31

On March 31, at 5:00 p.m., despite a government ban, 20,000 Kyiv residents and guests from various Ukrainian cities, and from other republics, e.g. Lithuania, gathered by the Republican stadium in the city to demonstrate their support for Lithuanian independence. The rally was dotted with thousands of Ukrainian national blue-and-yellow flags, several red-and-black flags of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, as well as the national flags of Lithuania, Byelorussia, Moldavia, Latvia, Armenia, and Bulgaria. Many rally participants carried placards with the following slogans: "Russians out of Lithuania!", "Lithuanian Brothers, Ukrainians are with you!", "Colonial Ukraine welcomes independent Lithuania!", "Down with the Communist empire—the Soviet Union!", and many others.

The police made an attempt to disrupt the rally at the very start. These attempts were drowned out by shouts of indignation. The security detail of the rally, designated by the rally organizers to maintain order, did not allow the police to the podium. The rally was led by Mykhailo Horyn—the Chairman of the Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) Secretariat—and Volodymyr Yavorivskyi a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

The speakers included Ivan Drach, chairman of Rukh, Dmytro Pavlychko, chairman of the Ukrainian Language Society, newly-elected People's Deputies Les Taniuk and Oles Shevchenko; representatives of the Ukrainian National Democratic League (UNDL), the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM), as well as representatives from Lithuania, including a Sajudis leader, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia and various regions of Ukraine.

Yavorivskyi announced that several prominent Communist Party members resigned recently from the party, most notably Ivan Drach and Dmytro Pavlychko, which was greeted with rounds of loud applause. The meeting approved an appeal to Ukrainians in Lithuania to support the Lithuanian people in their struggle for independence and a resolution expressing support for the Lithuanian struggle for independence (the text of both documents appears below). This resolution contains a statement pointing out that Ukraine is not placing any material demands on the Lithuanian state. The rally participants also approved a resolution demanding the release of all political prisoners, including Bohdan Klymchak.

On April 1, at 4:00 p.m. the local Kyiv chapter of SNUM organized a youth march, in which 5,000 young Ukrainians took part. The march route started at the Taras Shevchenko monument and ended at the local military command post. During the march and the subsequent rally, the marchers chanted: "Freedom for Ukraine! Freedom for Lithuania! Imperialists out!"

#### Lviv

Nearly 100,000 people participated in the large mass rally in Lviv. According to Yaroslav Kendzior—a People's Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR—the rally began in Lviv State University, where the Ukrainian national flag was officially raised, in accordance with an earlier decision in this regard by the professors and student body. During the rally, representatives of the Lviv Strike Committee announced that they will declare an all-Ukrainian political strike if the military and psychological pressure on Lithuania continues. The following Rukh and UHU leaders addressed the rally participants: Mykhailo Kosiv, Vyacheslav Chornovil, Stepan Khmara, Viktor Furmanov and others.

## Chernivtsi

Despite the relative tolerance of the authorities with regard to these mass rallies, in the western Ukrainian city of Chernivtsi, however, a deplorable incident did occur. Initially, the authorities in Chernivtsi sanctioned the rally, which was scheduled to take place on April 1. After the publication, however, of the decision of the Council of Ministers and the appeal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine regarding demonstrations in support of Lithuania, the local authorities revoked the permit to hold the rally, which resulted in a twoday protest picket, on March 30 and 31. On the day of the rally, Valeriy Kuzmin-the chairman of the local UHU branch in Chernivtsi, and Ihor Kravchuk—a Rukh activist, were detained by the police. Nonetheless, nearly 1,000 people gathered in front of the offices of the regional Party committee, carrying placards and Ukrainian, Lithuanian and Israeli national flags. A representative of the Republic of Lithuania addressed the rally participants. The police surrounded the demonstrators, who were chanting: "Get out of Lithuania!" According to Teofila Yakubovych, a Rukh activist from Chernivtsi, the police moved on the demonstrators, apparently to confiscate the Israeli flag. After a short

clash with the police forces, the demonstrators were able to prevent the authorities from confiscating this flag.

#### Dnipropetrovsk

In the city of Dnipropetrovsk the faithful of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church held a "moleben" (a religious service), after which a short rally in support of Lithuanian independence took place. A resolution was adopted at this rally which condemned Moscow's imperialist policies.

### Vinnytsia

Approximately 1,500 people participated in a rally in defence of Lithuanian independence, which was organized by Rukh, the UHU, and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM). According to Vasyl Pidpryhorshchuk—the chairman of the local UHU chapter, the rally adopted a resolution condemning the colonial policies of Moscow with regard to Ukraine and Lithuania and demanding the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet occupational troops from Lithuanian territory. The resolution also called for the start of negotiations between Vilnius and Moscow and for a referendum on all the peoples' lack of confidence regarding the USSR President and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which recently ratified an anti-Lithuanian resolution.

#### Kryvyi Rih

According to Oleksander Nynik, a rally took place in Kryvyi Rih, attended by 1,500 people, who gathered to voice their support for Lithuanian independence. The rally took place despite threats from local authorities and militia under the command of Major Kozhanov that the rally would be dispersed by force. Nonetheless, the rally took place under many Ukrainian and Lithuanian national flags. The demonstrators carried placards which read: "Lithuanian people—we are with you!" Eduard Krytskyi—a long-time Ukrainian political prisoner, who was recently released—was present at the rally, holding a placard which read: "Glory to the Lithuanian State! Shame on Gorbachev!" The organizers of this rally from the local Donetsk chapters of Rukh, UHU and SNUM were formally charged with violating the Decree on public assemblies and demonstrations. Nearly 1,000 people marched through the streets of this city, carrying national flags and placards. At one point, however, police units blocked the streets.

#### Ivano-Frankivsk

On March 31 more than 20,000 people gathered on the city's central square for a rally in support of Lithuania. People's Deputy Zinoviy Duma and other speakers addressed the participants. The participants adopted a resolution expressing full support for Lithuania.

### Stryi district

On March 31 a public rally in support of Lithuania was held in Stryi, on the square beside the polyclinic. People's Deputy Viktor Romaniuk, Ukrainian Helsinki Union member Volodymyr Heletko and representatives of other informal organizations addressed the participants, who numbered more than 15,000. A resolution in support of Lithuania was accepted at the rally.

#### Ternopil

On March 31 30,000 Ternopil residents took part in a rally in support of Lithuania. The chairman of the city council Zhukov, People's Deputy Bohdan Boyko, Maria Kuzemko, Levko Horokhivskyi and representatives of other independent organizations addressed the participants. During the rally a resolution in support of Lithuania was accepted.

### **Yavoriv** district

On March 31 a rally in support of Lithuania was held on the square beside the building of culture in Novoyavorivsk. The chairman of the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM) Richkovyi, the chairman of the local UHU branch Lubomyr Ivankiv, People's Deputy of the district council Dudianyi addressed the 1,000 or so participants. A resolution calling on the Soviet leadership to recognize the independence of Lithuanian state was adopted.

### Zdolbuniv (Rivne province)

An unsanctioned ecological rally was held here on April 1. The 1,000 participants expressed support for Lithuanian independence, and sent relevant documents to Vilnius and Moscow.

### Zhytomyr

March 31—The city's Gagarin park was the site of a public rally, attended by several thousand people. The participants held slogans stating: "Sajudis—Rukh is with you!", "Throw the last empire on the rubbish heap of history!" and others. After adopting the resolution the participants of the rally formed a column and marched to the Shevchenko monument, where flowers were laid at the foot of the monument. Although the police made no attempts to disrupt the proceedings, they issued a warning to the organizers of the rally, that they will be held legally responsible.

Similar rallies in support of Lithuanian statehood were also held in Khust, Lutsk, Zaporizhia, Mykolayiv and elsewhere. Prior to the rally in the city of Mykolayiv, the organizers were called in to the offices of the local Prosecutor and were told that the rally would be forcibly dispersed by special militia units. Despite such threats, the rally did take place without any major incidents. The rally participants endorsed a resolution in which they voiced their support for the Lithuanian people in their independence aspirations.

The various rallies that were held throughout Ukraine were organized not only to demonstrate the Ukrainian people's solidarity with the Lithuanian people, but also to manifest the lack of confidence in the current regime of the USSR and the Communist Party. According to Serhiy Naboka of the UHU Information Centre in Kyiv, activists from all of Ukraine participated in these mass rallies, representing the aspirations of the entire Ukrainian nation. Naboka stated: "The fact that for the most part the authorities did not attempt to disperse these rallies, demonstrations and actions of gathering signatures to petitions supporting Lithuania, and the fact that the people were not frightened off by the authorities from participating in this mass protest indicates that power is slowly but surely slipping from the hands of yesterday's tyrants".

## Declaration of the Kyiv Rally in Support of Lithuanian Independence March 31, 1990

The reestablishment of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania has angered the government of the USSR and has prompted it to resort to the use of military force so as to compel Lithuania to return into the Soviet empire. The military units in Lithuania have been incrementally increasing in size and have begun to occupy separate strategic points of the independent Lithuanian state. This strategy of incremental occupation is designed to weaken the vigilance of the Lithuanian people and all those who sympathize with it.

Yesterday, on March 30, 1990, the first steps were taken to change the composition of the Government of the Lithuanian state. The deputy Prosecutor-General of the USSR—Vasilyev—arrived in Vilnius, forced the resignation of the Prosecutor of the Lithuanian republic—Paulauskas, and replaced him with his former military Prosecutor from the city of Riga. There are no guarantees that tomorrow the same will not happen to the head of the Lithuanian state.

Having proclaimed a policy of perestroika, the Government of the USSR is trampling underfoot the rights of the Lithuanian people and is resorting to using force, as it did in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. World public opinion has condemned the imperialist policy of the USSR in the last decades. We are now faced with a new flare-up of imperialist contradictions. For this reason we resolutely declare that we unequivocally support the natural aspirations of the Lithuanian people to an independent existence. We are witnesses of how the Lithuanian people from the initial stages of independence have been building a lawful state, guaranteeing equal rights before the law to every citizen, regardless of nationality, religion or political views. These first stages of independent Lithuania raise hopes. The Republic of Lithuania should not fall victim to the bludgeoning strikes of an imperialist power.

We demand from the President of the USSR:

- 1. To immediately withdraw all occupying military forces from Lithuania.
- 2. To terminate all forms of interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Lithuania.
- To have all problems resolved through negotiations, which should begin immediately so as to relieve some of the built-up tension regarding this problem.
- 4. We issue to the President of the USSR our warning that he stands to lose his authority and the confidence of the peoples in the USSR, since his first step in international affairs included the use of bellicose military force.

We will not submit to having the 70-year long imperialist policy of the USSR continue any longer!

Freedom to the Republic of Lithuania! A free Lithuania is our freedom!

## Appeal of the Participants of the Rally in Support of Lithuania, held in Kyiv on March 31, to the Ukrainians of Lithuania

Ukrainians, brothers! Today, history is entering a new era—an Era of Enlightenment and Humanism. Today, the peoples of the world would rather create their own history, their own culture, than to become the material of the realization of imperialist ambitions. Today, mankind recognizes the right of every nation to self-preservation, to sovereignty, to political self-determination and to choose an economic and social system.

The last empire remaining on this planet—the USSR—is crumbling. Yet slavery still survives. It is present in the social injustice, the falsehood and duplicity of the ruling elite. It is present in our slave-like quiescence, our uncertainty, our social myopia. We still succumb to attempts to divide us, so as to rule over us. We still succumb to the lies that divide us.

The freedom-loving people of Lithuania have risen, so as to shatter the chains of slavery and to gain that longed for freedom for themselves and their children living on ancestral Lithuanian lands. This is its sacred right.

Ukrainians! Let us remember the fate of our Nation. We have been striving for our future day in the sun throughout years of grave struggle and oftentimes slavery. Yet, in the conflagrations of history, we never lost our desire to be free, our will to statehood as a guarantee of independence and free development. Hence, it is dishounorable for Ukrainians to stand in the way of the aspirations towards freedom of our fraternal people of Lithuania, as the policy of the Kremlin is leading us.

Ukrainians of Lithuania! The apologists of a "single and indivisible Russia" are trying to use you in their chauvinistic aims, hoping that you have been severed from your native roots. Various political adventurists are still hoping that by sowing discord among peoples they can buttress their prison—the USSR.

Ukrainians of Lithuania! The Lithuanian people welcomed you in their home as equal citizens of the state—a state that today is fighting for the freedom of all the various peoples that live within its borders. Become good and honest citizens of independent Lithuania, the true brothers of the Lithuanian people, the dignified sons and daughters of your great ancestors. Remember that a free Lithuania means a free Ukraine, freedom for all peoples that aspire to be free.

For your and our freedom!

Ratified by the Kyiv Rally in Support for Lithuania March 31, 1990

## Post-Electoral Rally Held in Kyiv Attended by 50,000 People

On March 10 a public meeting was held in Kyiv. Around 50,000 people attended the meeting, organized by the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh). Mykhailo Horyn, chairman of the Rukh Secretariat and recently elected People's Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, led the meeting. The results of the first round of elections were presented to the participants, many of whom then expressed their wishes with regard to the second round to be held on March 18. Decisions were made regarding which individual candidate to support in those constituencies where two candidates remain from the Democratic Bloc.

Many speakers gave examples of gross violations of the electoral process on the part of the authorities. Generally, this meeting did not differ from the previous preelection meetings. It is noteworthy, however, that the participants of this meeting manifested a marked change in their attitude towards the communists. For example, when I. Saliy, the secretary of the Party committee of Kyiv's Podillia district, came to the podium to address the meeting, the participants did not allow him to speak. They shouted: "Aparatchyk! Communist! Thief!" Until recently Saliy had enjoyed a degree of popularity.

## **UKRAINIAN STUDENT ACTIONS**

On the initiative of students of Kyiv and Dnipropetrovsk universities, on the morning of February 20 meetings were held in all institutes of higher education throughout Ukraine. The students demanded the following:

- 1) The abolition of compulsory study of Marxism-Leninism;
- 2) The abolition of KGB control and supervision in all higher education institutes;
- 3) The disbandment of Party committees in the institutes of higher education;
- 4) An increase in student grants to 80 karbovantsi (roubles) a month.

If the Party provincial committee does not meet the demands, a decision will be taken to declare a student strike, the date of which is still to be decided.

## **Lviv Students Hold a Strike**

Lviv—On March 1 students from Lviv University went out on strike in support of their colleagues from Kyiv, who were arrested on February 23. The next day, March 2, they were joined by students from Lviv Polytechnic.

On March 3 the students from Lviv Polytechnic and afterwards students from the city university met with the Minister for Higher Education of the Ukrainian SSR. Dmytro Ostash, a student from Lviv Polytechnic, who is a prospective member of the Ukrainian National Party (UNP), explained the UNP's programme to the Minister. Neither the Minister nor the administration had any remarks about the programme.

On March 5 a student rally, which began at 10:30 a.m., was held in Lviv in support of the students arrested in Kyiv and the striking Lviv students.

The same day, students from Lviv came to Kyiv to protest against the arrest of their colleagues and express their solidarity with the imprisoned students. Among the imprisoned students were two from Kyiv and the following five from Lviv:

- Ihor Kotsiurba, chairman of the Student Brotherhood of Lviv Polytechnic and a member of the UNP (imprisoned for 15 days);
- 2) Oleh Matsyshyn, student from Lviv Polytechnic (10 days);
- 3) Akhmed Hasanov, student from Lviv Polytechnic (15 days);
- Mykola Pokhodzhak, student from the Drohobych Pedagogical Institute (15 days);
- 5) Ostap Sadovyi, student from the Drohobych Pedagogical Institute (15 days).

The arrested students held a hunger strike in protest against their unlawful arrest. The physical condition of two of these students—Ihor Kotsiurba and Oleh Matsyshyn—deteriorated.

The meeting of the student strikers in Lviv on March 5 resolved to continue the strike until the students imprisoned in Kyiv were released.

Moscow, March 5—Ukrainian students organized a picket here in front of the "Moscow Hotel", in which many of the People's Deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR from Ukraine were staying. The picket was organized by the local Rukh branch. The participants of the strike were Ukrainian students studying in Moscow and members of the Moscow Student Club. The picketing students demanded the immediate release of the Kyiv and Lviv students that were arrested earlier in Kyiv. An appeal and a list of demands was forwarded to Yuriy Sorochyk, who is a deputy from Ukraine. Sorochyk reassured the picketing students that he will bring this matter before the forum of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

## Protest Action in Kyiv and Lviv Demand Release of Arrested Students

On March 6 a picket action of the building of the municipal council was held in protest against the unlawful arrest of students on February 22-23. The head of the Rukh Secretariat Mykhailo Horyn, Bohdan Ternopilskyi, Valeriy Hryshchuk (People's Deputy of the USSR), Larysa Skoryk (electoral candidate to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine), 80 representatives of the Lviv students, the Ukrainian Student Association (USS) and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) all participated in the picket. The protesters held Ukrainian national flags and placards with the following slogans: "UHU in support of the student strike!"; "USS opposes the arrests!"; "Kyiv—Wake Up!". The authorities invited Mykhailo Horyn, Bohdan Ternopilskyi and Valeriy Hryshchuk for negotiations, in which the deputy chairman of the Kyiv internal affairs department—Shaposhnykov, the head of the Lenin district department of internal affairs—Kondratiuk and representatives of the municipal council took part. The negotiations lasted an hour and ended with an agreement on the review of the case of the five students, who are still imprisoned. In the event that the students are not released, the picketing will continue.

On March 7, according to the agreement, the case of the arrested students was reviewed and they were released. The students were originally arrested for "violating the law on meetings (public assemblies)". However, three youths, who are not students, remained imprisoned: Chemerys, Yehorov and Shakyrianov. These three individuals are representatives of the Crimean Tartars. For this reason the picket of the municipal council continued, in which members of the Rukh Secretariat, including Mykhailo Horyn, representatives of the UHU, the USS and the Ukrainian Language Society of Taras Shevchenko took part.

#### LVIV

March 7—The student strike and picketing of the provincial headquarters of the Communist Party of Ukraine continued. The demands included: the release of Lviv and Kyiv students, arrested in Kyiv. The placards held by the protesters read: "For a strike to victory!", and "Unity of students in the struggle against the unlawfulness of the authorities!".

## GEN. SHUKHEVYCH AND UKRAINIAN INSURGENT ARMY HONOURED IN BILOHORSHCHA, LVIV PROVINCE

The Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) and the "Heritage" Society organized on Sunday, March 5, a memorial service and public meeting in honour of Roman Shukhevych-Gen. Taras Chuprynka, the commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), on the 40th anniversary of his death.

Shukhevych was killed on March 5, 1950, in a battle with Soviet Russian security forces in the village of Bilohorshcha, southwest of Lviv.

On March 4 a column of several thousand Lviv residents, carrying Ukrainian national flags and the red-and-black flag of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), left for Bilohorshcha, where the memorial service was held. Hieromonk Demian Bohun of the Ukrainian Catholic Church officiated at the service.

The service was followed by a commemorative meeting. The participants were addressed by the leader of the Ukrainian National Party Hryhoriy Prykhodko, who read a letter from the Representation of the Ukrainian National Government of 1941, Shukhevych's son, Yuriy, who returned to Lviv in October 1989 after more than 30 years of imprisonment, former OUN members Olha Ilkiv, Roman Bizhynskyi and Taras Vorobets, Volodymyr Maksymovych, Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) activist Vsevolod Uskiv, Oleh Vitovych of SNUM, and Levko Martyniuk, the head of the "Heritage" Society.

The participants resolved to demand the objective treatment of the activity of the OUN and UPA, the publication of archival documents and banned works about the UPA's struggle for Ukrainian independence against Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in the 1940s and 1950s, the erection of monuments on the graves of UPA soldiers, and the investigation of the crimes of the NKVD, which official history attributes to the UPA.

Gen. Shukhevych's wife and other relatives were among the 6,000 participants.

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army was formed in 1943 by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. It fought against both wartime invaders of Ukraine—Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. The capitulation of Nazi Germany in 1945 did not bring peace to Ukraine. Chuprynka and his troops turned their attention to Moscow and continued the war for Ukrainian independence into the 1950s.

In 1947, Yuriy Shukhevych, a 15-year-old youth, was arrested by the NKVD and was offered his freedom in exchange for a denunciation of his father. He refused and was incarcerated for 10 years. This scenario was repeated two additional times. By the time Shukhevych finally got out of prison in the mid-1970s, the original Ukrainian Helsinki Group was forming and Shukhevych became a founding member. This sent him into prison and exile for a fourth time. In October 1989 he returned to his native Lviv and resumed his national activity.

## UKRAINIANS MOURN VICTIMS OF COMMUNIST TERROR: Demand Outlawing of CPSU and KGB

On 13-17 February the Ukrainian people mourned the victims of the famine in Ukraine of 1932-33 and other victims of communist terror throughout the 70 years of Soviet rule in Ukraine.

On the last day, the people of Lviv individually and in groups went to the building of the KGB, situated on Dzerzhinskyi Street, to the KGB prison at 1 Peace Street, and to the former KGB prison Brygidki (today a deportation prison for criminals), where thousands of people were murdered for political reasons. From 12:00 noon to 3:00 p.m. the people stood in rows with lit candles. Many lit candles were placed in front of the buildings of these institutions. Relatives of victims of secret police terror gave interviews about their murdered family members and the circumstances surrounding their death.

From 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., a rally of mourning was held. Several dozen victims of Party-KGB repression addressed the rally. Among the speakers was Ivan Kandyba—a prominent Ukrainian national activist and jurist, who spent over 20 years in Soviet Russian prisons and concentration camps for promoting the cause of Ukrainian independence. In his address Kandyba stated that Ukrainians were not simply victimized by Stalin and Beria, but by the entire terror apparatus of the CPSU and the KGB. Ukrainians continue to be victimized by this same apparatus to this day, for which Gorbachev and his associates are also to blame. Kandyba underscored his own brutal experiences with the terror apparatus and the fate of his friends—Vasyl Stus, Yuriy Lytvyn, Oleksa Tykhyi and Valeriy Marchenko, who died in labour camps in 1984-85.

He said that Ukrainian national rights activists are still regarded as particularly dangerous state criminals. Most former political prisoners, who are still alive despite their ordeals, have yet to be rehabilitated; they are refused registration in Lviv, and without registration you cannot buy basic goods and commodities. Kandyba expressed his belief that the CPSU and KGB should be declared criminal organizations and should be outlawed and subjected to criminal judicial procedures.

#### UKRAINIANS AGAINST CREATION OF SOVIET PRESIDENCY

IVANO-FRANKIVSK—On March 3, Levko Lukianenko, the Chairman of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) and recently elected People's Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, while campaigning here stated the following: "I am categorically against the introduction of a presidential form of rule, since, as a form of government, it differs from a parliamentary form of government in that it is more centralized.

In democratic countries, such as the USA or France, a presidential form of government precludes frequent governmental crises. In these countries, however, there exists a mechanism of control of executive power in addition to well established democratic traditions. In the USSR, with its one-party system, no precedents exist of cooperation between the ruling government and democratic parties and organizations; a system of checks and balances, particularly of executive power, is lacking. For that reason it would be dangerous to unite in one person the functions of the head of state and the head of government, since this may lead to a brutal dictatorship. We cannot simply depend on the personal attributes of Gorbachev. Until several political parties are formed and until we gain experience of inter-party struggles and resolution of conflicts, I believe that an introduction of a presidential form of government would be unwise".

Earlier, on February 28, a meeting of the municipal branch of the Ukrainian Popular Movement (Rukh) in Ivano-Frankivsk took place. One of the resolutions adopted at this meeting states the following: "We are categorically against the introduction of a presidential form of government in the USSR as long as a oneparty system continues to exist and until a new Union treaty will be enforced". A telegram with a similar message was sent by the participants of this meeting to the Constitutional Committee and to the People's Deputies of the USSR from Ukraine—Tkachuk and Pavlychko. Over two thousand members of the Ivano-Frankivsk branch of Rukh called upon the activists of independent public organizations of the republic and the wider strata of Ukrainian society to protest against the introduction of a new position in the Kremlin leadership. A similar resolution was adopted by the participants of a local UHU meeting held in Ivano-Frankivsk on March 2.

### UKRAINIAN HELSINKI UNION HOLDS CONFERENCE IN KYIV

The Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) held an academic-theoretical conference in Kyiv Polytechnic on March 17. Nearly 130 UHU activists, representing UHU branches throughout all of Ukraine, participated in the conference.

The goal of the conference was to discuss the present political situation in Ukraine, the state of affairs in the UHU with regard to this situation, the UHU's future tactics, the possibility of transforming the UHU into a political party at the next congress (in April, 1990) and to formulate a draft programme and statutory by-laws for this new party.

After Mykola Horbal—a member of the UHU Executive Committee—opened the conference, Levko Lukianenko—the UHU Chairman—addressed the participants. Lukianenko presented an analysis of Soviet totalitarianism, the future development of which will inevitably lead to its self-annulment. He underscored the present position of most Russians, who are against the dissolution of the empire (the separation of Ukraine), although they regard themselves as "democrats". According to Lukianenko, the UHU must try to pursue its goals through its members in other organizations (e.g., Rukh, "Memorial", The Ukrainian Language Society), particularly with regard to the electoral campaign, and in various mass patriotic assemblies, such as the recent commemoration of Ukrainian Unity Day on January 21, 1990. Lukianenko stated that the UHU membership has neglected its organizational work, which has directly led to stagnation, the emergence of splinter groups, to a loss of the UHU's political influence in some regions, to a stunting of the growth of the UHU's membership (1,500 members).

Lukianenko also addressed himself to the recently published Rukh appeal, which proposed that Rukh be transformed into a separate party and that the Communist Party of Ukraine be severed from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and transformed into a separate leftist-democratic party. He voiced his belief that the UHU should support those Ukrainian communists that want to break away from Moscow and who support the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, disregarding the utopian tenets in communist ideology. This is why, Lukianenko explained, he and Mykhailo Horyn sat behind the same table with Ukrainian communists and signed this appeal. Lukianenko stated, however, that the notion of transforming Rukh into a separate party is absurd, since Rukh unites people of various political persuasions. Rukh and other populist organizations were founded to raise the people's awareness, to unite on a general platform all those that are not yet ready to accept the UHU's more radical positions. Presently, this is an epoch of "fronts", Lukianenko said, and with the subsequent development of a multi-party system in Ukraine, Rukh's role will diminish.

M. Horyn was the next speaker to address the conference. He also spoke at length on the UHU's tactics with regard to Rukh, to Ukrainian communists-

intellectuals who are democratically inclined. Horyn also spoke critically of the leaders of the Lviv Strike Committee, who he believes are too uncompromising, and are pursuing a sectist position, thereby doing damage to the cause. At this point in Horyn's speech, Stepan Khmara and other participants began shouting that Horyn's analysis is incorrect and that his tactics have led to the decline in the UHU's organizational activity, while communists have taken over the leadership of the Lviv branch of Rukh. Horyn replied that the essence of politics is to make friends of one's enemies, and that the UHU is a means of effectuating the goal of Ukrainian statehood. He continued by saying that the UHU is a confederative organization and that it is the responsibility of the local branches to carry out their functions and responsibilities, when the central organs cannot do so.

After Horyn's speech, Volodymyr Yavorskyi read a letter from Vyacheslav Chornovil to the delegates of the conference. He also explained his vision of the UHU as a political party to be named the Party of Ukrainian Statehood (PUD), outlining the basic tenets of his draft programme. Other speakers proposed that the new party be called the Ukrainian Democratic Party.

Another speaker, Larysa Lokhvytska, spoke of the need for spirituality in the life of the individual and of the need for religion. She underscored the various problems facing the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Stepan Khmara later spoke on the struggle of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, underscoring the tension between Catholics and Orthodox Ukrainians and the manoeuvrings of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine. Khmara's speech was considered to be somewhat controversial by some of the delegates.

Following a lengthy discussion of Lukianenko's and Horyn's presentations, all the delegates agreed that it is necessary to continue organizing mass assemblies, such as the commemoration of January 21. The delegates also agreed that one cannot be a member of several parties, if one is already a member of the UHU.

The conference participants adopted a resolution which obliges the UHU leadership to call a UHU Congress no later than April of this year and to begin making preparations to transform the UHU into a mass opposition party. A separate appeal regarding the religious situation in Ukraine was also adopted, calling for a peaceful resolution of all religious conflicts in Ukraine (see below). The conference participants also decided to forward a telegram to Mikhail Gorbachev, protesting against Moscow's interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Lithuania. A separate appeal to the people of Lithuania was adopted, in which the participants voice their support of the decision of the Lithuanian parliament to proclaim the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian republic.

The following day, March 18, a meeting of the All-Ukrainian Coordinating Council of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union was held in Kyiv Polytechnic. The Council decided to call the UHU Congress on April 29-30. The Preparatory Committee for the Congress is headed by Petro Borsuk. A rather animated debate took place regarding a proposal to change the UHU's name to the "Ukrainian Democratic-Christian Union/Party".

In a separate matter, the Coordinating Council accepted Vyacheslav Chornovil's resignation from the UHU Executive Committee.

## Thesis to the Programme of the Party of Ukrainian Statehood (PUD), to be founded on the basis of the UHU

- 1. Primary goal—the secession of Ukraine from the USSR and the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state.
- 2. The methods by which this goal is to be effectuated should avoid any form of violence and should be based on a wide campaign of agitation and propaganda among the population of Ukraine with the aim of raising the people's awareness as to the idea of Ukrainian statehood.
- 3. The independent Ukrainian state must be democratic on all levels, meaning that a multi-party structure and a pluralist system of social relations must be instituted. The economy of the independent Ukrainian state should be based on private property and free enterprise.
- 4. The Marxist-Leninist ideology is inhuman and anti-democratic in its very essence.
- 5. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) is the major roadblock in the restructuring of the Soviet Union.
- 6. The activity of the CPSU during its reign of power is considered to be a crime against the peoples of the USSR. Consequently, a general inquiry into the crimes of the communist rulers must be undertaken, with the subsequent judicial prosecution of all those that are responsible for these crimes.
- 7. The Communist Party of Ukraine never defended the interests of the Ukrainian people. On the contrary, it always acted against these interests and, as a subordinate branch of the CPSU, it methodically destroyed the very foundations of the Ukrainian nation. Presently, the role of the Communist Party of Ukraine is reactionary.
- 8. The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) are regarded as forces that defended Ukraine's freedom against fascist and communist tyranny.
- 9. The ideology of Ukrainian nationalism, with a certain reevaluation, is considered to be the basis of the ideology of the Party of Ukrainian Statehood. The reevaluation of this ideology should be undertaken with a view towards filtering out any elements of totalitarianism. PUD should formulate its actual political

concepts on the basis of the ideology of Ukrainian nationalism.

- 10. PUD members cannot be members of other political organizations.
- 11. PUD members can be members of other public organizations only when this does not interfere with their work in the party.
- 12. All citizens of Ukraine may become members of PUD, regardless of nationality, on the condition that they recognize the programme of the party and aspire towards the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state. Ideology, not nationality, is the determining factor.
- 13. PUD should have a clear organizational structure, based on a territorial principle and a strong sense of discipline.
- 14. The members of PUD have the right to voice any form of criticism of party activities.
- 15. The PUD executive organs will be elected on a yearly basis during conferences or general meetings.

March 11, 1990

## Appeal of the UHU on Religious Relations in Ukraine

Having listened to addresses and discussed the issue of religious relations in Ukraine the UHU conference

- --resolves that the democratization of society assists in the activization of religious life in Ukraine, which we regard as a positive fact;
- --regards that the renaming of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine to Ukrainian Orthodox Church does not alter its imperialist direction, resulting from its administrative dependence on the Moscow Patriarch;
- —notices that the pro-imperialist forces in Ukraine and, in particular, the Kyivan Exarchate, are using various methods to halt the process of the revival of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in eastern Ukraine, to disunite Catholic and Orthodox Ukrainians in western Ukraine, and to worsen relations between them in order to create the basis for the spread of its Church and with its help to halt the revival of the national consciousness of the Ukrainian people;
- --recognizes that in western Ukraine the authorities are fuelling religious conflict;
- —is disturbed by the religious conflict, which diverts the attention of a marked number of the Ukrainian people from the main problem—the struggle for Ukrainian independence;
- --promotes an educational programme in schools and adult evening classes based on the law of God and religious history, perceiving in this education not only one of the most powerful means to revive traditional Ukrainian popular morals, but also a way to achieve a peaceful understanding between people of different

religious persuasions;

--sees the future independent Ukraine as a civilized, democratic republic, which will defeat the basis of fanaticism and will base its laws on religious life on the article from the General Declaration on Human Rights: "Every individual has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes the freedom to change his religion or beliefs, both individually and collectively, by public or private means...".

The UHU conference, in bringing to the attention of the Ukrainian people the latest manifestation of Russian imperialism—the gross violation of the right of Lithuanians to constitutional secession from the USSR—calls for tolerance and a lessening of religious quarrels for the sake of the unity of the people in the struggle for an independent Ukraine.

Let us first of all put our great house in order!

Kyiv, March 17, 1990

## UKRAINIANS REFUSING TO SERVE IN SOVIET ARMY OUTSIDE UKRAINE

#### Kyiv, March 25

The Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM) organized a public protest meeting against military service by Ukrainian citizens outside the Ukrainian republic. More than 1,000 people attended the meeting, which was held outside the "Arsenal" factory. Loudspeakers turned on to full blast, played military marches with the aim of disrupting the meeting, outside the headquarters of the Kyiv military command. Approximately ninety policemen from the special units observed the meeting from a distance.

The speakers addressed the issue of the formation of a professional national army in Ukraine. After the meeting the participants formed a column and marched with Ukrainian national flags to the centre of the city. The police made no attempt to disrupt the meeting. Similar meetings were held by the "Darnytsia" underground station and the student town.

## FOURTH SESSION OF RUKH SUPREME COUNCIL Held in Khust

#### Khust (Transcarpathia)

On March 24 the Supreme Council of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) held its fourth session, which convened on the 51st anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state.

The first half of the session was dedicated to the historic events, which occurred in the Carpathian region of Ukraine 51 years ago. The session was opened by Rukh chairman—Ivan Drach (People's Deputy), who pointed out that although the session was convened on the anniversary of this historic event, only the first half would be dedicated to it. In the second half attention would be paid to discussing the questions concerning the declaration of the Rukh leadership and the idea of the creation of a new political party, based on the Rukh platform.

Several speakers addressed the Council during the commemorative part of the sessions, specifically B. Yakymovych, Yu. Slyvka, H. Demian, P. Chuchka and P. Fedak. The speakers outlined the historic course of Carpathian Ukraine from ancient times to the contemporary era.

After an intermission, Dmytro Pavlychko addressed the participants. He stressed the urgent need to transform Rukh into a political party and announced his resignation from the CPSU, which was greeted by the session's participants with loud rounds of applause.

Following Pavlychko's address, the following People's Deputies of Ukraine spoke before the session: Levko Lukianenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU); Vyacheslav Chornovil, chairman of the Ukrainian Independent Publishing-Information Association (UNVIS) and the UHU Press Service, Stepan Khmara, member of the Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, and Serhiy Konev. They all pointed out that to transform a mass movement like Rukh into a single political party is inappropriate and even impossible. After a lengthy discussion, the Supreme Council resolved not to convene an extraordinary Rukh Congress, which would transform the Popular Movement into a political party.

The session also approved an appeal to the Lithuanian people and to all the peoples of the USSR, in which the Supreme Council of Rukh expressed support for the Lithuanian people in their aspiration for independence. Concurrently, the Popular Movement of Ukraine condemned the decree of the third Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and relevant decrees of the USSR President for violating Lithuanian sovereignty.

Ecological issues, particularly the consequences of the Chornobyl tragedy, were also discussed in some length by the participants.

### Resolution of the Fourth Session of the Supreme Council of the Popular Movement of Ukraine for restructuring

#### To the Lithuanian republic and all the peoples of the USSR

The fourth session of the Supreme Council of Rukh, which was held in the city of Khust, Transcarpathian province, on the occasion of the 51st anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Ukrainian state of Carpatho-Ukraine, warmly welcomes the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian republic on the reestablishment of an independent Lithuanian state and its return to the family of the independent states of the world.

We are aware that the democratic parliamentary way is the only true way to freedom and independence for every people, whose sovereign rights are being suppressed even to this day. We stand in solidarity with the Lithuanian people in their struggle for freedom. We are convinced that the decision to proclaim independence is not directed against any other state, any other people of the USSR, or any other nationality, which resides in Lithuania.

The Popular Movement of Ukraine for restructuring considers the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian republic legally elected in complete accordance with the existing law of Lithuania and the USSR. Therefore, the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian republic is the true representative of its state sovereignty and of the sovereignty of the Lithuanian people. Decisions of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian republic are lawful from the point of view of international law.

The Popular Movement of Ukraine for restructuring condemns the decrees of the third Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and relevant decrees of the President of the USSR regarding the legality of the actions of the highest organ of Lithuanian state power and regards measures of union organs as such that violate the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian people and infringe upon the state sovereignty of the Lithuanian republic. All questions, which emerged in the relations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union should be resolved through peaceful negotiations on the basis of the principles and norms of international law.

The Popular Movement of Ukraine for restructuring supports the acts of the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian republic, directed towards the consolidation of state independence.

Long Live the Independent Lithuanian State! Long Live the Freedom-Loving Lithuanian People! May God help you!

> March 24, 1990 Khust

### Decree of the Fourth Session of the Supreme Council of the Popular Movement of Ukraine, Regarding the 51st Anniversary of the Carpatho-Ukrainian State

The Proclamation of an independent Carpatho-Ukrainian state on March 15, 1939, was one of the expressions of the realization of the natural right of the Ukrainian nation to self-determination and the establishment of a national sovereign state.

Regardless of the short duration of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state's existence, surrounded by countries that were continuously encroaching on ancestral Ukrainian lands, the role of this state was considerable in the future process of state-building of a united, independent Ukraine. The aspirations of the Ukrainian people to unity were again manifested throughout all of Ukraine's lands, which for centuries had been separated by political borders.

One of the most important lessons to be learnt from the experience of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state is that political stability in Europe is impossible without a just resolution of the Ukrainian question, particularly in light of the fact that Ukraine is a large Slavic and European nation. This conclusion has remained appropriate up to the present day, when the establishment of a peaceful European home is being discussed.

On the basis of several presentations, which were discussed by the session of the Supreme Council of the Popular Movement of Ukraine, the Council decrees:

- 1. That March 15, 1939, is to be regarded as a national holiday of all Ukrainian people, because that date marks the partial realization of the Ukrainian people's aspirations, formerly expressed on January 22, 1919, on St. Sophia Square, when the lands of Halychyna, Bukovyna, Transcarpathia and naddniprianshchyna were united into one state;
- 2. To condemn any attempt to implicate the government of the Carpatho-Ukrainian State in collaboration with Hitler's Germany, Hungary, Poland or Rumania, as historically false and anti-Ukrainian, particularly in light of the fact that the government of this state had the unreserved right to enter into negotiations in the interests of its people, insofar as it was given this mandate and the Ukrainian people's full support, which was confirmed by the democratic elections of February 12, 1939, to the Parliament of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state;
- 3. The liquidation of the Carpatho-Ukrainian state in its embryonic form was the result of the collusion of several external forces—Hungary, Germany, Poland and the USSR, which wanted to see Ukraine remain a colony and were never interested in the reestablishment of Ukrainian statehood or sovereignty over Ukrainian lands that were subjugated by neighbouring imperialist states;

- 4. To demand that the authorities of the Ukrainian SSR officially reevaluate the way that they have treated the events of 1938-39 in Carpathian Ukraine, to rehabilitate all the participants of the liberation struggle, to enshrine the memory of the fallen heroes who fell in battle defending the freedom and independence of their nation, to erect in Khust a monument dedicated to the first president of the republic—Avhustyn Voloshyn, to guarantee that these events will receive objective treatment in the history courses in high schools and universities. To call upon the appropriate institutions to immediately dismiss those who continue to falsify the events in Ukraine during the era of its struggle for statehood.
- 5. To direct all the organizations in Rukh to begin a campaign, explaining to the population of Ukraine the significance of these events.

Ivan Drach—Chairman of the Popular Movement of Ukraine Mykhailo Horyn—Chairman of the Rukh Secretariat

### UKRAINIAN NATIONAL FLAG RAISED OVER LVIV CITY HALL

On April 2, 1990, the organizational session of the council of the Shevchenko region of Lviv began its work. Prior to the opening of the session, the deputies sang the Ukrainian national anthem. At the same time a Ukrainian national flag was raised over the office building of the regional Executive Committee, which also houses the offices of the regional Party Committee.

In a festive and yet commemorative atmosphere, on April 3 the Ukrainian national flag was raised over the Lviv City Hall. The newly-elected city council in their first official act passed a resolution requiring the national flag of Ukraine to be officially raised over the city of Lviv. The residents of Lviv have been anxiously waiting for this first session since the recent elections in March. Everyone in the city knew that the newly-elected city council, in which the Democratic Bloc has an overwhelming majority, would pass such a resolution as its first official act. 130 deputies voted for the resolution, while only 5 voted against.

The flag was consecrated by bishops of the Ukrainian Catholic Church prior to the flag-raising ceremony. Before the session deliberation began (at 1:00 p.m.), a large throng of people, numbering tens of thousands, gathered on the square before the city council. The colour guard and flag-bearers, dressed in Ukrainian national costumes, were standing outside the City Hall ready to raise the flag, while the session was deliberating.

Stepan Khmara—a People's Deputy to the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet—submitted the resolution, in which it was stated that by raising the national Ukrainian flag, the red flag must be taken down, since it was forced on Ukraine during the Stalinist period, and to do otherwise would violate the Ukrainian people's national dignity. Given the present state of affairs, this proposition was regarded as unacceptable. Instead, the deputies decided that the national blue-and-yellow flag of Ukraine will be raised over City Hall, while the red-and-blue flag of the Ukrainian SSR will be raised at the start of the city council's sessions in the chamber. It was also decided that in Lviv the national flag is to be proclaimed legal and that during all national holidays and official commemorations the national flag is to be accorded a status equal to that of the state flag of the Ukrainian SSR. Many deputies argued against this last clause which would require the national flag to be raised during state-sponsored holidays, which would mock the name and dignity of the Ukrainian people.

In a separate resolution, the deputies also decided to legalize the "Trident"—the national symbol of Ukraine and Ukraine's national anthem—"Ukraine has not died". Moreover, the city council obligated the People's Deputies to the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet from the Lviv region to introduce legislation at the first session of the Supreme Soviet that this body officially recognize the Trident and the Ukrainian national flag as symbols of Ukraine.

After the deliberations and the ratification of these resolutions, the deputies and invited guests went out to the masses gathered outside the city council building. Rostyslav Bratun—a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR from Ukraine—in his address before the commemorative rally said that the Ukrainian national flag is not only being raised over City Hall, but in the hearts of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians as well. "This is a moment when Ukraine is embarking on a course towards sovereignty", stated Bratun. He expressed his hope that the time will soon come when blue-and-yellow banners will be raised over the whole territory of a sovereign Ukrainian state as a symbol of Ukrainian statehood. Thousands of Ukraine's sons and daughters fell in the struggle to raise this flag. At the end of his address, Bratun called for a moment of silence in remembrance of Ukraine's heroes.

The next address was delivered by Mykhailo Horyn—the Chairman of the Rukh Secretariat and a People's Deputy to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. He said that the Ukrainian national flag is now being raised over all of Ukraine as a symbol of national liberation. He continued by saying that the democratic wing of the Ukrainian parliament will have a greater ability to defend the ideas of truth and freedom with the people's support, as manifested in such mass rallies as this one in Lviv. He also informed the rally participants that the recent session of the regional council of the Zalishchyky region resolved to take down the bust of Lenin in the chamber. All the deputies considered their decision in this regard to be an appropriate and long-awaited step towards justice.

The chairman of the Russian Society of Andrey Sakharov—M. Sergeyev, said in his address that the leading groups of the Russian intelligentsia share this happy moment with the Ukrainian people and that it believes that the time has come to

70

raise the Russian national flag in the capital of an independent, democratic Russian state, instead of the present imperialist flag.

Among the other speakers that addressed the rally were Stepan Khmara and Vyacheslav Chornovil—both People's Deputies to the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet. While the national flag was being raised over Lviv's City Hall, the choir of the "Lev" Society sang the Ukrainian national anthem together with the rally participants.

## "UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE AND STATEHOOD" New All-Ukrainian Political Association Formed

On Saturday and Sunday, April 7-8, 147 representatives of nearly all the formal and informal organizations and parties, among them the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), the Ukrainian Language Society (TUM), the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), the Ukrainian National Party (UNP), the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front (UCDF), the Memorial Society, the Lev Society, the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth (SNUM), and the Ukrainian Catholic Church, as well as guests from Byelorussia, Lithuania, and Latvia, including 67 registered delegates from all regions of Ukraine, gathered in Lviv for the Founding Congress of a new all-Ukrainian political association—"Ukrainian Independence and Statehood" (DSU). Representatives of the World Ukrainian Liberation Front from Canada were also present at the Congress.

Oles Tsaruk, chairman of the Ukrainian Youth Club in Riga, Latvia, presided over the Congress. The podium was decorated with portraits of prominent figures in Ukraine's struggle for national statehood, from Prince Volodymyr the Great, King Danylo of Halych and Hetman Ivan Mazepa to Mykola Mikhnovskyi, Symon Petliura, Yevhen Konovalets, Stepan Bandera and Roman Shukhevych, a Trident (the national symbol of Ukraine), the blue-and-yellow Ukrainian national flag and the red-and-black flag of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN).

Dmytro Duzhyi, a veteran of the national-liberation movement in western Ukraine, an editor of the underground journal "Ideya i Chyn" (Idea and Deed), and former political prisoner of Polish, Nazi and Soviet Russian concentration camps, opened the Congress. This was followed by the singing of the hymn of the Ukrainian nationalists and a *moleben* (religious service) conducted by a Ukrainian Catholic priest, who blessed the participants and the national symbols.

The agenda included: endorsing the statement of the Initiative Group for the establishment of the DSU, chaired by Ivan Kandyba—a Ukrainian jurist and a former political prisoner, the presentation and discussion of the programme and statutes of the DSU, the acceptance of membership of the new association, the election of the executive organs, and the ratification of resolutions.

The Founding Congress ratified a series of documents and resolutions, including appeals to the Ukrainian people regarding the formation of national Ukrainian armed forces, to Lithuania, to the Ukrainian diaspora, to the people of Ukraine, as well as a resolution concerning the "Law on Languages".

The DSU is planning to publish a journal entitled "Samostiynist", or "Nezalezhnist" (Independence), and a newspaper "Poklyk Voli" (The Call of Freedom). Anatoliy Lupynis proposed that in the meantime DSU make use of his publication "Cherkaski Visti" (Cherkasy News). Anatoliy Ilchenko and Oles Tsaruk of the DSU were elected to the editorial board of this publication.

The Founding Congress elected a Provisional Council, which is to direct the association's activities until the convention of a Congress of DSU members, to be held in a few months time. The Council consists of the following persons: Ivan Kandyba, chairman; Petro Duzhyi, honorary member; Yaroslav Durda, Anatoliy Dotsenko, Mykhailo Kotak, Zenoviy Krasivskyi, Anatoliy Lupynis, Iryna Senyk, Oles Tsaruk, Daria Husiak, Anatoliy Ilchenko, Ihor Bondar, Taras Semeniuk, Taras Bilchuk, Myroslav Dziuban, Liudmyla Zyltsova (chairman of the Ukrainian community in Lithuania)—members.

The resolutions of the Founding Congress stipulate the goals of the newlyformed political organization as follows: "the political association DSU has set as its goal to propagate, together with other Ukrainian organizations and parties, the necessity of and to struggle by every peaceful means for an independent Ukrainian state as the only possible form of existence of the Ukrainian nation".

#### **STATEMENT**

## of the Initiative Group for the Establishment of the Association Ukrainian Independence and Statehood (DSU) 20 March 1990

Realizing that all the misfortunes, which brought our people to economic, ecological and cultural ruin, were caused by many years of existence within the Russian and Soviet empires, we, the participants of the opposition movement of the 1940s, 60s and 80s, have resolutely decided to demand the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state through peaceful means. Only an independent Ukrainian State will end the spiritual degradation of our people, the economic and ecological crises, and return our people to the ranks of the free states of the world. To avoid dissipating the patriotic forces, we have reached the conclusion that it is necessary to establish the association—Ukrainian Independence and Statehood, whose task would be to mobilize the people for the establishment of an independent state—the sole possible form of existence for the Ukrainian people. We call on our fellow countrymen and women, who realize the reasons for all our misfortunes and calamities, to unite with us and together establish the political association-----Ukrainian Independence and Statehood.

The Initiative Group of the association-Ukrainian Independence and Statehood

Chairman Ivan Kandyba

Oles Tsaruk Stepan Balinskyi Members Anatoliy Dotsenko Yaroslav Durda

Anatoliy Lupynis Ihor Bondar

#### APPEAL

### of the All-Ukrainian Founding Congress of "Ukrainian Independence and Statehood"

#### People of Ukraine!

You are living in trying and uncertain times, full of a sense of danger. No one knows what the near future will bring.

Everyone has lost faith in the imperialist centre, although some fear speaking about this openly, having learned from past painful experiences.

Who are we to believe, knowing that the people are presently uplifted with a hope in a brighter future?

Yet, life itself teaches us that one must fight for one's future.

Do not expect to be treated humanely, fairly and mercifully by those who have long since made a mockery of the principles of equality and brotherhood, having trampled these principles underfoot.

Where are we to seek advice in this difficult moment?

Seek advice in history, it is the best teacher, since history alone teaches us about life. Through history we learn about our glorious and great, as well as painful and tragic past.

Our enemy will tremble in fear as we begin to develop a historical memory. He does not want you to have a historical memory. He is happy, when you begin to sink in forgetfulness. He exerted considerable effort, so that you not know your past and learn about it only from what he tells you.

"Why should you", our enemy tells us, "trouble yourselves about the old times of Ukraine? Will you be satiated when you learn about the golden age of Kyiv, about the Kyivan and Halych-Volyn states, or, finally, about the Zaporizhian Sich, about the Kozaks, or the hetmans, who—except for Khmelnytskyi, were 'traitors of the people'"?

Our enemy argues, in trying to convince us: "You do not need to search for your

roots in the past. Have it emblazoned in your mind that your true glorious history begins in 1917, from the month of November, or—if we are talking about Soviet Ukraine, freed by communism—then start with December of 1917".

Your enemy, together with those Ukrainian historians that have sold out Ukraine, have rewritten the history of Ukraine. All of this history is covered with whole blank areas—black, and white, and bloody... There are many lies in this history, and no truth. Yet, you remain silent, because you walk in terror all the time. Perhaps you are too humble and do not want to insult your enemy. This, however, is just what he wants...

You throw yourself about, as a fish out of water; you seek that meadow where the truth is blossoming. Seek it out in your own meadow. Grasp in your hands, as your father instructed you, that most precious of books—the "Kobzar".

You will read there what our greatest Genius and national Prophet—Taras Shevchenko once wrote. He began his poem—"The Desecrated Grave" with the following words of agony:

> "Peaceful world, dear country, My Ukraine! Why have you been ravaged, Why are you dying?"

Think for a moment about these words: do we not have reason to ask the same question today, as we are approaching the gates of our third millennium? Have the words of our Bard, so filled with filial love for his Mother-Ukraine, lost their relevance today?

In 1917, when the tsarist "prison of nations" was torn asunder, people's hearts were filled with the happiness of hope and new expectations. Then Ukraine had its bright day in the sun. Our fathers and grandfathers rose up and awakened from their long slumber. They knew that they must begin building a new life, although they were still afraid to take determined steps. Finally, they came to their senses and began building their own home—a Ukrainian state "without masters, without slaves, violence and evil...".

They began building a state—a national, democratic republic, not having any pretensions on even a small plot of foreign soil; they built this state in such a way, that all its citizens could find a happy life for themselves in it.

Those among them who were more practical and experienced in the ways of life argued: there is turmoil everywhere in the world, and hence we must be prepared to defend our young state from all invaders, which requires our own army.

Others thought differently: "why do we need a large army, or any army for that matter? Are we not fighting for socialism and are not our neighbours to the north fighting for the same thing? Why should we not be able to forge an agreement with them?" These unwise enthusiasts soon became bitterly disillusioned. The sun shone brightly for a short time, while a new storm was brewing. Black clouds from the north covered our land. In place of the recently demolished tsarist "prison of nations" the new red tyrants began building a new prison, that was to become a hundred times more brutal and which continues to terrorize people to the present day.

Many people continued to hope, forcing themselves to believe that somehow we will be able to live in peace with our northern neighbours. These hopes were proven false. Many intelligent people shared such beliefs and even helped the red tyrants to do their black deeds. These people were not foreigners, but our Ukrainians: Skrypnyk, Zatonskyi and a 22-year-old young man, the son of a writer—Kotsiubynskyi—were all bought and even became members of the so-called Ukrainian Soviet government. Many years passed and those who were faithful to the colonizer had to pay a very high price for their service: before his arrest in 1933 Skrypnyk committed suicide; Kotsiubynskyi was killed by "Cheka" agents in 1937; and sometime later Zatonskyi was executed in prison.

"You, Ukrainians, will not last for one day without us, without our intelligent leadership",—we were told and are still being told by the communist partocrats. Lenin—the super-tyrant that first let loose on God's world this blatant lie, supported these claims; he emblazoned on our souls with hot iron rods the notion that: "without us, without the 'assistance' of the working class, there can be no thought of a free Ukraine". This far-fetched insinuation hung over our people as a black curse and the intellects of many of those that have sold out are still afflicted by it.

A lie will always be a lie. Upon learning of the "beneficence" of the bloody red dictatorship, those people, that are still capable of thinking with their own intellects, who are not closed-minded, are asking themselves: why cannot Ukraine live its own, separate existence, independent from Moscow? France, for example, can live. Italy also. Even Luxembourg, with its small territory and population. They are independent states, yet we, Ukrainians, in the view of the imperialists, have not yet matured to establish a state and we are incapable of living without Moscow's "assistance".

Other nations, European and non-European peoples, even those that only yesterday walked in colonial slavery—all of them are living better and more productively than us after having established their own independent states.

Have our brothers, duped and confused by the liars and cheats of the KGB, become so cold and blind so as not to see that Moscow is mercilessly exploiting us, like that highwayman on a crossroads? Cannot our fellow Ukrainians understand that all forms of exploitation, of illegality would not exist among us if the Ukrainian people lived in their own state, not dependent on anyone? Finally, is it so difficult for every one of us to understand that, which the African peoples, recently liberated from colonial oppression, fully understand?!

What have the last seventy years of red dictatorship brought our nation?

First, we were given the horrific genocide. Over 7 million of our people were liquidated under the shadows of blood-soaked flags in an organized, artificial famine.

We were given mass executions of innocent people in Kyiv, Odessa, Lviv, Lutsk, Vinnytsia, Zolochiv, Uman, Sambir, Stryi, Dnipropetrovsk, Ivano-Frankivsk and in many other cities and villages.

We were given the complete destruction of the Ukrainian intelligentsia—of our scholars, writers, adherents of religious cults, and cultural activists.

We were given an extreme form of exploitation of our workers, farmers, and intellectuals.

We were given rivers of blood from our Ukrainian sons and daughters in foreign territories in the name of insatiable Russian-communist, imperialist interests.

We were given a planned Russification of our entire population and were left bereft of our language.

Our educational system and the achievements of our nation were destroyed.

We were given blackmail, provocations, and the desecration of everything we held sacred.

One can continue listing the innumerable crimes committed against our nation, but this is enough to say to the imperialists—to the usurpers—NO!

Stop building nuclear reactors and other dangerous enterprises in Ukraine; stop expropriating our natural and national resources.

Stop destroying our people with new Chornobyls; stop killing us with radiation; stop sentencing to death entire generations.

Stop turning our land into a desert for hundreds of thousands of years.

Stop polluting our waters and our air with fatally dangerous chemicals.

Stop dictating to us our will, our life.

Having found itself in a difficult economic situation, Moscow continues to try to pacify us with new promises: limited sovereignty, illusory economic independence, establishment of a new federative union, etc.

Even an animal will not take the bait and will avoid a trap after being caught once before.

We, however, are not animals. We are human beings, we are the ancestral masters of our land.

Will we continue to allow the imperialists to oppress us?

All nations, that were victimized by Russian communist imperialism, are seeking to escape from the clutches of the colonizers. They want to live freely, without foreign "tutelage", without the Kremlin's rule. All nations, which are fighting for their freedom, for independent statehood, are our friends.

We are for friendship with all nations, including the Russian nation, which will build its happiness on its ethnographic lands.

The only guarantee of life, development and prosperity is a Sovereign and Independent Ukrainian State.

Freedom and independence for all nations! Peace and cooperation between all peoples! Glory to Independent and Sovereign Ukraine!

Lviv, 8 April 1990

#### To the Ukrainian Diaspora

#### **AN APPEAL**

We, the participants of the Founding All-Ukrainian Congress of the association—Ukrainian Independence and Statehood (DSU), have resolved to initiate a peaceful struggle for the transformation of the so-called Ukrainian SSR into an independent Ukrainian state as the only possible form of existence for our people. We are convinced that only the withdrawal of Soviet occupational forces from Ukraine will end the many years of Russification, the plunder of our natural resources and the merciless exploitation of our intellectual forces.

The transformation of the Ukrainian SSR into an independent state will eliminate the reasons for the emigration of Ukrainians: our homeland will become the native mother of all its citizens. We realize that an Independent Ukraine can only be established through our mutual cooperation. The struggle for Ukraine should become the daily business of every Ukrainian in Ukraine and beyond its borders. The time has come for us all to tell mankind that we no longer wish to see Ukraine a colony, but a free state. This is our sacred right, and the struggle for this right—our patriotic duty.

Glory to Ukraine!

Lviv, 8 April 1990

#### To His Excellency the President of Lithuania Vytautas Landsbergis Vilnius, Lithuania

We, the participants of the General All-Ukrainian Congress of the political association—Ukrainian Independence and Statehood (DSU), greet you and the freedom-loving Lithuanian people you represent with the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

We wish the Lithuanian people good fortune and prosperity in the ranks of the free states of the world.

1. Glory to the courageous and freedom-loving Lithuanian people!

- 2. Long live independent Lithuania!
- 3. May the friendship between Lithuania and Ukraine become stronger!

Lviv, 8 April 1990

#### To the Ukrainian People

#### **AN APPEAL**

We, the participants of the Founding All-Ukrainian Congress of the association Ukraine Independence and Statehood (DSU), realizing the necessity to transform the so-called Ukrainian SSR into an Independent Ukrainian State, believe that national Ukrainian armed forces are one of the important steps on the path to independence.

This will, first of all, end the costs involved with the transporting of Ukrainian youth from Ukraine and then back to Ukraine. Secondly, national Ukrainian armed forces will not be deployed by the authorities to break up rallies and demonstrations, and will constitute an immediate guarantee of the irreversible processes, which will transform the Ukrainian SSR from a colony into a democratic state.

It is the sacred right of our people to have their own armed forces independent of Moscow's control.

8 April 1990 Lviv

The Founding Congress of the association Ukrainian Independence and Statehood (DSU) resolves that the Ukrainian SSR "Law on Languages in the Ukrainian SSR" ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR on 28 October 1989 does not meet the needs of the day and is essentially directed towards the further Russification of Ukraine. In every state—and Article 1 of the Ukr. SSR Constitution stipulates that the Ukrainian SSR is a state—the state language is the language of the native population, which gives its name to the country in question. The linguistic equality of immigrants amounts to their national cultural autonomy.

By declaring the Russian language the language of international communication, the "Law on Languages" granted it the status of the state language of the Ukrainian SSR, knowledge of which is compulsory, thereby legalizing a form of bilingualism, under which the knowledge of the Ukrainian language by non-Ukrainians is not compulsory. Ukrainian Bulgarians, Gagauzians, Greeks, Rumanians, Hungarians, Poles and others will not learn Ukrainian in their place of continuous residence. We communicated with them in Russian in the past and will continue doing so. And this means that the number of Russian-speakers among the population will continue to increase. We are not opposed to the Ukrainian Russians' right to learn their native language. But the compulsory learning of Russian by Ukrainians and the national minorities contradicts the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR and transforms the Soviet Ukrainian "state" into a Russian colony.

The association—Ukrainian Independence and Statehood (DSU) will struggle for the abolition of the Ukrainian SSR "Law on Languages", and for a position whereby the Russian language would only be learned by Russians in Ukraine, and would constitute a foreign language for other citizens.

The association—DSU will demand the enactment of a state law on the compulsory knowledge of the Ukrainian language as the language of state, by all the citizens of Ukraine.

8 April 1990 Lviv

## SECOND (EXTRAORDINARY) CONGRESS OF THE UKRAINIAN NATIONAL PARTY HELD IN LVIV

LVIV, April 7—The Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the Ukrainian National Party (UNP) was held in this western Ukrainian city. The Congress ratified addenda to the UNP Statute, which abolished the trial period for persons, who were repressed for patriotic activity and survived these repressions honourably. The Congress also adopted the strategy of the UNP, authored by Hryhoriy Prykhodko, who was elected UNP chairman. Sofia Kalynovska was elected secretary, replacing Vadym Smohytel. The Congress also elected a Council, which consists of the following five members: Volodymyr Soloviov—Council chairman; Olena Protsiv; Ihor Huk; Ihor Fleytuta; Bohdan Chyk—members. Yuriy Rudenko was elected assistant secretary. The Congress ratified three resolutions, the text of which follows below:

## Resolution No. 1 of the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP

The USSR law on "The raising of responsibility for violating the national equality of citizens and the violent violation of the integrity of the territory of the USSR" has brought the UNP to the conclusion that the Soviet parliamentary system cannot be an arena for the struggle of peoples for their independent statehood, for the following reasons:

1. Participation in the activity of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR is tantamount to a recognition of the legality of the Ukr. SSR and its Constitution,

and thus, is the recognition of the legality of Article 74 and 75 regarding the territory of Ukraine. Thereby it gives the Parliament and President of the USSR the legal bases to interpret possible attempts of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR regarding the declaration of independence as separatism and an attack against the territorial integrity of the USSR.

- 2. Participation in the activity of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR is tantamount to recognizing the legality of the membership of the Ukrainian SSR in the USSR, contradicts the colonial status of Ukraine, and thus contradicts the lawfulness of the struggle of Ukrainians for decolonization, and in particular it contradicts the lawfulness of the use by the patriotic forces of Ukraine of such international acts as the United Nations Statute, the International Pact on civic and political rights (Part 1, Article 1), the declaration of the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, and other acts and accords, in which the right of peoples to struggle for independence and statchood and the right of the individual to political activity is clearly stipulated.
- 3. Participation of national patriots in the activity of parliaments of the USSR and the Ukr. SSR does not alter the essence of these parliaments. It creates the illusion of the democratic nature of the parliaments, and the legality of their laws.
- 4. The illusion of democracy of the parliaments of the USSR and Ukr. SSR gives formal bases for governments of democratic countries of the West to recognize the legality of the anti-national activity of the parliaments, depriving the national movements of support on the part of international democratic communities.

On the basis of the above, the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP states that participation of national patriots in the parliamentary struggle contradicts the programmatic goal of the UNP, and thus, as a method of direct activity, is unacceptable to the UNP. Therefore the Congress calls on the members of the UNP to desist from participating in the elections to the Soviet organs of power. Taking into account, however, the fact of the Ukrainianization of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR, the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP will cooperate with those deputies whose activity is directed towards the creation of separate power bases of the republican authorities and the recognition of Ukraine as a separate country.

## Resolution No. 2 of the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP

Taking into account that:

- —the colonial authorities are seeking to provoke inter-ethnic and inter-class conflict;
- -the imperialist policies of "divide and rule" have already provoked armed
clashes in the Transcaucasus;

- -armed conflicts weaken the common anti-imperialist front;
- implementing repression against activists of the opposition, the authorities are provoking political-civic groups to form their own security services;
- -Hoping to avoid armed inter-ethnic and inter-class conflicts in Ukraine, which could turn into a lasting civil war, the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP regards that civic and party military units may become the tool of armed conflict and civil war. The units in the Transcaucasus have already become such a tool. Therefore the Congress of the UNP turns to all civic and political organizations with the appeal:
- To recognize the necessity of a wide-scale campaign of all the patriotic forces of Ukraine for the creation of Ukrainian armed forces, a Ukrainian security service and a Ukrainian police force, as guarantees of the inviolability of Ukrainian borders, the integrity of its territory, and safeguards of its national and individual security and civic peace.
- 2. In the event that Soviet authorities will agree to the creation of republican power bases of authority and will assist in their emergence and organization, to publicly declare restraint from creating one's own security forces. In addition, to declare one's own readiness to refrain from the creation of non-governmental armed forces, once Ukrainian armed forces, a security service and police force are formed, with the participation of all the forces of the patriotic opposition.
- 3. To declare that any participation of Ukrainian parties and communities in already existing inter-ethnic and inter-class conflicts in other nations should also be treated as individual participation, moral or material, and any assistance in the acquisition of arms—is amoral and subject to public condemnation. Decisively rejecting genocide as a means of national policy, Ukrainian patriots have to, by force of their beliefs, help in forging an understanding between peoples, in order to avoid genocide and violations of the human rights of ethnic groups and national minorities.

#### Resolution No. 3 of the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP

In connection with the differences of opinion regarding the national flag, the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the UNP presents its position:

- 1. The national flag is raised on national holidays and on particularly solemn occasions (party congresses, particularly significant conferences, cultural and sporting events, manifestations).
- 2. The national flag is raised over civic, cultural and educational institutions, firms and enterprises, as well as private homes on the days stipulated above.

- 3. The blue-and-yellow flag was the state flag of the Ukrainian National Republic and the Western Ukrainian National Republic. Therefore it is inconceivable to present it as a municipal or regional flag. If a municipal or regional flag is to be regarded as a national flag, then that city or region must also be viewed as possessing the right to form a separate state. If the national flag is to be presented as a municipal or regional flag, then this symbolizes a partitioning of Ukraine into smaller nations, which, fortunately, Ukrainians do not have.
- 4. The raising of the national flag on state institutions is permissible only on the condition that an independent Ukrainian state already exists. The raising of this flag on the premises of councils, other executive committees, prosecutors' offices, the police, KGB and military units and ships of the occupational authorities is not permissible, in as much as: firstly, this desecrates the honour of the nation, secondly, individuals who raise the national flag over such institutions do not have the chance to defend it, and the flag, as a symbol of national honour, requires a commitment to defend it. Persons, who make decisions to raise the flag over buildings of Soviet organs of power, must carry individual responsibility for a possible desecration of the national flag on the part of the authorities.

Resolutions ratified by the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of the Ukrainian National Party

Lviv, 7 April 1990

#### "EARTH DAY" COMMEMORATED IN UKRAINE

#### Kyiv Rally Held in Atmosphere of Solemnity in Commemoration of Chornobyl Tragedy

Over 30,000 people participated in an "Earth Day" rally in Kyiv held on April 22. The rally in Kyiv centred on a solemn commemoration of the 4th anniversary of the Chornobyl disaster, which led to countless deaths in Ukraine and irreparable ecological damage.

The Kyiv rally was organized by the Popular Movement of Ukraine—Rukh— and "Zelenyi Svit"—a Ukrainian ecological association. Both the rally and a demonstration which was planned to be held afterwards were sanctioned by the newly elected city council, which is controlled by a majority of Democratic Bloc deputies.

The Kyiv rally commenced with a moment of silence in commemoration of the victims of Chornobyl. In his introductory address, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi—a Ukrainian deputy to the USSR's Supreme Soviet—underscored the catastrophic ecological condition of Ukraine. Afterwards, Yuriy Shcherbak—the head of "Zelenyi Svit" and also a deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR—addressed the rally participants. He spoke of the need for legislation which would require that

the Soviet authorities issue a detailed report on the Chornobyl disaster, specifically on any progress made in the past four years to clean up the region around the Chornobyl power station and on the number of casualties directly attributable to the incident. Shcherbak also informed the rally participants of plans to establish a Green Party in Ukraine. A founding congress of the Green Party was held on April 21 in Kyiv. Shcherbak voiced his belief that in light of the catastrophic ecological state of affairs in Ukraine, the Green Party may soon emerge as one of the largest, popular-based political parties in Ukraine today.

Among the other speakers to address the rally were the following: Borys Oliynyk, Oleksander Vasiuk—a candidate from the Democratic Bloc for mayor of Kyiv, Serhiy Plachynda—a writer, and I. Edmans—a representative of the Latvian Popular Front. In his speech, Edmans stated that the Supreme Soviet of Latvia proclaimed Latvian statehood and sovereignty on April 21.

Several leading members of "Zelenyi Svit" also addressed the rally, in particular Natalia Preobrazhenska—the secretary of "Zelenyi Svit" and Roman Stepaniak—the chairman of the Ivano-Frankivsk branch of "Zelenyi Svit". All the speakers underscored their conviction that none of the problems facing Ukraine today, including the serious ecological problems, can be resolved until Ukraine establishes itself as an independent and sovereign state.

Leonid Pliushch, a former Ukrainian political prisoner now residing in Paris, also addressed the rally. Pliushch expressed the feelings of all the rally participants in voicing his pain and grief over Ukraine's catastrophic ecological condition. He also voiced his support of the national-liberation forces in Ukraine, which was warmly greeted by the rally participants.

After the rally, the participants marched to the centre of this capital city, to the Lenin Museum. En route, the number of marchers quickly swelled to 50-60,000 people. Many were carrying the blue-and-yellow national flag of an independent Ukraine and the black-and-red Ukrainian nationalist flag. Many of the placards the marchers were carrying were written in red letters on a black background. Some of these placards read: "Shame on the Communist Party of Ukraine—CPU!"; "Bring the CPU to trial!"; "Long live the Communist Party in the Chornobyl power plant!"; "Let's cut off the head of the communist monster!"; "A good communist is a dead communist!"; "Shame on Lenin—Shame on Gorbachev!"; "For an independent Ukrainian state!"; "Glory to the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN)!; "Glory to Stepan Bandera!" (leader of the OUN, assassinated in Munich in 1959 by a Soviet Russian agent); "Independence! Now!"

Among the marchers was a long column of members of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM). As the SNUM members passed Lenin's monument, they threw torn and ripped copies of Lenin's works at the monument in a sign of protest. Two rows of militiamen stood guard near the monument and the museum. No incidents were reported.

The demonstration ended at 7:00 p.m.

#### UNDL HOLDS THEORETICAL CONFERENCE Reject Cooperation with CPU

On Sunday, April 22, approximately forty representatives of the Kyiv, Lviv, Odessa, Drohobych and Riga (Latvia) chapters of the Ukrainian National Democratic League (UNDL) attended a theoretical conference in the Ukrainian capital—Kyiv, organized by the League.

The conference was convened to discuss preparations for the UNDL Congress, which is to take place at the beginning of May, and the Congress of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU), scheduled to be held on April 28-30. The League is a corporate member of the UHU.

The conference participants discussed the credibility of cooperation with the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU), or persons, who, until recently, were members of the Party, resolving unanimously that any cooperation with the CPU contradicts the fundamental principles of the UNDL. Should the UHU Congress adopt a resolution on cooperation with the CPU, the Conference resolved that the UNDL will leave the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and declare itself a political party.

#### UKRAINIAN CHRISTIAN-DEMOCRATIC FRONT Holds Second Congress

LVIV—The Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front (UCDF) held its second congress on April 21-22. The UCDF functions primarily in the Lviv, Ternopil, and Ivano-Frankivsk provinces. It has branches in the Vinnytsia region, Odessa, the Luhansk region, and Moscow. Ukrainian Catholic priests—Revs. Yaroslav Lesiv, Petro Zeleniukh and Mykhailo Havryliv began the congress with a prayer, following which the "Dudaryk" boys choir sang part of the Divine Liturgy and the Ukrainian national anthem.

After a discussion of procedural questions, former political prisoner, the chairman of the Lithuanian Christian-Democratic association—Pjatkus, greeted the congress. He stated that we can free ourselves from Soviet Russian occupation only when a struggle will be led, based on Christian morals. Today, the whole of Europe is centred around Christianity, he said. Recently, a congress of Christian movements of Eastern Europe was held in Budapest. Ukraine, unfortunately, was represented by the diaspora.

The son of the Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), General Shukhevych-Chuprynka, Yuriy Shukhevych, said that a new Ukraine can be built on the ruins of the empire, when Christian and national ideas will become united. Today, we live in a time when all ideas are gaining increasing popularity. The following individuals addressed the Congress: Zinoviy Krasivskyi; Ivan Kandyba—the chairman of the new political all-Ukrainian association "Ukrainian Independence and Statehood"; Hryhoriy Prykhodko—the chairman of the Ukrainian National Party; Ukrainian Catholic priest Rev. Yaroslav Lesiv; Dmytro Boyko—a deputy from the Lviv municipal council; Zinoviy Duma—the chairman of the trade union "Iskra"; and a People's Deputy of the Ukrainian SSR from Ivano-Frankivsk. He stated in particular that the last empire is crumbling before our eyes and an independent Ukraine can only be built through parliamentary means. The UCDF, he said, should be a unifying link between all tendencies.

Other speakers included Christian-Democrats Ihor Vatuliv from the Donetsk region and Yuliya Polishchuk from Odessa; and guests from Georgia, Leningrad and Moscow.

The participants also listened to a report by the UCDF chairman—Vasyl Sichko, and other theoretical presentations.

The congress was at the same time the founding congress of the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party. The participants adopted a series of programmatic documents and resolutions. Vasyl Sichko, the present chairman of the UCDF, was elected to chair the Council of the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party.

#### New Party Formed IN UKRAINE Ukrainian Republican Party Based on Independence Platform

KYIV—On April 29-30, 1990, the Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) held its Congress, at which it was decided to transform the UHU into a political party—the Ukrainian Republican Party—URP.

Approximately 1,000 people participated in the Congress, including 495 delegates representing 32 UHU branches from all the provinces of Ukraine, Moscow and Lithuania.

Levko Lukianenko—the chairman of the now defunct Ukrainian Helsinki Union—was elected chairman of the URP. Stepan Khmara from Lviv and Hryhoriy Hrebeniuk, representing the miners from Donetsk, were both elected vice-chairmen.

The following individuals were elected to the URP's Secretariat: Oles Shevchenko, Vasyl Ovsiyenko, Petro Vovchuk, Roman Koval, Oleksa Mykolyshyn, Petro Rozumnyi, and Anna Bidoshko.

Zenoviy Melnyk was elected chairman of the Auditing Committee and Stepan Hura was elected the editor-in-chief of the URP's theoretical journal.

The Congress resolutions stated that the URP will function as a parliamentary party in Ukraine, the primary aim of which is "to expedite the reestablishment of a Sovereign and Independent Ukrainian State". With this view in mind, the URP will begin creating Committees of Citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic and will demand that Ukraine establish diplomatic relations with other countries throughout the world. Many of the leading members of the URP were recently elected People's Deputies to the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet.

The Congress also decided that all former UHU branches are to immediately begin registration of their membership into the URP in accordance with the programme and by-laws of the party. This reregistration process is to be completed by May 15.

#### Statement on the Dissolution of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union

The rapidly changing political developments in the USSR and Ukraine demand the immediate creation of a political party, which would become a serious force in the struggle for the realization of the fundamental goal of the Ukrainian people—the establishment of an independent and democratic Ukrainian State.

The Congress indicates that the UHU became the first political human rights organization in Ukraine, which unequivocally declared its anti-colonial position and opposition to the totalitarian imperialist CPSU.

The Congress resolves that in the under two years of its existence the UHU achieved several marked successes:

- —it created organizational structures throughout the whole of Ukraine and even beyond its borders, on the territory of the Soviet empire;
- --- it became an influential and clear-cut political force;
- —its ranks include the most experienced political cadres, hardened in the many decades of struggle in extreme conditions;
- —it became the first political organization to oppose the existing colonial and communist system, and is represented in councils, including the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine.

In the present political situation, the formal framework of the UHU does not accommodate its leading role in the political spectrum of Ukraine.

The time has come to change the name of the organization, its programme and by-laws.

Taking into consideration the present situation and the perspectives of the political struggle in Ukraine, the Congress declares:

To formally dissolve the human rights organization—the Ukrainian Helsinki Union. The Congress puts forward the following propositions:

- 1) To form a political party on the basis of the UHU.
- 2) To reregister members of former UHU branches as members of the newly created political party in accordance with the demands of the new programme and by-laws of the party.

#### **Resolution No. 1 of the URP Founding Congress**

Our Congress is being held in historical times. The collapse of the empire has begun.

The URP is the first parliamentary party in Ukraine. Therefore, we are obliged to to make efforts to expedite the reestablishment of a Sovereign and Independent Ukrainian State. For this purpose we regard the following as our primary goals:

- 1) To begin creating citizens' committees of the UNR [Ukrainian National Republic—UCIS<sub>1</sub>.
- 2) According to generally accepted principles, to demand the opening of Ukrainian consulates and diplomatic missions throughout the world without any restrictions (South Korea, Israel, Chile, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia).
- 3) We demand direct and full relations of Ukraine as a member of the UN with member-countries of the EEC and OAS.
- 4) We demand the dismantling of all nuclear power stations at the expense of central imperialist ministries.
- 5) We are prepared to cooperate with all political parties and organizations, which are taking political steps towards the genuine independence of our homeland. May God protect us!

God protect Ukraine!

Glory to Ukraine!

Kyiv, 30 April 1990

#### **Resolution No. 2 of the URP Founding Congress**

Ukraine has entered a new stage in the struggle for national independence. The new political organization-Ukrainian Republican Party, which represents the ageold aspirations of the Ukrainian people for freedom and an independent state, is entering this struggle at a critical time. The party will aspire towards the resolution of all social and national conflicts through purely political means-reforms and parliamentary measures.

The Founding Congress:

- 1) Proclaims the creation of the Ukrainian Republican Party.
- 2) Regards all delegates of the Congress as founding members of the URP.
- 3) Obliges the executive organs of the party to reregister former UHU members as members of the URP by May 15.
- 4) Entrusts the Chairman and Secretariat of the party to take steps towards the publication of a mass party newspaper and a party journal in the near future.
- 5) To regard the Programme and Statute of the URP temporary, and authorize the party Secretariat with their final revision until the Second Party Congress.

Kyiv, 30 April 1990

#### **Resolution No. 3 of the Founding Congress of the URP**

For decades communist propaganda has tried to drive into the minds of the citizens of the Soviet empire the idea that the Soviet state is a new type of state, the primary aim of which is workers' prosperity. In the name of this idea millions of people were liquidated, cultures continue to be destroyed, and grave crimes were committed against humanity. Tens, hundreds of millions of people lived in abject conditions and continue to live in base poverty.

The Secretary General of communists, M. Gorbachev, the so-called president of the empire, has informed the entire country as well as all the free peoples of the world, that—

"For decades we have tried to nurture in the genes of the Russian people and our other peoples the conviction that we live in a homogeneous world, which we call the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" (*Pravda*, April 28, 1990).

We do not know what motivated the President to speak the truth, but he did. We live in an imperialist prison of nations.

The Founding Congress of the URP considers this statement by Gorbachev to be a recognition of the *de facto* colonial status of all so-called "Soviet Socialist Republics," including Ukraine, and calls on the President as well as the government that is subordinate to him to be consequential to the end and to recognize the *de jure* colonial status of these "republics" and to announce this at the next session of the United Nations.

Kyiv, April 30, 1990

#### **DOCUMENTS & REPORTS**

#### **RUKH POST-ELECTORAL APPEAL** Calls for Pluralist, Multi-Party System in an Independent Ukraine

The Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) recently issued the following appeal in which it calls for the creation of a multi-party, pluralist system. The Rukh leaders that signed this appeal also called for the convention of an extraordinary Rukh congress, which should transform this popular front organization into a separate party that stands on the principles of an independent Ukrainian state.

#### To all the members of Rukh and to all the citizens of Ukraine

The pre-election programmes of many of the candidates running for the office of People's Deputy in the councils of Ukraine on all levels included a clause on the need for a multi-party system. Such a system is absolutely necessary. The dictates of one party were and continue to be the basis of the command-administrative system. Democracy is unfathomable without political pluralism; it cannot develop further without the elimination of the Party's monopoly over power and the truth. The CPSU, as the ruling force of our society, should be held responsible for the famine of 1932-33 in our republic, for the liquidation of the Ukrainian intelligentsia, for the mass deportations and repressions, for the policy of Russification, for the economic ruin and the ecological destruction of Ukraine. The CPSU continues to strive for a monopoly over power; it wants to preserve for itself a leading role in the economic and national-political life of the peoples of the USSR. It is true that healthy elements are to be found in the CPSU, that want to bring the country out of the present crisis. However, this is impossible because the CPSU remains committed to pursuing a colonial statist course. It has now become clear that as long as there exists a unitary party with a unitary centre for all the peoples of the USSR, these peoples will continue to be subjected to national, social and spiritual repression. Presently, we would like to see the Communist Party of Ukraine become a separate leftist party, under a democratic banner, and not controlled by Moscow.

In order to dismantle the command-administrative system, not only is the democratization of the Party necessary, but a multi-party system must also be

Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

instituted. This is the only guarantee that our society will become and continue to develop in a democratic fashion. Many of the workers' and farmers' collectives, that we met recently, are demanding the creation of a party based on the programme and statutes of Rukh. It is impossible to effectuate a rebirth of Ukraine by the will of the conservative majority of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine. Its position was manifested at its last Plenum, in which the CC CPU clearly demonstrated that it will continue working in accordance with the interests of the empire, although it masked its intentions behind the false rhetoric about "a renewed federation".

Consequently, we are calling for the convention of an extraordinary congress of the Popular Movement of Ukraine in order to establish a new set of principles and a new programme of activity for Rukh as a political party. We call upon all political groups and people holding various political convictions, who share a similar goal, to consolidate themselves with Rukh. Unity is our only guarantee of victory. The Popular Movement of Ukraine enjoys the support of Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians, of all honest citizens of our republic in this historic period and it is taking upon itself the responsibility to lead them in the struggle for the future of the Ukrainian people and of all peoples that live on our land, to defend democratic principles in a peaceful dialogue with all political parties and groups and to strive for real and ultimate independence, in accordance with the will of the people.

#### Signed:

Halyna Antoniuk, Yuriy Badzio, Mykola Bidzilia, Oleksander Burakovskyi, Stepan Vovk, Voleslav Heychenko, Serhiy Holovatyi, Mykhailo Horyn, Vitaliy Donchyk, Ivan Drach, Dmytro Zakharuk, Pavlo Kyslyi, Serhiy Konev, Roman Lubkivskyi, Levko Lukianenko, Volodymyr Muliava, Dmytro Pavlychko, Larysa Skoryk, Petro Talanchuk, Viktor Teren, Borys Tymoshenko, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi

#### **OPEN LETTER TO MIKHAIL SERGEYEVICH GORBACHEV**

The following is an open letter to Mikhail Gorbachev from Stepan Khmara, a leader of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and a recently-elected people's deputy from Chervonohrad, Ukraine, castigating Gorbachev for seeking the presidency of the USSR.

Your desire to concentrate, for all intents and purposes, unlimited power in your hands under the formalized umbrella of the presidency, which now you are impatiently striving to grasp with the help of the aggressively servile majority at the Congress of People's Deputies, is no more than the latest example of imperialist adventurism.

If you attempt to fulfil your desire at the Third Congress of People's Deputies, your actions will be judged to be another provocation, which could lead to destabilization in various regions of the empire. On your conscience lies the responsibility for the tragic events in Nagorno-Karabakh because your conduct, specifically, at a meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR helped to worsen the situation. Also, you cannot remove from yourself the responsibility for the tragic events in Tbilisi and Baku.

In Ukraine, we, too, have definitive complaints against you; you are one of the initiators of the Chornobyl catastrophe cover-up. Your sweet smile is concealing a cynical, conscious genocide of the residents of that national region as well as of the surrounding regions in Byelorussia and Russia.

Now you are resorting to another decisive provocative farce, with the intention of preserving the empire. Understand, Mikhail Sergeyevich, you are a great and insidious manipulator, but an unsuccessful politician because in the five years of your rule the multi-faceted crisis in the socio-political system of the USSR has increased. You refuse to comprehend the objective development of the historical process: there are no alternatives to the collapse of the last empire on Earth. We, democrats, hope that the dissolution of the empire can be achieved in a peaceful manner, by way of the legal confirmation of the rights of independence for the subjugated nations.

The presidential form of rule, like the one you have contrived, is an attempt to attain the impossible—to stop the process of decolonization of the Soviet empire.

I consider it imperative to remind you that if you decline to listen to the voices of the subjugated nations, then the full responsibility for the possible consequences of this imperial adventurism will rest on your shoulders.

As a People's Deputy of Ukraine, I pledge that I will not recognize your dictatorial regime and will apply all of my energies to undermine your imperial plans.

Thursday, March 8, 1990

#### UHU LVIV PROVINCIAL BRANCH HOLDS A CONFERENCE Decides on Tactics for Run-Off Election Campaign Rejects Legitimacy of Expanded Presidential Powers

The Lviv Provincial Branch of the UHU held a conference on March 10, 1990, at which the following resolutions were accepted by the participants:

#### Resolution of the Lviv Provincial Branch of the UHU on the perspectives of the development of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union

- 1. The Conference regards that the UHU has fulfilled its role of a human rights organization and that the time is now ripe for the necessary transformation of the UHU into a political party with a clearly defined programme and statutory by-laws.
- 2. The draft programme and statutory by-laws, reviewed at the Conference, are considered incomplete and require more work.
- 3. The Conference directs the editorial commission, elected by the Conference, to prepare draft programmes and statutory by-laws, to forward this draft to all branches for further discussion, and to submit the drafts to the General Council of the Lviv provincial branch of the UHU by March 25, 1990.

Lviv, March 10, 1990

#### Resolution of the Lviv Provincial Branch of the UHU on the tactics of the Lviv branch of the UHU in the run-off elections

The Lviv provincial Conference of the UHU obliges all its members to take the most active part in the upcoming run-off elections to the councils.

- 1. The electoral campaign should be run under the slogan—"No votes for communist candidates!"
- 2. Separate democratic organizations should be formed to assist UHU candidates in their pre-election campaigns.
- 3. Similar groups should be designated for democratic candidates in eastern Ukraine.

Lviv, March 10, 1990

#### Resolution of the Lviv Provincial Branch of the UHU on our position towards the introduction of a presidential form of dictatorship in the USSR

The participants of the Conference are disturbed by the attempts by the imperialist forces to bring to a halt the objective processes of decolonization of the Soviet empire. With these aims in mind, Moscow's imperialist leadership is striving to institute a personal dictatorship under the guise of a presidential form of government.

The delegates to the Conference regard the institution of a presidential form of government, as presented by Gorbachev and the highest party ruling organs, as no more than the most recent provocation of the imperialist camp.

The UHU will resolutely oppose the introduction of the projected presidential form of dictatorship. Should such a dictatorship be established, the UHU will not recognize the legitimacy of its authority and will conduct a decisive campaign against it through peaceful means.

The participants of the Conference urge the People's Deputies of the USSR from Ukraine to demonstratively leave the hall during the voting on this issue.

Lviv, March 10, 1990

#### UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC DEPUTY PROTESTS AGAINST VATICAN'S NEGOTIATIONS WITH RUSSIAN PATRIARCH

To His Holiness The Pope

Your Holiness,

The Ukrainian Catholic Church is living through an important stage of its history. After more than 40 years of continuous persecution and existence as a Church in the catacombs, the Ukrainian Catholic Church has attained a de facto legal status.

But the atheist state has not altered its hostile attitude towards our Church. This is the reason why up till now the Ukrainian Catholic Church does not have its rights. The present Party leadership of the Soviet empire stubbornly refuses to recognize the fact that the so-called "Synod" of 1946 was contrived by the state and was an act of terror against the Ukrainian Catholic Church; it refuses to acknowledge the need to rehabilitate the Church as a victim of the totalitarian system.

With the powerful pressure of the struggle of Ukrainian Catholics for their rights, the ruling regime can no longer suppress our Church so brutally and openly.

It resorts to other tactics for fighting the Ukrainian Catholic Church: intrigues,

provocations, slander, and so on. Moreover, the Kremlin is trying to gain political capital from the problem of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. It is, in various ways, supporting the Russian Orthodox-Party Church, which has always been a fierce enemy of the Ukrainian people and a leading force behind the imperialist policies of Russian chauvinism and messianism. In view of the above, I am surprised and disturbed by the Vatican's behaviour towards the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The Vatican delegation adopted an erroneous and completely harmful position towards our Church.

Firstly, it entered into attractive negotiations on the situation of our Church with the Moscow Patriarchate, and not with the Moscow government, which persecuted and destroyed the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

Secondly, together with the delegation of the Moscow Patriarchate, it compiled a completely false communique in Moscow, which is detrimental to Ukrainian Catholics.

Your Holiness, the Ukrainian Catholic Church was and will remain committed to Christian Truth and Evangelical Commandments. This is our fundamental principle. We will never compromise with lies, or allow our Ukrainian Catholic Church to become an object of trade between the Vatican and the Moscow Patriarchate.

Preserving our inviolable loyalty to the Apostolic See and Your Holiness in matters of faith, we, Ukrainian Catholics, resolutely protest the manner in which the Vatican is conducting its diplomacy and demand the following:

- 1) A halt to all negotiations on the fate of our Church with the Moscow Patriarchate;
- 2) The annulment of the Moscow communique;
- 3) Negotiations with the USSR government on matters regarding the Ukrainian Catholic Church with the participation of a delegation of the hierarchy and faithful of our Church.

I ask for Your Holiness' blessings Stepan Khmara People's Deputy of Ukraine, Member of the Committee in Defence of the Ukrainian Catholic Church

March 11, 1990

#### MINERS IN UKRAINE DEMAND BETTER WORKING CONDITIONS

То

The chairman of the Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union Bohdan Horyn

From

The workers of the Podorozhenskyi mine of the "Sirka" Corporation

#### Statement

We, the workers of the ore mining and boring division of the Podorozhenskyi mine of the "Sirka" corporation, Zhydachiv district, Lviv province, ask you to help us find an organization or institute, which could analyze the harmful conditions, which affect the people in our quarry: background radiation, electromagnetic radiation, gas, vibration and noise level, harmful admixtures and gasses and trotyl dust produced during manual drilling, sulphur dust produced by the mining of sulphur ore and the drilling of ore blocks.

The laboratory of the "Sirka" corporation carried out tests, but the results were not announced to the workers. The last tests were carried out on February 16, 1990. The equipment used for this was inaccurate and faulty. We have the results of the analysis, but we doubt their credibility, because the employees of the laboratory are dependent on the administration of the corporation and will not defend the interests of the workers of our division.

The statement was signed by 147 workers.

#### UKRAINIANS ARE RESISTING THE SOVIET MILITARY DRAFT Call for the Formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces

LVIV—A youth assembly, organized by the Initiative Committee for the formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces, was held in this western Ukrainian city on April 18, 1990. In light of the fact that resistance to the Soviet military draft is considerable, particularly in the western regions of Ukraine, the assembly issued an appeal (full text appears below) to the Lviv municipal council, which passed under the control of the national-democratic forces following the elections in March of this year. The assembly also passed a series of resolutions, which appear below in full.

#### AN APPEAL

#### to the Lviv municipal council of people's deputies

Distinguished Mr. Chairman!

Distinguished Deputies!

In light of the fact that the youth assembly, held on April 18, 1990, and organized by the Initiative Committee for the formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces, in an absolute majority vote ratified the appeal of the Initiative Committee to boycott the Ministry of Defence of the USSR together with all its functions and mandated authority in Ukraine—we continue to request of you: to assign for the "draft resisters" of the city of Lviv an area where they can be stationed and where a summer military camp of "resisters" can be held from April until the first frost.

We guarantee that this camp will be strictly organized and held in an atmosphere of order and discipline.

A system of military order will be effectuated in this camp and a training programme for the youth will be implemented and will incorporate spiritual and ideological education and athletic training on the basis of Christian morals and the best Ukrainian military tradition.

We ask that you come to our immediate aid in this matter by render to us various needed equipment and other assistance (tents, food, field kitchens, doctors, etc.).

As a sign of our appreciation for such assistance, we will volunteer our services by working without financial renumeration in any area of construction, the economy, communications, and the like.

We promise to carry out our end of the agreement between us.

We kindly ask that this matter be taken into consideration and that it immediately be taken under your control, taking into account the seriousness of the matter. The call-up has already begun and not one young man has reported to the army; the ranks of draft "resisters" are swelling each day and we hope that you understand that the only way to guarantee their security is by an organized selfinitiative of transference to an alternative military service with its own base (and not to wait for some false gratuity of an ineffective circular from Moscow); a military service which would be completely subservient to the municipal and regional councils, until our conditions are met.

It would probably be appropriate to form some kind of committee, which would deal with this matter and report to the council.

We hope to be able to have instructors for this camp.

We anticipate a positive and intelligent decision on your part, since we—are you—Ukrainians; our goal is the same—an Independent Ukrainian State!

We are forwarding to you the texts of resolutions of the assembly. We also declare that we are acting in complete accordance with the precepts of international law.

We express to you our appreciation!

Ukrainian youth faithful to you and the Initiative Committee for the formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces.

# THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

### **Autumn** • 1990

#### THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko Editor

Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky Assistant Editor

> Prof. Lev Shankovsky Assistant Editor

Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky Assistant Editor Volodymyr Bohdaniuk Associate Editor

> Borys Potapenko Associate Editor

Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn Associate Editor Stephen Oleskiw

Associate Editor

Price: £4.50 or \$9.00 a single copy, Annual Subscription: £18.00 or \$36.00

Editorial correspondence should be sent to:

The Editors, "The Ukrainian Review", 200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF.

Subscriptions should be sent to:

"The Ukrainian Review" (Administration), c/o Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd., 49 Linden Gardens, London, W2 4HG.

#### **Overseas representatives:**

USA: Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., 136 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003. Canada: Ucrainica Research Institute, 83-85 Christie Street, Toronto,Ont. M6G 3B1.

Printed in Great Britain by the Ukrainian Publishers Limited 200 Liverpool Road, London, NI 1LF. Tel.: 01-607-6266/7

## THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

#### Vol. XXXVIII

A Quarterly Journal

Autumn, 1990

#### CONTENTS

Editorial: Sovereignty is Meaningless Without Independence	2
Julian Birch: Towards a New Soviet Party Programme on the Nattionalities?	3
Borys Potapenko: Independent Ukraine: The Missing Link in European Stability and Security	20
Olena Apanovych: THE KOZAK REPUBLIC	26

#### NEWS FROM UKRAINE

Inaugural Congress of the Ukrainian Republican Party; A Reporter's Account	36
TWO NEW BISHOPS FOR UKRAINIAN AUTOCEPHALOUS ORTHODOX CHURCH	41
MEETING OF UKRAINIAN AND POLISH PARLIAMENTARIANS HELD IN YABLONKA	42
Mass rally Held in Lviv	43
First All-Ukrainian Great Assembly of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association	44
UKRAINIAN RURAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY HOLDS FOUNDING CONGRESS	48
UKRAINIAN AUTOCEPHALOUS ORTHODOX CHURCH HOLDS SOBOR IN KYIY	49
DEMONSTRATIONS IN KYTV IN SUPPORT OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE	50
Ukrainian Democratic Deputies Demand Release of Arrested Youths	51
DSU BRANCH ESTABLISHED IN ODESSA	52
RALLY HELD IN DONETSK	53
ACTIVISM IN SOUTH-WEST UKRAINE PROVINCE	53
COMMUNIST PARTY ORGANIZATION DISSOLVED IN UKRAINIAN VILLAGE	54
LVIV RESIDENTS MARK ANNIVERSARY OF RALLIES	55
PUBLIC RALLY IN SUPPORT OF DEMOCRATIC BLOC	56
Ukrainian Insurgents Remembered in Stryi	56
Thousands Attend Rally in Vinnytsia	56
100,000 Mark Kozak Victory over Polish King in Pliashiv	57
LVIV BRANCH OF URP HOLDS CONFERENCE	57
VICTIMS OF RUSSIAN OCCUPATION COMMEMORATED	59
Ralles Held to Mark Ukrainian Independence	59
STRIKES THROUGHOUT UKRAINE	61
UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE COMMEMORATIONS HELD.	62
Ukrainian SSR Declares Sovereignty	63
UKRAINIAN DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION LOSES KEY VOTE IN SUPREME SOVIET	72
CONFERENCE OF THE "MOTHERS OF SOLDIERS COMMITTEE" HELD IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK	72
TENS OF THOUSANDS RALLY IN LVIV.	73
ECOLOGICAL RALLY HELD IN KYTV	75
Association of Democratic Soviets Established in Ukraine	77
RALLY IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK DEMANDS RETURN OF UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS	78
CHEMICAL DISASTER PLACES HEALTH OF UKRAINIANS IN JEOPARDY	80
Independent Ukrainian Trade Unions Hold Conference	81
"DAYS OF KOZAK GLORY" CELEBRATED IN UKRAINE	82
Warning Strike in Kyiv	83

#### DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

APPEAL OF THE CITY AND PROVINCE OF ODESSA TO UKR.SSR SUPREME SOVIET	85
APPEAL OF NATIONALIST LEADER TO PRESIDENT BUSH ON THE EVE OF USA/USSR SUMMIT	88
UKRAINIAN DEMOCRATIC BLOC BOYCOTTS ELECTION OF PRESIDENT	91
Donetsk Nationalists Condemn Party	
AN APPEAL OF THE PEOPLE'S COUNCEL OF UKRAINE	93
UNDP Issues Statement on Declaration of Sovereignty	94

#### Published by

The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Ltd. Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine Inc. (U.S.A.) Ucrainica Research Institute (Canada)

#### ISSN 0041-6029

#### EDITORIAL

#### Sovereignty is Meaningless Without Independence

On July 16, 1990, the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR ratified a document entitled — "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine". Despite the fact that this declaration includes several positive points that — if enacted into law — will place Ukraine on a more autonomous footing vis-a-vis Moscow, it falls far short of being an act of independence, which would truly embody the ultimate aims and aspirations of the Ukrainian people. In fact, recent developments in Ukraine indicate that the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, which is dominated by a communist majority, will not be able and/or willing to incorporate the principles of the declaration that Moscow undoubtedly finds objectionable into the Constitution and laws of Ukraine. The declaration itself is not legally binding; it is basically a declaration of principles, i.e. of intent, that requires further legislation in order to acquire full legal /constitutional validity and practical significance.

Moreover, there are several glaring inconsistencies and vague passages that may weaken the declaration's future significance. Most importantly, the declaration establishes the supremacy of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, or more precisely — the supremacy of the laws of the Ukr.SSR over the laws of the USSR. Insofar as the Ukr.SSR was established only after the forced liquidation of the Ukrainian National Republic, which declared its independence in 1918, the declaration theoretically, if not practically, establishes the legitimacy of a "sovereign" government that the Ukrainian people view as a colonial regime, completely subservient to the imperialist centre in Moscow, and which, therefore, has no legitimate authority in Ukraine. The declaration does not nullify the "Union Treaty" of 1922. On the contrary, it states that "the principles of the declaration are utilized (sic., Ed.) in the formation of a union treaty". (The vague use of the present tense in this sentence leaves it open to various interpretations). It does not go as far as the Lithuanian proclamation which was far more forceful, since it declared the restoration of the Lithuanian Republic, which was liquidated with the forced annexation of Lithuania into the USSR in 1940.

The declaration establishes the right of every Ukrainian to citizenship in the Ukr.SSR, but it also guarantees the right of every Ukrainian citizen to "dual citizenship" in the USSR. This clause is a legal minefield, since the USSR territorially does not exist as a political entity outside its constituent "republics"/colonies. Hence, citizenship in the Ukr.SSR *ipso facto* is tantamount to citizenship in the USSR, as long as Ukraine remains in the "union". The declaration also establishes the right of every Ukrainian to serve in a future Ukrainian army, that is not to be deployed anywhere outside the borders of Ukraine without the expressed consent of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet. The document, however, is markedly mute on whether the Soviet army may retain its occupational forces on Ukrainian territory. Sovereignty is meaningless unless it can be exercised with the aid of an armed force, completely subservient to that "sovereign" government.

The declaration of July 16 must be viewed in its proper perspective: as yet another step, albeit a small step, towards the realization of every Ukrainian's dream; the full reestablishment of an independent and truly sovereign Ukrainian state, completely free from Moscow's imperialist control. The processes unfolding in the quasi-parliamentary body of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, which certainly cannot be viewed as truly representing the will of the Ukrainian people, keep the issue of Ukrainian independence alive; the cauldron is kept boiling. Much more, however, needs to be done in order for the Ukrainian people to reclaim their rightful place in the sun. Sovereignty will be meaningful only in an independent Ukrainian state. Julian BIRCH Department of Politics University of Sheffield

#### TOWARDS A NEW SOVIET PARTY PROGRAMME ON THE NATIONALITIES?

It has often been declared that the CPSU cannot cope with the problems of its national minorities because it cannot understand, or rather is not willing to understand, the very nature of the beast. There is much to be said for this proposition, mirrored as it is in the agricultural sphere where Prof. Peter Wiles has long insisted that to put a Marxist in a field is to pave the way for famine in no time. The party in power, from Lenin onwards, has constantly sought to analyse the complex ethnic structure of Russia and the USSR with a view to "solving" it as a problem for once and for all. Quite apart from the question of whether there is in fact "a" solution (or even solutions) to such a complex melange of problems, much of what has resulted has been more concerned with the idealistic world as it is.

The solutions adopted have variously involved planned economic development and redistribution to achieve a greater measure of equality and levels of development; temporary federation during the process of adjustment; uniform education and socialization programmes; population mixing across boundaries; *de facto* Russification; and a measure of stick to go with the carrots, as and where necessary.

The consequence, it may be argued, is that while a number of the smaller ethnic groups initially made up some development ground economically, socially and politically, at a faster pace than might otherwise have been achieved, in the longer run the Soviet "solutions" to the problems of the ethnic minorities have produced little more than an unending and unmitigated series of genocidal and demographic disasters for many of the peoples concerned, the results of which have come to fruition for all to see at the present time.

In the context of the crises of the late 1980s the ruling party has had to go back to the drawing board to reexamine the question and consider again its approach. This resulted in a draft programme on nationalities put to the Party's Central Committee for approval in September 1989.

Here it is proposed to consider whether this reevaluation does, or can, represent anything really new by way of approach to the issue, and to consider some of the prospects for success. First, however, something must be said about the context and content of the new programme.

#### **Background to the Policy Review**

After rather limited discussion of the matter at the special Communist Party conference of June 1988, a resolution was adopted calling for greater independence for the republics, autonomous regions and national areas, providing them with "fuller definitions of their rights and obligations".<sup>1</sup> It was also decided that there would shortly be a plenary session of the Central Committee devoted to the whole issue. However, in the face of growing ethnic clashes, with over 200 killed, tens of thousands of refugees, and defiance widespread in the republics, the plenum was repeatedly postponed. The satisfaction of the frequently mutually conflicting demands became seemingly insurmountable.

In the meantime, in March 1989, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, perhaps directly in response to growing pressure particularly from the three Baltic republics, published for discussion draft legislation on expanding the self-government and self-financing of republics, giving them enlarged powers over budgets and planning, local taxes and local prices, agriculture, consumer industries, health, transport, education, housing, environmental protection, culture and tourism.<sup>2</sup>

As an ongoing part of Gorbachev's general *perestroika* programme of greater autonomy for smaller units of administration, much responsibility for these often problematical areas was intended to be placed under republican government control, with such central ministries as those for agriculture, water supply, forestry, bread products, internal trade, and construction all disappearing. As such some 36% of industrial production would be under republican control in place of 5% previously, the percentage being greater in the smaller republics with limited numbers of large industries (57-72% in the three Baltic republics in place of the existing 7-9%).

Significant as these proposals were, they still fell short of the demands being made by then along the shores of the Baltic where, in Estonia for example, there was hope of attaining greater budgetary autonomy, including over the entire taxation system with but a fixed percentage of the revenue annually going to Moscow. Indeed, under the proposed new scheme, central control was still to be retained over defence, banking and finance, price guidelines, currency circulation, foreign trade, national transport, fuel and energy, heavy industries such as engineering, machine building, the chemical and pharmaceutical sectors and mining. In other words, some of the major polluters the republics were supposed to contain would still bypass local control, and the republics, allocated but a proportion of the enterprise profits and sales tax revenues raised locally, were only to be freed to gain additional monies from issuing shares, raising loans, organizing lotteries, and imposing fines for pollution.

<sup>1</sup>Pravda, 5 July 1988. <sup>2</sup>Tass, Moscow, 13 March 1989. Some of these proposals were quickly to be given greater substance by measures approved by the Supreme Soviet. After six hours of debate, which witnessed deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers on opposing sides and an overnight break to reduce the heat, two draft resolutions were put to the vote on 27 July 1989. One allowed Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to assume cost accounting, self-financing control over their budgets, tax policies, and price — permitting them to trade independently with the remainder of the USSR, as of 1 January 1990, one year before the remainder of the country. The other endorsed the proposals of Estonia and Lithuania for transitions to overall economic autonomy or sovereignty, independent of central planning, in effect approving the laws already passed in the republican Supreme Soviet calling for what amounted to a more market oriented economy devoted to agriculture and light industry and aided by possible foreign investment.

The approval of these measures came despite the declared opposition to two Politburo members (Vorotnikov and Maslyunkov) and the fact that avowed reformers were clearly in a minority in the assembly. In fact only 40 of the 412 deputies voted against the measures. However, to appease the centralizers and conservatives, the actual enactment of the proposals into all-union law was postponed until the following October and referred to committees to allow for amendments in the light of new circumstances and longer reflection on issues such as the administrative levels of control of natural resources, railways, power plants, and factories producing for the broader market or for the needs of the military.<sup>3</sup> Also to be considered further was the issue of extending the scheme to other areas, of which Byelorussia came high on the list. Some deputies were apparently envious of the opportunities afforded to the Baltic republics by such preferential treatment.<sup>4</sup>

It, thus, remained to be seen whether the former independence of the republics really could be replaced by a significant degree of independence, despite the obvious complications it would create for the residual elements of central planning. Indeed, in Estonia, the resolutions were met by a call, on 26 July, by Russian workers for a strike to oppose measures already announced by the Estonian authorities to restrict residence rights and downgrade the status of the Russian language within the republic.

Thus, with this planned reinforcement of the federal principle, the Party's programme on the ethnic relations issue now envisaged a rather more prolonged process towards the emergence of the truly international *homo Sovieticus*, along with the equally extended development towards full communism already conceded by Brezhnev and his successors from the late 1970s. Towards this end, the federal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Moscow Radio, 26 and 27 July 1989; Financial Times, The Guardian and International Herald Tribune, 28 July 1989.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>See interview with Deputy Svyatoslav Fyodorov in *The Daily Telegraph*, London, 28 July 1989.

system, with all its potential sources of diversity and divisions was to continue to play an important transitional role by pandering to the still persistent localism and desire to protect distinct values and mores.

In the course of the many ethnic disturbances of 1988-89, Gorbachev did, however, firmly set the limits to the degree of separate development to be permitted. In reference to the problems in Georgia in April 1989, he declared:

"Restructuring of inter-ethnic relations is not the replanning of the borders or the breakdown of the national-state structure of the country".<sup>5</sup>

Secession, and even internal border changes, it appeared were not to be conceded. Such too was part of the message addressed to the Baltic republics, in particular by the blunt, even ominous, Central Committee statement of 26 August 1989, calling for "urgent measures" to prevent the threat to the "vital interests" of the USSR and on communists "to preserve the single family of the Soviet people and the unity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union".<sup>6</sup> Gorbachev reiterated the point in his personal telephone messages to the Lithuanian Party leadership on 25 and 27 August, the Lithuanian first secretary subsequently quoting him as saying: "No republic will leave the Soviet Union, but within the federation the republics can have everything".<sup>7</sup> Such statements sought also to dissuade the local Party leaders from fraternizing too closely with their neighbourhood nationalists.

At the end of June 1989 it was announced that the now well overdue Central Committee meeting would tentatively take place at the end of July, a Soviet spokesman declaring that "we can suppose that it will end in a more clear definition of our national policy", while not apparently resolving specific individual problems.8 Again, however, events at large began to overtake the Party's and Gorbachev's plans. With the ethnic situation growing daily more dire, and the warnings of Andrei Sakharov in London in June about more or less inevitable upheavals in "the last colonial empire in the world" winging around via the international press agencies, Gorbachev, in a prerecorded Saturday night radio and television appeal on 2 July, warned that, "the very unity of our state" was now at stake. There was a danger, he declared, of the spread of conflict to areas with much larger minorities, and he called instead for mutual tolerance and more economic autonomy. While hinting at a new form of federation, he gave few specific details of what he or the rest of the leadership had in mind. Nevertheless, he indicated some of the principles underlying the policy to be placed before the Central Committee in proclaiming that all citizens would be able to exercise their rights as citizens anywhere in the USSR regardless of their particular nationality; all peoples would have the right to "free economic, cultural and social development" (though notably not to free political development);

<sup>5</sup>Reuters, 12 April 1989.
<sup>6</sup>Pravda, 27 August 1989.
<sup>7</sup>Financial Times and International Herald Tribune, 29 August 1989.
<sup>8</sup>Reuters, 28 June 1989.

6

and that a redrawing of boundaries ("economic anarchy and cultural isolation") was not an option open — indeed "decisive measures" would be taken to prevent the existing situation from getting worse.<sup>9</sup>

He also endorsed the concept of "free development of language and culture" (long proclaimed but less easily realized) as well as "conservation and rational utilization of the environment in which their forefathers lived for centuries" — a clear response to the open eco-nationalism of the previous few years since Chornobyl. Article 72 of the constitution on the right of secession was still a dead letter, despite the evident failure of the new, truly Soviet, man to appear in place of the 128 nationalities recognized in the January 1989 census. Gorbachev also avoided reference to the increasingly fashionable idea of confederation in favour of a transformation of the actuality of the existing federation. In his view, despite past mistakes, the system had developed to the point where the republics and regions were closely inter-linked and what had been built in this direction should be improved not destroyed.

Nevertheless, having apparently worked out many of the guidelines for the meeting, Gorbachev had to announce a further postponement of the Central Committee session at the last minute in July.<sup>10</sup> The Politburo reportedly had rejected the first draft of the policy document to be discussed there<sup>11</sup> before approving a presumably revised document in mid July,<sup>12</sup> which then had to be circulated to the republican and lower Party committees. The plenary meeting was now rescheduled for September 1989.

#### The Draft Proposals

Attributed to the Politburo itself, but presumably the work of a sub-committee before approval by the full Politburo, the draft proposals to be debated were eventually published in August 1989.<sup>13</sup> Somewhat disappointingly after all that had gone before, the document turned out to be rather more of a statement of general principle already enunciated than a detailed blueprint of precise new measures. The Party was clearly not in a mood to be totally diverted from its existing course in these matters, despite the breakdown of order in so many national minority areas.

<sup>9</sup>Moscow Radio, 1 July 1989.

<sup>10</sup>At a meeting of the first secretaries from all the republics, regions and territories — *Pravda*, 19 July 1989. See also A. Sheehy: "Gorbachev Announces Postponement of Plenum on Nationalities", Radio Liberty Research Report RL 335/89, 20 July 1989, in *Report on the USSR*, Vol. 1, No. 30, 28 July 1989, p. 19-20; and *Financial Times*, 20 July 1989.

<sup>11</sup>The Times, 18 August 1989.

<sup>12</sup>Pravda, 16 July 1989.

13 Pravda, 17 August 1989.

At an entirely general level the new text placed the existing problems in a longer term, less immediate context. It implied that the various republics had freely entered the "multi-ethnic motherland" — "joining forces" being the phrase used. It accepted the "errors" of the Stalin era — "the departmental and indifferently bureaucratic" approach to everything "from the siting of productive forces to problems of language, education and culture", and that at that time "the independence of the republics was limited and the trend toward unitarism gained its strength". Beyond recognizing the "resettlement" of several minorities, the full horror of those years was again too hot a potato for the Party to engage in excessive frankness.

Although admitting that these errors were not all corrected in the post-Stalin years, the document sought once again to distance the Party and leadership of today from the actions of that same Party and some of its leaders yesterday. Despite several missed opportunities, the tenor of the piece is one of "we will do better in future".

Having thus located and identified the cause of the problems, and some of the problems themselves, the draft turned to solutions, whereupon Gorbachev's earlier strictures quickly came to the fore. The Soviet Union was to remain as a unified federation, for, as the draft put it: "Without a strong union there cannot be strong republics. And without strong republics, there cannot be a strong nation". Mutual dependence of nation and republics, and of national and republican legislatures had been created, it declared. Economic decentralization there could be; protection of "national uniqueness" too; but both could occur only "within the mainstream of the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society".

In the same way, the Communist Party was to retain the leading role in the society, cementing the whole union together. There could be no division of it into separate national parties as in the past and as being mooted quite openly in the Lithuanian republic in 1989.<sup>14</sup> Thus the draft proclaimed: "The division of the CPSU into nationalities is unacceptable in principle", and in so retaining the Party's now traditional approach, it squarely reiterated that "Internationalism is irreconcilable with nationalism and chauvinism". Thus, the Party (with its democratic centralist principle), along with the KGB and the residual central economic planning agencies would *de facto* still be able to override any element of federal decentralization of power, even though at the previous Central Committee plenum Gorbachev had declared: "Under the current restructuring drive we must give more freedom to the Communist Parties of the union republics and to the local party organizations".<sup>15</sup>

Central control was in fact to be retained over the key areas of defence, foreign affairs and security, and even strengthened, along with the centre's "coordinating and fulfilling common tasks in the spheres of the economy, science, culture, the status of

<sup>14</sup>See Sovetskaya Litva, 25 and 28 July 1989; and see also below under response.
 <sup>15</sup>Text of speech in Morning Star, London, 28 August 1989.

the individual, effective use of integration processes, and mutual assistance".

There was, however, a pressing need for a clearer definition of the rights and responsibilities of the localities vis-a-vis the centre, and here the new document tried to set some general limits in certain areas starting with the question of ownership of resources. On the one hand the republics were to have the right of ownership and management over the land, the mineral resources, forests, water and other natural resources within their territory. On the other hand, the all-union government was to retain the power to formulate national legislation regulating the use of these resources, taking into account "national interests, inter-republican interests and the interests of the country's defence and security". To this end there would need to be established the property status of industrial, transport, agricultural, trading, service and other enterprises, i.e., whether the property belonged to the all-union government, the republics, cooperatives, or other public organizations. In theory this provision could help overcome objections in the Baltic republics and Uzbekistan over whether they are producing what is in their best interests as opposed to the interests of other parts of the union, but the inter-republican interests would still play a significant part in determining the actual outcome.

The second principle of the draft was a declaration that the republics should be free to choose the economic methods and forms of management operating within their territory with a view to economic efficiency. This too was, however, to be constrained by the need to take into account "the level of socialization of production and the structure of the productive forces", as well as principles of social justice and compulsory participation in the creation of an all-union fund to stimulate the development of more backward areas, not necessarily in their own republic. Indeed, the all-union bodies were given as a major task that of assisting the pooling of efforts on a bilateral and multilateral basis, though whether a Latvian, who probably never sought any relationships with say the Tadzhiks, could ever be persuaded of the merits of such assistance to other parts of the "Russian empire" is a matter of doubt.<sup>16</sup>

In the third place, and in direct response to the ethnic clashes which were increasingly occurring, a point already existing theoretically in law was reasserted. Privileges for one group or infringements of the rights of another on grounds of nationality, religion, language or terms of residence are inadmissible. Estonia, Latvia and Moldavia, all concerned about the number of Russian, and other nonindigenous settlers, were tinkering with electoral qualification, citizenship and immigration laws which would have favoured their "own" populations, and this clause was designed to reinforce the decisions already taken by the all-union

<sup>16</sup>This issue in fact resulted in the refusal of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in May 1989 to implement a road tax rise which was felt to be for the benefit of peoples outside the Lithuanian republic.

Supreme Soviet that such laws were unconstitutional,<sup>17</sup> despite the undoubted support shown for them in the republic concerned. Again the right of the republics to go their own way here was to be limited.

The fourth principle related to the conduct of foreign affairs, where Ukraine and Byelorussia had long had "separate" representations at the United Nations and the other republics went through the more formalized process of choosing foreign ministers to conduct non-existent foreign relations. This situation had been modified somewhat by the economic reforms which had permitted certain enterprises to carry out direct negotiations and trading relations with foreign organizations. Nevertheless, this fourth principle had little new to say in declaring the conduct of foreign policy to be a central prerogative while, in accordance with principles of sovereignty, the republics could maintain relations both with foreign states and international organizations.

The fifth principle, already touched upon, merely made the point that the republics were to contribute to the effort of all-union bodies towards ensuring the security of the union as a whole. This could, however, be interpreted as a warning not to seek to carry out acts which could be construed as potentially damaging to that favourite cover for any government, "national security". Thus, any divisive tendencies, or any challenge to the existing federal structure by way of secessionist nationalists could be presented as the work of a threatening fifth column.

As its sixth principle, the draft discussion paper turned to *perestroika*, or restructuring, of the federal system, though again giving with one hand and taking with the other in a somewhat vague, compromising attempt at gaining the best of both the worlds under consideration. The republican and all-union public organizations were said to have the right to choose on their own the form of relations between themselves. However, in the case of the Party, which was singled out for mention, this was, as we have seen, not to amount to very much other than independence while preserving the present structure, and the right to decide all the main questions of Party life by adopting their own documents within the limits of the Party programme.

One of the most specific principles was the seventh, in a sense a rebuff to the minorities and a concession to the growing Russian backlash against their ungrateful junior partners in the federation. The Russian republic, which for long had had its affairs, in a variety of fields, subsumed under the umbrella of the respective all-union body, was now to be put on more of a par with the other republics, in that the document called for discussion of the creation of republican, administrative, economic, ideological, cultural, scientific and other bodies for the RSFSR. While the Russian republic would perhaps lose some of the advantages of

<sup>17</sup>See below.

11

direct access to the top, reflecting its enormous geographic and demographic superiority, it would allow it a commensurate amount of autonomy from the other republics—at least in so far as that was on offer to any of them.

Finally, the draft raised the question of the rights of the smaller autonomous republics and territories within a number of the larger republics. Their position had been brought into the spotlight by the ethnic conflicts in recent years in Ossetia<sup>18</sup> and Yakutia.<sup>19</sup> but was particularly apparent in Abkhazia and Nagorno-Karabakh. The Central Committee discussion paper declared that the rights and interests of the peoples in this frequently minority-within-a-minority situation needed "rehabilitation", providing them with sufficient capabilities to enable them to meet their national needs in the face of pressures both from government departments and "petty tutelage" by national, republican, territorial and regional authorities. To this end it outlined a number of measures intended to overcome these difficulties and to enhance the role and legal status of the autonomous territories. The existing administrative sub-divisions were to be given a similar range of powers of economic self-management to those accorded to the republics as well as powers to decide on questions of administrative-territorial division within their own territories, on environmental protection issues, the development of cultures and languages and the conservation of historic monuments. They were to have the ability to take up grievances against unconstitutional acts of higher administrative bodies and a veto over border changes. In addition, there was raised the possibility of creating new national territories where one group was actually or potentially dominated by another, and of upgrading other territorial units to a higher status. Among those to feature in this context in the subsequent discussions were the Gagauz in Moldavia and the Adygeys in the Far East,<sup>20</sup> though the issue may have provided some initial cheer also to the Abkhaz in Georgia. More novel was the suggestion that there should be formed representative organs for citizens of large but dispersed ethnic groups lacking their own territory at present.

Encouragement, it transpired, was now also to be given to the creation of ethnic cultural centres and societies, bodies so often discouraged in the past. Special attention was to be paid furthermore to the situation and plight of the small national minorities of the North, Siberia and the Far East who had witnessed industrial development around them without due consideration being given for their way of life. Soviets among them should have exclusive rights to the control of hunting grounds, pastures,

<sup>20</sup>See e.g. Sovetskaya Rossiya, 30 August 1989.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>See A. Nekrich: Nakazannye narody, New York, 1978, p. 124; Financial Times, 24 November 1981; and A. Sheehy: "North Ossetian First Secretary Fired", Radio Liberty Research Paper, RL 25/82, 18 January 1982.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup>V. M. Tsjornovil: "Rassenstrijd", in *Russland bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1980, p. 18-22; and Racial Tensions in Yakutia, in *Soviet Analyst*, Pt. 25, 1980, pp. 6-8.

forests and waterways to preserve or rehabilitate their environment.

Additionally, the draft called for a legislative act to ensure the full rehabilitation of the peoples repressed for "national deviationism" and deported from their homelands under Stalin's rule, to ensure such actions would never recur. Finally, while further encouragement was to be given to the learning of Russian by the ethnic minorities, the Russians themselves were to be encouraged to learn the languages of the minorities among whom they lived.

Such then was the document for discussion. As can be seen, it involved a series of compromise positions which it was doubtless hoped would prove acceptable to the minorities as the best that was available, while indicating what were the sticking points as far as the central authorities were concerned — so far but no further. It was, however, still rather vague on two important and increasingly contentious issues:

1) how sovereign were the republics to be?

2) what was the relative validity of republican and all-union legislation within that context?

In the case of 1) the draft declared that the republics "must be entitled to decide all political and social matters, except those which they voluntarily delegate to the union", and yet the Baltic republics, for example, have been rebuffed in a number of such areas never having been given any serious choice in whether or not they wished to delegate such powers. While it may be impossible to legislate in absolute, unchangeable detail in such a field, this element of wanting cake and eating it seemed to leave matters much as they were, at the discretion of the centre in reality.

Similarly, on the question of legislation, the republics were merely to be able to call into question the all-union laws before a constitutional court — presumably the new USSR Committee for Constitutional Compliance established under the constitutional reforms approved in November 1988 — or, as the programme puts it: "If an all-union law goes beyond the limits of the union's authority, then the republic has a right to raise questions about its abolition".

However, in reverse, "Republican law that also goes beyond the framework of competence of the republics can also be subjected to abolition by the union". This was the nub of the issue where Estonia twice went against the centre in its laws — over the very question of the application of all-union law in the self-governing republic (where Moscow declared Estonia's November 1988 rejection of it without further local approval to be unconstitutional);<sup>21</sup> and over its August 1989 electoral law aimed against recent immigrants (which the Presidium of the all-union Supreme Soviet again rejected, calling for its annulment by October 1989).<sup>22</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup>Estonia subsequently ignored this decision, though, up to the time of the new draft discussion document, neither side pressed the point.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>Which the Estonian leaders declared an invalid act since the decision had been approved in the Estonian Supreme Soviet.

While much vagueness in the document left open the option of constitutional interpretation as a solution, it was already being tested and found wanting as far as some republics were concerned, even before being approved as Party policy.

The document overall once again presented a world as the Party would wish it rather than as it had increasingly become. That a demonstrably overwhelming proportion of the population in some of the republics, via mass meetings, petitions and opinion polls, has displayed its unwillingness to go on as before in an uncalled for and unwanted type of union with Russia remains unacceptable to the leadership in Moscow, where nine out of the twelve voting members of the Politburo responsible for approving this document were Russian in a population where the latter account for a bare 50%. Indeed, Vadim Medvedev, the Party's ideological secretary, speaking of a petition in which 900,000 of the 1.5 million Estonians declared themselves against the constitutional reforms of November 1988, and the Estonian Supreme Soviet's equal rejection by 254 votes to 7, reportedly declared: "I am not inclined to believe they reflect public opinion in the republic".

Although the new proposals did not promise any unrealistic, magic formula, instant answers to restore calm in the sphere of ethnic relations and maintain the USSR as a direct territorial unit, they fell well short of the hopes and expectations, unrealistic as some of them were, of the more radical nationalists, who perceived central authorities on the run in pursuit of solutions. The proposals were, for example, quickly condemned by Dr. Eskhibar Mamedov, founder of the Azeri Popular Front, as offering only "half-sovereignty",<sup>24</sup> while Azerbaijani sociologist Eldar Nazamov was quoted as declaring that it was a "totally conservative, self contradictory document" and that the authorities in Moscow were "trying to draw up an all-encompassing policy to deal with a multi-faceted problem".<sup>25</sup>

Once published in this way, the platform of the Central Committee on nationalities policy was subjected to the usual public debate. Among those participating, through speeches, articles and communications to the Central Committee were various citizen groups, the academic community and members of the Congress of Deputies. In the words of Gorbachev: "Many opinions and interesting proposals were made. Some provisions came under criticism, we should admit this".<sup>26</sup>

Dr. S. Yagudin, for example, called for a special law expounding the details of the degrees of autonomy in the Soviet federal structure,<sup>27</sup> while the Brezhnevite conservative, and former KGB chairman, Viktor Chebrikov, firmly opposed the residence qualifications for voting suggested in the Baltic republics and Moldavia,

<sup>23</sup>The Guardian, 30 November 1988.
<sup>24</sup>Ibid, 4 September 1989.
<sup>25</sup>Financial Times, 11 September 1989.
<sup>26</sup>Tass, Moscow, 19 September 1989.
<sup>27</sup>Sovetskaya Rossiya, Moscow, 30 August 1989.

and any revision of frontiers as called for by the more radical reformers.<sup>28</sup> During this period, Gorbachev also elaborated on the degree of autonomy permissible to the republican Party organizations in his meeting with the leaderships from the Baltic republics on 13 September. Not only was total independence unacceptable but the Party organization, he declared, should not be weakened at a time when inter-ethnic relations had worsened and economic devaluation was under way.<sup>29</sup>

#### **The Special Central Committee Plenum**

When the long postponed plenary session of the Central Committee eventually materialized in September 1989, the nationality issue actually came to be somewhat overshadowed by discussion of the broader problems of *perestroika*, Party reconstruction, and more especially the confrontation of Gorbachev with the conservatives, culminating in the removal of five members of the Politburo. Nevertheless, Gorbachev did himself deliver a long and detailed report on the nationalities issue,<sup>30</sup> concentrating on the origins of problems in this sector, the current thinking of the Party on the matter and the programme for dealing with it, including both the new platform and future legislation. The arch reformer was clearly in need of support from the ardent reformers found in even the leaderships of the outlying republics, and concessions were in the air. And yet, as one observer aptly put it, Gorbachev was not merely Martin Luther, he was, at one and the same time, the Pope, in de facto control of ideology and guardian of some measure of orthodoxy.<sup>31</sup> The federal structure of the existing constitution, the unity of the party and the equality of all Soviet citizens, wherever they resided, were not to be called into question. Not even the idea of a confederation (as in 1920-22) in place of the existing federation was to be permitted. Self-determination did not and should not amount merely to secession. In other words, the devolution being contemplated by Gorbachev, while sweeping in comparison with previous practice, fell far short of that now called for in the more radicalized republics where the local leaderships needed some concessions to appease this growing nationalist pressure. Indeed, in his speech, Gorbachev repeatedly stressed just how far the republics were now enmeshed with one another economically, and demographically, as well as politically. To reverse such "existing realities" would be both wasteful and destructive of positive achievements like the national power grid. He also went on the offensive and blamed the republics themselves for some of the situations about which they were currently complaining, such as shortages (caused by their own

28 Pravda, 19 August 1989.

<sup>29</sup>Financial Times, 16-17 September 1989 and Soviet News, London, 20 September 1989. <sup>30</sup>Tass, 19 September 1989 — the speech was broadcasted live.

<sup>31</sup>Michael Dobbs in the International Herald Tribune, 22 September 1989.

inertia in some cases) or the environmental pollution (produced by factories not imposed on them but often requested by republican bodies). Similarly, the Russian republic was not immune from the problems affecting the minority republics. The solutions in large measure he saw as lying in the reconstruction of the USSR as a whole and the consequent extension of economic well-being, while in the case of the republican Party organizations they were to be given greater freedom to set out their own programmes, make their own appointments and determine their priorities within the general framework set by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The role of the new Central Committee platform was essentially to lay down some lines of general approach, with the more specific decisions to be worked out subsequently in the decision-making organs of the state structure to give real substance to a devolution of power. Such measures could then be spelt out also in the constitution.

Gorbachev also touched on the specific problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, admitting that the Party's political measures to date had not born fruit and declaring that more resolute approaches were now needed. The language was also singled out, and here he gave some hints as to the continued importance accorded to the Russian language, making comparisons of its role in the USSR with that of English in India. Curiously, this baptized Christian, albeit latter day atheist, also perceived a role for the Churches in helping to bring about greater inter-ethnic harmony. Other proposals with which he identified himself included the creation of committees on the nationalities policy and inter-ethnic relations within the central committees and committees at all levels of the Party, and the assigning of special responsibility for these matters to one of the Central Committee Secretaries.

In the subsequent debate on the Central Committee platform, several further amendments were suggested, with the Lithuanian Party leader, Algirdas Brazauskas, also pointing out that many in his organization did wish to regain its independence from the CPSU and that some real autonomy was necessary; while the Estonian Party leader, Vaino Valjas, criticized the central leadership for not having consulted him before issuing a rebuke on the situation in the Baltic republics the previous month. Defence Minister Yazov warned that the ethnic unrest was also having an effect on and in the armed forces. The platform of a unitary Party in a federal state was eventually approved unanimously in its modified form — a from which was not, however, to appear publicly until 23 September.<sup>32</sup>

This final document, the culmination of 18 months' work, followed the line taken by Gorbachev in his directing role as ring master. As such, it came as a not entirely unexpected disappointment for many among the disaffected minorities, retaining as it did the apparent contradictions of the draft with its mixture of conditional concessions. Once again, no secession was permitted but even the degree of autonomy for the minorities appeared to have been watered down.

<sup>32</sup> Pravda, 24 September 1989.

In the first place, several rights apparently promised in the original or in Gorbachev's various statements failed to materialize. Rejecting Estonia's claim to autonomy in its law making, the platform declared that any measure in republican law which contradicted Soviet all-union law could be overturned. Furthermore, the Constitutional Commission which was to decide on such disputes was now replaced in that role by the Supreme Soviet, dominated as that agency has always been by the Russian element of the Soviet population. With the local elections due at the end of 1989, this placed the local Party leaderships in a quandary — whether to appease Moscow by taking firm decisive action against secessionist pressures and risk losing out in the elections, or to appease the localism and risk Moscow's ire. Either way some of the pressure was removed from Gorbachev and the central leadership for the moment.

A second significant area of modification came in the firm condemnation, as "unsusceptible in principle", of attempts developing in the Baltic republics, and especially Lithuania, to establish autonomous communist parties. While they were to be allowed to govern some of their own affairs in a way lacking in practice previously, such autonomous factionalism was no more to be permitted now than it had been in the past.

As a further new move, the final draft of the platform also enshrined Russian as the official state language — a shift from a *de facto* to a more formalized *de jure* position. While other languages were to be allowed to attain such status within their areas, Russian was now preeminent as the language of political discourse in the union as a whole.

Finally, there came another surprise. The Constitutional Commission, a creature of the constitutional reforms of November-December 1988 which was destined to decide on jurisdictional disputes between the centre and the republics, was shorn of this role and replaced therein by the new style Supreme Soviet, dominated as that was by ethnic Russians.

With these modifications, the platform, loosely defined as many of its proposals were, duly appeared as the essence of current Party thinking on the ethnic problems — in effect as a new, elaborated section of the Party's general programme of 1986. Like that larger document, the proposals would take on a more practical shape following elaboration in the Supreme Soviet and codification in new, more detailed, legislation.

#### Response

The build-up in pressure from the nationalists preparatory to the Central Committee session did not diminish with the appearance of the final document, coming as it did as an undoubted set-back to those who had hoped for many more concessions. Indeed, on the very day that Gorbachev introduced the platform to the

Central Committee, the Ministry of the Interior announced that two policemen had been lynched by an Azeri crowd on the border of Nagorno-Karabakh;<sup>33</sup> between the Committee's meeting and the platform publication day, the Lithuanian communists, on 22 September, published a draft programme calling for its separation from the CPSU with a view to becoming a political actor in an independent Lithuanian state, and the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, on 23 September, adopted (by a vote of 274 to 0) a report denouncing the occupation of 1940 and the vote for the annexation as invalid;<sup>34</sup> while on the day the platform was released, it was reported that three people had recently died in Russo-Kazakh ethnic clashes in Semipalatinsk.<sup>35</sup> Throughout this time, the Azeris were maintaining a blockade of rail links through to Armenia, in open defiance of Moscow's wishes. Clearly, the element of fear of the centre which had done so much to cement the union together in the past had now failed partly if not wholly. Gorbachev was not the man to evoke fear in the nationalists. Indeed, they were clearly the more determined to force the pace and press on with or without him. Estonia's scheme for a separate currency, announced later in October 1989, was but one further act of defiance.

#### Conclusions

The crucial problem for the Party in this area, as in the past, lies in translating the theoretical paper propositions into a workable set of measures and actual actions which bear some relation to the plans. And herein lies the stumbling block. How can the internal organizational principle of democratic centralism ever be anything other than a contradiction in terms, and how can its leading role co-exist with local autonomy? Neo-Stalinists and Party conservatives have always been vociferous on the contradictions of capitalism, but have seldom hesitated to resolve this contradiction of Soviet socialism in favour of the centre. Can Gorbachev, the latest reformer, really square the circle? If equal rights are really to be available to all Soviet citizens, this automatically limits the right of each republic to legislate on a whole range of social and educational fields relating to immigration and language use, for example. If the centre is to retain a guiding role over investment and industrial units of all-union import, how can the republics seriously be said to have economic autonomy? Such delicate balancing acts which can so easily end up with the worst of both worlds (rather than the best), have usually led to an opting for centralism as the simplest solution in the past. And yet now that centralism itself has been found so wanting, the obvious solution is to try the alternative of greater local autonomy. However difficult this might be, and however offensive it is to

<sup>33</sup>The Guardian, 20 September 1989.

<sup>34</sup>Le Monde, Paris, 24-25 September 1989 and International Herald Tribune, 25 September 1989.

<sup>35</sup>Tass, 24 September 1989.

central bureaucrats accustomed to having their will obeyed (if only on paper), it may prove to be the only viable option if the territory of the USSR is to be maintained as inviolate and integral. Gorbachev's proposals clearly recognize this and go some way towards a solution within his own frame of reference.

This "solution" is, however, made much more uncertain by the growth of widespread and open hostility in many republics towards the predominantly Russian centre. The more vigorous dissenting minorities are unlikely to see the Party's new ethnic programme as going far enough. As Marju Lauristin, deputy leader of the Estonian Popular Front and member of the Congress of People's Deputies, was quoted as saying of the central leadership: "The problem is that our practice has already gone further than their theory".<sup>36</sup>

While natural caution may have dictated some of the previous calls for greater autonomy, the radical nationalists have increasingly voiced and popularized the concept of full independence. They are unlikely to achieve this without more of a fight with the Party centralizer-internationalists than has been visible until recently. A tougher line towards the nationalists has now been exhibited by former KGB chief Chebrikov in his speech to the Academy of Social Sciences on 1 September 1989 and by Ligachev, both on television the following day and in Frunze on 8 September, with their calls for strengthening the law enforcement agencies, political measures such as a tighter Party discipline, and better communication between the Party and workers and peasants.

Whether either the old style centralizers or the central reformers prevail will, however, depend crucially on the degree of cooperation and adherence they obtain from the Party organizations in the republics in implementing official Party policy. Some have gone native to maintain popularity, beyond even the wishes of the central reformers but others seem set to take a middle course, reformist but not separate from the CPSU.

It remains to be seen if the new approaches can provide any real answers to the ethnic problems besetting the Soviet regime, seeking, as they do, compromise between disintegration of the union and outright repression to hold it together. Few nationalists seem to believe that they will, be they ordinary people flocking to register as Latvian or Estonian citizens in a gesture of defiance, or some of the Party's own ideological officials in these same republics decrying the Central Committee warning of August 1989.<sup>37</sup> It is, indeed, difficult to see how there could be even meaningful economic autonomy without meaningful borders that cannot be overridden from the centre. Shared or divided sovereignty may be an aspiration of the internationalists of the structuralist or pluralist school of thought, but it has

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup>The Washington Post, 22 November 1988.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup>Such as Ivars Kezberis in Latvia or Mikk Tiitma of Estonia — see report on their broadcast critiques in *The Times*, 29 August 1989.
hardly been a high priority of the realist-nationalist oriented school. They have already instituted a degree of economic self-defence, with controls over what can be exported from, for instance, Estonia.<sup>38</sup>

With the Supreme Soviet working on the question of levels of ownership of state property in October 1989, and economic devolution to be implemented from 1990, the constitution itself is next in line for further reform. This will provide a further opportunity for the revolution launched by Gorbachev from above to respond to the revolution launched by the nationalists from below.

<sup>38</sup>Financial Times, 3 October 1989.

**Borys POTAPENKO** 

# INDEPENDENT UKRAINE: THE MISSING LINK IN EUROPEAN STABILITY AND SECURITY

An imperialist regime bent on retaining its dominion, even one which, seemingly, is benevolent at home and cooperative abroad, cannot in the long term create the necessary conditions for lasting regional stability and international security. On the contrary, it can only lead to further strife and turmoil inside its domain and heightened tensions world wide.

In this regard, it is a dangerous misconception to believe that the Kremlin can with impunity dictate the course of events in the empire either by cajoling, friendly persuasion and promises, or through threats and intimidation, including a resort to force against the subject peoples. Likewise, Gorbachev can no longer repackage with immunity the tenets of Soviet Russian imperialism by promising the future end of central control, while at the same time preventing the Ukrainian people from acting in accordance with their historical quest for national freedom. Western governments should compel Moscow to confront squarely the utter futility and dire consequences of attempting to sustain the integrity of the Soviet Russian empire, in whatever guise or under whatever pretext. Neither slogans of revamping a never existent "federation" nor the promises of some sort of "confederation", or the threat of reviving "tsarist Russia" can obscure reality — in Ukraine and throughout the empire the subjugated nations are overwhelmingly demanding the re-establishment of their independent states.

Against this backdrop, recent political differences between Gorbachev and other members of the Politburo reflect more a concern with the viability of the "union" than an essential break with the ideologico-political conception of the Soviet system. Gorbachev has on many occasions reiterated his conviction that the unity and territorial integrity of the USSR will be sustained under any political dispensation offered to the republics. In fact, the policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika* are officially proclaimed as vehicles for a reinvigorated and more powerful Soviet Union.

Consequently, the plan for political reform is rooted in the maintenance of a powerful centralized political structure while allowing for limited local authority in the areas of administration and in certain cultural and economic spheres. While the Kremlin has made pronouncements concerning changes in the political structure of the USSR, its "reform" plan does not even grant genuine and irreversible social and economic freedoms to the non-Russian nations, much less fulfil the yearning for the full restoration of their right to sovereign independence. It will be at the free world's own peril to ignore or misperceive the profoundly tragic reality of Soviet Russian imperialism and its consequences, as the truth about Soviet Russian despotism is increasingly revealed, including the terrible abuse of man and nature. The historical lesson is that the existence of the Soviet Russian empire has and continues to constitute the single greatest source of human misery, ecological destruction and geo-political instability on the European continent and the most potent threat to peace world-wide.

Today, Ukraine and the other subjugated nations hang by a thread over the Kremlin rulers. For its own sake Moscow should take immediate and meaningful steps towards fundamental disengagement from Ukraine and the other republics of the USSR, which, through negotiations, will lead to the peaceful dismantling of the empire and the restoration in its place of sovereign, independent and democratic states, including Russia itself. The subjugated nations fully understand that only with the establishment of their respective independent states can an edifice be built for cooperation among themselves and with their former oppressor, as well as the rest of the international community, in accordance with the relevant norms and precepts of international law governing relations between sovereign and independent states.

Moreover, only this approach can realize the hopes for a united and free Europe. Regrettably, since 1985 the industrialized democracies have been beguiled by Gorbachev's pronouncements about a "single European home" and "the right of all nations to self-determination" and even the right of the republics of the USSR to "economic sovereignty" and "political independence". Yet, despite the initiation of a limited Soviet political disengagement from Central and part of Eastern Europe, and notwithstanding the policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika*, it should be abundantly clear that Moscow has no intention of going the way of the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and the other empires of the world. Under these circumstances, even the tentative gains towards national freedom achieved by the Central and some of the East European nations cannot be consolidated and made durable unless and until the other European states are also allowed to regain their national independence, usurped by Soviet Russia over the course of the past 72 years.

Thus the situation is being exacerbated by the fact that the tide of freedom in Eastern Europe has stalled at the border of the USSR. This should be of paramount concern to the industrialized democracies. For the Kremlin's attempts to halt this process at the western frontier of the USSR, especially in Ukraine, constitutes the single greatest source of instability in Europe. Indeed, the geo-political reality is that Ukraine lies at the epicentre of the European continent. It is also situated between two historical protagonists — Germany and Russia. Ukraine is, therefore, perfectly positioned to fulfil the role of anchoring the security arrangements involving the East European states. With a population of over 50 million, a territory

the size of France and the most highly developed and self-sustaining economy of all the subjugated nations, an independent Ukraine would provide the missing link in the European framework of stability and security.

As to the prevailing situation in Ukraine itself, neither the repressive means available to the authorities nor the other coercive policies and practices have proven successful in uprooting the pro-independence opposition. The repressive organs attempt to undermine all opposition to Moscow's rule, in particular, grass roots community organizations and activists, through intimidation and detention; to co-opt activists through political surrogates of the communist apparatus, such as "federationalist" and "confederationalist" parties; and to address the issue of a limited relaxation of ethnic and cultural autonomy. More recently, there have been stepped-up attacks against the pro-independence leadership; the suspension of local and regional legislative bodies and the administrations of governmental agencies, including the organs of mass media, the police and local militias, through direct central rule by decree; and a massive militarization of the country including the holding of large scale and continuous military exercises and manoeuvres.

Likewise, economic conditions for fanning continued resistance persist. Moscow has yet to even begin dealing with the structural economic problems incumbent on a colonial exploitative system. One of the most widely cited statistics in Ukraine today is that 95% of all industrial production is expropriated and taken out of Ukraine, leaving 5% for the Ukrainian population. The data is only slightly better in the agricultural sector where the exploitation is so great that what remains for local consumption barely staves off severe malnutrition in some of the worst affected areas. Likewise, in the energy sector it is now widely discussed that Ukraine utilizes less than 10% of the electricity generated by nuclear power stations in the country, while Moscow exports the rest to its client states for 1 kopek per kilowatt. The consequences of the Chornobyl nuclear disaster include neurological and physical handicaps to 33% of all births since the disaster and the spread of diseases among children never before experienced in Ukraine, as well as medical experts' predictions that adult susceptibility to devastating diseases will increase radically this year following the completion of a four year incubation period. This critical health situation confronts a society that at best has a medical infrastructure comparable to a third world colony.

Broad sectors of the population are becoming increasingly aware that the economic dislocation, social and educational backwardness, widespread hunger and disease, is the direct consequence of ruthless colonial exploitation by the imperial centre in Moscow. The strike committees of workers in the factories and the oil and coal fields of Ukraine have taken a leading role in political action along these issues including mass work stoppages.

Based on the foregoing, the situation in Ukraine remains, in essence, as grim as

ever with the prospect of a popular uprising, as has already taken place in other republics, more likely than before. After five years of a further mobilization and deepening of the pro-independence and anti-Soviet movement, it has become clear that the Kremlin rulers are facing a crisis situation that is rapidly getting out of control. The pro-independence Ukrainian majority, led by the nationalist movements and political parties, have enlisted the support of an increasing portion of the ethnic minorities in Ukraine, including Russians, Jews and Poles.

Consequently, the pro-independence movement has eclipsed the interests of a narrow sector of the Ukrainian intelligentsia and has now entered a new stage of mobilization and direct action by the workers in the industrial and agricultural sectors of society, as well as involving broad segments of government, management personnel and even reform minded communists. The process is characterized by an ever accelerating pace of rebuilding and strengthening of nationalist and nationally conscious community organizations. The strategic objective of these organizations is to consolidate the pro-independence movement's capacities at the base, in stronger neighbourhood, factory, university, collective and other committees, and in civic, youth, church, student, professional and academic and workers groups. These organizations and groups are successfully undermining the communists' domination of society and in some regions and districts replacing them *in toto*.

The broad and loosely defined alliance of reform and radical organizations under the umbrella group Rukh, which has not been able to forge a political consensus, is being supplanted by the emergence of pro-independence political parties, including the Association for Ukrainian Statehood and Independence, the Ukrainian National Party, the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Republican Party (formerly the Ukrainian Helsinki Union), "Unity" --- the national network of workers' strike committees ---, the Association of Independent Ukrainian Youth, the Memorial Society and others. The parties with explicit independence planks in their political platforms are building an alliance among themselves, which is seen as a short-term defensive strategy to rebuild the grass roots pro-independence community organizations, and as a long-term strategy to achieve the mobilization and coordination of all popular independence forces for the transition to an independent and democratic Ukrainian state. This does not preclude joint actions on specific matters with other parties and groups, as was the case in Rukh. However, as the organizational infrastructure is galvanized among the independence parties, and as their strategic and tactical approaches crystallize, it will be this alliance that will constitute the critical political mass for direct, decisive action in challenging the communist regime and undermining its capacity to rule.

For the organized pro-independence opposition in Ukraine, the basis for the reestablishment of an independent Ukrainian state is the expressed will of the people of Ukraine themselves, as already irrevocably recorded in the annals of history:

- the proclamation of Ukrainian sovereignty and independence on January 22, 1918, in Kyiv;
- --- the proclamation of the national unity and territorial integrity of the Ukrainian National Republic on January 22, 1919, in Kyiv;
- the restoration of the independent Carpatho-Ukrainian State on March 15, 1939, in Khust;
- the restoration of the Sovereign and Independent Ukrainian State on June 30, 1941, in Lviv, including the ensuing armed struggle of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army to defend the newly re-established Ukrainian state.

A concomitant development to the fundamental importance attached to the earlier periods of national independence is that behind the resurgence of the organized pro-independence opposition in Ukraine lies the political strategy pursued by the national-liberation struggle during this century. Its objectives guide the pro-independence forces in their assessment and definition of strategies to confront the regime. The historical precedents of the Ukrainian liberation struggle in 1918-22 and 1941-50 continue to be the subject of intense focus among pro-independence forces within and outside Ukraine. The stress is on the imperative need for urgent action to resolve the underlying problem of alien, colonial domination in Ukraine through a comprehensive, just and peaceful settlement. In this, the only viable path to a lasting solution is the exercise by the Ukrainian people of their inalienable right to national independence.

It is to be emphasized that it is not possible to make progress nor to find a solution to the last empire of the bygone colonial era on the basis of outmoded and discredited plans of "federation" or "confederation". Developments in Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations, and in Russia itself underscore this reality. The impasse between the subjugated nations and the imperial centre in Moscow will continue to widen so long as Western governments rely on dangerous policies of supporting Gorbachev in his attempts to resuscitate the "union".

Western leaders have two options: to continue their unqualified economic and political support for Mikhail Gorbachev, thus maintaining a lifeline to the imperial system and allowing the Soviet President to proceed with the repression of proindependence movements while seeking to rebuild a more powerful empire; or they can step up the pressure, by adopting a policy of firm solidarity with the aspirations of the pro-independence movements in Ukraine and the other subjugated nations and by making all further relations with the Kremlin conditional upon the initiation of a genuine process of disengagement from them, especially as this pertains to terminating military and KGB presence on the territories of the independence seeking countries. This would also necessarily involve the removal of all nuclear weapons from the territories of these nations under effective international supervision and control.

The first option will undoubtedly lead to a deepening of the crisis, contribute to regional destabilization and pose a threat to international peace and security. The second option would lead to a peaceful and comprehensive settlement to the problem of the Soviet Russian empire through the restoration of independent states in the place of the present "republics" including Russia.

In the final analysis, international peace and security, regional stability and national freedom are, in this interdependent world, indivisible. Their common denominator is justice, historical justice earned by those nations who never succumbed to the will of the oppressor and remained resolute and steadfast in their resistance. Unrepentant Ukraine is such a nation. It has borne every injustice, sustained every conceivable repression, faced every genocidal policy that its oppressors could devise and has survived.

Throughout its 1,000-year-long and complicated history, Ukraine has passed through many stages in which hope was mingled with despair and optimism tempered with caution. Today, Ukraine and the other nations held captive in the Soviet Russian empire stand at a historical crossroads. The direction they take will impact profoundly on the whole European continent and humanity as a whole.

At this critical juncture, there can be no room on any one's part for hesitation or inaction. This moment must be seized. This historic moment must be seized by the Western governments in particular, by using their economic power and political influence to convince Gorbachev and his colleagues in the Kremlin that the time of empire has passed and that the time for the national freedom of Ukraine and the subjugated nations has come. Moscow must be brought to its senses and must relinquish its colonial bondage over Ukraine. Olena APANOVYCH

#### THE KOZAK REPUBLIC

The Zaporozhian Sich belongs to those thought-provoking phenomena in world history which many generations of scholars have sought to understand and explain.

"Knaves, cutthroats!", cried the Polish *szlachta* (nobility) in their *Sejm* (Diet) and Senate. Seething with hatred of the Kozaks, they demanded the destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich and its Host.

But the Ukrainian peasants referred to the Sich as the "glorious Zaporozhia", to which they fled from their feudal lords, seeking refuge from unbearable oppression. The Zaporozhian Kozaks — "holy knights, defenders of the country" — were lauded by the people in their *dumy* (epic songs, sing. *duma*), ballads and legends.

"A nest of wilfulness", wrote Tsarina Catherine II in her 1775 manifesto ordering the destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich.

"Zaporozhian Host" was the name the Ukrainian people gave to the lands liberated from Polish rule in 1648-54. The same name was also applied to the Ukrainian Kozak and peasant armies in 1648 which absorbed the best military traditions of the Zaporozhian Sich.

The Kozaks have become the subject of numerous works of literature and art.

Karl Marx called the Zaporozhian Sich a "Kozak Christian republic", stressing that "with the appearance of Kozakdom the spirit of freedom flooded Ukraine".

Voltaire was fascinated by the Kozaks' heroism and tried to find something comparable in world history. "So that is it, the Sich!", Nikolai Gogol wrote. "So that is the nest from which fly out all these men, proud and strong like lions, so that is from where freedom and Kozakdom flows throughout the entire Ukraine!" Ilia Repin, who created the famous canvas *The Zaporozhian Kozaks Writing a Letter to the Sultan*, remarked with enthusiasm: "No one in the entire world felt freedom, equality and brotherhood as deeply as they did".

In the history of the Ukrainian people the Zaporozhian Sich played an exceptionally progressive role. However, to this day scholars have not cleared up all the questions and mysterious aspects and facts concerning the life, customs and history of the Zaporozhians.

We do not know the exact date when the Sich was founded. In the latter half of the 16th century it was already known beyond the borders of Ukraine. European rulers sent their envoys here to seek the Kozaks' support against the Ottoman Porte. For this purpose Erich von Lasotta, the envoy of the Habsburgs of Austria, visited the Sich in 1594.

For Ukraine, the turn of the 15th century was a difficult and grim period. By that

time, it had been dismembered by the Lithuanian, Polish, and Magyar feudal lords. First the Halych-Volyn Principality and, eventually, the Kyiv Principality fell under the attacks of foreign invaders. The feudal lords of the Ottoman Porte and the Crimean Khanate turned the southern Ukrainian steppes into a springboard for their marauding and destructive inroads into Ukraine and Muscovy.

Against this historical background, the people established their own armed forces — the Kozakdom — which took upon itself one of the basic functions of a state, namely, the defence of the country.

The lands of the nomadic Tatars neighboured immediately on the sparsely populated expanses of south-western Ukraine which suffered extensively from the devastating, bloody attacks. The area around Kyiv (in the region of Cherkassy and Kaniv) and Bratslav (southern reaches of the Buh River) attracted the peasants and burghers from distant Halychyna (Galicia), Volyn, Podillia and the northern Kyiv area, as they fled from feudal oppression and exploitation and foreign domination. Bohdan Khmelnytskyi would later say that Kozakdom was formed of "people who could not bear serfdom and so became Kozaks". Small wonder that in the Turkic languages "Kozak" (*Kazak*) stands for "a free, independent person".

The bravest and the strongest joined the Kozaks, because they were expected to endure military campaigns, battles, and a long uninterrupted struggle against invaders. However, these recent peasants used to tilling the land were engaged not only in fighting. They found themselves in the plains of fertile land and fullflowing rivers teeming with wildlife. So the Kozaks took to ploughing, hunting, cattle breeding and the crafts. They founded hamlets and villages, built new cities and restored ruined towns. Due to their efforts, life in the Ukrainian steppes, devastated by the Tatars, was revived.

Eventually, the Kozaks built a system of fortifications on the islands on the lower reaches of the Dnipro (Dnieper) below the river's rapids. Concealed in the *plavni* (flats of dense willow and reed), the Kozak fortress was impregnable to the attacks of the Turks and Tatars. The rapids obstructed the approaches to the fortress from another enemy — the Polish *szlachta*. The Kozaks employed the fortification traditions from the times of Kyivan Rus'. Apart from earthen ramparts, abatises played an important role in the defences. "Zaporozhian Sich" is derived from the work *zasika* (lit. a defensive obstacle of trees), although some scholars believe that the word *sikty* (lit. chop, slash) lies at the root of its origin. "Zaporozhian" is derived from the Sich being situated below the rapids (lit. *za porohamy*).

The Sich was a refuge for all who protested against social and national oppression and fought for freedom. It accepted people regardless of race, nationality or social status, thus fostering a Sich fraternity, solidarity and friendship among various peoples. Apart from Ukrainians, who constituted the overwhelming majority of the Sich, there were many Russians, Byelorussians, Lithuanians, Georgians, Armenians and people from the South Slavic lands. Occasionally, Italians, Frenchmen and even Arabs found their way to the Sich.

The Zaporozhian Sich placed itself at the head of a struggle against the domination of *szlachta*-ruled Poland, the Turkish and Tatar aggression, and the oppression of the feudal system of serfdom.

The government of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth regarded the Kozaks as a threat to their rule and feudal order in Ukraine. Trying to bring the Kozaks under their heel, the Polish kings, at the same time, enlisted them for the defence of their southern frontiers and for suppressing peasant rebellions. In 1572, King Sigismund II Augustus took several hundred Kozaks into state service and entered them in a special register. The registered Kozaks, however, were much smaller in number than the entire Kozakdom which increased with the years. During rebellions the registered Kozaks, who suffered from the high-handedness of the *szlachta*, joined the insurgents.

The Zaporozhians were united in a single organization — the Zaporozhian Host. Relying on the Sich as their base camp, they launched an active struggle against the invaders.

The Sich changed its location several times. It is believed that its first site was on Khortytsia Island, where Prince Dmytro Vyshnevetskyi built a fortified castle in the middle of the 16th century. Its garrison consisted of Kozaks who must have constructed earthen defences and employed a system of abatises. From Khortytsia, they launched several land raids into the Ottoman realm in 1559 and 1560. Although we still lack precise historical information as to whether the Kozaks built their Sich on this island, Khortytsia had always been part of the Zaporozhian domain. Documents of the 1570s reveal that the Sich was on Tomakivka Island, and from the 1590s it was located on another Dnipro island, Bazavluk. It is about the Bazavluk Sich that Erich von Lasotta left us his recollections. From 1638 to 1652, the Sich was located on Mykytyn Rih, where an insurgent army was formed and Bohdan Khmelnytskyi was elected Hetman. From here, the Kozaks under his command marched forth on April 22, 1648, to unite with the rebel movement in the Dnipro area and to begin a liberation war of the Ukrainian people.

The Chortomlyk Sich had the longest recorded history. It is associated with the life and activity of the Kish Otaman Ivan Sirko who opposed the Tatar inroads. By order of Tsar Peter I the Chortomlyk Sich was destroyed, because part of its officers and men had sided with Ivan Mazepa (Kozak hetman who turned against Russia and joined forces with the Swedes during the Great Northern War of 1700-21). Thereafter, the Zaporozhians moved to the south and founded a Sich on the Kamianka River. However, this choice also met with the prohibition of the tsarist authorities, and the Kozaks had to camp at Oleshky which was part of the Crimean Khanate at that time.

To live under the rule of their enemies of long standing — the Tatar feudal lords — was extremely difficult. Often the Zaporozhians appealed to the Russian government to permit them to again become Russia's subjects. Finally, the request was granted in 1734, shortly before the Russo-Turkish war. Then the last, Pidpilna Sich (derived from the name of the River Pidpilna on which it was built), was founded.

Foreign eyewitnesses and Russian officers have left us recollections of the life and customs of the Zaporozhians. Archives provide perhaps the most valuable information in this respect. The Sich maintained active diplomatic relations with the governments of many countries and exercised control over its internal life. Clerical work and record-keeping were well developed. Highly educated people of renown served in the Zaporozhian chancellery which produced historians and chroniclers. However, in the maelstrom of events, many of the documents were lost or destroyed. We have only the material concerning the last New Sich which is a unique archival fund of world importance.

The Kozaks left an unusually interesting and precise description of the external appearance of their Sich. Their legation under Otaman Shashol described the Chortomlyk Sich during its visit to Moscow in 1672. Outwardly, it resembled a fortified town. On the left side it was washed by the River Chortomlyk, and on the right by the Prohnoy. Beyond the fortress flowed the River Skarbna, its steep banks serving as natural defences supplemented by a thirty-metre-long rampart and moat. The fourth side of the Sich opened onto a field, where the rampart had embrasures and was fortified by a paling of sharpened stakes impregnated with pitch. On this side, rose a tall defence tower of some 43 metres in diameter, and in front of it, in a circle of up to 216 metres, was a special earthen fortification with embrasures for cannon. On the other side, wicker baskets filled with earth stretched to the rampart. Entry into the Sich was possible only through eight narrow passages with embrasures. In the winter, the Zaporozhians broke the ice on all the rivers surrounding the Sich, thus obstructing access to the fortress.

In the centre of the Sich, was a square surrounded by  $38 \ kurins$  — wooden barracks covered with skins or reed thatch. The quarters of the *starshyna* (body of officers) and the *pushkarnia* (armoury) storing fort and field cannon were also located on the square. Outside the town, near the port, was the "Greek House" for foreign envoys and merchants. The Zaporozhian Sich was engaged in lively trade and, moreover, was a transit point of all the Ukrainian lands and Muscovy with the countries of the East. The town's suburbs were built with living quarters and workshops for craftsmen. The Kozaks were remarkable gunsmiths and produced their own gunpowder of high quality. Among them were also famous builders of combat boats — *duby* and *chaiky* —which successfully competed with the redoubtable Turkish galleys. Frequently, Zaporozhian shipwrigths were invited to Muscovy. The *kurins* were quarters of the Sich garrison. They also served as a militaryadministrative and economic unit in the territories under the Sich. A *kurin* was commanded by a Kurin Otaman. The greater part of the Kozaks and their families lived in winter camps, and eventually in the villages in the territory of the Sich. In the latter half of the 17th century, these lands were called the *volnosti* (free lands) of the Zaporozhian Sich.

To bring a woman, even if she were a mother, into the Sich was prohibited on the pain of death. Such a restriction was dictated by the extremely rigorous and dangerous conditions of life in Zaporozhia, where everything was subordinated to the demands of readiness for war.

In their struggle against foreign invaders, the Sich developed a well-formed military organization. Each Kozak was officially called "comrade of the Zaporozhian Host", which reflected elements of a democratic relationship. The Kozakdom was divided into regiments of 500 to 1,000 men, and eventually more, under the command of a colonel. The regiments were made up of *sotni* (companies) under *sotnyks* (captains). The *sotni* were divided into *kurins*. Overall command of the Kozaks was vested in the Hetman in the territories outside the Sich. With the *Nyz* Kozaks (i.e., those living on the lower Dnipro, or the Zaporozhian Kozaks proper), authority was exercised by a Kish Otaman who wielded unlimited power during campaigns. Together with the *pysar* (chancellor), *sudia* (judge) and *oboznyi* (quartermaster), the Kish Otaman formed the government — the Kish of the Zaporozhian Sich. The Kish *starshyna* were elected every year at a general military conference held three or four times a year to decide important matters, such as receiving envoys, approving decisions on campaigns, distributing lands and pastures among the *kurins* and the like.

Features of an early bourgeois republic can be traced in the activities of the Zaporozhian Sich. The *starshyna* and well-established Kozaks, however, violated democratic procedures and, resorting to demagoguery, bribes and force, they attempted to make the democratic rights serve their selfish ends and privileges and foisted their will on the Kozak council. All the higher offices were held exclusively by the rich Kozaks. By the end of the Sich's existence, the *starshyna*, in agreement with the tsarist government, reduced the principle of election to a mere formality. An acute social conflict prevailed in the Host. The bulk of Zaporozhians consisted of poor Kozaks who bore the brunt of military campaigns and constituted the most active force in the peasant and Kozak uprisings.

By the mid-17th century, the Zaporozhian Host was among the best European armies, while its daring offensive strategy and flexible tactics surpassed the European feudal armies which persistently adhered to position and defensive warfare.

The Zaporozhian foot soldiers were considered the best in Europe. They engaged the enemy, forming up, as a rule, in three lines. The first delivered fire, the second passed on the firearms to the first line, while the third loaded the muskets. The Kozak foot soldiers gained fame for their daring assaults on enemy fortresses and were equally proficient in fighting on sea as part of the Kozak sail- and oar-propelled flotillas. They were also engaged in shore guard duty. There is historical evidence corroborating the fact that Kozaks employed undersea boats during their campaigns against the Ottoman Porte much earlier than in Western Europe. Apart from attacking individual vessels, the Kozaks engaged entire Turkish flotillas. When the enemy was overwhelmed, the crews were neutralized and the galley slaves were freed and taken to their lands of origin or accepted into the ranks of Kozakdom.

In the first half of the 17th century, the Zaporozhian cavalry was numerically smaller than the foot soldiers, but it was remarkable for its battlecraft. The cavalry mounted a charge in what was called a *lava* (compact body) formed up in a semicircle; thus it was able to attack the enemy both frontally and from the flanks, as well as to penetrate into its rear.

The most widely employed type of battle formation was the tabir (laager), perhaps the most important element of Kozak tactics used in a steppe terrain. A tabir was a quadrangular fort on wheels, made up of several rows of wagons fastened together, with the troops positioned in the middle. Such a battle formation made it possible to quickly pass over from the offensive to the defensive and vice versa. The *tabir* was formed both in battle and during marches. It was often referred to as a "mobile fortress". During marches, the foot soldiers occasionally went beyond the tabir. However, when threatened with danger, they grouped in a defensive circle. During the defensive the wagons were placed side by side, their wheels tied together with chains, and the shafts turned like spears in the direction of the oncoming enemy. The troops took up position behind the wagons. During sustained sieges of enemy fortresses or an all-round defence, the wagons were sometimes covered with earth to make a strong rampart, around which were dug entrenchments and pitfalls with sharp stakes on the bottom. Contemporaries noted that a hundred Kozaks in a tabir could successfully withstand a Tatar unit of a thousand or more troops. The Polish armoured *uhlans* usually smashed themselves against the strong tabir walls.

The Zaporozhians raised sentry duty and reconnaissance techniques to a high level of efficiency. In protecting their southern frontiers from the raids of Tatar hordes, the Kozaks developed a distinctive signalling system — maiaky (beacons) — a type of fire telegraph which transmitted information to friendly steppe dwellers. Once the enemy was spotted, the first maiak on the frontier was set alight, followed by the second, the third, and so on. The dense, black smoke and the bright flames warned people of the approaching enemy. One maiak burning signified that the enemy was pushing towards the frontier, three maiaks signalled enemy intrusion into Ukrainian territory.

The Kozaks were armed with swords and spears, as well as firearms — muskets, harquebuses and pistols which earned them the name "musket army". In addition, they were armed with *kelepy*, *yakirtsi* and *rohulky* (battle hatchets and hammers) used against enemy cavalry. We know that they employed incendiary rockets in the early 16th century.

Arms and ammunition (gunpowder, bullets) were produced by the Zaporozhians themselves or captured in battle. Apart from his arms and equipment, each Kozak had to have an axe, scythe, shovel, ropes and the like for constructing defences and tying the wagons together into a *tabir*.

The Kozaks excelled in building earthen defences. The papal nuncio Juan de Torres, who visited Poland and Ukraine, remarked: "The Kozak fights as much with his musket as with a mattock and shovel... piling up and building fortifications amid the boundless plains of his land". Ramparts, abatises, entrenchments, redoubts, and the *tabir* were built with incredible speed. "There is no other army in the world capable of building entrenchments as skilfully as the Kozaks", wrote a Transylvanian chronicler. "As soon as he builds himself a fortification on some river", he continued, "the Kozak becomes entirely unassailable".

The Kozaks also widely employed a particularly effective defensive measure against enemy fire — entrenchment — which was yet unknown in Western Europe. It was much more effective than the armour of the Polish army and the mercenaries it enlisted, specifically the Germans.

The artillery of the Zaporozhian Host consisted of heavy pieces of ordnance used during sieges and defence, as well as light manoeuvrable falcons. Some units had *vertliuhy* (pivot cannon) installed on the sides of boats or galleys.

Observers pictured the Zaporozhian Kozaks as hardy, courageous and audacious men, indefatigable in battle. In describing a sea engagement of Kozak *chaikas* with a Turkish fleet, Mustafa Naim, an Ottoman chronicler, noted: "It can be stated with certainty that there are no people on earth who care less about life and have less fear of death than they".

Iron discipline was the rule in Zaporozhia. Betrayal of Kozakdom and country was considered the gravest of crimes. Zaporozhia was thus developing an indomitable spirit, firing the hearts and minds with patriotism, and fostering hatred of every form of oppression. From the late 16th century, the Sich became the political centre of the Ukrainian people, producing distinguished generals, wise statesmen, and leaders of popular insurrections — Severyn Nalyvaiko, Taras Fedorovych (Triasylo), Pavlo Pavliuk, Ivan Sulyma, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Ivan Sirko, Maksym Zalizniak, and Symon Paliy.

The military campaigns of the Zaporozhians gained particular scope and intensity during the first quarter of the 17th century. Several times the Kozaks "fumigated with musket smoke" the capital of the Ottoman Porte and struck fear into the hearts of Sultans whose might made the rulers of Western Europe tremble.

A considerable part of the campaigns, especially in the 1620s-1640s, was conducted jointly with the Don Kozaks, with whom the Zaporozhians shared a social unity and longstanding friendship in their common struggle against foreign invaders. The Zaporozhian and Don Kozaks formed a military barrier against Ottoman and Tatar aggression both for Ukraine and Muscovy, as well as for the other countries of Europe. The blows inflicted by the Kozaks on Ottoman and Tatar rule in the maritime regions of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov had a great impact on the liberation struggle of the neighbouring Balkan peoples, subjugated by the Ottoman Empire. However, the liberation of large numbers of captives was the most important result of the Kozak campaigns. Hundreds, at times thousands, of slaves — Ukrainians, Russians and other peoples — were freed by the Zaporozhians.

The role of Kozakdom in the sociopolitical life of Ukraine was so great and its bonds with the people so strong that the documents of the 17th and 18th centuries even refer to all Ukrainians as a "nation of Kozaks" or a "Ukrainian Kozak nation".

With the passing of decades, the Sich remained a centre of freedom, from which spread the waves of insurrection against the domination of *szlachta*-ruled Poland. In the great liberation war of 1648-54, the Zaporozhian Sich played an outstanding role, especially at the outset. An insurgent army was raised at the Sich, where Bohdan Khmelnytskyi was elected Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host. From here he dispatched his appeals, calling on the population to join the struggle. The first three thousand troops under his command set forth from the Sich in April 1648. The Sich provided the insurgents with cannon and other arms. In the course of the liberation war, the Zaporozhian Kozaks retained their importance, since they were the best organized, experienced and battleworthy part of the insurgent army. Many Zaporozhians became outstanding military leaders. The organizational system and formation of the insurgent popular army also relied to a considerable degree on the traditions of the Zaporozhian Sich.

After the Treaty of Pereyaslav (1654) brought Ukraine into Muscovy's sphere, Poland did not wish to relinquish its hold on the Ukrainian lands and resumed hostilities. According to the Truce of Andrusovo (1667) between the King of Poland and the Tsar of Muscovy, Ukraine, though it won freedom from foreign domination in a hard, bloody war, was divided between the two powers. Right-Bank Ukraine (all lands west of the Dnipro river) was again ceded to Poland, and the Zaporozhian Kozaks saw the day when the articles of the Pereyaslav Treaty were implemented. In 1689, following the Eternal Peace between Poland and Muscovy, the Zaporozhian Sich officially became a part of Muscovy, while Right-Bank Ukraine remained under the rule of Poland as before.

The tsarist government granted the Zaporozhian Sich a large territory to the south of the rivers Tiasmyn and Orel (in what are now the Zaporizhia, Dnipropetrovsk and Kirovohrad regions). The Sich remained a separate body politic, retaining its right to local self-government and justice, and the Host received an annual "Tsar allowance", i.e., money, food supplies and ammunition.

After the Pereyaslav Treaty, the Zaporozhian Kozaks remained in the forefront of the struggle against Poland and Ottoman-Tatar inroads. At that time, the Sich produced a talented leader in the person of Ivan Sirko who was elected Kish Otaman eight times. His name is associated with the famous letter the Zaporozhians sent to the Sultan, in which they sarcastically ridiculed the haughty ruler and his claims to world domination. As a separate component of the Russian army, the Zaporozhian troops took an active part in the Russo-Turkish wars of the 18th century. By then, horses already constituted a dominant feature of the Zaporozhian Host, and the Russian command committed Zaporozhian cavalry against the Tatar hordes who engaged their adversaries exclusively on horseback. The Zaporozhian flotilla also contributed to the successful operation of the Russian troops against the Ottoman and Tatar armies along the Black Sea coast. All these factors resulted in the Sich playing an outstanding role in liberating the southern Ukrainian lands and the Crimea from Ottoman domination, and led to the conclusion of the Treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji in 1774.

So widespread was the fame of the Zaporozhian Host, so remarkable its courage and battlecraft, that senior Russian officers considered it an honour to be enrolled in a *kurin*. Among such "*kurin* comrades" we find the name of the outstanding Russian general Mikhail Kutuzov.

Throughout the 18th century, the population of Zaporozhia swelled, as an increasing number of fugitives fled from feudal exploitation and serfdom. The Zaporozhian poor constituted the military bulk in the Haydamak movement. Their leader, Maksym Zalizniak, came from a Kozak milieu. As Taras Shevchenko wrote in his poem "The Haydamaks", Zalizniak "had neither an abode, nor an orchard nor pond" to call his own.

The Kozaks also fought in Muscovy in its peasant wars. Many of them served in the armies of Yemilian Pugachov. After the tsarist troops suppressed the Pugachov uprising, the peasant leader contemplated, as he himself declared, "to reach the Zaporozhian Kozaks by sea".

In Zaporozhia itself, the rank-and-file Kozaks repeatedly rebelled against the *starshyna* who abused their power. The biggest rebellion broke out on December 26, 1768, when the Kozaks seized all the cannon, freed the imprisoned Haydamaks, and razed the quarters of the *starshyna* to the ground. The Kish Otaman, disguised as a monk, barely managed to save himself from the insurgents who had surrounded his house. The rebels resisted the tsarist punitive troops seeking to dislodge them from the Sich. However, it was an uneven struggle and the rebellion was crushed.

Following the reprisals against the Pugachov uprising and the conclusion of the war with the Ottomans, the tsarist government decided to abolish the Zaporozhian Sich, which by that time had lost its significance as a southern military outpost. The former Zaporozhian frontier was now within the bounds of the Russian Empire. Moreover, the large number of fugitives, who found refuge in the Sich, presented a threat to the tsarist government as a potential force of ceaseless anti-feudal struggle. Pursuing its policy of national and colonial oppression, the tsarist government abolished the Hetmanate in Left-Bank Ukraine in the 1760s, because it could not tolerate the special order and self-government of Zaporozhia. Its lands were distributed among the Russian and Ukrainian landed gentry, and a part of its population was turned into serfs.

Zaporozhia led a rich spiritual life. In the territory under its authority, there existed general educational and choral schools. Many Kozaks were alumni of the Kyiv Mohyla Academy and even of Western European universities.

Among the Zaporozhians we frequently find talented singers, musicians, poets and dancers. Such dances as the *hopak* and *metelytsia* originated in the Sich which also had a *vertep* (marionette theatre). The *dumy* (pl. of *duma* — epic song) and other songs created by the Kozaks are among the most fascinating cultural features of the Ukrainians, as are the *kobzars* (players of the *kobza* — a lutelike instrument). The *kobzars* were much more than composers and performers of *dumy* and songs. The lyrics of their songs inspired the people to struggle, in which the *kobzars* played a direct role themselves. Martial music also gained a high level of development in Zaporozhia. For several centuries popular pictures of "Kozak Mamay" were to hang in practically every village home throughout Ukraine.

An atmosphere of permanent danger and heroic resistance to injustice developed great traditions of brotherhood, friendship, mutual assistance and selfsacrifice in the Kozaks.

To this day many a *duma* and historical ballad capture our imagination with their tales of the valorous exploits of the knights of the Kozak Republic.

Reprinted from "Ukrainian Heritage", published by the Ukrainian Society for the Protection of Monuments of History and Culture and the Ukrainian Culture Foundation, Kyiv.

# NEWS FROM UKRAINE

# INAUGURAL CONGRESS OF THE UKRAINIAN REPUBLICAN PARTY A Reporter's Account

The following account of the inaugural Congress of the newly-formed Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) was published in a special edition of the bulletin of the URP Lviv branch — "Lviv News". In the introduction to this account it is stated that "the primary goal of the Ukrainian Republican Party is full independence for Ukraine".

In the darkness of Brezhnevite lawlessness, when many lost faith, a group of patriots was formed, which through the strength of their greatness of spirit and at the cost of their own lives proclaimed to the world and to the rulers of the Kremlin that Ukraine continues to live and fight. The Gorbachevite "thaw" ignited a conflagration of civic-political activity. People are gathering around movements which reject the communist path in the life of nations. In July 1988 a political association called the Ukrainian Helsinki Union was formed and it quickly became an all-Ukrainian structural organization. In less than two years of activity, the UHU acquired widespread political legitimacy not only in Ukraine, but beyond Ukraine's borders as well. The communist rulers of Ukraine are forced to deal with UHU leaders, despite the fact that the "red press" has continuously tried to discredit these leaders. The Union was victorious in the elections. Twelve UHU members were elected People's Deputies of the Ukrainian SSR. Many UHU members became deputies in municipal councils. By the end of April 1990 the Ukrainian Helsinki Union had over 2,300 members, which is a considerable accomplishment given the continuous ideological campaign waged against the Union by the ruling party apparatus. Recently, many individuals have indicated their willingness to join the UHU or a party that would be established on the basis of the Union. For at least half a year, much has been said about the need to transform the UHU into a political party. Such a step would place the Union on a new level of activity. By April 29, when the UHU Congress began, several political parties were already formed, such as the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party and the Rural-Democratic Party, but they are relatively small. The difference between these parties and the Ukrainian Republican Party is that the former were established in

Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

western Ukraine, where a specific political climate exists, while the URP encompasses all of Ukraine in its structural organization. Since many people's deputies are in the ranks of the Ukrainian Republican Party, it has, in fact, become the second parliamentary party in Ukraine. This fact alone forces the republican leadership of the Ukr. SSR to recognize a multi-party system.

The Congress of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, at which the Ukrainian Republican Party was founded, was held on April 29 and 30, 1990, in Kyiv in the Republican Theatre building. Until the last days, it was not certain whether the Congress would even take place, since problems regarding the hall unexpectedly arose. The red press again began a disinformation campaign. This campaign, however, had no effect on the directors of the theatre building and the Congress convened as scheduled. 495 delegates participated in it, as well as hundreds of invited guests, and many journalists from around the world.

The last forum of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union began with a religious hymn, "Oh God, great and one", which echoed from a tape recorder. Afterwards, a young priest of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church from Mykolayiv near the southern Buh river delivered a short pastoral address. He said that the existence of people in Ukraine who started the Ukrainian Helsinki Union, of people who today stand by the national-liberation struggle, is a gift from God, is a sign that Ukraine will break the chains of slavery. His address was punctuated by a high level of patriotism and a deep sense of toleration to the representatives of other religions in Ukraine.

Oksana Meshko, a founding member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, spoke about the founding of the Union and its subsequent fate. The Ukrainian Helsinki Group, which was created immediately after the creation of the Moscow group, delineated the fate of all other Helsinki groups in the USSR, and its members were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. They did not suspend their struggle, even when behind the barbed wire fences.

The Congress then resolved several procedural questions. The presidium of the Congress was chosen and it included Levko Lukianenko and Mykhailo Horyn. A secretariat, verifications committee, and editorial committee were elected. The editorial committee was mandated with the task of preparing programmatic documents, taking into account the comments of the delegates. The Congress decided that a new presidium should be chosen for every session.

Levko Lukianenko, the head of the UHU Executive Committee, read his report on the work of the UHU. The Union presently has over 2,300 members, organized in 190 centres of activity. They form 28 branches, 2 of which are outside Ukraine — in Moscow and Novyi Uranhoy. New organizational branches will soon be formed in Kirovohrad, Kherson and Cherkasy. Branches of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union are being formed in Magadan and a number of cities in Siberia, the Far East and in Kuban. Presently, the Ukrainian eastern diaspora numbers nearly 15 million people. A sense of national consciousness was severely repressed in many of these people, but nonetheless the processes of national self-determination are developing rapidly. Besides Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, Byelorussians, and representatives of many other nationalities were also members of the UHU. The social breakdown of the UHU's membership indicates that it includes people working in the humanities, the technical intelligentsia, and the working classes (including people from the trade unions of south-eastern Ukraine). Levko Lukianenko underscored the fact that the new party will need to have its own printing machines and that its leadership will begin a campaign to obtain them from the start. We must win the struggle at the time that the empire is crumbling. Levko Lukianenko ended his address by stating that if events should unfold in a different manner, then we are not needed on this world.

The Congress received greetings from the following: the regional council of Ivano-Frankivsk, the Ukrainian Central Information Service from London, the chairman of the Christian-Democratic International — Andrew Lewis, the president of the Ukrainian National Republic — Mykola Plaviuk. The chairman of the presidium read a leaflet that was distributed in Kyiv before the Congress, in which the anonymous author, masking himself behind words about "honour and conscience", called upon the residents of Kyiv not to permit the formation of a new party on the basis of the "UHU", which, in his words, will be inimical to the Ukrainian people...

Ivan Kandyba, the chairman of the association "Ukrainian Independence and Statehood", a founding member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, and a long-term political prisoner, addressed the delegates and endorsed the decision to transform the UHU into a political party. He stated that the association that he heads is ready to cooperate with the new party. Afterwards, Hryhoriy Prykhodko, the chairman of the Ukrainian National Party, greeted the Congress and read a declaration. From the diaspora, Pavlo Dorozhynskyi, the editor of "Samostiyna Ukraina" and Vasyl Markus, a professor from Chicago, greeted the Congress. They said that the diaspora is following the present processes in Ukraine with great hope. In analysing these processes they expressed their conviction that the Ukrainian nation is ready for statehood. The formation of political parties is an indication of this readiness. An independent Ukrainian state is also needed by the diaspora.

A statement was read on behalf of the Executive Committee in which it was stated that the editorial committee, which was formed by the All-Ukrainian Coordinating Council on March 18, 1990, has completed its activity and is asking the Congress to accept its work. The Presidium read a resolution by which the Congress gave its mandate to the editorial committee.

Bohdan Horyn, a People's Deputy of the Ukrainian SSR, read a presentation on the political situation in Ukraine and on the need to form a party that would be an alternative to the Communist Party. The catastrophe of Chornobyl has become a great tragedy for the Ukrainian nation. An even greater tragedy, however, is the fact that the adherents of the communist ideology, having suffered serious setbacks in the world, continue to commit lawlessness in Ukraine.

Mykola Horbal, a member of the UHU Executive Committee, in speaking on the ethics of the members of the new party, said that the party, in terms of its ethical base, will be founded on a Christian morality. The primary sources of the party should be the "Kobzar" [the collected poems of Taras Shevchenko, Ukraine's national poet] and the Bible. The "Kobzar" should remind us that our primary goal is Ukraine.

Mykhailo Horyn, the chairman of the Rukh Secretariat and a deputy of the Ukr. SSR, underlined the need to guard against a great catastrophe which may result from the fall of the empire; we need to consolidate our forces with all healthy currents in society and to look for allies, for supporters of our ideas, of our cause, everywhere, even among our enemies.

The present guests from Armenia stated that Armenia is also an ally of Ukraine in the struggle for state independence.

The representative of the National Front of Azerbaijan greeted the Ukrainian nation on the occasion of the formation of a new political structure, which is fighting for the liberation of Ukraine. Ukraine will have an ally in this struggle. Presently, the Azeri people are divided between two states: the imperialist USSR and Iran.

Vasyl Kapkan, a member of the Ukrainian Community in Lithuania, greeted the Congress on behalf of *Sajudis*. Near the end of the Congress, one of the members of the *Sajudis* parliament arrived and addressed the Congress. He gave a detailed account of the widespread economic and informational blockade of Lithuania and asked that Ukraine not participate in this imperialist blockade. The leadership of the newly-formed party and of Rukh declared their support of Lithuania. It was stated at the Congress that despite the decisions of the administrative councils of various factories and enterprises, the councils of workers' collectives are deciding to continue exchanges with Lithuania.

The representative of the Democratic Association of Moscow, Novodvoska, stated that the Democratic Association has separated itself from the imperialist policies of the Kremlin leadership. The Association regards all the conquests of the tsarist and Soviet empires illegal and its position is that an independent Russia will not have any claims to any of these conquered territories. The dissolution of the empire and the formation of an independent Ukrainian state is also in the interests of Russia.

Vyacheslav Chornovil, who was at one time a member of the Executive Committee of the UHU and who is presently the Chairman of the Lviv regional council, also delivered a speech at the Congress. He stated that the UHU has etched for itself a prominent place in the history of the Ukrainian state. He also presented his views on various programmatic documents of the newly-formed party, which was met with a harsh reaction from the delegates of the Congress.

The issue of Ukrainian military formations was brought up in the discussion. It was stated that in the ranks of the military personnel, this idea is finding support.

The representatives of the Ukrainian Independent Youth Association declared their support of the new party. On the proposition of the youth, a decision was taken that the age criteria for membership in the new party be set at 17 years of age.

Yevhen Proniuk, a member of the Executive Committee, read a draft of the programme, on the basis of which the new party is to function. The delegates to the Congress had many comments to this draft. The editorial committee incorporated these comments in the form of changes to the draft. After a brief, but heated debate, the programme was ratified and will remain in force until the next Congress, which should take place in one year's time, according to the by-laws. Throughout the upcoming year, the editorial committee will consider all the comments on the programme and by-laws and will prepare a new draft of the programmatic documents of the party. A considerable number of delegates, particularly working class representatives, expressed their concerns that in the programme the interests of the working classes are not included, which may result in a lack of support for the party among the workers. Other delegates underscored the fact that the working classes, particularly the coal miners in the large mining areas, have long since been waiting for the appearance of a force which in its essence would have an anti-communist ideology.

The programme clearly states that the party will strive for the establishment of an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state, as the primary condition for a political, economic and cultural rebirth.

Five separate proposals were put forth regarding the name of the new party: Ukrainian Republican Party, Ukrainian Democratic Party, the Democratic Party of Ukraine, Ukrainian Republican-Democratic Party, and Ukrainian National-Republican Party. The name — Ukrainian Republican Party — was accepted in a majority vote.

After several changes were added, the by-laws were ratified by the delegates. This, concurrently, was regarded as the act of proclamation of the new party. This moment was greeted by the delegates and guests with a cheerful round of applause.

Levko Lukianenko, a long-term political prisoner of Soviet concentration camps, was subsequently elected Chairman of the new party. Stepan Khmara a deputy of the Ukr. SSR and a member of the Lviv branch, and Hryhoriy Hrebeniuk, a doctoral candidate from Donetsk, were elected vice-chairmen. A party Council was chosen, consisting of 75 members. The Council, in accordance with the bylaws, is to choose seven secretaries, who are to function as political workers.

In his acceptance speech, the Chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party said that the highest goal in his life is Ukraine. The party is an instrument, which will help Ukraine gain its independence. As an experienced politician, Levko Lukianenko spoke of the momentous role that the Ukrainian Republican Party will play in Ukraine in the future.

Dmytro Pavlychko, the Chairman of the Ukrainian Language Society and a deputy of the USSR and the Ukr. SSR, greeted the Congress on behalf of the Society and the initiative group for the formation of a party on the basis of Rukh. The Rukh leadership, which actively assisted in the organization of the Congress, also greeted the Union with its transformation into a political party.

The Congress delegates spoke on a number of painful and critical issues. The most painful issue raised was with regard to the fact that the population around Chornobyl has yet to be evacuated, and that Russian settlers are being sent to the most russified cities of Ukraine. The party chairman said that these questions require immediate attention and the effectuation of political measures.

During the plenary sessions of the Congress, many UHU members and sympathizers gave donations to cover the costs of the Congress. After the ratification of the by-laws, statements were read regarding membership in the new party. Former UHU members automatically become members of the Ukrainian Republican Party.

The Congress ratified a series of resolutions, including an appeal to the head of the empire, the leader of the imperialist communist organization, regarding his recent anti-democratic measures and statements.

At the close of the Congress, a choir from the capital of Ukraine sang the national anthem — "Ukraine has not died".

# Two New Bishops For Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church

On Saturday, April 28, Rev. Mykhail Kovalchuk was appointed Bishop Danyil of the Chernivtsi and Khotyn eparchy (diocese) of the UAOC. The ceremony was held in the Church of Sts. Peter and Paul in Lviv.

Rev. Vasyl Romaniuk, a former political prisoner, who has recently toured Ukrainian communities in the West, was appointed Bishop of Uzhhorod and Khust the following day, Sunday, April 29, in the village of Kosmach in the Ivano-Frankivsk province.

They will join the present three bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church — Ioan, the head of the UAOC; Vasyliy, Bishop of Ternopil and Buchach; and Andriy, Bishop of Ivano-Frankivsk and Kolomyia. For the time being Bishop Danyil (Mykhail Kovalchuk) will act as assistant bishop to the Bishop of Lviv. Bishop Volodymyr (Vasyl Romaniuk) will work as a missionary bishop in Kyiv.

Rev. Vasyl Romaniuk worked as a parish priest in Kosmach when he was arrested and sentenced to ten years of strict regime imprisonment during the Brezhnev era.

# MEETING OF UKRAINIAN AND POLISH PARLIAMENTARIANS HELD IN YABLONKA Discuss Ukrainian-Polish Relations

YABLONKA—A meeting of several Ukrainian and Polish parliamentarians took place in this city near Warsaw on May 4-5, 1990. The meeting was held to discuss Ukrainian-Polish relations.

Representatives from both delegations spoke of the many mistakes and injustices committed throughout history, particularly in the 20th century. Both sides were forthright in their admission of mutual injustices committed against both nations. All the participants underscored various mutual interests that both peoples share and that bring them closer.

In the discussions, much attention was directed towards the need to create mutual research groups that upon gaining access to archival material would be able to present a more objective assessment of the history of Ukrainian-Polish relations. Emphasis was placed on the need to do away with all negative stereotypes, to review school textbooks in those areas that touch upon Ukrainian-Polish relations, and to remove all political and economic roadblocks, which stand in the way of forging a foundation for Ukrainian-Polish cooperation.

The following parliamentarians took part in the meeting:

-from the Ukrainian delegation:

Orest Vlokh, Bohdan Horyn, Mykhailo Horyn, Ihor Derkach, Vyacheslav Chornovil, Mykhailo Shvayka

---from the Polish delegation:

Bogumila Berdychowska, Zbigniew Bujak, Andrzej Bjelowejski, Genyk Wujec, Jerzy Wuttke, Aleksander Hall, Richard Hanowicz, Bronislaw Geremek, Andrzej Krawczyk, Zofia Kuratowska, Jacek Kuron, Barbara Labuda, Jan Litynski, Aleksander Malachowski, Adam Micznik, Volodymyr Mokryi, Jan Musal, Andrzej Okszesik, Janusz Onyszkewicz, Jan Rokita, Franciszek Sak, Bogdan Skarazinski, Andrzej Stelmalowetski, Jerzy Turewicz, Anna Szymanska, Zbigniew Janas, Jerzy Jascembowski, Jerzy Jachowicz

#### MASS RALLY HELD IN LVIV

LVIV—On May 17, 1990, a mass rally took place in this western Ukrainian city near the monument to Ivan Franko. The rally was organized by the Rukh Council and it concerned three separate issues: a) to render support to the democratic deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR; b) to voice support of the Lithuanian Republic; c) the newspaper of the Lviv regional soviet.

Nestor Hnativ spoke on behalf of the Rukh Presidium and the regional soviet. He stated that the party apparatus in Lviv is blocking the legislation passed by the Lviv regional soviet. He raised the issue of the newspaper to underscore the way that party officials are manipulating the situation. He further called on the people to assist the democratic deputies in the parliamentary struggle by becoming more politically active, by sending telegrams demanding that the issues raised by the democratic parliamentarians be considered, and by going to sections of eastern Ukraine to popularize the idea of national independence and statehood in these areas.

Regarding the issue of the newspaper, calls were issued at the rally for people to refuse receiving the two communist newspapers. In this manner, there will be more paper for printing the new newspaper of the Lviv regional soviet. By an order of the bureaucratic apparatus, only 100,000 copies of the new newspaper are to be printed, which is insufficient for the region of Lviv. Many of the speakers addressing the rally underscored the significance of information on the development of the national-liberation processes. Viktor Furman — a leading member of Rukh — said that the communists are using disinformation tactics and are usurping the channels of communication to achieve their aims. He further stated that if the democratic majority in the Lviv regional soviet will be forced to leave the session hall, then the population of Lviv should manifest their support of the democratic bloc by initiating a political strike.

Several speakers at the rally stated that the party apparatus is trying to convince people that western Ukraine is preparing to secede from the rest of Ukraine and that many people are being victimized by this false "concept". Oleksander Zhovtnevyi, a guest from Poltava (a city in eastern Ukraine) stated that this disinformation campaign presently being waged by the party apparatus is generally ineffective and that Ukrainians in eastern Ukraine look towards western Ukraine with great hope. He further stated that despite the actions of the militia in their attempt to create differences between Ukrainians in the east and west, there is a growing awareness that all Ukrainians are the slaves of the same enemy.

The rally also raised the issue of the present draft of Ukrainian young men into the Soviet army. Contrary to guarantees of the military command, Ukrainian servicemen are being sent to Central Asia and Lithuania. As of May 21, representatives of the Presidium of the regional soviet and of Rukh should be allowed to become public observers in the Lviv drafting station.

The rally ratified three separate resolutions dealing with assistance to Lithuania, support of the democratic bloc of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and regarding the matter of the press in Lviv. Despite a steady downpour, several thousand people participated in the rally.

# CONFERENCE DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF METROPOLITAN ANDREY SHEPTYTSKYI HELD IN LVIV

On May 4, 1990, for the first time in the history of communist rule in Ukraine, a conference was held dedicated to the memory of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi, the former head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church (UCC), who died in 1944. The conference was held in the hall of the Theoretical Corpus of the Lviv Medical Institute.

The conference was opened by Most Reverend Volodymyr Sterniuk, an archbishop of the UCC. The following individuals gave presentations at the conference: Yevhen Hryniv, Oleksander Kitsera, Yuriy Durkevych, Ihor Yukhnovskyi, Borys Bilinskyi, Iryna Kalynets, Yaroslav Hnativ, Volodymyr Hordiyenko, and Pavlo Pundiy from the USA. Several of the Metropolitan's contemporaries and eyewitnesses of his historical era shared their reminiscences from the past. After the theoretical part of the conference, a concert was held and money was collected to fund the re-opening of the National Hospital of A. Sheptytskyi.

The issue of the re-opening of the National Hospital was also raised at the session of the Lviv regional soviet, which delegated the matter to the Presidium of the soviet.

### FIRST ALL-UKRAINIAN GREAT ASSEMBLY OF THE INDEPENDENT UKRAINIAN YOUTH ASSOCIATION HELD IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK

On May 26-27, 1990, the First All-Ukrainian Great Assembly of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) was held in the cultural-athletic complex — "Budivelnyk" in the western Ukrainian city of Ivano-Frankivsk. 205 delegates representing 18 separate SNUM branches participated in the Assembly together with 150 invited guests.

Over the course of the previous year, at least 18 separate branches of SNUM or related organizations were established throughout Ukraine. Leading SNUM activists in Ukraine estimate the total membership of all SNUM branches or related organizations to be several thousand. Exact figures are unavailable since up until the recently convened Assembly, no central, all-national executive board had been established. According to its programme, SNUM is a Ukrainian nationalist youth organization, the primary aim of which is to strive for the reestablishment of an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state. Much of SNUM's ideology is based on the programme of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), which has led Ukraine's underground national-liberation struggle since its founding in 1929. Several SNUM branches have been periodically publishing their own journals, e.g., "Molodyi Nationalist" (Lviv) and "Zoloti Vorota" (Kyiv). From these publications it is clear that SNUM members consider Stepan Bandera — an OUN leader assassinated by the KGB in Munich in 1959, and Taras Shevchenko — Ukraine's national poet, to be their foremost heroes.

The Assembly was opened with a prayer, conducted by the Rev. Vasyl, a priest of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, who extended his blessings to the Assembly. Afterwards, the Assembly participants joined in the singing of a Ukrainian religious anthem — "Oh God, Great and One".

The following individuals addressed the participants with greetings: Oleh Vitovych — the chairman of the Lviv SNUM branch; Zenoviy Duma — a people's deputy from Ivano-Frankivsk; Mykola Porovskyi — a people's deputy from Rivne; Maksymovych — a former soldier of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA); Yuriy Kalynychenko from Kyiv. Separate greetings were forwarded to the Assembly from: Yuriy Shukhevych — a former long-term Ukrainian political prisoner and the son of Roman Shukhevych — the Commander-in-Chief of the UPA; Levko Lukianenko — the chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP); Mariyka Halaburda-Chyhryn from Australia and others. Ihor Derkach from the Lviv SNUM branch delivered the keynote address.

In the course of the discussions, the majority of the delegations, as well as the present members of the Ukrainian National-Democratic League (UNDL), URP and the Catholic Youth Association, presented a common statement, in which they underscored the need to strive for the reestablishment of an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state strictly through peaceful, parliamentary means. This statement was ratified by the Assembly, although the delegates also stated that they will never forget the glorious memory of the fallen heroes of Ukraine's liberation struggle such as Bandera, Shukhevych and others.

The Assembly also adopted a set of By-Laws and a SNUM programme, in which it is stated that the primary goal of SNUM is to organize the struggle for Ukrainian independence and statehood. The Association also stands for a multiparty system, for a market economy and for the formation of Ukrainian national armed forces. In its programme, SNUM calls for respect for and recognition of the rights of all national minorities in Ukraine and for the formation of a common anticommunist front of subjugated nations.

A Central Leadership was elected, consisting of 36 members, with each delegation designating two of its members to this central executive body. After the plenary sessions of the Assembly were completed, the participants travelled to Velykyi Uhryniv to commemorate the memory of Stepan Bandera, who was born in this village in 1909.

Some of the programmatic documents ratified by the Assembly are presented below.

## Resolution

We, the delegates of the First Great Assembly of SNUM, condemn the repression of our members for their political beliefs by the authorities. We consider the initiation of criminal proceedings against Mykola Berdnyk and Andriy Dukhonikov to be illegal and provocational. We demand their immediate release, financial compensation and a public apology. We place all responsibility for this lawlessness on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and its loyal cohorts from the MVD and the KGB. The illegal actions of the militia may have a negative effect on civil order in the city of Kyiv and in the republic.

Ratified in the city of Ivano-Frankivsk May 27, 1990

#### Programme

#### of the All-Ukrainian Independent Ukrainian Youth Association

- The Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) is a civic-political youth organization, based on the noble values of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement, which cooperates with all progressive forces in Ukraine and outside its borders.
- 2. The primary goal of the Association is the reconstruction of a democratic, independent and sovereign Ukrainian state.
- 3. SNUM is against communist and all other anti-human ideologies.
- 4. In terms of Ukraine's future economic system, SNUM stands for the construction of a Ukrainian economy based on ecological priorities, free market principles and legal equality for all forms of ownership.
- 5. The Association considers that one of the necessary preconditions for achieving an independent republic and the fundamental guarantee of its longevity is the existence of professional Ukrainian armed forces.
- 6. By inculcating in the youth a sense of respect for all national minorities living on the territory of Ukraine, the Association supports the aspirations of every nation towards its liberation from communist and imperialist tyranny.
- 7. SNUM is based on principles of Christian morality and believes that the reestablishment of Ukraine's national Churches the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church must be carried out in accordance with the law. The Association supports the right of all faithful to form their own religious communities, regardless of their religious persuasion.

- 8. SNUM is against forms of artificial migration onto the territory of Ukraine.
- 9. The Association stands for the establishment of the Ukrainian language as the only state language on the territory of the republic and calls for its establishment as such on all levels of life.
- 10. SNUM is striving for the reestablishment on a state level of the national symbols of the Ukrainian people, SNUM inculcates in the young men and women a deep respect for the blue-and-yellow flag and the "Tryzub" [Ukraine's national emblem] and will seek to have the anthem of an independent Ukraine "Ukraine has not died" recognized as the state anthem of Ukraine.
- 11. The Association stands for the democratization and de-ideologization of the educational process and all schools.

### **Resolution of the Assembly on the Army**

In 1918-1920 the Bolshevik armies of the RSFSR occupied the greater part of Ukrainian territories. In 1939-1940, as a result of the notorious Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, this occupation was extended over all Ukrainian territory by the armies of the USSR.

In light of these facts, the participants of the assembly consider the incorporation of Ukraine into the USSR as an illegal act, since this act was carried out by an occupational regime.

In 1949 the Geneva Convention was signed regarding occupied countries, in which it is stated that citizens of occupied countries are not required to fulfil military service in the armies of the occupying state. Moreover, insofar as Ukraine is a member of the United Nations, it has the right to have its own armed forces.

We believe that the formation of national armed forces of Ukraine will not only be one of the most significant conditions for the reestablishment of an independent Ukrainian state, but that it will also guarantee its longevity.

Furthermore, the participants of the assembly declare that the path towards the reestablishment of Ukrainian armed forces should be peaceful and should be carried out by an incremental Ukrainianization of those sections of the Soviet army, that are deployed on the territory of the republic by increasing the number of Ukrainian servicemen who will fulfil their military duty within the borders of Ukraine.

May 27, 1990 — Ivano-Frankivsk

# **Address by Yuriy Shukhevych**

I am pleased to have the opportunity to greet the delegates of the Assembly of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association, which has been convened in an historical period of the dissolution of the last empire on earth — the Soviet Union.

At this time the Ukrainian nation, as well as all the nations of the Soviet empire, stand on the doorstep of liberation, on the doorstep of the creation of their own independent states. This moment is very critical for every nation, including the Ukrainian people. We should understand that the path before us is difficult and complicated, because the empire does not let go of "its own" territories, of its colonies, so easily. Moreover, the long-term rule of foreigners over our land, over Ukraine, lessened the sense of responsibility for the nation's fate in many Ukrainians. Do not forget, my dear friends, that the idea of the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation must be realized on the basis of the following principles:

-first, the idea of our own national statehood;

-second, the Christian ideal, the idea of Christian morality, because without morality, without spirituality, a nation is dead.

The crucial mission of the Ukrainian people, as well as all of the other subjugated peoples of the Soviet empire, is the responsibility to destroy this empire together, in a common front!

Be united, stay together, nurture your national awareness, your idealistic determination, to be prepared for tomorrow's great deed — the deed of the creation of an Independent and Sovereign Ukrainian State.

God be with you in this endeavour! Glory to Ukraine!

26 May, 1990

### UKRAINIAN RURAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY Holds Founding Congress

KYIV—On June 9 and 10, 1990, the Ukrainian Rural-Democratic Party (USDP) held its founding congress in this capital city's Academy of Agriculture. The 106 delegates to the congress, representing USDP branches in 11 provinces throughout Ukraine, discussed and ratified a programme and the statutory by-laws of the newly-formed political party.

The primary points in the party's programme are: a) the reappropriation of land by the farmers and the rebirth of the agricultural population, which can only be achieved through full economic and political freedom in an independent Ukrainian state; b) equality of ownership, including private property; c) the establishment of a free market economy. In many aspects, the USDP programme coincides with the programmes of other newly-created political parties in Ukraine — the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), the Ukrainian National Party (UNP), and the Ukrainian Christian Democratic Party (UCDP). During the congress, the party's executive organs — a Great Council, a Presidium and an Auditing committee — were elected.

Volodymyr Shcherbyna, chairman of the agricultural company "Progress" based in the Brody district, Lviv province; Serhiy Plachynda, a notable writer from Kyiv; Hryhoriy Kryvoruchko, a journalist; and Roman Kuzmych, general director of an agricultural trading company in the Pustomytiv district of Lviv province, were elected joint USDP chairmen.

The delegates adopted two appeals: to the Democratic Bloc of Ukraine and to the deputies representing the rural community, urging mutual cooperation in the resolution of pressing problems facing the revival of the agricultural economy. A resolution was also adopted, mandating founding conferences, which are to take place in provinces where USDP branches have not yet been established, and to coopt their representatives to the Great Council.

# UKRAINIAN AUTOCEPHALOUS ORTHODOX CHURCH HOLDS SOBOR IN KYIV Metropolitan Mstyslav designated Patriarch

KYIV, June 5—On this day, by the Cathedral of St. Sophia at 9:30 a.m., a solemn Divine Liturgy was held to mark the opening of the All-Ukrainian Sobor (church council) of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC). During the Liturgy, religious banners and Ukrainian national, blue-and-yellow flags adorned the Cathedral, where for almost 60 years the Word of God has not been spoken.

The head of the UAOC in Ukraine, Archbishop Ioan, blessed the opening of the Sobor.

After the Liturgy, a religious procession was held down Volodymyr Street and Red Army Street, to a theatre on Saksahanskyi Street, where the *Sobor* was held. During the procession, a commemorative ceremony was held in the Taras Shevchenko park where Bishop Vasyliy laid a wreath of flowers at the foot of Shevchenko's monument.

After the registration of delegates and invited guests was completed, Ivan Drach — the chairman of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) and a people's deputy of the Ukrainian SSR, greeted the participants. He underlined that the Christian faith in Ukraine has always been an integral element in the history of the Ukrainian nation, its past, present and future. He urged every Ukrainian to accept the UAOC in his soul. The present revival of the UAOC, he said, is the will of the people, its hope.

The presidium of the *Sobor* was headed by Archbishop Ioan and consisted of seven members. Archbishop Ioan proposed that a Metropolitan of the UAOC be elected and that the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul in Lviv be given the status of Metropolitanate.

The following presidium members proposed that Archbishop Ioan be elected Metropolitan: Bishop Vasyl of Ternopil and Buchach, Bishop Andriy of Ivano-Frankivsk and Kolomyia, Bishop Danylo of Chernivtsi, Khotyntsi and Bukovyna, Bishop Volodymyr of Uzhhorod and Khust, Bishop Mykolay of Rivne and Lutsk and Bishop Roman of Chernihiv and Sumy. They were supported by Revs. Volodymyr Yarema and Myron Sas-Zhurakivskyi. The latter called on the *Sobor* to condemn the uncanonical decision of the Moscow *Sobor* to excommunicate Archbishop Ioan.

In the subsequent vote, the decision of the Moscow Sobor was declared null and void. Archbishop Ioan was elected Metropolitan of Lviv and Halych. He then presented before the Sobor a programmatic address, underlining the past and present revival of the UAOC and the problems facing the Church. Afterwards, Metropolitan Ioan read out telegrams from the Brotherhood of the Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul in Lviv, the Congress of Cinematographers in Moscow, the Parish of the Ascension in Lviv, the Initiative Group for the Creation of a Brotherhood in Kharkiv, and others. He also read out a telegram from the Metropolitan of Kyiv and all of Ukraine — Mstyslav Skrypnyk, who resides in the USA, and Metropolitan Vasyliy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada.

On the second day of the *Sobor*, in a unanimous vote, Metropolitan Mstyslav was elected Head of the UAOC and given the title of Patriarch. Metropolitan Ioan was designated as the Patriarch's representative and the deputy Head of the Church in Ukraine. The participants also ratified a series of appeals, resolutions and a number of other documents.

Archbishop Ioan, 6 bishops and 547 delegates (including over 200 priests) participated in the two-day *Sobor*.

### DEMONSTRATIONS IN KYIV IN SUPPORT OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

KYIV—On June 13, 1990, a demonstration was held outside the building of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR to manifest support for the Democratic Bloc deputies and to demand independence for Ukraine. People arrived from all the regions of Ukraine to participate in this demonstration.

An incident was precipitated when two people appeared at the demonstration carrying an all-union Soviet red flag and the blue-and-red flag of Soviet Ukraine. When some of the organizers of the demonstration attempted to talk with these two unnamed individuals, they immediately folded up their flags and disappeared into the vast throng of people. Later, it was established that the Bila Tserkva district party committee, which has been conducting agitation against the Democratic Bloc and Ukrainian independence among the various organizations and institutions that are subordinate to it, was responsible for sending these two individuals in an apparent attempt to provoke an incident. The head of the office of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) was informed that despite being offered a free trip to Kyiv, the workers of the district refused. From all indications, only seven people took part in this provocational action: the secretaries of the party committees from the village of Pischane, the collective farm from the village of Bykovo-Hreblia and other party officials.

Approximately 100 workers travelled to Kyiv at their own cost to protest against similar agitation in the future. Having expressed their protest, they returned to work.

# UKRAINIAN DEMOCRATIC DEPUTIES DEMAND RELEASE OF ARRESTED YOUTHS

During the morning session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, Ihor Derkach — a deputy from Lviv, read a statement demanding the immediate release of Mykola Berdnyk and Andriy Dukhovnykov, who were arrested and imprisoned in Kyiv in early May for placing a wreath of barbed wire and throwing Lenin's works at the foot of his monument in Kyiv on April 22. Both young men are members of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) — a nationalist youth organization, whose following has burgeoned tremendously in recent months. Both were held in a cell in the Kyiv department of internal affairs. A wideranging campaign is being waged by the official, party-controlled press in support of the prosecutor's decision to imprison the two young nationalist activists.

Deputies from the newly-created parliamentary oppositional group — "Narodna Rada" (People's Council) presented a resolution demanding the immediate release of the two SNUM members. In response, Volodymyr Ivashko, first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine and the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, stated that such a resolution is inappropriate at this time, since the public prosecutor must first be heard prior to any decision.

Recent reports, seem to indicate that Berdnyk and Dukhovnykov were released on June 14 after considerable pressure on the authorities, particularly from Stepan Khmara, who is a deputy in the Ukrainian SSR's Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Ukrainian trade union movement — "Yednist" (Unity).

### UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE SOCIETY HOLDS CONFERENCE

ODESSA—On June 9, 1990, a national conference of the Ukrainian Language Society (TUM) was held in this southern Ukrainian port city, with the participation of representatives of many oppositional parties and organizations.

Among those addressing the conference were the following: the writer B. Yamchuk, and Ya. Yakymovych and Yu. Chornyi — the co-chairmen of the Odessa branch of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh). The deputy chairman of the all-Ukrainian TUM, V. Yaremenko, chaired the conference. The majority of those who spoke supported the issue of Ukrainian independence.

Ihor Stoliarov, the chairman of the local branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), speaking on behalf of the URP, the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party (UCDP), the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) and the Association Independence and Sovereignty for Ukraine (DSU), called for the creation of an anti-Bolshevik bloc "for the independence of Ukraine". The conference participants unanimously supported this idea.

The conference adopted a resolution demanding that the "Law on Languages in the USSR" be repealed and condemning the implementation of the "Law on Languages in the Ukrainian SSR" in Odessa.

A telegram was sent to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet demanding that a law be enacted on the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state, and the immediate recognition of Ukraine's historic national symbols as state symbols. In the telegram the participants also voiced their concern over the organized resettlement of Russian migrant workers in the Odessa region and demanded that this policy be terminated immediately.

The conference expressed its support of the newly-created parliamentary opposition group — "Narodna Rada" (People's Council). Also, separate greetings were forwarded to the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, on the occasion of its recently convened *Sobor* (church council).

Prior to the closing of the conference, the participants elected a TUM national council and executive. The conference ended with the singing of the religious hymn — "Oh God — Great and One" and the Ukrainian national anthem.

#### **DSU BRANCH ESTABLISHED IN ODESSA**

ODESSA, June 11—A local branch of the newly created Ukrainian nationalist association — Independence and Statehood of Ukraine, known under the acronym — DSU, was created in this southern Ukrainian port city at a founding conference. Stanislav Ishchenko was elected chairman and Henadiy Baziuk the secretary of this local branch.

The conference participants decided to create an anti-Bolshevik bloc "for the independence of Ukraine" together with other independence-minded political groups. Furthermore, the conference decided to commemorate the 49th anniversary of the act of proclamation of an independent Ukrainian state on June 30, 1941, by Prime Minister Yaroslav Stetsko.

The branch fully endorsed the principles of Ukrainian nationalism, declared by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, and resolved to use peaceful means to strive for the reestablishment of Ukrainian statehood.

#### **RALLY HELD IN DONETSK**

DONETSK, June 10—A sanctioned rally, organized by the "Democratic Movement", was held in this industrial city today outside the building of the provincial Party committee on October Square.

The government programme on the transition to a market economy, whose recent announcement led to panic buying of goods, was discussed during the rally. Mykola Porovskyi, the secretary of the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh, and Lev Ubozhko, one of the leaders of the Democratic Union, were among those addressing the rally, which lasted for four hours.

The following day, the local branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party was gathering signatures under a petition protesting the election of Volodymyr Ivashko, the first secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine, as head of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet. Some 1,500 signatures were collected. This action was undertaken under many Ukrainian national, blue-and-yellow banners, which symbolize the independence aspirations of the Ukrainian people. The militia made no attempt to interfere.

### ACTIVISM IN SOUTH-WEST UKRAINE PROVINCE

#### Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Mobilize

CHERNIVTSI—Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox faithful held their first mass in over 50 years in the Chernivtsi province, southwestern Ukraine, on June 10, 1990, in the village of Mamayivka in the Kitsman district. The mass was celebrated by Bishop Danylo of Chernivtsi and Khotyn, who was greeted by more than a 1,000 faithful with banners and crosses.

Following the service, the parish community declared its intention to transfer its allegiance from the official Ukrainian Orthodox Church to the nationally-conscious, non-official Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. The official Church was recently renamed from Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine.

In response to the parish's actions, on June 14, Bishop Antoniy of the statesanctioned Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Chernivtsi issued a decree banning Reverend Stepan Antonovych, pastor of the "breakaway" parish, from performing religious services.

Reverend Antonovych, however, declared his intention to continue conducting his religious duties.

The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was destroyed by Stalin in the 1930s. Its faithful were forced into the sanctioned Russian Orthodox Church. The UAOC has renewed its activity in the past five years within the context of Ukraine's national revival.

#### Nationalist Activists Protest Health Conditions

CHERNIVTSI—A hunger strike to protest conditions in the Chernivtsi childrens' hospital was held during the week of June 7-14 by members of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) Mykola Kohut and Volodymyr Tymchuk.

Many children in the Chernivtsi province are suffering from a mysterious, undiagnosed disease which affects their skin, hair and internal organs; the ailment appears to be related to the province's unregulated chemical industry. Local and republican authorities have refused to acknowledge the situation.

According to activists, the local Party hospital is well-provisioned and wellmaintained in comparison to the provincial childrens' hospital.

On June 13-14 the protest action continued outside the venue of a conference on ecology and health preservation.

Tatiana Tovcheva, the mother of two children suffering from the mysterious disease, joined the protesters on June 14.

### COMMUNIST PARTY ORGANIZATION DISSOLVED IN UKRAINIAN VILLAGE

KYIV, June 18—On the eve of the 28th Congress of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU), which began on June 19 in Kyiv, the party organization in the village of Pylypka (Bila Tserkva district, Kyiv province) was dissolved. Forty-five of the 47 Party members of the second department of the state farm of the Bila Tserkva Agricultural Institute declared their exit from the party and voted to dissolve their Party organization. This is the first known instance in Ukraine, where an entire Party organization voted to dissolve itself.

On June 19, prior to the opening of the CPU Congress, the former communists from Bila Tserkva staged a picket outside the Palace of Culture "Ukraina", where the registration of delegates was taking place.

The protesters indicated that the primary reason for their exit from the CPU's ranks was because of the vast corruption within the Party. Viktor Pruskyi, an employee of the Bila Tserkva state farm, pointed out in an interview that he and his colleagues discovered through their own bitter experiences the dishonesty, corruption and collective criminal responsibility of the ruling Party bureaucracy. Fourteen years ago, Pruskyi stated, the collective farm in his village, which encompassed 1,300 hectares of land, was joined to the state farm of the Agricultural Institute. In the course of these years, the district Party leadership, with its first secretary R.K. Loboda, and the state farm administration, headed by
its director — Myliuk, ruined the agriculture of the area completely. Despite having to work harder, the wages of the employees were very low even according to Soviet standards. The younger people began leaving the village en masse in search of better opportunities elsewhere. At the same time, the director and the Party rulers got wealthier, openly embezzling state funds.

Pruskyi continued to explain that the Party bureaucrats of his village built for themselves 2 and 3 storey houses with the funds that they embezzled, while the workers had no accommodation built for them. Last year, when the workers declared their intention to leave the state farm, the Party leaders allowed them to do so only after several months and after having appropriated 400 hectares of the most fertile land that belonged to the village. All the attempts of the villagers to secure the return of their land were to no avail. The Bila Tserkva villages asked that the people's deputies of the USSR — Revenko and Valentyna Shevchenko intercede on their behalf, but their letters and petitions went unanswered. V. Ivashko, the First Secretary of the CPU, also refused to see a delegation from the village.

#### LVIV RESIDENTS MARK ANNIVERSARY OF RALLIES

On June 13, 1990, several thousand of this city's residents gathered beside the Ivan Franko monument at 7:00 p.m. to mark the second anniversary of the beginning of public rallies and assemblies. The rally was organized by the Ukrainian Language Society of Taras Shevchenko (Ukraine's national poet) — TUM. TUM member, Sereda, led the rally and gave a detailed account of the first public rallies that were held in this western Ukrainian city, explaining their significance in the subsequent national rebirth.

Representatives of various ethnic groups (Polish, Armenian, Jewish and Russian) addressed the participants and expressed their support of the democratic processes currently taking place in Ukraine.

Also addressing the rally were several guest speakers from Odessa, Kryvyi Rih, Zaporizhia, Kyiv and Kharkiv. The representative of the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh — from Kryvyi Rih addressed the issue of education in Ukrainian schools in his city. He pointed out that although Ukrainian schools can now be opened, there are no teachers. He asked for teachers, literature and concert tours from western Ukraine to cities in eastern Ukraine, so as to expedite the national rebirth there.

A separate resolution was adopted by the participants of the rally, demanding the immediate release of two members of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) — Berdnyk and Dukhovnikov, who were arrested and imprisoned for laying a wreath of barbed wire at the foot of Lenin's monument in Kyiv (they have since been released).

#### PUBLIC RALLY IN SUPPORT OF DEMOCRATIC BLOC

JUNE 17—A public rally was held in support of the Democratic Bloc in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, which is formally called "Narodna Rada" (People's Council). People's deputy Iryna Kalynets informed the several thousand rally participants about the problems facing the democratic opposition. Natalia Stetsyk and Mykhailo Tabachko — both representing the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), also addressed the gathering.

#### UKRAINIAN INSURGENTS REMEMBERED IN STRYI

JUNE 17—In a special religious ceremony, the graves of soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) were restored and consecrated at the Vereha farm. The UPA waged a two-front war of liberation against Nazi Germany and the USSR during World War II, continuing this armed struggle against the Soviet occupational armies up to 1952. Ukrainian Catholic priests conducted the religious service. A Ukrainian national, blue-and-yellow flag was erected at the gravesite.

### **THOUSANDS ATTEND RIGHTS RALLY IN VINNYTSIA**

JUNE 10—A rally of several thousand people was held in this city's park. The theme of the rally was — "Human Rights — National Rights". The rally was organized by the URP provincial branch, the Podillia initiative committee for the establishment of a Democratic Party of Ukraine, the council of the Podillia branch of Rukh, the provincial SNUM council and the Independent Student Association.

The rally was led by Volodymyr Muliava, a lecturer in the Department of Philosophy of the Vinnytsia Pedagogical Institute, who declared a three-day hunger strike in protest against the recent repressive measures undertaken by the authorities in this city. Vasyl Huryn, a college lecturer, and Valeriy Paliy, a jurist, also joined Muliava in this hunger strike.

Some of the slogans held by the rally participants read: "CPSU — gang of criminals"; "We want to know the truth about our history!"

Artem Zimchenko, a people's deputy from this city, addressed the rally. He spoke about the work of the Democratic Bloc. Vasyl Pidpryhorshuk, Ivasiunko and Kutuzov spoke on behalf of the URP provincial branch.

Several young Komsomol (Communist Youth League) members, Serhiy Komenda, Vyacheslav Cholovskyi, Serhiy Kovalchuk and Valeriy Kozak, who are residents of Vinnytsia, publicly burned their membership cards.

# 100,000 MARK KOZAK VICTORY OVER POLISH KING IN PLIASHIV

PLIASHIV, JUNE 17—Over 100,000 people gathered in this city from all parts of Ukraine to commemorate the Kozaks that died here 339 years ago, defending Ukrainian independence and statehood. In 1651, a Kozak army led by Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytskyi — the head of the Ukrainian Kozak republic — defeated a Polish army under the command of King Jan Kaziemierz.

Memorial religious services were held in front of a pantheon of "Kozak graves". Many wreaths were placed at the foot of the pantheon. Ukrainian Orthodox priests celebrated a memorial service, following which a rally was held. Levko Lukianenko — the URP chairman and a people's deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, addressed the rally.

### **MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR UKRAINIAN HEROES**

JUNE 10—In 16 separate places throughout this province, memorial services were held to commemorate Ukraine's national heroes, who fell in the liberation struggle. In all, some 60,000 people participated in the commemorations. Several Ukrainian national, blue-and-yellow flags, symbolizing the Ukrainian people's independence aspirations, were consecrated by the Catholic priests, who conducted the ceremonies and religious services.

In the village of Yablunivka, Bishop Vasylyk of Ivano-Frankivsk conducted the memorial service.

### LVIV BRANCH OF URP HOLDS CONFERENCE

LVIV—The Lviv branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP — formerly the Ukrainian Helsinki Union) held a provincial conference on June 23-24, 1990, in this western Ukrainian city. 263 delegates, 27 URP candidates and 200 guests from 14 regions of Ukraine attended the conference. The participants reaffirmed their determination to effectuate the establishment of an independent and sovereign, democratic Ukrainian state. Following the conference a public rally was held beside the Ivan Franko monument in Lviv, organized by the Lviv provincial branch of the URP and the Society of the Repressed. The rally was held to commemorate the thousands of Ukrainians who were shot in the prisons of Lviv by the Russians in 1941, prior to the Nazi invasion.

The first day of the conference consisted of addresses and discussions. Elections to the executive bodies and various commissions also took place.

Bohdan Horyn, a people's deputy and leading figure in the URP, gave a

presentation entitled: "The way to the URP". He outlined the principal aspects of the work of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union from July 1988: the first steps, human rights activity, tactics, attacks in the press, the provincial branch, mass actions, publications, and activities prior to and during the elections.

Serhiy Zhyshko and Volodymyr Yavorskyi, both members of the URP Secretariat, spoke on the strategy and tactics of the Lviv branch and on party discipline. Yavorskyi informed the conference participants that 600 former UHU members have been re-registered as members of the URP.

The following individuals participated in the lengthy discussions that followed: Ihor Derkach (people's deputy), Volodymyr Fartukh (people's deputy) Yuriy Shukhevych (a former political prisoner), Bohdan Pakholok, Ihor Kulyk, Yuriy Mykolskyi, Lubomyr Poberezhnyi, Fedir Stetsiuk, Diana Bidochko (member of URP Secretariat), Bohdan Matiashyk, Yosyf Myhal (from Chervonohrad), Oleh Pavlyshyn, Myroslav Hlubish (from Drohobych) and others.

After the discussions, elections of the branch's executive bodies took place. Bohdan Horyn was elected branch chairman. Others elected to the executive included: Bohdan Matiashyk — deputy chairman, Omelian Mudryi — treasurer, Lesia Taran — secretary. 50 people were elected to the branch Council, 2 from each district of the province. Oleh Pavlyshyn was elected Council chairman. Five Council secretaries were also elected.

Serhiy Zhyshko was chosen to chair the theoretical department and Volodymyr Yavorskyi will head the informational-press department of the provincial branch.

The programme of the Conference on the following day consisted primarily of a series of addresses. Among those speaking were the following: Holovchenko from the Ukrainian Youth Association (SUM); Yuriy Khmara—Kharkiv; Ivan Sokulskyi — Dnipropetrovsk, Volos — Uzhhorod; Ivaniuchenko — Mykolayiv; Serhiyiv — Kirovohrad; Musienko — Zhytomyr. Representatives of the Armenian society — "Akhptiur" and the Jewish society of Shlomo Aleykhom also addressed the Conference.

Several documents were ratified by the delegates: an appeal for the support of the democratic soviets of the Lviv region; an appeal to the faithful of the Ukrainian Greek-Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church; an appeal to the non-Ukrainian population residing in Ukraine; an appeal of the First Lviv provincial branch of the URP to the workers' collectives of the Lviv region; a Declaration of the Conference of the Lviv Branch of the URP regarding the Act of Restoration of the Ukrainian State on June 30, 1941.

The Conference concluded with the Ukrainian national anthem.

### Victims of Russian Occupation Commemorated

LVIV—On June 24, 50,000 people gathered for a public rally near the monument to Ivan Franko — a famous Ukrainian poet from the 19th century — to commemorate the thousands of Ukrainians murdered by the Russians in the Lviv prisons in 1941, prior to the Nazi-German invasion of Ukraine. The rally was organized by the URP Lviv provincial branch and the Society of the Repressed.

Bohdan Horyn, the newly elected chairman of the URP provincial branch, opened the rally. In his speech, Horyn pointed out that the URP considers the reestablishment of an independent Ukrainian state as its primary goal. He also said that the URP is an alternative party to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

The following persons also addressed the rally: Stepan Khmara, Yaroslav Kendzior, Serhiy Zhyshko — URP secretary — and Yuriy Mykolskyi.The participants of the rally adopted a resolution which called for memorial services to be held on a yearly basis to remember the victims of the NKVD.

Following the rally a memorial service was conducted by priests of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Catholic Church. Afterwards, the rally participants proceeded in a march to the places where the prisoners were shot in 1941, including the prison situated at 1 Myr (Peace) Street. Further memorial services were held there. Thousands of candles were lit in memory of the victims of Russian occupation.

### **RALLIES HELD TO MARK UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE**

On Saturday, June 30, 1990, mass public rallies were held in several cities and villages throughout Ukraine to commemorate the 49th anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian statehood on this day in 1941.\*

LVIV—The central observance of this important event in Ukrainian history took place in Lviv on Rynok Square, outside the building where the National Assembly proclaimed the Act of the Restoration of the Ukrainian State, forming a Ukrainian National Government headed by Yaroslav Stetsko. Over 20,000 people gathered in the square to solemnly commemorate this day. The public rally was organized by

\*The Act of June 30, 1941, was proclaimed in Lviv by Yaroslav Stetsko, the Prime Minister of the Ukrainian National Government, called into being by a Ukrainian National Assembly prior to the proclamation. After this declaration of independence, which was proclaimed a few days before German troops entered Lviv, Stetsko and the members of the Government were arrested, as were Stepan Bandera, chairman of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), and other leading OUN members. The OUN and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) then launched a two-front war of liberation against both Nazi Germany and communist Russia, continuing this armed struggle under the leadership of General Roman Shukhevych against the occupying Soviet forces well into the 1950s. the local Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) branch. The participants held portraits of Stepan Bandera (leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists), Yaroslav Stetsko and Roman Shukhevych (Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army — UPA). A youth choir sang the march of Ukrainian nationalists and several UPA songs.

Fifteen speakers, representing various political parties and associations, addressed the rally, among them: Ivan Kandyba and Petro Duzhyi from the Association for Ukrainian Independence and Statehood (DSU); Yuriy Nikolskyi from the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP); Mykhailo Osadchyi from the Ukrainian Association of Independent Creative Intelligentsia (UANTI); as well as representatives of Rukh and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM).

The rally participants adopted several resolutions, calling for the annual commemoration of the Act of June 30, 1941, and for the annulment of the recent election to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR. Another resolution called for a plaque to be mounted into the wall of the building where the Act was proclaimed.

KYIV—A separate public rally, organized by SNUM, was held in Kyiv. Several thousand predominantly young people attended this rally, which was held outside the main Post Office. The participants held Ukrainian national (blue-and-yellow) and revolutionary (black-and-red) flags and placards that read: "Long live an independent Ukraine", "Freedom for Ukraine", "Glory to Stepan Bandera". During the rally the full text of the Act itself, epistles from Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi (Ukrainian Catholic Church) and Bishop Polikarp (Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church), and an appeal of the Ukrainian National Government were read out. Yuriy Kalynychenko — the head of the SNUM branch in Kyiv — then spoke on the significance of the Act in Ukrainian history. Representatives of Rukh and other organizations participated in this commemorative gathering.

IVANO-FRANKIVSK—On June 30 a conference dedicated to the 49th anniversary of the Act of the Restoration of the Ukrainian State was held in this city's Building of Culture No. 1. It was organized by the Association for Ukrainian Independence and Statehood and attended by other political groups of this region of western Ukraine.

Several presentations were given: Orest Smytniuk and Oleh Ozarko — both people's deputies to the provincial soviet; Vitaliy Chapolech of SNUM, who spoke on the question of Ukrainian statehood in the present political context. Chapolech also presented an analysis of the draft declaration of Ukrainian sovereignty, presently under review in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR in Kyiv. Daria Sesyk of the Democratic Party chaired the conference. The full text of the Act was read out by M. Zelenchuk. Other commemorative rallies took place in Stryi, Drohobych, Ternopil, Kharkiv and elsewhere. MOSCOW, June 30—A group of Ukrainians gathered in the centre of Moscow beside the monument to Taras Shevchenko (Ukraine's national poet from the 19th century) to mark the anniversary of the restoration of Ukrainian independence and statehood, proclaimed on June 30, 1941, in Lviv. During the commemorative rally, the participants burned the blue-and-red flag of Soviet Ukraine and raised the national blue-and-yellow banner of an independent Ukrainian state.

The participants then proceeded to march with their flags through the centre of Moscow.

### **STRIKES THROUGHOUT UKRAINE**

JULY 11—Twenty-four-hour strikes were held throughout Ukraine today to demand the resignation of the Ukrainian and Soviet governments, the nationalization of the property of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the depoliticization of the economy. The demands had been put forward at a conference of workers of the Donetsk and Luhansk regions held on July 8 in the "Shakhtar" (Miner) stadium in Donetsk.

According to Andriy Slyvka of the Donbas (Donets Basin) strike committee, 141 out of almost 250 Donbas coal mines took part in the strike, while others held rallies in support of the striking miners.

In the city of Donetsk, 10,000 miners gathered for a one-day rally on the central October Square. Unlike last summer, they exchanged their dirty work overalls for normal everyday clothes. "We did this to show that we are not striking because we want to solve our specific miners' problems. We want to show that we are striking for the needs of all people", Slyvka said.

Smaller rallies in support of the strike were also held at various factories and institutions throughout Donetsk. In neighbouring Pavlohrad, Dnipropetrovsk region, almost all the pits were closed.

Actions in support of the miners were also held in the Ukrainian capital — Kyiv, where several factories supported the strike, and in western Ukraine, in the city of Ternopil, where 115 enterprises took part in the strike, 102 enterprises held 24-hour strikes, while others striked for several hours. In the town of Kalush, in the Ivano-Frankivsk region, several factories and a coal mine also participated in the strike.

### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE COMMEMORATIONS HELD Fallen UPA Insurgents Remembered Plaque Erected in Memory of UPA Commander

JULY 7—A religious memorial service was held over the grave site of soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) in the village of Yabluniv (Halych district, Ivano-Frankivsk province).

[The Ukrainian Insurgent Army was organized in 1942 and fought a two-front war of liberation against both Nazi German and Soviet occupational forces, continuing this armed struggle against Moscow well into the 1950s. The UPA, which at one point had over 350,000 troops in its ranks, was commanded by Gen. Roman Shukhevych, who was killed in battle with Soviet internal security troops in 1950. The official Soviet press continues to depict the UPA as Nazi collaborators in an attempt to discredit the Ukrainian national-liberation struggle].

The religious service in Yabluniv was conducted by the overseer of the Ivano-Frankivsk cathedral — Rev. Mykola Simkailo — and the local priest.

Zinoviy Duma, a deputy to the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the "Memorial" society, addressed the 1,000 people attending the service. He was followed by a former ensign of the UPA — M. Zelenchuk — who reminisced about the armed struggle Ukraine led during and after the Second World War.

The local choir sang various songs of the *Sich* Riflemen (a WWI military unit which fought for Ukrainian independence) and the UPA.

Similar events were also planned in the villages of Maniava and Loyova (Ivano-Frankivsk province). Moreover, on July 8, in the village of Nadvirna, a commemoration of the restoration of Ukrainian statehood, proclaimed on June 30, 1941, was held.

JUNE 29—A solemn unveiling of a memorial plaque to the Commander-in-Chief of the UPA — Gen. Roman Shukhevych — was held in the village of Bilohorshcha near the western Ukrainian city of Lviv. The plaque was mounted into the wall of the building where Shukhevych was killed by Soviet Russian forces on March 5, 1950.

The memorial service was conducted by several Ukrainian Catholic priests, following which a public rally was held, attended by Shukhevych's son — Yuriy (a long time political prisoner of Soviet Russian prisons and concentration camps) and other members of his family. Addressing the rally were several prominent participants of Ukraine's national-liberation struggle, including Yuriy Shukhevych, Mr. Maksymovych, Zinoviy Krasivskyi, and others.

The memorial was unveiled by its sculptor — Olha Ilkiv. A choir performed various patriotic national songs.

# **UKRAINIAN SSR DECLARES SOVEREIGNTY**

Declaration on State Sovereignty of Ukraine Enacted by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR July 16, 1990

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR

- expressing the will of the people of Ukraine;
- striving to create a democratic society;
- acting on the need for all-encompassing guarantees of the rights and freedoms of man;
- respecting the national rights of all nations;
- caring about the full-fledged political, economic, social, and spiritual development of the people of Ukraine;
- recognizing the necessity of establishing a lawful state;
- having as a goal the affirmation of the sovereignty and self-rule of the people of Ukraine;

#### PROCLAIMS

the state sovereignty of Ukraine as supremacy, independence, fullness, and indivisibility of the republic's authority within the boundaries of its territory, and its independence and equality in external relations.

#### I. Self-Determination of the Ukrainian Nation

The Ukrainian SSR, as a sovereign national state, develops within existing boundaries on the basis of the realization of the Ukrainian nation's inalienable right to self-determination.

The Ukrainian SSR effectuates the protection and defence of the national statehood of the Ukrainian people.

Any violent actions against the national statehood of Ukraine on the part of political parties, public organizations, other groups or individuals will be prosecuted in accordance with the law.

#### **II.** Rule of the People

Citizens of the republic of all nationalities comprise the people of Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine are the sole source of state authority in the republic.

The complete authority of the people of Ukraine is realized directly on the basis of the republic's constitution, as well as via people's deputies elected to the supreme and local soviets [councils] of the Ukrainian SSR.

Only the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR can speak in the name of all the people of Ukraine.

#### **III. State Authority**

The Ukrainian SSR is independent in determining any questions regarding its state affairs.

The Ukrainian SSR guarantees the supremacy of the constitution and laws of the republic on its territory.

State authority in the republic is realized in accordance with the principle of its division into legislative, executive, and judicial [branches].

The highest authority as regards the precise and uniform application of the law is the General Procurator of the Ukrainian SSR, who is appointed by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR and is responsible and accountable only to it.

#### IV. Citizenship of the Ukrainian SSR

The Ukrainian SSR has its own citizenship and guarantees each citizen the right to retain citizenship of the USSR.

The basis for acquiring and forfeiting citizenship of the Ukrainian SSR is determined by the law on citizenship of the Ukrainian SSR.

All citizens of the Ukrainian SSR are guaranteed rights and freedoms provided by the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR and by standards of international law recognized by the Ukrainian SSR.

The Ukrainian SSR guarantees equality before the law to all citizens of the republic regardless of their ancestry, social or economic status, racial or national identity, sex, education, language, political views, religious beliefs, type and character of activities, place of residence or other circumstances.

The Ukrainian SSR regulates immigration procedures.

The Ukrainian SSR expresses its concern and uses its means to defend and safeguard the interests of citizens of the Ukrainian SSR beyond the republic's borders.

#### V. Territorial Supremacy

The Ukrainian SSR exercises supremacy on all of its territory.

The territory of the Ukrainian SSR within existing boundaries is inviolable and cannot be changed or used without its consent.

The Ukrainian SSR independently determines the administrative-territorial system of the republic and the procedures for establishing national-administrative units.

#### **VI.** Economic Independence

The Ukrainian SSR independently determines its economic status and secures it by law.

The people of Ukraine have the exclusive right to control, use, and direct the national wealth of Ukraine.

The land, its interior (mineral wealth), air space, marine, and other natural resources found on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR, the natural resources of its continental shelf and exclusive (maritime) economic zone, and all economic and scientific-technical potential created on the territory of Ukraine, are the property of its people, the material foundation of the Republic's sovereignty, and are used with the aim of providing for the material and spiritual needs of its citizens.

The Ukrainian SSR has the right to its share of the all-union wealth, especially in all-union gemstone and hard currency stocks and gold reserves, which were created through the efforts of the people of the republic.

Determination of questions concerning all-union property (joint property of all republics) is made on the basis of agreements between the republics by the subjects of this property.

Businesses, institutions, organizations and objects of other states and their citizens, and international organizations may exist on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR and may use the natural resources of Ukraine in accordance with the laws of the Ukrainian SSR.

The Ukrainian SSR independently establishes banking (including a foreign economic bank), pricing, financial, customs and tax systems, prepares a state budget, and, if necessary, introduces its own currency.

The highest credit institution of the Ukrainian SSR is the national bank of Ukraine, which is accountable to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

Businesses, institutions, organizations, and manufacturing concerns located on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR pay a fee for use of land and other natural and labour resources, and a portion of their currency income, and pay taxes to local budgets.

The Ukrainian SSR guarantees protection for all forms of ownership.

#### **VII. Ecological Safety**

The Ukrainian SSR independently determines procedures for organizing the protection of nature on the territory of the republic and procedures for the use of natural resources.

The Ukrainian SSR has its own national commission on the protection of the population from radiation.

The Ukrainian SSR has the right to ban construction and halt the operation of any businesses, institutions, organizations, and other objects that constitute a threat to ecological safety. The Ukrainian SSR cares about the ecological safety of its citizens, about the genetic stock of its people and about its young generation.

The Ukrainian SSR has the right to compensation for damages to the ecology of Ukraine brought about by the acts of union organs.

#### VIII. Cultural Development

The Ukrainian SSR is independent in deciding questions of science, education, and the cultural and spiritual development of the Ukrainian nation and guarantees all nationalities living on the territory of the republic the right to free nationalcultural development.

The Ukrainian SSR guarantees the national-cultural rebirth of the Ukrainian nation, its historical consciousness and traditions, national characteristics, and functioning of the Ukrainian language in all spheres of social activity.

The Ukrainian SSR expresses its concern with satisfying the national-cultural, spiritual, and language needs of Ukrainians living outside the republic's borders.

National, cultural, and historical treasures on the territory of the Ukrainian SSR are the sole property of the people of the republic.

The Ukrainian SSR has the right to [secure] the return to the people of Ukraine its national, cultural, and historic treasures found outside the borders of the Ukrainian SSR.

#### **IX. External and Internal Security**

The Ukrainian SSR has the right to its own Armed Forces.

The Ukrainian SSR has its own internal armies and organs of state security, subordinate to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

The Ukrainian SSR determines procedures for military service by citizens of the republic.

Citizens of the Ukrainian SSR perform their actual military service, as a rule, on the territory of the republic and cannot be used for military aims beyond its borders without the consent of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR.

The Ukrainian SSR solemnly declares its intention of in the future becoming a permanently neutral state which does not participate in military blocs and adheres to three nuclear-free principles: not to produce, not to proliferate and not to acquire nuclear weapons.

#### X. International Relations

The Ukrainian SSR, as a subject of international law, conducts direct relations with other states, enters into agreements with them, exchanges diplomatic, consular and trade representatives, and participates in the activity of international organizations to the full extent necessary for the effective safeguarding of the Republic's national interests in political, economic, ecological, informational, scholarly, technical, cultural, and sports spheres.

The Ukrainian SSR acts as an equal participant in international affairs, actively promotes the reinforcement of general peace and international security, and directly participates in the general European process and European structures.

The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the preeminence of general human values over class values and the priority of generally accepted standards of international law over standards of internal state law.

Relations of the Ukrainian SSR with other Soviet republics are built on the basis of agreements entered into on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual respect, and non-interference in internal affairs.

The Declaration is the basis for a new constitution and laws of Ukraine and denotes the position of the republic in concluding international agreements. The principles of the Declaration of the Sovereignty of Ukraine are utilized in the preparation of a union agreement.

# Declaration on Sovereignty — A Brief Analysis

The ratification by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR of the "Declaration on Sovereignty" on Monday, July 16, represents a major first victory for the fledging, but increasingly vocal, democratic opposition in an institution that until recently was nothing else but a rubber-stamp "parliament". Hence, the significance of this declaration should first be gauged in this perspective and under no circumstances should be viewed as an "act of independence".

Furthermore, despite the many points in the declaration, that — if enacted into law — may give Ukrainians a greater say in their own affairs, the declaration itself is fraught with several glaring inconsistencies that remain to be resolved prior to or during the precise wording of relevant legislation. The debate on citizenship is a case in point. During the proceedings, several deputies noted that the declaration creates a confusing legal minefield, by allowing for "dual citizenship" of the Ukr. SSR and the USSR. There would be no problem if the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were two completely separate political entities. The USSR, however, does not exist, territorially, outside the territories of its 15 constituent republics.

The same reasoning can also be applied to the section of the declaration concerning "military neutrality". As long as the USSR remains the primary state entity of the Warsaw Pact, and as long as the Ukrainian SSR is a constituent republic of the USSR, then how is the Ukrainian SSR to become "neutral"?

Despite the fact that the democratic opposition has made significant strides in establishing its own power base in the Supreme Soviet, the negative vote taken on Wednesday, July 18, regarding the "Decree on Power" leads to several worrisome conclusions, since this vote is an indication that the old centres of power, completely subservient to Moscow, remain well entrenched. For instance, although the declaration reserves for the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet the right to reject the deployment of Ukrainian troops outside the territorial jurisdiction of the republic, it is unlikely that such a decision will be taken by the communist majority. Moreover, given the fact that these same soldiers are allowed to maintain "dual citizenship", what right does the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet have to disallow a soldier in the Ukrainian army that has such "dual citizenship" his right to fight in the ranks of a Soviet Army?

Finally, the declaration differs greatly, in principle, from similar declarations enacted by the Baltic republics, which rejected "Soviet sovereignty" as a basis of legitimacy. The Lithuanian declaration of March of this year clearly states that the sovereignty of the Lithuanian Republic is based on the state sovereignty of the political entity which existed prior to 1940 and not on the "sovereignty" of the Lithuanian SSR, insofar as Lithuania was militarily annexed into the USSR. The Ukrainian declaration does not establish a separate sovereignty outside the union agreement of 1922, by which Ukraine was formally incorporated into the USSR, following the military liquidation of the Ukrainian National Republic, proclaimed on January 22, 1918. On the contrary, the last sentence of the declaration clearly states that: "The principles of the Declaration of the Sovereignty of Ukraine are being utilized [the present tense ought to be noted — UCIS] in the formation of a union agreement". Although this may be an oversight on the part of the deputies, no mention is made of a new union agreement in the text of the declaration itself. Clearly, however, the sovereignty that is in question here is based on Soviet legality. Levko Lukianenko's words to the effect that a "long road" still lies before the Ukrainian people in their struggle for national independence and statehood should put this declaration in its proper perspective.

÷2

# A Synopsis of the Debate on the Declaration of Sovereignty July 11-July 16

**July 11**—Volodymyr Ivashko's letter of resignation was read out, in which he stated that despite the recall of Ukrainian communist deputies by the Supreme Soviet, he will not leave the Party Congress and return to Kyiv. Ivashko then expressed his dismay over the position of the Ukrainian communist deputies, stating that lack of support, particularly among the communist ranks, was the primary reason for his resignation.

After accepting Ivashko's resignation, the deputies proceeded to discuss the draft of the declaration. The name of the declaration was first ratified — "Declaration of the State Sovereignty of Ukraine". The preamble and the first section of the declaration — "Self-determination of the Ukrainian nation" — were then approved. According to the preamble, the Ukrainian government is sovereign, independent and the supreme authority on the territory of the republic. An amendment forwarded by Vyacheslav Chornovil, proposing that the name of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic be changed to the Ukrainian republic did not pass.

The deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet — Mr. Hryniv — proposed that an arbitration committee be established to iron out any differences regarding the final text of the declaration. Following a rather heated debate on this proposal, it was rejected by the deputies in a separate vote. Subsequently, the following section of the declaration—"Authority of the People" — was ratified, following a short discussion. According to this section, only the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR has the right to speak in the name of the Ukrainian people. The third section — "The Authority of the State" — was also accepted without any objections. This section proclaimed the Ukr.SSR to be independent in carrying out any of its decisions, guaranteed that the Constitution of the Ukr.SSR is supreme on the territory of the republic, and divided the functions of government into the three traditional branches: judicial, executive and legislative.

**June 12**—In the morning session a long and heated debate took place over the next section of the declaration — "Citizenship". The communist majority in the Supreme Soviet forwarded an amendment, that had the backing of 239 deputies, which called for dual citizenship: of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR. Speaking on behalf of the democratic opposition, Serhiy Holovatyi stated that such a formula for citizenship contradicts all the basic norms of international law and is sheer nonsense from a juridical perspective. Following a debate, this section was rejected

in its entirety and sent back to committee.

On this day the next few sections of the declaration were accepted without any major revisions or opposition.

According to the fifth section — "The Supremacy of the Laws of the Ukrainian SSR on its Territory" — the sole supreme power on the territory of the Ukr.SSR is the Supreme Soviet. This territory is non-divisible and cannot be utilized in any fashion without the expressed consent of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR.

The sixth section deals with economic issues and is entitled "Economic Independence". According to this section, the Ukr.SSR independently decides its economic status; the people of Ukraine decide how the resources of their country are to be utilized; the Ukr.SSR independently forms its own banking, pricing and taxing systems and prepares its own, separate state budget. All forms of ownership are to be secured in the Ukr.SSR.

The section entitled "Ecological Security" was also ratified by the deputies on this day. A separate committee dealing exclusively with ecological issues is to be formed. On this day the section dealing with cultural issues was also ratified without any major revisions.

**June 13**—The next section reviewed and ratified by the Supreme Soviet was entitled "Foreign and Internal Security". According to this section, the Ukr. SSR has the right to form its own armed forces, which are to be subordinated to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR. Only upon the expressed consent of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR may Ukrainian troops be deployed outside the borders of the Ukr.SSR. Furthermore, the declaration voices the intent of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR to become a militarily neutral country and not to participate in any existing military blocs. Furthermore, the deputies in this declaration voiced their intention to transform Ukraine into a nuclear-free zone. A considerable number of the communist deputies were opposed to this section. After a lengthy debate, the section was ratified, with 238 deputies voting in favour. Following the vote, many of the deputies from the democratic opposition broke out into prolonged applause.

The following section — "Foreign Relations" — was revised, with 317 deputies voting in favour of the revised version. According to this section, the Ukr.SSR has the right to enter into diplomatic relations with any other country of the world, to exchange diplomatic, consular, and trade missions with them, and to participate in international organizations.

Following ratification of this section, the deputies again turned their attention to the thorny section on "Citizenship". After a long and oftentimes acerbic exchange, the final compromise draft of this section was ratified, with 296 deputies voting in favour and 26 voting against. According to the compromise version worked out in committee, every citizen of the Ukrainian SSR will have the right to become a citizen of the USSR. Moreover, the declaration establishes that all citizens are equal, have equal rights and privileges, regardless of nationality, social or financial status, race, education, language, political views, religious beliefs, occupation, place of residence, or any other conditions.

Lastly, the concluding remarks were also accepted, in which the declaration states that this document is to be the basis for a new republican constitution and for any international agreements, as well as the union agreement.

**July 16**—In an overwhelming majority (355 votes in favour, 4 against) the entire text of the "Declaration of the State Sovereignty of Ukraine" was ratified by the deputies, who then rose from their seats and applauded what they view as a historic decision on the part of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet. Following words of greeting to the Ukrainian people by several deputies, Mr. Altunyan, a deputy, proposed that the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR remember all those who died in the struggle for Ukraine's freedom in a moment of silence.

Then, Mr. Kendzior stated that this declaration is only a first step towards the reestablishment of Ukrainian statehood. Mr. Zayets proposed that the declaration be given the status of a constitutional act. Mr. Karpenko underscored the need to pass new legislation based on the declaration, since without such laws the declaration carries no legal or political weight.

The next item on the agenda before the deputies was the formation of the state structure of the government of the Ukr.SSR and a review of the candidates for governmental positions.

In a short, but jubilant rally outside the building of the Supreme Soviet, attended by several thousand people, several deputies spoke to those gathered on the significance of the day's events. Levko Lukianenko, a leading democratic opposition figure and the chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, stated that "this declaration is only a first step towards the building of a fully sovereign and truly independent Ukrainian State, in the transformation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic into a Republic of Ukraine". Lukianenko concluded his brief remarks by stating: "A long road still remains before us". Although many of those present at the rally were under the impression that the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet had passed a declaration of independence, several deputies, most notably Mykhailo Horyn — the chairman of the Secretariat of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) — tried to temper the people's euphoria and expectations.

# UKRAINIAN DEMOCRATIC OPPOSITION LOSES KEY VOTE IN SUPREME SOVIET "Decree on Power" Rejected in Narrow Vote

KYIV, July 18—In the first key vote following the ratification of the "Declaration of Sovereignty" on Monday, July 16, the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR on Wednesday, July 18, rejected a critical legislative proposal, forwarded by the democratic opposition. The bill, entitled — "Decree on Power" — stated that all power in the Ukrainian SSR is exclusively vested in the Supreme Soviet. The measure was narrowly defeated, by four votes.

[According to Soviet law, the soviets on all levels fulfil the function of the legislative branch of government, i.e., to enact laws. Until recently, the soviets, which means "councils", were rubber-stamp institutions, completely monopolized by the Communist Party. Presently, the Democratic Bloc in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet controls approximately 30% of the seats].

The decree was regarded as the first legal act, through which some of the basic principles of the Declaration of Sovereignty were to be enacted into law.

Many deputies in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet were criticizing the government's unwillingness to abide by and begin implementing the basic principles of the declaration. The vote on Wednesday was regarded as a critical test of how serious the government and party circles will be in respecting the basic premises of the Declaration of Sovereignty, which many of them voted for. "They are simply ignoring it", said Mykola Porovskyi, the deputy chairman of the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh, in his speech before the Supreme Soviet.

# CONFERENCE OF THE "MOTHERS OF SOLDIERS COMMITTEE" HELD IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK

IVANO-FRANKIVSK—A Conference of the recently established "Mothers of Soldiers Committee" was held on July 22 in the Cultural Building No. 1 in this western Ukrainian city. The Committee itself was created on July 11 in Ivano-Frankivsk. Its primary objective is to prevent the deployment of Ukrainian soldiers, serving their mandatory military duty in the Soviet army, in areas of the USSR that are experiencing some form of social, cultural or religious turmoil.

Many people's deputies, both on a republican and provincial level, as well as leading activists in the national-democratic movement, addressed the participants of the Conference. All those who spoke harshly condemned the policy of sending Ukrainian soldiers to the empire's "hot spots" in an effort to quell rising tensions and in pursuit of Moscow's colonial policies.

Mykhailo Zelenchuk, speaking on behalf of the Ukrainian Statehood and Independence Association (DSU), underscored the cruel fate of Ukrainian mothers, whose sons fought in the ranks of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) during and after the Second World War, and who were repressed by the communist authorities. Many such mothers were even murdered during interrogations in MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs) prisons. Zelenchuk ended his address by stating that the mothers of UPA insurgents knew that their sons were fighting for liberty and justice. "And what are our sons fighting for today in the Caucasus and Central Asia?" — asked Zelenchuk, echoing a theme often reiterated at this conference.

Prior to closing the conference, the participants passed several resolutions: 1. demanding that all Ukrainian soldiers be brought back to Ukraine to complete their military service; 2. to deport from Ukraine all non-Ukrainian military personnel, so as to avoid any flare ups, like the one that occurred in the Chortkiv region of the Ternopil province recently; 3. to financially compensate those mothers who lost their sons outside the borders of the empire; 4. that the autumn call-up be allowed to take place only on the condition that Ukrainian soldiers fulfil their obligation on Ukrainian lands; 5. to participate in the All-Ukrainian Rally on the necessity to create Ukrainian Armed Forces (pursuant to the recently enacted in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine), which took place on July 26; 6. in the event that these demands are not met, to bring Ukrainian soldiers back to Ukraine, and to organize picket actions and protest strikes.

The resolutions were passed on to the deputies present at the conference for their subsequent enactment.

### TENS OF THOUSANDS RALLY IN LVIV Demand Immediate Realization of Declaration on Sovereignty

LVIV—Tens of thousands of Ukrainians gathered near the Ivan Franko monument in this western Ukrainian city on July 21 for a mass rally organized by the Lviv provincial branch of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP).

The rally was called to review the "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine", which was passed by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR on July 16, and to demand the immediate enactment of relevant legislation pursuant to that declaration.

[Many leading members of the democratic opposition in the Supreme Soviet have voiced their concerns over the apparent foot-dragging of the communist majority on enacting into law the Declaration's principles. The Declaration, which was not ratified as a constitutional act, carries little legal weight on its own merits, but should be considered in the drafting of all subsequent legislation in the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet. On July 18, for instance, two days after the ratification of the Declaration, the communist majority managed to narrowly defeat a measure proposed by the democratic opposition, that sought to vest all power and sovereignty in Ukraine in the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet. The Lviv rally was opened by Bohdan Horyn — the chairman of the URP Lviv provincial branch and a people's deputy to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet. Mr. Horyn outlined the basic principles of the Declaration and gave an overview of the arduous path towards its realization.

Several other people's deputies participated in the rally and addressed the throngs of people, including: Rostyslav Bratun, Oles Shevchenko, Levko Horokhivskyi, Mykhailo Horyn (chairman of the Secretariat of the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh), Mykhailo Kosiv, Iryna Kalynets, and Ihor Derkach. The participants of the rally endorsed a resolution, which was read out by Oleh Pavlyshyn — the chairman of the URP provincial branch's Secretariat.

#### **RESOLUTION OF THE RALLY**

Having discussed the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine, the rally completely endorses this significant historic document. Concurrently, the participants of the rally express their desire to see the Declaration filled with real content as soon as possible through the implementation of all its principles. We believe that the attainment of this goal is impossible without the ratification of the Decree on Power and of a new Constitution, which would be consistent with the requirements of the Declaration and with the aspirations of the people towards an independent Ukraine. This is not possible without the nationalization of the CPSU, as an organization that has perpetrated crimes against humanity. This is not possible without the decommunization of our society.

The first stages on the road towards achieving this should be:

- ---the liquidation of Party organizations in the army, police organs and the KGB;
- -the exclusion of Party committees from all enterprises;
- -the termination of the interference of Party workers in the activity of enterprises, collective farms, newspapers, and the television and radio media;

The rally demands:

- —the return of offices to the Lviv provincial and municipal soviets, that are presently occupied by the provincial, municipal and regional committees of the CPSU, specifically the Political Education Building, the social-political centre, and the liquidation of public pro-communist agitation in the city and province;
- ----the transfer of the "Vilna Ukraina" [Free Ukraine] Publishing House as well as other provincial publishing houses to the soviets;
- -that monuments to the founders of Marxism-Leninism and activists of the

communist movement be torn down;

The rally considers the ratification of the Declaration on Sovereignty as the first significant step towards the building of an Independent Ukrainian State.

### ECOLOGICAL RALLY HELD IN KYIV Demands Closure of Chornobyl Power Station

KYIV—20,000 people participated in a rally held on October Revolution Square of this capital city on Sunday, July 29, to demand the immediate closure of the Chornobyl nuclear power station. The rally was organized by the Inter-Party Assembly.

[The first session of the Inter-Party Assembly was held in the cinema theatre in Kyiv on Sunday, July 1. It was attended by 81 delegates, representing 15 separate Ukrainian political parties, societies and organizations, the principal two being the Ukrainian National Party (UNP) and the Ukrainian National Democratic Party (UNDP). 119 guests, including 19 from the Baltic republics, were also present at this first session.

At the session, the delegates elected a National Council (chairman — Hryhoriy Prykhodko, the UNP chairman), a Coordinating Council of Citizens' Committees of Ukraine (chairman — A. Kyreyev), and an Executive Committee (chairman — Anatoliy Lupynis). According to Mr. Lupynis, the Inter-Party Assembly is planning to hold its second session on October 5-7 of this year. Prior to this second session, the Assembly is planning to organize a conference to propose and discuss a draft constitution of an independent Ukrainian state].

Among the speakers that addressed the rally participants were the following: Anatoliy Lupynis — the chairman of the Inter-Party Assembly, Hryhoriy Kryvoruchko and Mykhailo Ratuzhnyi, both of whom are members of the National Council, Mykhailo Markin and Serhiy Lohvinov — representatives of the strike committee of the Kyiv Tram and Trolleybus Administration, Bohdan Ternopilskyi — Secretary of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), and Anatoliy Zubkov, a journalist.

All the speakers stressed the point that the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet, in its present composition (the democratic opposition controls only 30% of the seats), is incapable of resolving the problems facing Ukraine today, particularly the effects of the Chornobyl nuclear disaster. According to the speakers, the various rallies and demonstrations that were organized in the past have proven to be ineffective, as a means of influencing policy decisions taken by the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet. Several speakers brought up the example of the strikes organized by the Donbas (Donetsk basin) coal miners and the Lviv workers as an indication that such strike

actions are an effective instrument in pressing for qualitative changes of the present social order, with a view towards forging an independent and sovereign Ukrainian state in the future.

At the end of the rally, a series of resolutions were adopted, which included several demands that the rally participants issued to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet. The rally participants established August 7 as the deadline by which a number of health-related issues, concerning the effects of the Chornobyl disaster, are to be resolved. Otherwise, a general strike will be called on August 9.

The demands include:

- 1. the immediate closure and dismantling of the Chornobyl nuclear power station;
- 2. all work in the 30-kilometre zone to be placed under the control of the Republican Committee to Eradicate the Consequences of the Chornobyl Disaster;
- 3. all decisions regarding the financing (presently from all-union funds) of all clean-up operations in the Chornobyl region must be ratified by the Republican Committee;
- 4. all lands with a contamination level of 1 curie per square kilometre of caesium, including the city of Kyiv, is to be declared a disaster zone and the population of these areas is to be provided with uncontaminated food products;
- 5. every person living in the disaster zone (including children and pensioners) must receive a monthly payment of no less than 50 karbovantsi (roubles); for every person residing in the 30-kilometre zone no less than 100 karbovantsi;
- 6. children in the contaminated areas are to have a vacation outside the borders of the distress zone for a minimum of 45 days, to be paid for by the state;
- 7. the creation of a Republican Centre on Safety in Nuclear Energy, which is to control all nuclear power stations in Ukraine;
- 8. the reactor of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukr.SSR is to be transferred outside Kyiv;
- a committee of representatives of various ecological organizations is to be established to ensure public control over the work of the Committee to Eradicate the Consequences of the Chornobyl Disaster of the Council of Ministers of the Ukr.SSR;
- 10. the immediate resettlement of families with children from the contaminated zone; party schools, hotels, dachas are to be used as temporary residences for these people, while auditoriums of the Higher Party School are to be used as temporary schools for the resettled children;
- 11. the immediate termination of mobilization through the military commissariats of the Ukrainian population for clean-up work at the Chornobyl nuclear power station; people under the age of 30 are not to be used for clean-up work.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR is to inform the Kyiv strike committee

about the implementation of these demands by 6:00 p.m. on August 7. In the event that these demands are not met, the organizers are calling on the population of Kyiv to stage a warning general strike in the capital on August 9. According to Anatoliy Lupynis, the chairman of the Assembly's Executive Committee, there are presently some 60 strike committees in the Kyiv region. It is the hope of the Assembly to unite these separate committees into a single broad-based Kyiv strike committee.

The Assembly is urging the city's labour collectives to concentrate their efforts on the resolution of several pressing problems, connected to the effects of Chornobyl:

-to establish strike committees at the work places;

-to coordinate their actions with the municipal strike committee;

On July 30, one day after the rally, representatives of over 20 enterprises and institutions of the city expressed their wish to support the strike.

# Association of Democratic Soviets Established in Ukraine

DNIPRODZERZHINSK, Dnipropetrovsk province—On July 28-29 the founding conference of the Association of Democratic Soviets and Democratic Blocs in the Soviets of Ukraine was held. It was attended by 178 people's deputies, representing 73 district, municipal and provincial soviets, including 35 soviet and executive committee chairmen, 9 deputies of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, and 2 deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet. People's Deputy Serhiy Konev was elected chairman of the Association's Coordinating Council.

# RELIGIOUS SERVICES FOR METROPOLITAN A. SHEPTYTSKYI AND UKRAINE'S FALLEN HEROES HELD IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK

IVANO-FRANKIVSK—A religious memorial service was held in this western Ukrainian city on July 29 to commemorate Andrey Sheptytskyi, the Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, on the 125 anniversary of his birth. (Metropolitan Sheptytskyi died on November 1, 1944).

The service was conducted by Bishop Pavlo Vasylyk of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and a priest from the USA. This was followed by a rally, attended by 10,000 people and organized by the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM).

After the consecration of Sheptytskyi Square, the rally participants walked over to the place where members of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists were shot, where a separate memorial service was conducted. [The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) was founded in 1929 as an underground national-liberation movement, fighting for Ukrainian independence and statehood. On the OUN's initiative, the reestablishment of Ukrainian statehood was proclaimed in Lviv on June 30, 1941, together with the establishment of a Ukrainian National Government headed by Yaroslav Stetsko, a leading OUN member and ideologue. In 1942 the OUN organized the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), commanded by Gen. Roman Shukhevych. OUN-UPA forces led the Ukrainian people in their two-front war of liberation against Nazi Germany and Communist Russia during the Second World War. Following the war, this armed struggle against Russia was continued well into the 1950s, at which time the OUN went underground. In 1959, Stepan Bandera — the OUN leader — was assassinated by a Russian agent in Munich].

# RALLY IN IVANO-FRANKIVSK DEMANDS RETURN OF UKRAINIAN SOLDIERS

IVANO-FRANKIVSK—On July 26 a mass rally took place in this western Ukrainian city to demand the immediate return of all Ukrainian soldiers serving their military duty outside the borders of the Ukrainian SSR, according to Mykhailo Zelenchuk — a spokesman for the Ukrainian Statehood and Independence Association (DSU). The rally was primarily organized by the recently established Soldiers' Mothers Committee and was opened by the chairwoman of this committee — Maria Dashchenko, whose son is presently "defending" Kazakhstan.

The several speakers that addressed the rally participants, including Daria Letsyk — a people's deputy to the provincial soviet, underscored the unacceptability of continued military service by Ukraine's young men in an imperialist army.

Also present among the rally participants was Colonel Katanaka, who agreed to speak after the rally participants requested him to do so. Although Col. Katanaka attempted to explain the policies of the Soviet military, he admitted to feeling a sense of shame for the ruthless brutality of Soviet army officers.

Vasyl Rushchak, a former soldier, then addressed the rally, describing the various forms of persecution to which Ukrainian soldiers are subjected. Mr. Rushchak stated that oftentimes these persecutions lead to tragic consequences: suicides, insanity, and desertions.

On the proposal of Mrs. Dashchenko, the rally participants commemorated those soldiers that died in the ranks of the Soviet army during peacetime with a moment of silence. Vitaliy Tsapovych — a 16-year-old member of the leadership of the

Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) then addressed the rally in what amounted to a passionate condemnation of Soviet military practices. Mr. Holobiuk, the co-chairman of the municipal branch of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) called for mass protest actions, such as a campaign of public resistance and a one-hour political strike of all Ukrainian mothers.

The rally participants also endorsed a set of resolutions that call for the establishment of independent Ukrainian armed forces, a decrease in the period of mandatory military service from the present 2 years to one-and-half years, and the institution of Ukrainian national symbols (national blue-and-yellow flag, the traditional "trident" — Ukraine's national emblem) in the military.

### An Appeal of the Soldiers' Mothers Committee

Dear Mothers! Dear Countrymen! Our sons are in danger! Every day that the sons of Ukraine spend serving in the Soviet army takes away from their life and health. We call upon you to take part in an all-Ukrainian rally in your villages, regional centres and cities on July 26, 1990, at 6:00 p.m. Mothers! Leave behind for one hour your pressing daily matters and unite your energies with a view towards one goal: to have our sons returned to Ukraine! Everyone to the all-Ukrainian rally! Forward your demands to the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine.

The Organizational Committee of Soldiers' Mothers July 22, 1990 — Ivano-Frankivsk

### GRAVES OF UKRAINE'S FALLEN SOLDIERS COMMEMORATED

SADZHAVA, Ivano-Frankivsk Province—Several thousand Ukrainians participated in the blessing of the gravesites of the "Sichovi Striltsi" (Ukraine's military contingent during World War I) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA — which led Ukraine's armed liberation struggle against Nazi Germany and communist Russia during and after World War II), which took place in this western Ukrainian village on July 22. Religious services were conducted by four priests of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

Afterwards, a public rally took place, led by Mr. Yavorskyi — the chairman of the provincial soviet of Ivano-Frankivsk. Keynote addresses were delivered by Daria Detsyk, the Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) regional secretary, and Stepan Kastruk, representing the Great Council of Rukh and the provincial branch of "Memorial".

Mr. Kastruk brought attention to the countless lives that were lost in the struggle of the Ukrainian people against the Stalinist-Beria clique. He stated that "Memorial" has already uncovered many gravesites, which contain irrefutable evidence of the brutal persecution inflicted on those that were fighting for Ukraine's freedom. Most recently, "Memorial" activists uncovered one such gravesite in the village of Posich. Mr. Kastruk went on to state that this village no longer exists, since it was completely liquidated on Easter day in 1950 by forces of the MVD — the USSR internal security apparatus — when all the men of the village were executed and everyone else was deported to Siberia.

Mykhailo Zelenchuk, the chairman of the provincial branch of the Ukrainian Statehood and Independence Association (DSU), also addressed the rally, underscoring the patriotism of the residents of the village of Sadzhava. This village, stated Mr. Zelenchuk, gave 30 of its sons and daughters in the struggle for Ukraine's freedom, including the UPA commander — Oleksa Blahyi, who died in 1945 in a fire fight with Soviet Russian forces. Commander Blahyi's entire battalion was killed in this fire fight. Their remains are to be found in the manholes outside the village and will soon be reburied properly in the village, stated Mr. Zelenchuk.

### CHEMICAL DISASTER PLACES HEALTH OF UKRAINIANS IN JEOPARDY 40 tons of toxic chemicals dumped into major waterway

KYIV—A major chemical disaster occurred in the USSR on July 21, 1990, in a glass factory in the Russian province of Bryansk, according to Anatoliy Zubkov of the Independent Ukrainian Press and Information Service (UNVIS). As a result of the disaster, which Soviet authorities attribute to human error, over 40 tons of dangerous and highly toxic chemicals, including formaldehyde and phenol, were dumped in one of the tributaries of the Desna River — a major waterway that runs from the territory of the RSFSR through Ukraine, flowing near the major Ukrainian metropolitan centres of Kyiv and Chernihiv.

When asked about what is being done to deal with this disaster, ecological specialists from the Department of Nature of the Ukr.SSR replied that they contacted the local authorities of the northern and central Ukrainian provinces of Kyiv, Chernihiv and Sumy, informing them of the accident. Unfortunately, however, no sanitary laboratories exist in the northern regions of Ukraine, bordering on the territory of the RSFSR, to be able to assess the level of pollution in the waterways of this region.

A spokesman for the Department of Nature stated that there is no reason for the Ukrainian population to be alarmed, since the chemicals would have been diluted by the time they reached Ukrainian territory, which they estimated to be sometime on August 1 or 2. The residents of the affected regions are, nonetheless, understandably distressed, not having forgotten the bitter memory of the Chornobyl nuclear disaster and the manner in which the authorities initially attempted to cover it up, downplaying its catastrophic consequences.

# THIRD CONGRESS OF WORLD FEDERATION OF UKRAINIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS HELD IN KYIV

KYIV—The IIIrd Congress of the World Federation of Ukrainian Medical Associations was held in this capital city's opera theatre on August 3, 1990. Akhil Khrebtovskyi, the president of the federation, addressed the Congress first. In his introductory remarks, Mr. Khrebtovskyi emphasized the need for assistance from Ukrainians in the diaspora. He also expressed his desire to cooperate with nongovernmental organizations, stating that this congress marked the first meeting of Ukrainians on a professional level.

Many of the speakers that addressed the congress stated that the state of affairs in medicine and health related matters is atrocious in Ukraine at the present time. Yuriy Spizhenko — the health minister of the Ukr.SSR — stated in his speech that the health problems facing Ukraine today cannot be resolved without a resolution of pressing social problems.

Speaking on behalf of all public organizations, Serhiy Konev, a people's deputy of the Ukr.SSR, stated that the holding of this congress in Kyiv is a step in the direction of the unification of Ukraine with the world public. His concluding words — "I stand for an independent Ukrainian state" — were greeted by the participants with loud rounds of applause.

The congress was closed with the singing of the Ukrainian national anthem — "Ukraine has not died!"

### INDEPENDENT UKRAINIAN TRADE UNIONS HOLD CONFERENCE

KYIV—Representatives of several independent Ukrainian trade unions met in this capital city on August 4 in a conference that was held under the auspices of the all-Ukrainian workers' organization — "Yednist" (Unity). Members of the United Trade Unions of Ukraine gave the initiative for the convening of the conference. The goal of the conference was to create a common bloc of all independent trade unions in Ukraine prior to the congress of the official trade union organization in Ukraine — "Ukrprofrada" — which is to be transformed at this congress into the Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine.

Several proposals were presented during the conference regarding the need to reorganize the activity of the independent trade unions and to create a common bloc. After a lengthy discussion, the participants of the conference passed a motion that a new Inter-Trade Union Bloc be formed, which would include the workers' organization — "Yednist". The primary goal of this new formation will be to secure the rights and to defend the interests of citizens of an independent Ukrainian state in questions regarding work and social justice.

Representatives from various trade unions representing rail workers, athletes, journalists, writers, Kyiv bus drivers, and from the strike committees of Lviv, Chervonohrad, Yenakiyev, Mukachiv participated in the conference. Also present were delegates from "Yednist" and guests from the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party, the Ukrainian Republican Party and the Inter-Party Assembly.

# "DAYS OF KOZAK GLORY" CELEBRATED IN UKRAINE 150,000 Ukrainians Take Part in Historic Commemoration

NIKOPOL, Dnipropetrovsk province—The all-Ukrainian commemoration of the "Days of Kozak Glory" was opened in this Ukrainian village, near the grave of Ivan Sirko — the commander of the armies of the "Zaporozhian Sich" (the fortress of the Ukrainian Kozaks, which was destroyed by Tsarina Catherine II in the 18th century, thereby liquidating the last remnants of the independent Kozak Republic) — on August 4, 1990. According to eyewitness reports, nearly 150,000 thousand Ukrainians participated in this commemoration. The parade to the monument of Ivan Sirko stretched for over a kilometre and was led by leaders of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine): Ivan Drach, Mykhailo Horyn, Mykola Porovskyi, and others.

The parade itself lasted for nearly two hours. The parade route was lined with thousands of Ukrainian national and Kozak flags, historical banners from Ukraine's glorious past. After the parade religious services were held, conducted by priests of the Ukrainian Catholic and Autocephalous Orthodox Churches, in memory of Ukraine's fallen Kozak heroes.

Afterwards a rally was held, which was opened by the chairman of the organizational committee of this commemoration — Anatoliy Nosenko. Several notable Ukrainian leaders addressed the rally, including: Mykola Kharlam, the chairman of the Nikopol regional soviet; the deputy chairman of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, Ivan Plyushch; Ivan Drach, Rukh chairman; as well as representatives of the National Fronts of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

When Ivan Drach mentioned that a new "union agreement" is being prepared, the participants of the mass rally chanted in unison: "Away with the union agreement!"

ZAPORIZHIA—On the morning of August 5, the commemoration of the "Days of Kozak Glory" continued on the island of Khortytsia (a former site of the Kozak Sich on the Dnipro River) with a Divine Liturgy in dedication to the 500th anniversary of the establishment of the Sich. The service was led by Bishop Roman of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, with the assistance of several priests.

Following the religious service, the assembled throng marched for 2 and one-

half hours to the centre of the city of Zaporizhia, where a mass rally took place. Over 100,000 people participated in the rally, which was led by the regional Rukh chairman — Yuriy Vasylenko.

During the rally, the Appeal of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the Sich was read out. In addition to the many speeches delivered at the rally, Meletey Semeniuk of the former soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA — formed in 1942 to fight against both the Nazi and Russian occupational forces in Ukraine) addressed the rally. He invited everyone to come to Volyn (a region of northern Ukraine where the UPA was established) where a commemoration of UPA soldiers that died in the struggle against Nazi Germany will take place on September 9.

### WARNING STRIKE IN KYIV

KYIV—On the initiative of the Executive Committee of the Inter-Party Assembly, the workers of various factories and enterprises in this capital city staged a two-hour-long warning strike on August 9, 1990. The strike was held as a follow-up action to the mass rally held in Kyiv on July 29, which issued several primarily ecological demands to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet.

The factories and enterprises that participated in the strike included the following:

- 1. The Kyiv motorcycle factory (5,000 workers). A rally was held during the strike, during which time the Ukrainian national, blue-and-yellow flag was raised. This factory has an active strike committee.
- 2. The furniture factory "Druzhba" (Friendship). All 500 workers at this factory went on strike. A rally was held, organized by an initiative committee for the formation of a strike committee.
- 3. The Kyiv construction and renovation enterprise. Over 60% of the workers went on strike, during which a rally was held. An incident occurred prior to the rally, when the chairman of the official union committee attempted to have Serhiy Kotyk — a labour activist trying to organize a strike committee at this enterprise — physically removed from the premises of the enterprise.
- 4. The Kyiv enterprise "Lepse". All the workers of this enterprise joined the strike, organized by the strike committee of the enterprise. During a rally, a resolution was adopted.
- 5. The official Kyiv production association "Komunist". Prior to the strike, the administration of this association attempted to frighten the workers by threatening to call in KGB personnel, since the association is an official enterprise. Nonetheless, a strike and rally were held, in which 200 workers participated. A strike committee was also formed.

- 6. The productive association "Korolov". 500 workers participated in the strike and rally. The striking workers adopted a resolution, to which were added specific economic demands. An initiative committee is trying to create a strike committee at this enterprise.
- 7. The Kyiv enterprise "Medaparatura". All 1,500 workers participated in the strike, organized by the resident strike committee.
- 8. The factory "Zhovten" (October). One division of the factory went on strike.
- 9. A spontaneous strike was held in the Kyiv factory "DOK 6", in which 1,000 workers participated.
- 10. The Kyiv shoe factory -- "Kyiv". Over 500 supported the strike.
- 11. "Kyivpromash". 25% of the workers of this factory went on strike for 30 minutes.

In addition to these factories, the strike organizers say that spontaneous strikes occurred in several other factories and enterprises. Moreover, in the city of Cherkasy a mass rally was held on August 9 in the centre of the city in support of the Kyiv strikers and their ecological and economic demands. The rally was organized by the association — "Ekolohiya".

# DOCUMENTS & REPORTS

# Appeal of the City and Province of Odessa to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR

To the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR through a People's Deputy of Ukraine From the undersigned residents of the city of Odessa and the Odessa province

#### Statement

We, citizens, residents of the city and province of Odessa, appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR with a resolute protest against the policy of colonization of our province, as likewise the entire southern Ukraine, and the violation of the constitutional rights of the Ukrainian population, which is being carried out by the Odessa party-state apparatus, which serves the central government.

At the time when the Ukrainian population in the regions of the Chornobyl zone polluted by radiation is left to its fate by the union (central) leadership, colonist-settlers are being imported to the Bilhorod-Dnister, Ovidiopol, Biliayiv and Ananyiv districts of our province from Siberia and other non-Ukrainian regions.

We are far from propagating the principle of "Ukraine for the Ukrainians", but all the same we cannot remain apathetic, when the welfare of the Ukrainian people is at stake. We cannot remain apathetic when the right of our people to existence is being placed in jeopardy.

Our hospitality has brought us to a state when several guests, having settled on our land, have trampled over our language and culture, and are now openly impinging on the territorial integrity of the republic, demanding the secession of the southern regions of our province, the secession of the Crimea and the Donbas.

The long ears of the Odessa party apparatus stick up from behind the statement of a group of Bulgarians and Gagauz, who live in the south of the Odessa province on the secession of Ukrainian lands settled by them and their annexation by Russia.

Today, in the city and province of Odessa a situation has developed where the majority of the Ukrainian population is deprived of the right to study and pray in their native language; our writers are gradually losing their readership, and the Ukrainian people — their face.

Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service The Odessa party apparatus is openly ignoring the implementation of the law on state languages of the Ukrainian SSR, everything Ukrainian is ridiculed by them, and people who hate everything Ukrainian are situated in leading posts. In the Ukrainian lands of Odessa there is no room for the Ukrainian Language Society, not to mention other Ukrainian civic organizations. Offices have been allocated to Bulgarians, Gagauz, Greeks, Jews, and Ukrainians are stepchildren on their own land.

The denationalized Odessa party-state apparatus does not represent, and such a form cannot represent, the interests of the Ukrainian people, the majority of whom reside in the city and province of Odessa. With the help of preelection machinations the true defenders of the interests of the people did not get the opportunity to be elected during the recent elections to the councils, in connection with which we demand the annulment of the results of the elections and the holding of new ones.

In creating the conditions for colonization, the Odessa leaders completely ignore the fact that their population is living in squalid conditions, that there is no food for their children, that the city of Odessa is literally crumbling, that there are no funds allocated for the construction of kindergartens, for schools and hospitals.

In cities there is no money for the construction of waste removal sites and our Black Sea, which used to bring so many returns, is now polluted. The province does not have the money for the renewal of the fertility of land, 40 per cent of which has been lost. We have the largest mortality rate in Ukraine for children from cancer-related illnesses, but this does not trouble our leaders, who built communism a long time ago — for themselves.

Apart from that, the party-state apparatus of Odessa is desperately realizing plans to convert the city and province of Odessa into a zone of so-called "free trade", which is nothing other than an attempt by the mafia to enter the outsideeconomic market, and to avoid control on the part of the Ukrainian government; an attempt is being made to tear away the "free economic zone" from Ukraine and to create something on the model of Hong Kong. This would mean additional wealth for the mafia and new promises for the people of Odessa.

We are despondent and with pain in our soul endure all humiliation from all kinds of leeches. We feel no protection on the part of the Ukrainian government, and we do not feel any control over the activities of the Odessa aparatchiks.

In connection with the above, we ask the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine to put a stop to the colonization and russification of the towns and villages of the Odessa province.

We also ask that a stop be put on all attempts to tear the southern region away from Ukraine under the pretext of the organization of a "free economic zone".

Since the issue of resettlement has been raised, we ask that people from the Chornobyl zone be resettled in our province.

We demand that you resolve the question of the representation of the Ukrainian population in the governing bodies of the city and province of Odessa, and not by placing businessmen with Ukrainian surnames in positions of power.

Odessa, April 30, 1990

# New Ukrainian Party Issues Statement to Ukrainian SSR Press

The Ukrainian Republican Party (URP), which was established at the last Congress of the former Ukrainian Helsinki Union (UHU) held on April 29-30, 1990, recently issued a Statement to the press of the Ukrainian SSR, signed by Levko Lukianenko — the newly elected URP chairman. The full text of this short statement appears below.

#### STATEMENT

to the Press of the Ukrainian SSR

On April 29-30, 1990, in the Theatre building in Kyiv the Congress of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union took place. This Congress disbanded the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and created the Ukrainian Republican Party.

The Congress ratified the URP Programme and By-Laws, making them effective until the next URP Congress, and elected an executive board consisting of the party chairman, two vice-chairmen and the Council of the party composed of 78 members.

At its first meeting, the party Council elected a Secretariat of the Ukrainian Republican Party consisting of 7 members and a chairman of the URP By-Laws Committee.

Levko Lukianenko was elected chairman of the party.

The party's vice-chairmen are: Hryhoriy Hrebeniuk (Donetsk branch) and Stepan Khmara (Lviv branch).

The following were elected to the Secretariat of the Ukrainian Republican Party:

1. Diana Bidochko (Ivano-Frankivsk branch)

- 2. Petro Borsuk (Kyiv branch)
- 3. Oleksa Mykolyshyn (Kyiv branch)
- 4. Roman Koval (Kyiv branch)
- 5. Vasyl Ovsienko (Zhytomyr branch)
- 6. Petro Rozumnyi (Sicheslav branch)
- 7. Oles Shevchenko (Kyiv branch)

Zinoviy Melnyk (Kyiv branch) was elected chairman of the By-Laws Committee of the Ukrainian Republican Party.

We are including and submitting for publication the URP Programme and By-Laws, so as to fully inform the Ukrainian people.

Chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party People's Deputy Levko Lukianenko

### NATIONALIST OPPOSITION LEADER ISSUES AN APPEAL TO PRESIDENT BUSH ON EVE OF USA/USSR SUMMIT

What follows is a translation of a letter written by Dr. Stepan Khmara to President Bush. Dr. Khmara, a physician, is a newly elected Deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian S.S.R. He is also the Vice-Chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, which calls for the restoration of Ukrainian independent statehood, as well as the founder of "Unity" — a national network of independent Ukrainian trade unions. He was released from prison in the summer of 1988 after serving nearly 9 years as a political prisoner for defending the national rights of Ukraine. Dr. Khmara is among the principal leaders of the Ukrainian independence movement.

Dear Mr. President,

Freedom — the highest intrinsic value of humanity — has created a powerful and prosperous America.

However, this greatest of gifts from God has also placed a huge responsibility on your and our America: to be the guarantor of Freedom in the contemporary world. I regard America as ours, love and respect her, because I understand that without your blessed country, hope and freedom in today's world would be transformed into an unrealizable dream.

The great American nation has rewarded the world a hundredfold with its bounty, aware that the unique American home, through God's mercy, was created by all humanity.

All who know the value of freedom will remember the great Presidents of America in the 20th century: Woodrow Wilson, the fervent supporter of national self-determination, and Ronald Reagan, a good Christian and a wise, world-class statesman, who made the struggle against the evil empire and human rights the corner-stone of his policy. This great President was able to demonstrate through deeds that politics can be moral and at the same time effective. Honour and praise be his.

One would like to believe that the leaders of America will uphold the best traditions of their predecessors.

Without question, the most important contemporary problem is the threat posed by the last world totalitarian empire — the USSR. The Moscow rulers' policy of unbridled imperialist expansionism directed towards world domination, is based on an aggressive, anti-human, communist ideology and has led the nations of the Soviet empire to the abyss of catastrophe.

It is self-evident that solving the deep economic, ecological, spiritual and social crisis under conditions of empire is impossible.

For 5 years the Gorbachev leadership has demonstrated its total inability to solve any of these major problems. The reason is that the leadership does not want to reject the totalitarian, imperial concept and is striving at all cost to preserve the integrity and inviolability of the empire. Gorbachev and his entourage would like only to adapt the imperial totalitarian regime to contemporary conditions, without changing it in any fundamental way.

However, imperialism and democracy are incompatible. The colonial yoke has become so intolerable and exhausting that it threatens the very existence of the captive nations. Therefore, with their very survival at stake, each day the anti-imperialist movement is growing in all of the regions. The costs of sustaining the imperial structure carry with them a destructive impact on the economy and translate into a huge destabilizing factor for the empire itself. There is no alternative to the liquidation of the empire. There can be discussion only about the means of decolonization. We, the representatives of the democratic movements of the captive nations, would like to liquidate the empire through the avenue of a civilized parliamentary process of dismantling (the empire) and building in its place democratic and independent states.

Small Lithuania is the first to step on the path that is desired by all of us. The successful reestablishment of the Lithuanian State will determine not only the fate of the nations in the Soviet empire, but in all of Europe as well as the future course of world history.

A monster like the USSR cannot enter the European home. This would be synonymous with letting a wolf into the hen house. Only democratic states, which will arise in the place of the empire can flow into the European community.

In this way, the Lithuanian question has become geopolictical.

If, God forbid, emperor Gorbachev was able to strangle the Lithuanian Republic, then, rather than a peaceful parliamentary dismantling, the empire will crumble along a chaotic path with incalculable consequences for us and the rest of the world. This, regrettably, Gorbachev does not want to accept, since he wants to brutally force the Lithuanian nation to its knees through an economic blockade.

The conduct of certain European leaders, who do not understand the situation in the USSR and are guided by an outmoded stereotype, is a source of anguish. "Munich" 1990 is a year more infamous than "Munich" 1938, because today nothing stands in the way of demanding the implementation of the Helsinki Accords and other international legal instruments, which were forgotten by western European governments when the tragedy of Armenia began and when the the unheard of and loathsome crimes in Tbilisi and Baku took place. When now Moscow is strangling Lithuania, certain leaders of the West, instead of supporting the Lithuanian nation, are fearful of insulting the emperor in Moscow. However, such a policy is not only immoral, it is also unwise and dangerous, because it encourages Moscow to retain its imperialist positions and thereby obstruct the successful implementation of the parliamentary path to the dismantling of the empire, which will hasten the advent of chaos, social and economic catastrophe. Perhaps some were pleased with certain steps taken by Gorbachev in the sphere of disarmament. However, they don't understand that the main threat to Europe is the ecological catastrophe, which the USSR is ever more quickly precipitating and with its imperial structure cannot avoid.

One would like to believe that the USA will not follow the mistaken path of its European partners. It is in your power Mr. President to convince Gorbachev to lift the economic blockade of Lithuania. If the USA proclaimed a moratorium on all trade with the USSR for the duration of the blockade of Lithuania or any future blockade of other republics, then Moscow would suspend the blockade immediately. I believe it would be prudent to postpone your meeting with Gorbachev at this time, because this will not have the best impact on America's authoritativeness, since the rulers in Moscow cynically trample underfoot international law and totally refuse to take into account the will of the nations in the empire.

Such a policy will not bring benefit to any one, because one cannot achieve happiness at the expense of others.

With respect, Stepan Khmara People's Deputy of Ukraine
#### DEMOCRATIC BLOC DEPUTIES IN UKRAINIAN SUPREME SOVIET BOYCOTT ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

KYIV, June 4—The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR held elections for President of this second largest "republic" in the Soviet Union. Volodymyr Ivashko, the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU), received 278 of the votes cast to be elected President. Only 334 of the 450 deputies participated in the voting as the Democratic Bloc in the Supreme Soviet, which controls approximately 30% of the seats, boycotted the vote. Although the full reasons for the boycott are not known at this time, many of the deputies from the democratic opposition voiced their protest against Ivashko's candidacy, which, in effect, amounts to uniting two of the most powerful political positions in the Ukrainian SSR. Many deputies felt that the election of the First Secretary of the CPU as President would give one individual too much power.

Prior to the vote, on June 3, the Coordinating Council of the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh — issued an appeal to the Ukrainian people, the full text of which appears below.

#### **AN APPEAL TO THE UKRAINIAN PEOPLE**

Rukh stands against the merging of the offices of First Secretary of the CC of the CPU and the President of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr. SSR into one position.

In light of this -

From June 3, 1990, mass rallies and protest actions will be held throughout all the cities and villages of Ukraine.

Rukh supports such rallies, warning strikes and other forms of public protest, by which the citizens of the republic seek to exert their influence in a non-violent fashion on the the final resolution of the issue of the inappropriateness of merging in one office two of the most powerful political positions.

Rukh calls on the citizens to support the protest rally of June 4 at 2:00 p.m. near the building of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR.

The Coordinating Council of Rukh

#### **DONETSK NATIONALISTS CONDEMN PARTY**

DONETSK—Several hundred local Ukrainian nationalists demonstrated on June 17 to protest alleged attempts by local Party officials to instigate hostility between Ukrainians and other ethnic groups in this industrially vital region. The protest meeting issued the following statement:

For a long time, people of various nationalities resided and continue to reside in the Donetsk region. Together, they experienced various cataclysms and the current restructuring.

However, when our long-suffering Ukraine is in a stage of transition from a terrorist, totalitarian regime to a legal, democratic state, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, under the keen eye of the Central Committee of the CPSU, is resorting to various forms of provocation, including the kindling of inter-ethnic hostility, in order to preserve its "nomenklatura" privileges. The Central Committee of the CPU does not want to relinquish the special weal, which it made use of at the expense of the people.

The Party apparatus, with Volodymyr Ivashko [General Secretary of the CPU] at its helm, continues to use repressive methods to rule the people and seeks to stage in Ukraine a variant of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Therefore, the participants of the meeting have resolved:

- 1. To categorically protest against this policy, which violates the long-established conditions of the Donetsk region.
- 2. To express our complete lack of confidence in the newly-created government of Ukraine and demand its dissolution. This government is incapable of getting Ukraine out of its present crises.
- 3. To demand new parliamentary elections in Ukraine based on party pluralism.

The Communist regime in Ukraine has consistently attempted to portray its national-democratic opposition as "chauvinistic" in an attempt to discredit it in the eyes of Ukraine's non-Ukrainian citizens. In response, the national-democratic movement has consistently demonstrated its multi-cultural membership and stressed respect for ethnic minority rights in a future independent Ukraine.

To the Heads of Governmental Delegations of the 35 Countries Participating in the Copenhagen Conference Regarding the Human Dimension

#### AN APPEAL of the People's Council of Ukraine the Constructive Opposition in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR

The representatives of the Democratic Bloc of people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR, who have established themselves in the new parliament as a constructive opposition under the name the People's Council of Ukraine, are of the opinion that the Ukrainian SSR, as an European state with a population of 52 million, should occupy its due place in the political life of European peoples.

The super-centralized administrative system of the USSR, which has deprived the union republics of freedom of action in their internal and external affairs, has created the conditions by which these republics are ignored by the Western world as sovereign states. After the Second World War the Western states strived to deprive the USSR of "unnecessary votes" at international forums; today their refusal to recognize the union republics as subjects of international law is rationalized by not wanting to destabilize the situation in and around the Soviet Union.

According to international law, the question of direct participation in international relations of states that are members of a federation of states is a matter of the internal competence of that federation. Article 80 of the USSR Constitution, however, clearly stipulates that every union republic "has the right to enter into relations with foreign states, make agreements and exchange diplomatic and consular representations with them, participate in the activity of international organizations". This clause is also fixed in the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR (Art. 74).

The People's Council of Ukraine believes that the continued exclusion of the Ukrainian SSR from the Helsinki process will be in direct contradiction to the principle of "new thinking" in today's new Europe.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Ukrainian SSR has stated that "the question was raised regarding the participation of representatives from Ukraine in the Copenhagen Conference as part of the USSR delegation. This question could not be resolved, however, because of the refusal of the union institutions to finance such participation". We are convinced that this paradoxical situation will lose its significance with the adoption by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR of the "Declaration on the state sovereignty of the Ukrainian SSR". A country with a large population and expansive territory, situated in the geographical centre of Europe, a

country that is a founding member of the UN, a participant of the Paris Peace Conference of 1947, Ukraine can and should be co-responsible for peace, security and cooperation on the European continent.

The People's Council of Ukraine asks the governments of the 35 countries that signed the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference of 1975 to strive towards granting the Ukrainian SSR official status as an observer at all deliberations and seminars of the Helsinki process, including a possible UN seminar for countries participating in the CSCE on human rights issues in September 1990 in Kyiv and the next human dimension conference in 1991 in Moscow. We also ask that these countries seek to include the Ukrainian SSR as a recognized participant with full rights of the Second Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki-2).

Chairman of the People's Council of Ukraine Ihor Yukhnovskyi — Academician Kyiv, June 22, 1990

#### UNDP ISSUES STATEMENT ON DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY

DONETSK—The All-Ukrainian Coordinating Council of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party (UNDP) held a meeting on July 29, 1990, in this industrial city of central Ukraine. During the meeting a resolution was ratified concerning the "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine" that was recently ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR. The full text of this resolution appears below.

#### STATEMENT

#### of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party on the "Declaration of the State Sovereignty of Ukraine"

In light of the fact that no real changes have been instituted in the Constitution and legal system of Ukraine, which would at least allow for the implementation of a truly democratic transformation of our social life

- —mindful of the continuous sabotage of the decisions of the democratic soviets by the executive and judicial bodies subordinate to the Party apparatus, and in consideration of the attempts of the CPSU and CPU apparatus to create artificial inter-ethnic conflicts and social tensions in Ukraine;
- —taking into account the already proven inability of the functionaries of the Party and state apparatus to act in accordance with general principles of democracy

and humanism;

- realizing that only the establishment of Ukrainian statehood and independence will guarantee individual liberty from the forced "happiness" of the existing state;
- -calling for the realization of the indivisible right of the Ukrainian nation and of all the Ukrainian people to life in conditions of Statehood, Democracy, Prosperity and Spirituality, the UNDP states:

- —that the determined insistence of the communist majority in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and of the Communist Party of Ukraine to have this Declaration become the basis of a Union Agreement is a new attempt to place colonial fetters on Ukraine, forces us to conclude that the Declaration in fact protects the interests of the ruling class of the "nomenklatura" and not the real interests of the Ukrainian people;
- —that nonetheless the fact that the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine was ratified is a step, or at least a half-step, towards the independence of Ukraine, which must be utilized by all democratic forces that aspire to build a Ukrainian State in accordance with the legitimacy of the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917-1918.

The UNDP considers it necessary to underscore that while it does not recognize the legitimacy of the existing government as an occupational and colonial regime, it will continue to recognize and act only upon those principles in the Declaration that do not conflict with any further measures needed to be taken to reestablish Ukrainian independence. Any and all other principles in this Declaration are to be regarded as null and void on the territory of the Ukrainian State.

The UNDP believes that the ratification of the Declaration must result in a parliamentary crisis. Insofar as such a crisis has not yet emerged, and given present circumstances it is doubtful that it will, the UNDP will continue its efforts to prepare and convene a National Congress of citizens of the Ukrainian State, the primary purpose of which will be to pave the way for a new Declaration of Ukrainian Independence, in accordance with the demands of the Ukrainian people, that will acquire constitutional status.

> Ratified during the meeting of the All-Ukrainian Coordinating Council of the UNDP Donetsk, July 29, 1990

# THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

A quarterly journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

### Winter •1990

#### THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW A Quarterly Journal devoted to the study of Ukraine

#### EDITORIAL BOARD

Slava Stetsko Editor

Prof. Nicholas L. Fr.-Chirovsky Assistant Editor

> Prof. Lev Shankovsky Assistant Editor

Prof. Volodymyr Zarycky Assistant Editor Volodymyr Bohdaniuk Associate Editor

> Borys Potapenko Associate Editor

Dr. Oleh S. Romanyshyn Associate Editor

> Stephen Oleskiw Associate Editor

#### Price: £4.50 or \$9.00 a single copy, Annual Subscription: £18.00 or \$36.00

Editorial correspondence should be sent to:

The Editors, "The Ukrainian Review", 200 Liverpool Road, London, N1 1LF.

#### Subscriptions should be sent to:

"The Ukrainian Review" (Administration), c/o Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Ltd., 49 Linden Gardens, London, W2 4HG.

#### **Overseas representatives:**

USA: Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., 136 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003. Canada: Ucrainica Research Institute, 83-85 Christie Street, Toronto,Ont. M6G 3B1.

> Printed in Great Britain by the Ukrainian Publishers Limited 200 Liverpool Road, London, NI 1LF. Tel.: 01-607-6266/7

## THE UKRAINIAN REVIEW

#### Vol. XXXVIII

A Quarterly Journal

Winter, 1990

#### CONTENTS

Editorial: A "Hot" AUTUMN	2
Michael Lawriwsky: Kyiv: A GLIMPSE OF SOCIALIST REALITY	3
Julian Birch: BORDER DISPUTES AND DISPUTED BORDERS IN THE SOVIET FEDERAL SYSTEM	14
Volodymyr Lenchenko: THE LAST KOZAK CAPITAL ON THE DNIPRO	37

#### NEWS FROM UKRAINE

PUBLIC RALLY IN KYIV ISSUES ULTIMATUM TO UKRAINIAN SSR SUPREME SOVIET	43
300,000 BELIEVERS TOOK PART IN RELIGIOUS SERVICE IN ST. GEORGE'S CATHEDRAL IN LVIV	45
DEMOCRATIC FORCES FORM A COMMITTEE TO ESTABLISH A UKRAINIAN ARMY.	46
40,000 Ukrainian Catholic Youth Participate in First "Youth in Christ" Rally in Ukraine Since 1933	48
UKRAINIAN MOTHERS PICKET SOVIET ARMY	49
Soviet Military Lashes Out Against Ukrainian Deserters	50
100,000 LVIV RESIDENTS PROTEST AGAINST NEW UNION TREATY	51
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY HOLDS MEETING	52
"No to the New Soviet Empire!"	54
TENS OF THOUSANDS RALLY IN KYIV FOR AN INDEPENDENT UKRAINE	55
400,000 Workers Strike in Kyiv	
UKR.SSR SUPREME SOVIET SESSION DISRUPTED ON FIRST DAY.	58
VIOLENCE BREAKS OUT AT SUPREME SOVIET	
THE UKRAINIAN STUDENT REBELLION.	
SECOND SESSION OF THE UKRAINIAN INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY.	
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY MEETS TO DISCUSS FUTURE PLANS	68
Ukrainian Parties Hold a Joint Meeting	
CONFERENCE OF SUBJUGATED NATIONS HELD IN KYTV	
REPRESENTATIVES OF INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY AND STRIKE COMMITTEES MEET IN DONETSK	• •
Ukrainian Political Groups Agree to Coordinate Action	_
THOUSANDS GREET UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH	
CONFERENCE OF PUBLIC COMMITTEES HELD IN KYIV	73
SECOND RUKH CONGRESS OPENS IN KYIV	74
UKRAINIANS PROTEST AGAINST ARRIVAL OF RUSSIAN ORTHODOX PRELATE	77
MILITIA BREAKS UP STUDENT DEMONSTRATION	78

#### DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

STATEMENT OF THE RUKH SECRETARIAT ON MILITARY SERVICE BY CITIZENS OF UKRAINE OUTSIDE ITS BORDERS	80
HRYHORIY PRYKHODKO: THE PRESENT SITUATION IN UKRAINE	81
Implementing the Sovereignty Declaration: An Interview with Bohdan Horyn	85
LENIN MONUMENT REMOVED IN LVIV BY PETRO SHMIGEL	92
A Profile on Ukraine's Hunger-Strikers by Petro Shmigel	93
RED ARMY MAJOR: INDEPENDENCE FOR UKRAINE BY PETRO SHMIGEL	95

Published by The Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain Ltd. Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine Inc. (U.S.A.) Ucrainica Research Institute (Canada)

#### ISSN 0041-6029

EDITORIAL

#### A "Hot" Autumn

This past summer, Mykhailo Horyn, a leading figure in the Ukrainian national-liberation movement, visited the United States and Canada. Mr. Horyn repeatedly emphasized that he and his colleagues in Ukraine expected the autumn of 1990 to be a "hot" one, that the increasingly tense political situation in Kyiv and throughout Ukraine may very well soon reach a boiling point, as the Russian imperialist forces in the USSR make a concerted effort to, in effect, force the Supreme Soviets of the Soviet "republics" to ratify a new "union treaty". Mr. Horyn pointed out that M. Gorbachev's idea of a new "union treaty" represents Moscow's latest attempt to manoeuvre the subjugated nations in the USSR into yet another colonial framework, that would be legitimated following its ratification by the various republican Supreme Soviets. For this reason, Mr. Horyn concluded, the Ukrainian people cannot, and will not be quiescent.

Recent events in Ukraine clearly indicate that the political atmosphere is, indeed, getting "hotter". On September 31, the capital of Ukraine witnessed some of the largest street demonstrations that have taken place anywhere in the USSR. More than 100,000 people took to the streets to demonstrate against any new union treaty. The following day, on October 1, nearly 400,000 workers either went on strike or participated in some form of protest actions in their work places. Similar protest actions were held in other major metropolitan centres throughout Ukraine, as the Ukrainian people resolutely, in one united voice, expressed their will to live in a truly sovereign, independent, democratic nation-state, free from Moscow's colonial tutelage.

All of these rallies and mass demonstrations, however, may have been overshadowed by the events that began to unfold in Kyiv on October 2. On that day a small group of approximately 60 young and determined, Ukrainian students from various cities in Ukraine began a hunger strike on October Revolution Square (renamed by the hunger strikers — "Independence Square"), proclaiming to the world — "Liberty or Death!" Despite its inauspicious beginning, the hunger strike very quickly grew into a major event, capturing the imagination not only of every nationally-conscious Ukrainian student, but of every Ukrainian patriot. Students from all over Ukraine began pouring into Kyiv in an unprecedented manifestation of student solidarity and youthful bravura. In only a couple of days a tent city was erected on Independence Square, which became the temporary domicile of more than 390 young Ukrainian students, who proclaimed to Moscow and to the world that they will not leave until Ukraine is free. For several days in excess of 100,000 students paraded through the streets of Kyiv, in a spontaneous demonstration of protest, blocking traffic and paralysing the city. A group of students erected yet another tent city outside the Supreme Soviet building, while others barricaded themselves in the main buildings of Kyiv University.

The students were not only demanding a rejection of a union treaty, but were also demanding that the Ukrainian government and the Supreme Soviet be dissolved; that a Ukrainian national army be formed, so that Ukrainian soldiers can serve strictly on Ukrainian soil; that the property of the Communist Party be nationalized; and that new, truly democratic elections be held. The strike ended on October 17 only after the students had forced the dismissal of the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukr.SSR — V. Masol — and after the Supreme Soviet accepted, at least in principle, the students' demands. The students' victory must be gauged not only in light of this temporary, forced retreat on the part of the communist, colonial regime in Ukraine, but in terms of its long-term significance. For the first time, the youth of Ukraine were galvanized into a truly revolutionary force, whose voice will not be easily stifled in the future. In these two weeks of October, the loud, ominous rumble of disaffection with the colonial system in Ukraine erupted with volcanic force, energized by the moral force of the students' convictions. The final result of this explosion will undoubtedly be the final dissolution of the Soviet Russian empire and the establishment on its ruins of sovereign, independent and democratic nation-states. *Let freedom ring!* 

Michael LAWRIWSKY School of Economics and Commerce La Trobe University

#### **KYIV: A GLIMPSE OF SOCIALIST REALITY**

*Hlasnist* (Glasnost) is a reality, said my colleague, Dr. Marko Pavlyshyn, as we drove into Kyiv from the airport through the snow. As Lecturer in Ukrainian at Monash University, he had been there for a month to lecture and pursue his literary research interests.

I had just told him how an SBS videotape in my possession, which was highly critical of Soviet persecution of Ukrainians throughout the past 70 years, had been passed by customs control at the airport. The tape included an interview with Volodymyr Yavorivskyi, a leading Ukrainian literary figure and politician who had recently visited Australia.

Marko was also impressed with the new-found freedom of expression which is apparent everywhere: in official and unofficial sources, in the press, on television and in countless new publications. The flow of ideas and the intellectual liveliness of the city made it an exciting place to be at this time. It was as if many revolutions were taking place at the same time.

(I later discovered that English-born Taras Kuzio, director of the London-based Ukrainian Press Agency, had been detained in Moscow and placed on the same plane back to Warsaw. Kuzio had an invitation from the Ukrainian Helsinki Union).

The economic crisis, the tragedy of Chornobyl (Chernobyl), bureaucratization and centralization of control in Moscow have all strengthened the independence movement in Ukraine. Glasnost has enabled groups like "Rukh" (the Ukrainian National Movement for Perestroika), the Ukrainian Helsinki Union and the green movement "Zelenyi Svit" ("Green Earth") to flourish. A group calling itself "Memorial" is crystallizing memories of forced famine and purges in the 1930s which resulted in the deaths of ten million Ukrainians.

Just to set matters in perspective: In 1983 the fiftieth anniversary of the famine was commemorated by Ukrainian communities in the diaspora, but was still officially denied by the Soviet Government. The Ukrainian community in Australia was being vilified by *The Socialist* as a group of anti-communist fascists concocting the "Big Lie". Recently the Ukrainian Government officially recognized the famine and placed the blame squarely with Stalin. In September Kyiv hosted an academic conference on the topic. A leading Western researcher, Dr. James Mace, who until recently was director of the US Senate Commission on the Ukrainian Famine, visited Kyiv earlier this year and delivered several lectures on it.

Glasnost, meaning that people can say virtually what they like, is indeed a

reality, but the apparatus of terror, the KGB and MVD, are still there and are applied when the talk turns to action. Beatings and 15-day prison sentences are the order of the day, as compared to executions and 15-year prison sentences in earlier periods. As for Perestroika (*Perebudova* in Ukrainian), unfortunately the socialist economic shackles are still firmly in place, and the quality of life is miserable for most. While some essential managerial personnel are being trained they will not be allowed to demonstrate their true potential unless radical economic reforms are introduced.

#### Management Education Spearheading Perestroika

I was in Ukraine at the invitation of the newly-established International Management Institute (IMI-Kyiv), which has close connections with IMI-Geneva, developed through the latter's long-serving director, Dr. Bohdan Havrylyshyn. The idea behind this institute and others that have been established in Moscow and Vilnius, is to train new cadres of managers who will be able to undertake investments and manage resources with the benefit of Western techniques developed through academic research and practical experience in a competitive environment.

My brief was to deliver a series of seminars on corporate finance principles to a group of 31 Master of Business Administration (MBA) students. It was an intensive week, during which I came into contact with students and professionals, nationalist leaders and literary figures, People's Deputies and Party members. It was obvious that all of them want change.

Seventy years of socialist reality have destroyed faith in the system. While the authoritarian "visible hand" has been relaxed somewhat, and a semblance of democratic parliamentary process has begun to be instituted, the crucial changes to institutions and laws which would allow the "invisible hand" of the market to function have not yet been contemplated.

Inordinate power still rests with the central planning ministries and as a result relative prices do not reflect relative values. Many would claim that if it weren't for the black market the whole system would have collapsed by now. If the hard decisions are taken to move to a market-based economy there will doubtless be considerable suffering along the road. But this would be preferable to a continuous twilight zone of partial reform or of brutal repression of pressures for reform.

There can be no doubt that the work ethic of the population and the "animal spirits" of entrepreneurialism have been damaged after generations of administered stagnation. To make a profit and create value was considered an economic crime, while maximizing output of capital items and commodities of doubtful quality (which nobody wanted) was rewarded. Nevertheless, given appropriate reforms the

economic potential of the Ukrainian Republic, with a population of 52 million and a land area comparable to France, is enormous.

The people who impressed me were young and middle-aged professionals and academics who, under a system that provided appropriate rewards for talents which create material and spiritual wealth for society, would be high fliers. In the past such people have been stifled by the bureaucracy because their ideas and actions would inevitably have encroached upon some political dogma or threatened entrenched positions of power. These people were confident that they could create wealth in Ukraine, and that they did not need to be told what to do by some bureaucrat in Moscow.

The group of students I lectured to were bright and highly motivated. Seven were already holders of PhDs and almost all were between the ages of 25 and 40. I spoke on the methodology used by Western investors to assess the value of a joint venture proposal in an Eastern Bloc country and what incentive structures are used in the West to motivate managers and employees to create wealth. The issue of shares to employees and the workings of the stock exchange (they had heard of "bulls" and "bears") were also of considerable interest. They were eager to hear about life in Australia — the fact that women in Australia have the right to a pension regardless of how many years they have worked caused bewilderment. I lectured in Ukrainian, which meant that only three Russian-speaking students from outside the Republic had difficulty understanding me.

#### Chornobyl

Four years after the nuclear catastrophe, Chornobyl is seldom mentioned in the West. That is not the case in Kyiv, which lies only 100 kilometres south of the entombed reactor. During my short stay it was a topic which kept coming up in the media, in offices and on the street. I can still recall the anger of a middle-aged professional who spoke of how officials had allowed people onto the irradiated streets of Kyiv for the May Day march, while privately arranging for their own children and families to be evacuated to Moscow. When he eventually arrived in Moscow and extended his hand to colleagues they would not touch it. My driver claimed that everyone in Kyiv had only ten years to live.

Speaking at a recent conference at Rutgers University in the United States, Dr. Dmytro Hrodzinskyi of the Institute of Botany, Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, declared that the accident "revealed the disgrace of the commandadministrative system". He went on to describe the mutation of plant life in the zone around the reactor. Deformed pine needles and mutant vegetables have become an export industry due to the interest of Western scientists. According to Dr. Hrodzinskyi, while women of child-bearing age have decided not to give birth, even so there will be deformities in coming generations. He recalled Kyiv in the days after the explosion in a recent interview with Roma Hadzewicz, editor of the New York-based Ukrainian Weekly (22 April):

I remember sitting at home and sticking a dosimeter outside the door to the balcony. This dosimeter crackled incredibly. The level was very high, for a long time on some days it was 1.5, 2, 3, 4 milliroentgens per hour. (The normal background level is .01 to .02 milliroentgens per hour). Throughout the city on those very same balconies, on the streets, hot particles were flying about. And they flew into open windows. If only those windows had been tightly closed at least inside the buildings a normal level would have been maintained for a long time ... But they were not even told. Even in Prypiat itself (where Chornobyl plant workers were housed), where it was already known that the accident had occurred — where "liquidators", those engaged in deactivating the reactor, were seen walking around in their frightening masks and equipment, armed with dosimeters and riding in armoured vehicles — at the same time scantily-dressed little children played in the sand. The question arises: How can this be? Such a horror: the army is on the scene and here, right next to it, little children are playing. And this happened.

And how could it be — and this I consider a very great sin before the people — that the May 1 demonstrations were not called off. Why hundreds of thousands of people walked in these parades, carrying little children or leading them by the hand; they carried flowers and waved. And all this occurred while a cloud of radioactive iodine advanced. This happened in Kyiv, Zhytomyr and Chernihiv regions. This is a crime. It cannot be called anything else.

Four years after the event it has been decided to extend the evacuation zone from 30 to 100 kilometres and at least a million people still live under direct threat, with many more eating food grown in the region.

Chornobyl is seen as the symptom of a wider problem: the lack of economic autonomy and political independence. "Rukh" (which means "Movement") has a detailed programme on economic and ecological issues which respond to the concerns of the populace. Bitterness arises from the fact that Ukrainians have a high proportion of all Soviet reactors on their soil, and nuclear-generated electricity has been exported to neighbouring Eastern Bloc countries. Ukrainians have had to bear the ecological risk without reaping the economic rewards, and having no say as to safety standards on whether it is a trade-off they wish to make in the first place. More conventional forms of pollution are rife in the Republic as production plans (and associated bonuses) have been achieved at the expense of the environment. Lacking well-defined property rights and media-driven political pluralism it appears that appropriate pollution control and compensation mechanisms have not developed.

#### The Economy

Volodymyr Yavorivskyi, a People's Deputy who recently resigned from the Communist Party, has revealed that the Ukrainian Government has controlled only five per cent of Ukrainian resources. "Rukh's" platform argues that Ukraine has been subjected to colonial exploitation and that its economy has been disfigured. For example, Ukraine has a population of 52 million but produces more steel than France and the United Kingdom combined. It also produces more rolling stock than the United States. The Ukrainian economy is capable of producing the largest aeroplane in the world, the "Mriya" ("Dream"), which carries the Soviet space shuttle, but is not capable of providing either the quantity or quality of food and consumer durables demanded by its citizens. Meanwhile, the concentration of basic heavy industry has brought pollution but not prosperity.

Dr. Oleh Bilorus, Director-General of the IMI-Kyiv, and professor of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, delivered a paper on economic issues at the Rutgers conference in which he declared that Ukraine is in the midst of a total socio-economic crisis. In his view, "a new economic system can be the only basis for social progress", as the entire nation stands before a historic crossroads. However, his opinion is that radical change is impossible, with a transition period of some 15-20 years being required. Furthermore, both political and economic sovereignty are required, placing economic relations with the Russian Republic and other Eastern European countries on a rational economic basis.

While some Russians are advocating a break-up of the USSR on the grounds that the Russian Federation (i.e. the bulk of the Russian nation) is subsidizing an imperial system, most Ukrainians are convinced that they are subsidizing Russian interests through inter-republic transfer pricing and other mechanisms, and would be better off on their own. Writing in *Literaturna Ukraina* (26 October 1989), Professor Mykhailo Shvaik put it this way:

To be free, to attain freedom, one must free oneself from economic and political dependence. Today we talk a great deal about feeling like masters in our own land. What sort of masters are we — what characteristics define a master?... It's common knowledge that the plans [of production] or, rather state orders, are determined in Moscow. So we are not masters here...

To be free, we must completely eliminate administration by central ministries, state ownership, and give the Ukrainian people complete freedom to produce and live as they wish... [Prices in Ukraine] are artificially low. This is done intentionally to devalue our work. As a result, our agriculture loses close to one billion roubles, our coal industry — close to half a billion. Because prices on agricultural equipment and construction materials [which

Ukraine imports] are unnaturally high, we lost three billion roubles last year...

Sovereignty is impossible without the creation of our own financial, monetary and credit system, our own banking system... We must issue our own currency... What good will republican cost-accounting be to us if 10 to 20 billion devalued roubles flood into our republic from other republics? We must create a Ukrainian bank.

Serhiy Konev, a 28-year-old doctor who is now a USSR People's Congress Deputy, put the economic case much more bluntly to John Lloyd of the *Financial Times* (1 March 1990): "We have coal, iron ore and agricultural products. We could sell these to the West for hard currency and it would be much more profitable for us. At the moment, 95 per cent of our economy is under Moscow's control and we do not get back what we put in". Economist Volodymyr Chernyak summed up the feeling at the recent "Rukh" congress in the following words: "We want to move from a free-market economy to a free Ukraine".

I doubt that this is what Mikhail Gorbachev had in mind when he coined the term "Perestroika", but then there are probably as many views of what Perestroika means in the USSR as there are of the meaning of "Multiculturalism" in Australia. Promises of shifting the emphasis from heavy industry and the military to consumer goods followed the leadership changes — from Stalin to Khrushchev to Brezhnev. Nothing has changed. Unless a radical shift towards private ownership and the market economy is made "Perestroika" will not succeed.

#### Solidarity with Lithuania

A week before I had arrived there was a 30,000-strong unsanctioned demonstration in Kyiv which was designed to demonstrate solidarity with the independence stand of the Lithuanians. There were more demonstrations in other Ukrainian cities. By the time I had arrived moves were being made by conservative forces (i.e. the "right-wing" communist stalwarts) to seek injunctions on the status of the newly-elected Deputies who attended and spoke at these illegal meetings. I met with one of these, Dmytro Pavlychko, who is a leading poet and president of the 280,000-member Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society. The Society was a major force in achieving the recognition of Ukrainian as the state language of the Republic from 1 January of this year.

While he did not appear to be perturbed by the attacks of the conservatives, he felt deeply disappointed at the lack of a spirited Western defence of the Lithuanians. "At least the Australians have come out in support", he told me. It was the second time in two days that I had heard this, and on both occasions I had to reply that as far as I knew, the then Leader of the Opposition, Andrew Peacock, has sent a letter of support to the Lithuanian Parliament — nothing more.

#### **The National Movement**

In western Ukraine, which had never been under Russian domination until the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939, Ukrainian nationalist candidates won more than 80 per cent of the vote in the 4 March elections. The traditional blue-and-yellow flag now flies from official buildings in the western capital of Lviv (Lvov). It was described to me by one young Kyivite as virtually a *de facto* independent state. Lithuania has been engaged in negotiations with representatives of the city to provide fuel in return for food and consumer goods. Recently, the Lviv Council of Workers' Deputies voted 130 to 6 for the Russian Orthodox Church to vacate (by 12 April) the premises of the Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral of St. George which had been forcibly occupied by the former on 11 April 1946.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church was destroyed by Stalin in the 1930s. When Soviet control was extended in the western regions thousands of Catholic priests, bishops and nuns were imprisoned in 1946 so that a bogus "synod" could proclaim "reunification" with the Russian Orthodox Church. Recently, Ukrainian Catholics have mounted demonstrations of more than 200,000 people in Lviv calling for the return of the Cathedral and a full legalization of the Church (currently it is merely "recognized").

Recent events in Lviv have so disturbed the KGB that more than 200 ethnic Russian officers have been sent in to Lviv to strengthen local militia units. It is reminiscent of the "twenty-five-thousanders" sent in to ensure the collectivization, and the famine of 1933. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church has also renewed itself. The initial response has been to rename the Ukrainian branch of the Russian Orthodox Church, "the Ukrainian Orthodox Church", while maintaining Moscow's control. The conservative forces, including the official Russian Orthodox hierarchy, may also seek to create internal conflict between Orthodox and Catholic Ukrainians.

Throughout Ukraine "Rukh" candidates won seats in most of the areas which they contested. However, because "Rukh" was legalized only weeks before the elections and did not have the resources at that stage for a Ukraine-wide campaign, only 30 per cent of current Deputies are from "Rukh". Opposing them in the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet is a hard core of communist conservatives who occupy a further 30 per cent of seats. The other 40 per cent of positions are held by an as yet uncommitted group. On the day I spoke to Pavlychko he told me that five Deputies had left the Communist Party. However, the initial voting patterns at the Supreme Soviet, which began sitting on 15 May, have indicated a maximum of 162 votes for the Democratic Bloc in a house of 450 Deputies.

"Rukh" did have a resounding electoral success in the capital, Kyiv. Of 22 constituencies, 15 were won by Democratic Bloc candidates, despite allegations of

electoral fraud. For example, it was alleged that 12,000 Red Army troops were brought in especially to vote for Communist Party First Secretary Volodymyr Ivashko, and electoral statistics indicate that the implied absentee rate in his district was significantly below that of all others. It is also interesting to note that US Representative Don Ritter was denied an entry visa when he expressed a wish to be present in Kyiv during the elections. An an aside, it is interesting to note that only about five per cent of candidates in the elections were women, as opposed to the precise 33.3 per cent which obtained seats in the days when 99.99 per cent of votes were invariably cast in support of officially-sponsored candidates.

To date, the most impressive public manifestation of support for "Rukh" and the Ukrainian national movement was the 21 January "Freedom Chain". The chain commemorated the declaration of Ukrainian independence on 22 January 1918 and the Act of Reunification of Ukrainian lands exactly a year later. It stretched for 700 kilometres from Ivano-Frankivsk, near the Hungarian border, through Lviv to St. Sophia Square in Kyiv. Kyiv had seen nothing like it even in the Revolutionary period. Estimates put the number of participants at up to half a million, with thousands of blue-and-yellow flags being flown. Not only Ukrainians but also members of minority groups such as Russians, Jews and other ethnic minorities participated. Viewing a detailed video of the event I wondered to myself how Moscow could possibly stop this force without the use of tanks.

Significantly, the national movement has not taken on any of the chauvinistic attitudes which characterize groups like the Russian "Pamyat" ("Memory"), even though there have been attempts from official quarters to discredit it as "anti-Semitic". This move was checkmated in February by a joint demonstration of "Rukh" and Jewish groups. I met the General Secretary of "Rukh", Mykhailo Horyn, who is a People's Deputy and member of the newly-formed Ukrainian Republican Party) at the "Rukh" headquarters in Kyiv. "Rukh" occupied a twostorey building near the city centre. He spoke of the fact that all the peoples of Ukraine, not just Ukrainians, see the need for independence:

Today there is no one in Ukraine who cannot understand that only an independent Ukrainian state can take us out of our current deep crisis — a crisis brought upon us by the empire which goes under the name "Soviet Union". "De-imperialization", that is the establishment of separate independent states, is just a matter of time. It is not the "ranting of extremists", as the conservatives have alleged, but a natural process. This is understood not just by Ukrainians, it is being understood by Russians and Jews and Armenians. All those who wish to live in Ukraine understand that without an independent Ukraine they have no future.

Later that day I had lunch with an ethnic Russian student, which provided an opportunity to put Horyn's hypothesis to the test. I asked him how he, as a Russian, looked at the question of Ukrainian independence. His answer was that anything less would merely serve to perpetuate the current catastrophe. Nor did he think that the ten million Russians living in the Republic would be reduced to janitor status as has been alleged in the context of Lithuania by a recent visitor to Australia, Dr. Sergei Rogov.

The most recent events, however, point to a possible crackdown on the national movement. "Rukh" has apparently gained access to a document calling for the sacking of disloyal Party members and others in the Democratic Bloc who have influential posts. In that event the opposition movement would be forced underground and the possibility of violence would be increased to the point where conservative reactionary forces could topple Gorbachev.

The nationalist movement itself is composed of moderate, centre and radical wings. The centre group's leadership is composed of former long-serving political prisoners, typified by its leader Levko Lukianenko, and has its roots in the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, formed in the mid-seventies. It has recently transformed itself into the Ukrainian Republican Party and draws most of its support from the western and central regions. The moderate wing's leadership is composed of leading Kyiv literary figures such as Ivan Drach (the leader of "Rukh"), Volodymyr Yavorivskyi and Dmytro Pavlychko, who are all former Communist Party members. This wing has developed a programme for a new political party on Social Democrat lines, which will be called the Democratic Party. Both groups have strong representation in the current Supreme Soviet.

The Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Front forms the most radical wing of the national movement. Its view of the recent electoral process can be summed up in the following statement issued by the group: "There can be no elections while Ukraine is still an occupied territory. Those who take part in them will be judged by history". It called for a boycotting of the elections and condemned the leaders of the "Democratic Bloc" as "collaborationists". It is argued that the whole process co-opts and pacifies opposition forces because they have, by their presence, legitimized the institution (the Supreme Soviet) they are ostensibly opposed to.

#### The Social Malaise

On my final night in Kyiv I visited 85-year-old Oksana Meshko, who lives in a small flat in the Obolon district. A founding member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, she had visited Australia in 1988 for an eye operation. The Obolon is a relatively new residential district situated on the northern outskirts of the city. Oksana considered herself lucky to be living in her small flat in a dreary looking high rise which was distinguishable from those around it only by the unique patterns of concrete cancer developing along the walls. Since 1947 she has spent ten years in prison camps in Siberia, five years in Siberian exile and eighteen months in a psychiatric hospital, so that in relative terms she has every right to feel lucky. She explained that people wait up to 15 or 20 years for such accommodation.

In stark contrast to the centre of Kyiv, which although neglected, is among the most beautiful cities in Europe for its parks and historic architecture dating back to the 9th century "Golden Gates", the Obolon looked like an urban nightmare. In long- distance photographs these high rise suburbs appear like reasonable living quarters. The reality is that they are in dire need of maintenance before they have been properly completed. There one encounters what the locals term "historic road building sites", i.e. construction which has been under way for 8-10 years. Among the buildings there are curious one-product shops selling staples such as bread and milk. Their spacing does not seem sensible given that most women shoppers are on foot.

Most Kyivites have only one child, due to the practical constraints imposed on them by an economic system which simply doesn't work. Its major contradiction is that the system is built on a philosophy of the equitable distribution of goods that it is incapable of producing. Apart from the need to provide food and clothing during adolescence, there is the question of where the children and their spouses will live during the 15 years they are waiting for their flat. There are similar waiting periods for cars and telephones. Unfortunately, the most widely practised form of contraception appears to be abortion, which, when combined with pollution and the effects of harsh working conditions, has meant that life expectancy has actually declined over time. "Spontaneous abortions" have risen by 400 to 600 per cent in recent years.

But perhaps the most damning evidence of the failure of the socialist system was obtained through a visit to a "supermarket". On my way to the airport my driver insisted that I see this, and "let them know in the West how we live". As we drove up some old women sat outside the store selling fresh vegetables they had grown on private plots in the country. "The paradox here", my driver explained, "is that the goods are on the outside, where free enterprise is at work". On the inside it was immediately apparent that the store was grossly overstaffed, drab and dirty.

Many of the shelves were empty. Staples such as milk and bread were abundant, but there was absolutely no choice within the limited range of goods on hand. I looked into a five-metre-long, waist-high refrigerated cabinet and saw only four or five bags of unprocessed fish wrapped in clear plastic. "This will be gone before lunch", the driver noted. At the back of the store perhaps a dozen women were waiting around the service entrance because there was word that a new item was going to be brought out.

As contacts with the West increase through two-way travel, film and video, and the education system tells the truth, the indignation of these people can only grow.

They have the education (with the exception of appropriate managerial training) and skilled manpower, and they have a rich endowment of natural resources. What they need is the political and economic freedom to use these talents for their own betterment.

#### In Conclusion

Leaving Kyiv, I was thankful that Glasnost had enabled people to speak openly to me, and I was heartened by their bravery and idealism. I was impressed with the clearly articulated alternative society presented in the "Rukh" programme because it more closely resembles ours. I felt an empathy for these people who are forced to live well below their objective capabilities, while they felt they are in the most important place on earth — where the future of the Soviet Union would be decided.

Even before Perestroika I had questioned the viability of decentralization and economic reform without a total political reform of the Soviet empire which was likely to result in its destruction. Like the experiment that went wrong at Chornobyl four years ago, Mikhail Gorbachev may already have withdrawn one too many cooling rods, and the reaction which is currently building may soon be out of control. One hopes that the outcome will be a peaceful transition to democracy, and not a violent explosion. Julian BIRCH Department of Politics University of Sheffield

#### BORDER DISPUTES AND DISPUTED BORDERS IN THE SOVIET FEDERAL SYSTEM

While the national question in the USSR has received much attention in terms both of the regime's ideological approach to it and the nationalist response to that approach, the issue of the actual minority territories created in the period from the 1920s to the 1940s has attracted little attention in recent times. Disputes over the external frontier aspects of some of these territories have certainly become familiar, as in the case of the Baltic states and Moldavia, but it is less widely appreciated that disputed borders were created, and continue to exist, within the USSR itself. A number of factors may account for this. In the first place, frequent disdain has been shown in Western emigre writings towards the very relevance of the Soviet federal system and its division of the country into units based either on ethnic composition or on administratively convenient populations. So readily have these divisions been bypassed by the Communist Party's own organization, the KGB, the military, the economic planning organs, major industrial enterprises and combines, and, increasingly, the legal apparatus, that it seemed legitimate to accord the system little import. Then again, with the passage of time, it has come to be taken almost for granted that such boundaries as have been established are correctly and irrevocably drawn to delineate the peoples therein. Finally, it has often been assumed, not least by Soviet officialdom itself, that the borders are destined to prove more and more irrelevant in an era of increasing personal mobility, urbanization, industrialization, mass communications, and, most especially, of progress towards the goal of full communism. Nevertheless, despite the opportunities afforded by the change of constitution in 1977 to eradicate them, the territorial units remain, along with the problems they create, many now of longstanding.

In some of these territories the borders are a contentious issue, including dissent of considerable intensity for the very good reason that, in the absence of a truly universal Soviet identity and culture, borders still can markedly affect the character and quality of a citizen's life. It is the intention here to examine the background to these contested borders in seven case studies, before drawing some conclusions about their impact on Soviet success or failure in solving the national problem.

Given the number and diversity of ethnic groups on Soviet territory, with the best will in the world it is likely that some such clashes would occur, no matter how much care was taken in drawing boundary lines. With rather less than the best will in the world and a determination to impose a solution satisfactory to the political centre, it became perhaps inevitable that problems would arise after the event.

In the setting up of the USSR in its federal form in the years between 1917 and 1924 (and to a much lesser extent at the time of the 1936 constitution), numerous difficulties were encountered in separating distinct ethnic and dialect groups and in drawing up territorial borders based in part on ethnic territories — especially in the very mixed population areas of the west and northwest frontier zones (where many had no clear concept of national identity, so often had the borders changed and so overlapping the population), in the Caucasus (where dozens of groups existed in small but highly mountainous areas like Dagestan), and in frequently nomadic Central Asia.

A glance at the map of Soviet Central Asia readily reveals a number of the straight-line borders so familiar from the days of the colonial carving up of Africa and the Middle East. Here, as there, the lines were fairly arbitrary in terms of their artificial separation of common population - populations, moreover, with traditions of pastoral nomadism unrestrained by the kind of finite boundaries so beloved by social planners and administrators.<sup>1</sup> The sense of urgency involved in restoring order after the Civil War, the strongly internationalist outlook of many of the actors in the process, and the desire to counter a Turkic nationalist call for at least a Central Asian federation gave rise to a Territorial Commission in 1924 - a commission whose decisions were adopted, in the words of Wheeler, "not so much in defiance of the wishes of the Muslim peoples of Central Asia as over their heads."<sup>2</sup> The merit of this and other schemes was that they swept aside the potential objections that might arise from dividing up the various peoples and territories inherited from the Tsarist empire. They created relatively neat, administratively convenient units while providing some semblance of selfdetermination, even though in Central Asia some two million of the twelve million population were Russian and Ukrainian settlers, concentrated in and near the centres of power and holding some seventy per cent of the government posts.<sup>3</sup> The appearance of autonomy was rarely much more than that, while the new frontiers were made nonsense of by situations such as that in the city of Bukhara, now in Uzbekistan, where a major medium of communication in public was Tadzhik, the language of the republic two hundred miles away at its nearest point. A sizeable infusion of Koreans into that same area following the deportation from their home territory in 1937, and of others from the Crimea and elsewhere during World War II, produced further anomalies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>On the setting up of the present Central Asian boundaries see particularly O. Caroe, Soviet Empire (London, 1967), pp. 145-49; and R. Vaidyanath, The Formation of the Soviet Central Asian Republics, (New Delhi, 1967), pp. 151-202.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>G. Wheeler, *The Peoples of Soviet Central Asia* (London, 1966), p. 69. <sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 9, 62, and 69.

Even the small groups of northern peoples presented their own special difficulties in assigning them a territory with, for instance, the 20,000 Evenki spread over huge areas in eastern Siberia, many times the size of Britain. Borders were established and imposed where necessary, all across the map, even as late as 1959 only 3,474 out of 24,583 Evenki actually lived in the Evenki territory, compared with 9,505 in the neighbouring Yakut autonomous republic.<sup>4</sup>

Further Soviet territorial expansion in World War II raised new difficulties in determining borders, as did the deportation of groups mostly accused of collaboration with the invaders. For example, after the war, parts of the formerly independent republics of Estonia and Latvia were transferred to the Russian republic, along with East Prussia (on the grounds of the extent of the Russian population now there), while parts of Byelorussia were added to Lithuania.<sup>5</sup>

The 1956 change in status of the Karelian republic, as a result of changes alleged to have occurred in its population balance,<sup>6</sup> involved only a demotion to the level of an autonomous republic, not a change in borders, and produced no significant dissent of a type shortly to be manifested elsewhere.

It was in the course of the 1960s and 1970s that the disputed internal borders reemerged or again came to light, together with the more general growth of open political dissent. It was also this changed climate which briefly, and often tantalizingly incompetently, gave outsiders a glimpse of what was occurring behind the facade of normality put up by the official media vis-a-vis the localities.

#### The Buryat Mongol Case

A longstanding situation that has caused perhaps the least open dissent has been that of the Buryat Mongol territories. Russian colonial settlement in the 18th and early 19th centuries split up the Buryat people, both reducing their territorial hold and creating a physically separate enclave in the area around the town of Chita, an enclave more readily and increasingly open to the settlers' cultural and religious influences. The immediate post-1917 settlement in which the two parts fell administratively under two distinct republican administrations — the Russian and the Far Eastern — served to reinforce the separation politically. Although reunited administratively in 1923, they remained physically apart, with a Russian population majority in both.<sup>7</sup>

While there was, no doubt, official disquiet over pan-Mongol tendencies among elements of the population (elements seeking closer association with the Khalka-Mongols of independent Outer Mongolia, and even with the Kalmyks far to the

<sup>4</sup>Itogi vsesoyuznoy perepisi naseleniya 1959 goda, RSFSR (Moscow, 1963), pp. 300-37.
<sup>5</sup>See below.
<sup>6</sup>Pravda, July 17, 1956.
<sup>7</sup>W. Kolarz, The Peoples of the Soviet Far East (1969), pp. 116-17.

southwest), and over the pro-Japanese sentiments of many Buryats revealed during the Civil War<sup>8</sup> — disquiet sufficient to sustain the division of the territory — it was the major purge trial of Buryat leaders in September 1937 which exacerbated matters. Amid the familiar wild accusations of treachery and espionage so common in that period, Buryat territory was further dismembered. Gone were districts in the western part of the Buryat autonomous republic, reduced to the lesser status of a national area within the Russian republic; gone, too, was the enclave near Chita relatively near to Japanese territory in Manchuria, similarly reduced in status and now subordinated to Russian republic control with its focal point in Moscow. Russian settlers were simultaneously specifically encouraged to move into the area in systematically increasing numbers.<sup>9</sup>

And so the division of Buryatia remained. However, with the emergence of some small measure of Buryat and Buddhist self-assertion, which climaxed in the trial of the Buddhist leader Bidya Dandaron in 1972,<sup>10</sup> visitors to the area reported hearing from local people a desire for some kind of land corridor to be introduced linking up the disparate parts of Buryat Mongolia — the Buryat Mongol Autonomous republic, the Ust-Orda Buryat Mongol National Okrug to the northwest, and the Aga Buryat Mongol National Okrug to the east.<sup>11</sup> As yet, no such move has been made, and seems most unlikely to be made, given the potential within the two relatively small okrugs for encouraging assimilation and eventually eliminating the problem. In any event, nothing has been heard of pressure being mounted by the Buryats in support of this move. As such, it must at present be considered one of the more minor and dormant of the border disputes. Nevertheless, given that as a group the Buryats increased numerically from 253,000 in 1959 to 315,000 by 1970<sup>12</sup> — well in excess of the Russian growth rate in the area — it is one which could well reemerge.

#### The Lezghin Case

The Caucasus mountain region with its multiplicity of ethnic groups has been the most fertile ground for border disputes. Among those becoming known to the outside world, again in the 1960s and 1970s, was that affecting the Lezghins (or Lezghians), who are Sunni Moslems in the southeastern part of the Dagestan Autonomous Republic and in the north of the Azerbaijan Republic. Numbering

<sup>12</sup>Pravda, April 17, 1971.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Indeed, a pan-Mongol congress under Japanese auspices in February 1919 had called for the expulsion of all Russians living east of Lake Baikal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Decree of November 17, 1937.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>See Khronika Tekushchikh Sobytiy (Moscow), no. 28, December 31, 1972.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Private correspondence, confirmed in discussions during a visit to the area by the author in July 1986.

some 223,129 in 1959 and 382,611 by 1979, they found themselves coming under increasing assimilationist pressures from their Avar neighbours in Dagestan to the north, but more so from the three million Azeris to the south. Indeed, in 1939 Lezghin was abolished an as official literary language in that part of their territory situated south of the river Samur in Azerbaijan and was replaced by Azeri.<sup>13</sup> As a consequence, Lezghin children were thereafter being taught in Azeri on one side of the river and Russian on the other (Dagestan lay within the Russian republic and used that as the lingua franca), their language and culture suffering as a result. The advantages gained in terms of university entry and careers within the two republics also led considerable numbers, perhaps a majority, of the Lezghins in Azerbaijan to prompt their children to claim Azeri nationality in their internal passports, whether or not this was a solution they wished.<sup>14</sup>

Pricking the national consciousness, there arose some form of nationalist movement, or at least a grouping to rectify this apparently anomalous situation and advance the cause of a separate territorial identity to override the artificial boundaries dividing the 163,000 Lezghins in the north from the 153,000 in the south.

The leader of the campaign was Iskander Kaziev, a journalist and member of both the Writers' Union and the Communist party. In 1965 he protested against an article in the Dagestan *Pravda* which referred, as a progressive movement, to the fact that there had been eighty different peoples in the area in 1915, thirty-two in 1935, and a mere eleven in 1959. Kaziev and his associates did not find this "amalgamation" of peoples satisfactory, and, indeed, sought to ensure a future for the Lezghins by sending, on several occasions, to the Supreme Soviet, a proposal for an autonomous Lezghin territory.<sup>15</sup>

In consequence, Kaziev found himself criticized by a Dagestan Party resolution of May 14, 1965, entitled "On the Nationalistic and Anti-Party Activities of the Writer Iskander Kaziev",<sup>16</sup> and in 1969 he was exiled to Ugoldar village in the Donbas region of Ukraine. His supporters also began to be arrested and detained in prison or psychiatric hospital on a variety of charges. Nadir Abduldzhamalov, a philologist, was detained for "speculation" in the course of 1968; Mavlud Akhmedov, a philology assistant, was incarcerated in a psychiatric hospital on several occasions from 1968 onwards; Ali Aliverdiev, a senior legal official, was arrested in 1970 and given fifteen years in a severe regime labour camp; Osman Osmanov, a captain in the police force, was sentenced to a camp for several years; Igramudin Emirzaiev, a juridical counsellor, was charged with hooliganism; and

<sup>13</sup>R. Wixman, The Peoples of the USSR (London, 1984), p. 126.
<sup>14</sup>Arkhiv Samizdata (Munich), doc. no. 4755.
<sup>15</sup>Le Monde (Paris), May 24, 1980.
<sup>16</sup>Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 4755.

18

Kalmadin Mahmudov, a doctor, was held in a psychiatric hospital for four years.<sup>17</sup>

Even such responses did not deter Kaziev. An appeal by him to UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, dated March 7, 1980, reiterated the grievances and cited some twenty members of the Lezghin intelligentsia who had by then been persecuted for their involvement (some of them suffering premature death as a result).<sup>18</sup> Subsequently, at the beginning of April 1980, he was called to the KGB and told to stop or be forced to emigrate to some non-socialist country. Far from agreeing with the unreasonable demand, Kaziev apparently spoke up in support of the equally exiled Academician Sakharov and condemned the invasion of Afghanistan for good measure.<sup>19</sup> To date, no further news of the campaign has come to light, but no Lezghin territory has been created straddling the old borders.

#### The Azerbaijan-Armenia Case

From the most southerly part of the Caucasus region of the USSR have come details of a contested border which seems at present to be locked into an indefensible position, albeit one of long standing. It involves the ethnic Armenians, who find themselves the overwhelming majority in the Karabakh region administratively located just within the Azerbaijani Republic, despite the Armenian Republic, being only a short distance away.

The dispute is particularly galling for many nationalistic Armenians in the region in that they view the Azeris (with some justification) as the newcomers on territory traditionally Armenian for thousands of years.<sup>20</sup> That the Azeris are ethnically close to the Turks (whom the Armenians hold responsible for the massacres of 1895-96 and 1915-16) scarcely helps allay Armenian fears. Indeed, in the clash which broke out between the two communities in the Tsarist era in 1903-05, a considerable massacre of Armenians was carried out by the Azeris in Shushi, then in the Elisavetpol gubernia of the empire.<sup>21</sup>

After the breakup of the Russian empire, the Azeri-Armenian border was thrown into flux by the civil war and the temporary creation of independent republics. It proved a difficult frontier to delineate clearly and to mutual satisfaction.<sup>22</sup> Villages of the two groups lay in close proximity across the border zone, and the very ambitious territorial goals put forward by the Azeris to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 did not help in resolving matters.

<sup>17</sup>Le Monde, May 24, 1980.

18 Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 4755.

- <sup>19</sup>Le Monde, May 24, 1980.
- <sup>20</sup>On the long-standing animosities see, e.g., R. G. Hovannisian, *The Republic of Armenia* (Berkeley, 1971), 1: 78-79.
- <sup>21</sup>Ibid., pp. 79-81.
- <sup>22</sup>See, e.g., R. D. "The Question of Armenian Boundaries", *The Armenian Review* (Winter 1948): 103-07; and J. G. Mandalian, "The Transcaucasian Armenia Irredenta", *The Armenian Review*, 14 (Summer 1961).

The Karabakh region presented a particular problem, separated as it was from the rest of Armenia to the west by the Karabakh mountain range yet heavily populated by Armenians. It was, in fact, a source of armed conflict between the two republics in the brief period of independence in 1919-20.<sup>23</sup> With the coming of the Red Army and Soviet control, a decision was initially taken by Stalin to return the Karabakh region to the new Soviet Armenia.<sup>24</sup> Even after the Armenian revolt of February 1921, this view was reiterated several times from March to July 1921.<sup>25</sup> The decision was reversed, however, and overridden by the treaty of economic and military union of September 30, 1921, apparently out of consideration for Turkish and Azeri interests; the latter, though, seem to have amounted to little more than the use of the eastern slopes of the Karabakh mountains by transhumant Azeri shepherds. The mineral wealth of the region was doubtless a further consideration.<sup>26</sup>

The distinct Armenian character of the area was nevertheless recognized by the creation of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous oblast (province) in 1923, centred on Stepanakert (the ancient Armenian Khanate), within the new Soviet republic of Azerbaijan. Even by 1970 some 80.5 per cent of the quarter-million population of this geographically and politically determined anomaly was still Armenian, however, and a succession of protests were mounted to preserve this curious and potentially explosive situation. Indeed, it has been claimed that the chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, Aghassi Khandjian, pressed Stalin for the restoration of all Armenian-claimed territories<sup>27</sup> including Karabakh, and that this, along with other crimes (such as allowing works to be published ignoring Stalin's role in the revolution in Transcaucasia)<sup>28</sup>, lay behind his alleged suicide in July 1936.<sup>29</sup> Rather later, the Armenian Party First Secretary Suren Tovmasyan is said

<sup>23</sup>Hovannisian, The Republic of Armenia, pp. 88-90, 156-89, 356-58; R. G. Hovannisian, "The Armeno-Azerbaijani Conflict over Mountainous Karabagh 1918-19", The Armenian Review, 24, no. 2 (Summer 1971): 3-39; and A. H. Arslanian, "Britain and the Question of Mountainous Karabagh" unpublished paper presented to the Eleventh Annual Meeting of Middle East Studies Association of North America, Los Angeles, 1977.

<sup>24</sup>*Pravda*, December 4, 1920.

<sup>25</sup>E.g., Kommunist (Yerevan), April 2, 1921.

<sup>26</sup>On the Azeri case, see Hovannisian, *The Republic of Armenia*, pp. 81-82 and 90-91; and C. J. Walker, *Armenia: The Survival of a Nation* (London, 1980), p. 373. The region's hydroelectric potential was hardly an issue then.

<sup>27</sup>Armenia has additionally laid claim to Nakhichevan, also from Azerbaijan, and to Alkhalkalak and Alkhaltzkha, from Georgia. As these no longer contain anything like Armenian majority populations they have been less contentious issues in recent times, not the source of significant internal protest movements as far as is known.

<sup>28</sup>B. Souvarine, Stalin (London, 1939), p. 660.

<sup>29</sup>American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, "The Problem of Karabagh: Memorandum Addressed to the Soviet Union, the United Nations and the Peoples of the World", *The Hairenik Weekly*, Boston, August 24, 1967. to have proposed the same to Khrushchev as a gesture to mark the fortieth anniversary of Soviet Armenia in 1960 — an act which preceded his dismissal from office.<sup>30</sup>

Renewed conflict over the area came to light in the 1960s in the heady era of Khrushchev's liberalization of the Soviet body politic. The earliest-known instance was a critical letter to the Communist Party's Central Committee in Moscow from an elderly Armenian revolutionary from Yerevan which, among other items, called for the carrying out of long-overdue internal territorial restorations,<sup>31</sup> while a more significant appeal reportedly came from a number of Communist Party members on the staff of the State University, also in Yerevan. They specifically called for the reincorporation of the Karabakh region into the Soviet republic of Armenia.<sup>32</sup>

In 1963 another, even larger, petition was sent to Khrushchev with the signatures of some 2,500 Armenians claiming to represent nearly 200,000 of their compatriots in Karabakh and four neighbouring districts.<sup>33</sup> Their calls for the integration of Karabakh with Armenia rested not simply on the question of historical and ethnic ties but upon accusations of suppression,<sup>34</sup> discrimination, and enforced population shifts encouraged by their existing hosts (the Azeris) in support of a "pro-Turkic policy" in the area. The signatories spoke of an unbearable situation which had emerged, placing them in fear of their livelihoods and their very lives, while some languished in prison for their protests. The positive persecution, economic strangulation, and general takeover of key sectors which the Armenians were suffering were, it was claimed, designed expressly to drive out the Armenians by instilling an air of desperation. This, the signatories declared, all made a mockery of the alleged autonomy they enjoyed in an autonomous oblast, particularly in the light of the overwhelmingly Armenian population.

They also revealed that the situation was a matter upon which they had already dispatched hundreds of protests to Moscow and to the Azeri authorities, not the mere trickle which had become known in the west. All efforts had, however, been met with a brooding silence. A further appeal from people within Karabakh to the

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

<sup>31</sup>Cited in V. N. Dadrian, "Inter-Ethnic Conflicts in the Soviet Transcaucasus with Particular Reference to Armenia", *International Review of History and Political Science* 6, no. 2 (May 1969): 80-81.

<sup>33</sup>Text and details in Spuerk (Beirut), December 31, 1963; Haiastan (Paris), May 21, 1964; Alik (Tehran), May 23-25, 1964; L. Mkrtchiyan, Hairenakan dzayner (Munich 1978), pp. 26-34; Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 1214. See also details in Dadrian, "Inter-Ethnic Conflicts", p. 81.

<sup>34</sup>It has been claimed subsequently that in 1967 mutual lynchings occurred and a number of Armenians were killed when the authorities intervened with force; see "The Problem of Karabagh".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup>Ibid.

leadership and people of Soviet Armenia seeking help against Azeri chauvinism reached the West in September 1967.<sup>35</sup>

In 1965 the issue was also taken up in Moscow by Armenian students who attempted to demonstrate outside the Turkish embassy on the day commemorating the Turkish massacres of Armenians, April 24. Finding their attempts blockaded by the police, the students marched instead on the office of the Armenian permanent representative in the federal capital, Melkoumov, with whom they had a two-and-a-half-hour confrontation. In the course of this, the failure to reunite Karabakh with Armenia and the dire condition of Armenians in the region was raised, in the hope that Melkoumov would take the matter further. Whether or not he did just that is unknown, but it seems unlikely in the light of his negative response to other requests.<sup>36</sup>

It has been reported that in 1969 republican leaders from the Armenian SSR actually visited Moscow to pursue the complaint and call for remedial measures, albeit without success.<sup>37</sup> Another unsigned document detailing the situation in Karabakh first appeared in the West in November 1972.<sup>38</sup> While much of the activity was taking place outside the area of immediate concern, it was within the Karabakh that local leaders were dismissed in 1973 on charges of condoning Armenian separatism and calls for the province to be detached from Azerbaijan.<sup>39</sup> Others were removed from the party there in 1975, and some were imprisoned following trials on charges of nationalist agitation.<sup>40</sup>

The issue surfaced again as a source of contention in 1976-77 in samizdat documents from Armenia,<sup>41</sup> where the claims now gained some open support. At the trial of Robert Nazaryan in November-December 1978, this founding figure of the unofficial Armenian group to monitor the fulfilment of the human rights aspects of the Helsinki Agreement, admitted to preparing and duplicating in April 1977 the declaration of the group, containing as it did a call for the "reunification" of Nagorno-Karabakh with Armenia.<sup>42</sup>

Another dissident, Razmika Zohrabiana, a member of the illegal National United Party of Armenia who had publicly burned a portrait of Lenin in Yerevan in

<sup>37</sup>Azdak Shabatoriak (Beirut), no. 6 (1969), p. 95.

<sup>38</sup>Mkrtchiyan, Hairenakan dzayner, pp. 104-10.

<sup>39</sup>Bakinskiy rabochiy (Baku), January 11, and October 13, 1973, and April 1, 1975.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., and *The New York Times*, December 11, 1977.

<sup>41</sup>Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 3160 and The New York Times, December 11, 1977.

<sup>42</sup>Khronika Tekushchikh Sobytiy, no. 51, December 1, 1978; and "Trial of Robert Nazarian", Cahiers du Samizdat 64, (November-December 1979): 3-11.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup>Text in Haratch (Paris), September 1, 1967; Posev (Frankfurt), September 20, 1967; Mkrtchiyan, Hairenakan dzayner, pp. 96-6; Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. AS 1215.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup>Hairenik (Boston), October 7, 1965; see also V. N. Dadrian, "The Events of April 24 in Moscow: How They Happened and Under What Circumstances", *The Armenian Review* 20, no. 2 (1967): 17.

January 1974 during a visit by Gromyko, continued his protests about the situation from within a labour camp near Perm in the Urals. In a declaration smuggled out, he condemned the allocation of Karabakh to Azerbaijan, describing it as designed to prolong the enmity and friction between the two peoples.<sup>43</sup>

As on previous occasions with respect to nationality problems in general, a June 1977 article in the official media claimed that the Karabakh situation had, in fact, been resolved for once and for all.<sup>44</sup> Undeterred by this, one of Armenia's foremost novelists, Sero Khanzatian, a member of the Writers' Union and a party member since 1943, wrote a powerful letter to Brezhnev reasserting the Armenian claim to Karabakh and declaring such an injustice a hindrance to solidarity between the proletariats of different peoples.<sup>45</sup> An anonymous commentary accompanying Khanzatian's letter declared that the pressures on the Karabakh Armenians were, in effect, a form of genocide and that the desire for association with Armenia was fully borne out by an unofficial survey of opinion.<sup>46</sup>

Another prominent Armenian writer, the poet and member of the official writers' union, Hovares Shiraz, was responsible for a few stanzas in praise of Karabakh which, although not published in the USSR, were leaked to a journal in the Armenian diaspora in 1980.<sup>47</sup> In these he referred to Karabakh as being in foreign hands, comparing its fate with that of western Armenia, now part of Turkey. Armenia and Karabakh, he went on to say, are in reality inseparable, but part of one and the same body; yet like a flower, its nectar was being seized by a foreign body, and those responsible could not be considered brotherly in their intent.

No official support for this cause seems to have been forthcoming, though the identification of the Nagorno-Karabakh Armenians with Armenia seems to remain strong. Indeed, the strength of the attachment could ironically weaken the case for unification, since it does appear that some of the Armenian population of the province has been moving to Armenia — especially young people to continue their education<sup>48</sup> — and the Armenian population in Azerbaijan as a whole actually fell by nine thousand over the decade 1970-79.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup>For an English translation of this document see ABN Correspondence (Munich) 29, no. 2, (March-April 1978): 16.

<sup>44</sup>Problems of Peace and Socialism 20, no. 6 (June 1977).

<sup>45</sup>Zartonk (Beirut), October 15, 1977, and Mkrtchiyan Hairenakan dzayner, pp. 128-83. See also G. J. Libaridian, "Armenia and the Armenians: A Divided Homeland and a Disposed Nation", in W. O. McCagg and B. D. Silver, eds., Soviet Asian Ethnic Frontiers (New York, 1979), pp. 41-42; and C. J. Walker, Armenia: The Survival of a Nation (London 1980), p. 372.
 <sup>46</sup>Zartonk, October 15, 1977, and Mkrtchian, Hairenakan dzayner, pp. 133-37.

<sup>47</sup>Heghapokhakhan Yergaran (Beirut 1980), pp. 200-01.

<sup>48</sup>A. E. Ter-Sarkisyants, "Sovremennye etnicheskie protsessy u armyan Nagorno Karabakha", in *Etnicheskie i Kulturno-bytovye protsessy na Kavkaze* (Moscow 1978), p. 66, and A. Sheehy, "Data from the Soviet Census of 1979 on the Azeris and the Azerbaijan SSR", *Radio Liberty Research Paper* (henceforth RL) 170/80, May 13, 1980.

<sup>49</sup>E. Fuller and A. Sheehy, "Armenia and Armenians in the USSR: Nationality and Language

#### The Saingilo Georgian case

Again in the republic of Azerbaijan a problem emerged in 1976,<sup>50</sup> when it became known that a number of Christians of Georgian ethnic origin from around Kakhi in the Saingilo area, who had been incorporated in traditionally Moslem Azerbaijan in 1922, had accused the Azeris of a "systematic policy of annihilation of the concentrated Georgian population" through a process of de-Georgianization. This, they claimed, in various appeals to the local authorities,<sup>51</sup> had involved the closing of Georgian schools; a total ban on Georgian orthodox churches in the area; the destruction of national monuments; the arrest of a priest and the murder of protesting activists.<sup>52</sup>

The visits to the Georgian side of the border by two senior officials from Moscow in quick succession in 1978 (which, despite the lack of experience in matters agricultural, had been interpreted by one observer at the time as being probably connected with problems in the grape-growing industry<sup>53</sup>), could simultaneously have been prompted by these troubles. Ya. P. Ryabov, Party Central Committee secretary, and V. V. Kuznetsov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Presidium, both also had talks with the Georgian leaders during their visits in September and October 1978, respectively.

The Saingilo case was taken up by the Georgian group of Helsinki Agreement monitors, notably Zviad Gamsakhurdia, a researcher at the Rustaveli Institute of Literature of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, in a letter to Brezhnev and the Twenty-Sixth Party Congress in 1981.<sup>54</sup> In it he questioned whether the USSR, in its treatment of believers, had turned into another Albania.<sup>55</sup> In May 1981 Gamsakhurdia also submitted to the Georgian Communist Party First Secretary Shevardnadze, on behalf of nationalist and civil rights activists who had staged a demonstration the previous March, a series of "demands", a number of which related to the Saingilo issue. Some twenty-one points were made about it, at a general level, ranging from the setting up of a government commission on the issue and the carrying out of an opinion poll among the Georgians there, to a call for the ending of discrimination and repressions and the inquiry into crimes already committed against them.<sup>56</sup>

Aspects of the Census of 1979," RL 208/80, June 11, 1980. <sup>50</sup>Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 1830. <sup>51</sup>Ibid., doc. nos. 4174, 4183, and 4184. <sup>52</sup>Khronika, no. 61, March 16, 1981. <sup>53</sup>A. Sheehy, "Trouble in the Kakhetian Vineyards", RL 253/78, November 17, 1978. <sup>54</sup>Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 4308. <sup>55</sup>Khronika, no. 61. <sup>56</sup>Khronika, no. 63; and Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 4415. It was further alleged that an attempt was being made to settle their land instead with Azeris, the village of Keskhutan being cited as the next target of this de-Georgianization. To this end it was alleged that a terror campaign was being waged both to frighten the Georgian Moslems into becoming Azeris (by changing their names and giving them internal passports describing their nationality as Azeri) and actually trying to drive them out. It was also claimed that they were being deliberately deprived of contact with Georgian culture by an absence of Georgian-language newspapers; an inability to receive Georgian television broadcast; the absence of visits by Georgian cultural ensembles; the closing down of a local commission of the Georgia other than through the Azeri capital of Baku. Georgian cultural monuments in the area were also being damaged or destroyed.<sup>57</sup>

As yet, however, no readjustment of the border has been made, and none seems to be particularly likely while Azerification is being tested as a solution.

#### The Ossetian-Ingushi Case

Georgia and its periphery was the scene of two other border disputes of rather greater intensity, one involving the Ossetians and the Ingushi, and the other the Abkhaz. Brought together under the Russian imperial umbrella after their previous shared subjugation to the Turkish empire, the process of creating satisfactory administrative boundaries between them in the Soviet era would have proved troublesome enough without the variable status for nationalities embodied in the Soviet federal system.

In the case of the Sunni Moslem Ingushi people, the immediate problem was the outcome of the central government decision to deport them to northern Kazakhstan in 1944. This action was the culmination of long-standing hostilities between these mountain people and Russians, dating back to the Tsarist invasions. Relations with their Ossetian neighbours, who collaborated more willingly with the Russians, were equally bad. At the beginning of the period of enforced internal exile of the Ingushi, a considerable portion of their former territory was transferred to be adjacent to the North Ossetian ASSR (within the Russian republic), one of the two home territories of the Ossetian people (the other being to the south, across the border of the Georgian republic). In this area the Ossetians were mostly eastern orthodox by religion.<sup>58</sup>

With the return of the Ingushi permitted at the end of the 1950s, an inevitable clash of interests took place with both the Russians and the Ossetians, who had expanded to fill the vacuum created by the absence of their former neighbours from their former lands, houses, and jobs. Indeed, even with the recreation of a Chechen-

<sup>57</sup>Khronika, no. 63.
<sup>58</sup>R. Wixman, The Peoples of the USSR (London 1984), pp. 151-52.

Ingush territory, one Ingushi district was left as part of an enlarged Ossetia, since it bordered on the North Ossetian capital of Ordzhonikidze on three sides. From that point onwards a series of explosive clashes have been reported in the area, sparked by incidents including killings.

Some of the earlier incidents, such as the four days of violence in Grozny in August 1958 and a demonstration in 1973, have been described in both secondary and eyewitness accounts.<sup>59</sup> Further outbreaks of hostilities involving the three parties were reported in 1981. The renewed hostilities took place in Ordzhonikidze on October 23-25, apparently following the murder of an Ossetian taxi driver by an Ingush and the refusal of the oblast party first secretary to meet with a family delegation of the bereaved calling of a full investigation of the case.<sup>60</sup> A crowd which joined them was driven by the militia out of the square by the party headquarters, but some then occupied at least one government building before clashing violently with the police. The state authorities, rather than the Ingushi, thus suffered the brunt of the disquiet, and tanks or armoured cars had to be brought in to quell the disruption. The chairman of the Russian Republic Council of Ministers, Mikhail Solomentsev, a very senior central government official, apparently made some kind of address to quell the disturbance, but eventually the imposition of a curfew was needed to bring matters back under control. That some such dramatic occurrence had taken place was indicated by the most unusual presence of Party Central Committee Secretary Ivan Kapitonov at the subsequent meeting of the North Ossetian Oblast Party Committee and the removal there of First Secretary Bilar Kabaloev.61

#### The Abkhaz Case

In northwest Georgia the Abkhaz autonomous republic witnessed one of the most curious border disputes, one injurious to ethnic harmony and the creation of a genuinely voluntary fusion of people en route to a fully communist system. The dispute here was with their Georgian cohabitees of the Abkhaz ASSR, situated within the larger Georgian Republic. By the late 1970s a significant number of the approximately 90,000 Abkhaz (at 77,000 in 1970, they had represented 15.9 per cent of the ASSR's population)<sup>62</sup> were increasingly dissatisfied by what they alleged was discrimination against them by the numerically vastly superior

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>59</sup>See, e.g., A. M. Nekrich, *The Punished Peoples* (1978), pp. 149-54, and 184-87.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>60</sup>The Guardian, November 12, 1981; Financial Times, November 24, 1981; and The Observer, November 29, 1981.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>61</sup>Pravda, January 16, 1982: A. Sheehy, "North Ossetian First Secretary Fired", RL 25/82, January 18, 1982; and *Le Monde*, January 19, 1982.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>62</sup>Itogi vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1970 goda, (Moscow, 1973), 4:19.

Georgians (41 per cent in 1970).<sup>63</sup> There is some indication that assimilationist pressures from the Georgians, their control of leading posts in the autonomous republic, and a lag in economic development compared with the rest of Georgia, had been growing causes of concern since at least the beginning of the decade,<sup>64</sup> adding to more traditional antipathies.<sup>65</sup>

Beginning with a letter from 130 Abkhaz intellectuals to the USSR Supreme Soviet in December 1977 criticizing the influx of Georgians, Georgianization in schools, and economic exploitation,<sup>66</sup> many individual and collective protests criticizing the party and state organs in both Abkhazia and Georgia were sent to central government bodies.<sup>67</sup> These protests, included various requests for the autonomous republic to be administratively reassigned to the Russian Republic instead of Georgia, to help rectify the population imbalance and the resultant discrimination. By late April 1978 there had been several mass meetings in at least three cities, including Tkvarcheli, and in the village of Likhny, the for the residence of the Abkhazian rulers; the meetings were attended by as many as twelve thousand people.<sup>68</sup>

In consequence, Party Central Committee Secretary Ivan Kapitor was sent to the area in May 1978 and addressed the Abkhazian party organization will be visited the Georgian capital. In his speech he acknowledged that some of the grievances were well founded, particularly the incorrect treation at accorded Abkhaz history, the lack of Abkhaz geographical names, the unsatisfactory development of Abkhaz language and culture, the inadequate training and promotion of Abkhaz personnel, and various economic shortcomings.<sup>70</sup> Such admissions were in themselves fairly unusual. He also disclosed that a Georgian party resolution, "On Measures for the Further Development of the Economy and Culture of the Abkhaz ASSR and the Intensification of Ideological-Educational Work among the Toilers of the Autonomous Republic", had been approved to take these matters in hand.<sup>71</sup> In support of this, the Party Central Committee in Moscow,

63Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>See R. Dobson, "Georgia and Georgians", in Z. Katz, ed., *Handbook of Major Soviet Nationalities* (London, 1975), p. 185; and R. Solchanyk and A. Sheehy, "Kapitonov on Nationality Relations in Georgia", RL 125/78, June 1, 1978.

<sup>65</sup>On the historical relations between Georgians and the Abkhaz, see A. Sheehy, "Recent Events in Abkhazia Mirror the Complexities of National Relations in the USSR", RL 141/78, June 26, 1978.

<sup>66</sup>The New York Times, June 25, 1978.

<sup>67</sup>Revealed by Party Secretary Ivan Kapitonov, Zarya Vostoka (Tbilisi), May 26, 1978.
 <sup>68</sup>The New York Times, June 6 and June 25, 1978.

<sup>69</sup>Sovetskaya Abkhazia, May 23, 1978. See also Solchanyk and Sheehy, "Kapitonov". <sup>70</sup>Zarya Vostoka, May 26, 1978.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid.

together with the USSR Council of Ministers, passed a resolution on June 1, 1978, "On Measures for the Further Development of the Economy and Culture of the Abkhaz ASSR",<sup>72</sup> to cope with larger-scale material needs. These included the establishment of a university in the Abkhaz capital of Sukhumi, television broadcasts in Abkhaz, more Abkhaz book and journal publishing, and a new building for the local Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers.<sup>73</sup> Improved representation for the Abkhaz in the Georgian party organization seems to have been set in motion,<sup>74</sup> and other measures of an immediately practical kind were taken in the cultural arena to ensure the promotion and interchange of Abkhaz and Georgian cultures in the republic and to promote mutual understanding.<sup>75</sup>

However, the demand of numerous Abkhaz that they be administratively reassigned to the Russian Republic and that this be guaranteed in the new constitution, along with the exclusion of Georgian as an official language in the ar momous republic, was not accepted. Kapitonov claimed that there was no legal basis for such moves; there was nothing to be gained by them; and indeed, on the language issue, the suggestion was incompatible with the party's nationality policy. That it could have given succour to other dissenting groups, if acceded to, was not a matter here was approved on June 6, 1978,<sup>76</sup> it brought about no change in this respect. Nonetheless a perhaps a salutary lesson to the Georgians that, just as they rushed to a constitutional provision in 1978, so others within the republic could feel the same about Georgianization.

Abkhaz grievances, especially economic ones, were not fully assuaged, however. Further demonstrations and strikes in support of their cause in early October 1978<sup>77</sup> seem to have resulted in the imposition of something like martial law in parts of the area. Certainly, it became clear that the issue of discrimination and republican borders were not to be resolved instantly by decree. The lines of hostility between the two groups were firmly drawn, and in August 1980 Pravda spoke of demagogues and slanderers who were not slumbering.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., June 7, 1978.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid.

<sup>74</sup>See M. McAuley, "Party Recruitment and the Nationalities in the USSR: A Study in the Centre-Republican Relationships", *British Journal of Political Science*, no. 10 (1980): 482.

<sup>75</sup>See E. Fuller, "Moves to Promote Abkhaz-Georgian Cultural Relations", RL 256/80, July 18, 1980.

<sup>76</sup>Zarya Vostoka, June 7, 1978.

<sup>77</sup>AFP and Reuter, November 6, 1978; The Guardian, London, November 3, 1978; and Le Monde, November 7, 1978. See also E. Fuller, "Nationalist Protest in Georgia, 1976-81", RL 28/82, January 19, 1982.

<sup>78</sup>Pravda, August 16, 1980. See also A. Sheehy, "Continuing Tension in Abkhazia", RL 294/80, August 20, 1980.
An equally vehement Georgian backlash emerged, with claims that Abkhazia had always been an organic part of Georgia.<sup>79</sup> More than one hundred Georgians in Abkhazia responded with accusations, dispatched in April 1980 and January 1981 to Brezhnev and the Georgian party leader,<sup>80</sup> that the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic,<sup>81</sup> (lying as it does at present within the borders of the Georgian Republic). The accusations related to jobs within the police force,<sup>82</sup> *de facto* residence restrictions on Georgians, and physical attacks on them, including one (and possibly four) Georgians killed by Abkhaz separatists.<sup>83</sup>

A series of demonstrations and petitions took place in metropolitan Georgia in 1981, to protest both the Abkhaz actions and the concessions granted as a result of the 1978 protests.<sup>84</sup> One of them, at Government House in Tbilisi, the Georgian capital, on March 30, 1981, included banners declaring "Stop the persecution of Georgians in the Abkhaz ASSR".<sup>85</sup> It was apparently met by the republican party leader, Shevardnadze.<sup>86</sup> The most coherent statement of grievances, however, came in a set of demands and an accompanying letter presented to the republican party Central Committee office in Tbilisi on May 20, 1981, by long-time civil rights activist Zviad Gamsakhurdia, on behalf of a larger body of protesters, particularly the students of the city.<sup>87</sup>

Since that time, an apparently uneasy truce has prevailed, with local police and KGB action against the demonstrators keeping the now well-established hostilities under firm containment, while the economic and cultural measures are given time to make an impact.

<sup>79</sup>Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 4415; see also doc. no. 4638.

<sup>80</sup>Protests reported in Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 4415.

<sup>81</sup>For example, Boris Kakubava, who was sentenced to fourteen years' deprivation of freedom in September 1980, claims to have been the victim of a fabricated case resulting from his protests against such discrimination; see Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 5232-34.

<sup>82</sup>See Arkhiv Samizdata, doc. no. 5623; and Khronika, no. 63, December 31, 1981.
<sup>83</sup>Ibid.

<sup>84</sup>See E. Fuller, "Georgian Demonstrations", ABN Correspondence, 32, no. 6 (November-December 1981); "New Samizdat Document Gives Details of Georgian Demonstrations", RL 360/81, September 11, 1981; and "Nationalist Protest in Georgia, 1976-81", RL 28/82, January 19, 1982.

<sup>85</sup>"Twelfth Report on Catholics in the USSR", Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church, no. 55 (Novemebr 1982).

<sup>86</sup>He agreed initially to have a subsequent meeting with the demonstrators, but the meeting failed to materialize; an attempt to read a petition on the matter to a deputy Minister of the Interior at a meeting on March 31 was blocked. *Arkhiv Samizdata*, doc. no. 4415.

<sup>87</sup>Khronika, no. 63.

#### The Lithuanian-Byelorussian Case

Another border dispute which became particularly acute in the 1970s was one which stood even less chance of being satisfactorily resolved as time passed. This concerned the ethnic Lithuanian districts on the periphery of that republic, particularly those within the Byelorussian Republic. It has been an area with a remarkably tangled history of border demarcations and an equally complex population mix.<sup>88</sup>

When the boundaries of the independent republic of Lithuania were established by the Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of July 12, 1920, a number of districts of Lithuanian population were allocated to the USSR and became part of the Byelorussian Republic. Following the Soviet occupation and incorporation of Lithuania in 1940 as part of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, Byelorussia apparently offered six districts, or raions, to its fellow union republic of Lithuania, presumably accepting the merit and justice of the case at that time. The commencement of the war with Germany in July 1941 intervened to prevent further action, and on the return of the area to Soviet control in 1944, only two of the districts were offered. While this may have been the result of the less-pressing need to appease Lithuanian sensitivities following the earlier loss of independence and to denationalize easy target areas of mixed population (as alleged by the later critics of the arrangement), wartime changes in population balance may have contributed to this decision.

The net result was that what Lithuanian nationalists view as south and east Lithuania lay within the neighbouring republic of Byelorussia, and up to 50,000 Lithuanians may have found themselves administratively located in that republic.<sup>89</sup>

The active criticism, especially from the residents of the Breslav, Ostrovets, and Voronovo raions, apparently began as early as 1944, shortly after the second Soviet occupation of the area. A string of appeals was sent to local government agencies in Byelorussia and Lithuania, such as a statement with four hundred signatures presented to the Ministry of Education in Minsk in 1945. Others followed to the central authorities in Moscow, particularly to the Soviet of Nationalities and the Central Committee of the CPSU in 1955, complaining about the discriminatory policies which resulted from the misallocation of their territory to Byelorussia and calling for the problem to be eliminated by a transfer of the administration to

<sup>88</sup>See, in particular, J. B. Duroselle, *Les frontieres europeenes de l'URSS, 1917-1941* (Paris, 1957); and K. Pakstas, "National and State Boundaries", *Lituanus* 5, no. 3 (September 1959); 67-72.

<sup>89</sup>See samizdat report, 1978 (hereafter *Report 2*) in Remeikis, "Opposition", pp. 322-23; and "Samizdat Report on the Lithuanian Minority in Byelorussia", 102/79, March 26, 1979. A further report appeared in the samizdat journal *Ausra*, no. 32 (August 1982) and no. 33 (October 1982). Lithuania.<sup>90</sup> Three further appeals are known to have been sent to Khrushchev in 1960 and April and May 1961 (the latter with 2,100 signatures, despite pressures not to sign); to Brezhnev in 1963;<sup>91</sup> and to Brezhnev and Podgornyi in March 1976.<sup>92</sup> And yet, apart from a commission of inquiry into the matter following the first 1961 appeal, little or nothing seems to have been achieved on the territorial issue. Indeed, most of the letters were merely returned to the local authorities to resolve.

The appeals in the 1970s claimed that the Byelorussian Lithuanians were specifically being subjected both to Byelorussification (or Russification) in the schools and Polonization through the churches, in an attempt to eliminate them as a problem by amalgamation. With an absence of Lithuanian schools, the teaching and thus the passing on of their language was being obstructed.<sup>93</sup> Parents who sent their children across the border for education in Lithuania were risking and, indeed, suffering, official sanctions.<sup>94</sup> With many of their own churches now officially closed,<sup>95</sup> they were often compelled to share with the local Polish community the limited number of Catholic churches permitted and to listen to church sermons in Polish.<sup>96</sup> In effect, then, the protesters claimed, they were being denied the use of their native tongue, contrary to the constitutional provisions, some even suffering false recording of their nationality in the census. This view was supported by a Lithuanian visitor to "East Lithuania", who reported the Lithuanian language as being also dead there in the early 1980s.<sup>97</sup>

Furthermore, it was alleged, cultural facilities in general were increasingly denied to the Lithuanians, especially from 1971-72 onwards, including Lithuanian materials in local libraries and visits by folk groups and choirs from Lithuania itself.<sup>98</sup> Members of the local Lithuanian intelligentsia were being overlooked for official posts and intimidated into leaving the area,<sup>99</sup> while ethnographic and

<sup>90</sup>See details of the second samizdat report, 1978 (hereafter *Report 2*) in Remeikis, "Opposition", pp. 322-23; and "Samizdat Report on the Lithuanian Minority in Byelorussia", 102/79, March 26, 1979. A further report appeared in the samizdat journal *Ausra*, no. 32 (August 1982) and no. 33 (October 1982).

<sup>91</sup>See Report 1 (1972), which contains the texts.

92 Report 2 (1978).

<sup>93</sup> Ausra, no. 33 (October 1982).

94 Report 2.

<sup>95</sup> "Twelfth Report on Catholics in the USSR", *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Catholic Church*, no. 55 (November 1982).

<sup>36</sup> See Ausra, nos. 32 (August 1982) and 33 (October 1982), and "Twelfth Report on Catholics". For commentary on the latter, see J. Papartis, "The Twelfth Report of the Lithuanian Chronicle on Catholics in the USSR (Byelorussia, the Ukraine and Latvia)", RL 124/83, March 21, 1983.

<sup>97</sup>Ausra, no. 34 (December 1982).

98Report 2.

99 Report 1.

folklore researchers from across the border were being denied permission to visit, detained by police, fined, and branded as bourgeois nationalists and anti-Soviet.<sup>100</sup>

Aid with the schooling situation was apparently even sought from the Minister of Education in Lithuania back in 1969, but despite promises, nothing came of it. The issue went beyond just the Byelorussian Republic and affected the twenty-five thousand Lithuanians in the old East Prussian territory, now the Kaliningrad oblast of the Russian Republic. The minister actually claimed to have intervened on that matter, but unsuccessfully.<sup>101</sup> A similar situation prevailed for forty thousand Lithuanians in Latvia, but the dissenters saw in this, too, the hand of Moscow rather than the local authority in Riga, and compared the situation unfavourably to that of Lithuanians in Poland.<sup>102</sup>

By the time of the report on Byelorussia in 1978, it was claimed that conditions had worsened markedly, despite at least four appeals submitted to Party General Secretary Brezhnev and Chairman of the Presidium Podgornyi between 1976 and 1978, again including requests for a shift in the border if other measures were not forthcoming.

The case by now had been taken up also by dissenters in Lithuania itself, specifically by the Lithuanian Helsinki Agreement Monitoring Group in an appeal of April 1977, to be submitted to an international audience at the Belgrade Conference. Arrest of one of the group's members, however, prevented this.<sup>103</sup> In any event, some Lithuanians apparently believed that efforts on behalf of national and civil rights for Lithuanians should be concentrated in metropolitan Lithuania rather than dispersed on a possible lost cause.<sup>104</sup>

Nonetheless, in one of the Lithuanian nationalist samizdat journals in 1982, an author using the pseudonym A. Galindas once again denounced the detaching by the USSR government of the eastern and southern parts of Lithuania and their incorporation into the relatively new territory of Byelorussia. He went further and called on Lithuanians not to accept this situation but rather to renounce what should be Lithuanian territory as a result of the Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of August 1920.<sup>105</sup>

Little or nothing positive from the Lithuanian point of view seems to have been achieved by the constant campaigning and petitioning since 1944, and little seems likely to be achieved in the future.

Official expectations appear to be that the Byelorussian Lithuanians will eventually be Byelorussified (and, perhaps, subsequently Russified), or will move

<sup>100</sup>See, for example, the specific cases cited and detailed in *Khronika*, no. 54, November 15, 1979, and *Ausra*, no. 33 (October 1982).

<sup>101</sup>*Report 1*. <sup>102</sup>Ibid. <sup>103</sup>*Report 2*. <sup>104</sup>Ibid. <sup>105</sup>*Ausra*, no. 32 (August 1982). to the Lithuanian Republic if they wish to maintain their separate cultural identity up to the period of the full-scale merging of nations and the loss of exclusive national identification. There is some evidence that these processes may, indeed, be underway and that neater ethnic-territorial units are emerging from this previously confused area. The 1978 report claimed some thirty thousand Lithuanians to be living in the area affected, a considerable drop from the alleged fifty thousand of the immediate postwar era. Official census returns and other Soviet sources have put the figure for the late 1970s at some eight thousand.<sup>106</sup> If this latter figure is to be squared with the former, many of the *de facto* Lithuanians have settled for adopting Byelorussian as their official nationality. Alternatively, the report estimates are wrong and large numbers of Lithuanians have left the area or have been similarly denationalized.

Each of these varied cases illustrates just some of the problems created by the enforced association of the peoples often arbitrarily brought together by an external force and the almost impossible odds faced by Soviet-style division of the country into administrative units based, to a large extent, on the criterion of nationality. Although of varying types, these disputes nevertheless provide some general insight into the impact of the federal unit boundaries on people's lives and into Soviet approaches to these jurisdictional problems and the national question in general.

It has been particularly in the multi-national Caucasus that the problems have been felt and where they have had the most dramatic impact. There, as elsewhere, the disputes have mostly involved an ethnic minority on the fringes of its territorial range and overlapping that of its neighbour. As such, they were often situations almost impossible to resolve without substantial movements of population similar to the Turkish-Greek separation in Cyprus. Curiously, for a regime which has shown no qualms in deporting whole ethnic groups from one area of the country to another as punishment for wartime collaboration or opposition, this option has not been applied.

Nor have the disputes involved any simple form of Russian-inspired *divide et impera* policy. While there are still elements of Russian domination in the territorial empire inherited from the tsars alongside the Marxist-Leninist elements of internationalism, the populations involved in the disputes have mostly been tco small to require any such approach.

In the case of the Karabakh Armenians, the Saingilo Georgians, and the Byelorussian Lithuanians, the problem essentially involves the discrimination attendant upon being on the wrong side of the border from the majority of their own group. For the Armenians, the matter is alleviated somewhat by their having an administrative organization which recognizes a degree of separateness. In their

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>106</sup>See sources cited by Papartis, "Twelfth Report".

case, much of the demand for a change of borders has come from the metropolitan territory. In the case of the Lithuanians, the metropolitan support has been more cautious and mixed; neither they nor the Saingilo Georgians have any administrative recognition within their host republic. The Lezghians have been in the unfortunate position of being squeezed on both sides of a border (a situation which could ultimately affect the Ossetians as well).

The solution adopted in such cases has essentially involved either spontaneous population movements across the borders out of the areas witnessing discrimination and into those where the language and culture in question is the norm, or harmonization and assimilation into the majority population by a change of language and nationality to produce ersatz Azeris, Byelorussians, or whatever. That this latter process was not without risks had been made abundantly apparent back in 1969, when Tadzhiks in Uzbekistan, given new internal passports making them Uzbeks, reacted violently and reportedly killed some eight people in Bukhara.<sup>107</sup>

The second type of problem, that affecting the Buryats and Karabakh Armenians (and, to a degree, the Lezghins and Byelorussian Lithuanians) involves the artificial separation of the territories of a population. Here again the solution adopted has been not to unify the territories or to provide a land corridor, but to encourage assimilationist tendencies and merger with the larger surrounding group on the part of those in the outlying territories.

Groups like the Lezghins, without their own territorial unit, represent a third type of problem, but they seem unlikely to gain such a unit in the near future (even though there has been some largely unofficial talk over the years about the possibility of providing some recognition to the Soviet Poles, at present also lacking an administrative unit of their own).

The Abkhaz have presented another type of problem, that of a minority within the territorial unit it has been accorded. Although by no means a unique situation (one matched in a Tatar autonomous republic and even in the Kazakh republic, for example), it could potentially presage a further reduction in status, much as the Karelians were demoted in 1956, unless the influx of Georgians slackens and the fertility rates of the Abkhaz improve greatly. At present, gradual harmonization of the Abkhaz with the Georgians, by lessening the economic impact of the existing Georgian predominance and the continued influx, lies at the heart of the solution.

The solutions adopted, although sometimes apparently *ad hoc* improvisations producing unexpected results, must be seen within the broader framework and context of Soviet nationalities policy. A merger of nations into an internationalist entity remains the long-term objective. As a first stage in this, assimilation of small groups into larger ones has persistently been encouraged, as was seen in the case of

<sup>107</sup>Khronika, no. 8 (June 30, 1969).

Dagestan. Although this would seem to have, as an inevitable product, larger, more compact groupings, potentially more capable of resisting any further denationalization, the first stage was also to be accompanied by policies such as bilingualism (with Russian for all), internationalist education, and parity of economic development to eliminate the key sources of conflict. The more compact units would also be accompanied by greater physical mobility of the population as a whole and a steady growth of the intermarriage across national lines, as barriers which previously inhibited this (such as exclusive religions) also diminished.

As such, the solutions to the problem of border disputes are not merely a local matter of patching up conflicts. What has been underway has been but part of an attempt at a final solution to a much wider and inconvenient barrier to the implementation of full communism. What breathed new life into a number of conflicts was a more determined approach adopted by some local authorities in eliminating them for once and for all, coupled with a greater willingness on the part of those discriminated against to suffer no longer in relative silence. To the peoples concerned, the borders and consequent discriminatory policies applied presented very real problems and led to imprisonment, exile, even bloodshed. While usually local in their manifestation, the actions taken, along with the petitions sent to Moscow, served notice that the minorities were not content to be trampled upon for some allegedly greater cause planned in some abstract fashion from the centre.

Equally, this study has demonstrated that the Soviet federal structure and its borders matter, not merely psychologically but more practically in respect of the type of life people are able to live. Although a number of the protests occurred during the 1970s, they were unrelated to discussion of the new constitution and the prospect of changes in the federal structure which were widely expected. Indeed, several of the cases had seen protest movements well established before the idea of a new constitution was mooted by Khrushchev in 1959. Details of the protests frequently merely surfaced in the 1960s and 1970s (along with more general available samizdat at that time), when they were joined by other, newer, nationalist protests more directly related to the constitutional provisions.

Whether the protests represent merely another instance of rural peasant parochialism resisting inevitable change in the guise of nationalism is also to be doubted. They have involved too many of the urban intelligentsia for that to be valid observation. As in areas like Ukraine, nationalism in these cases has followed the influx into the town and the education of an urban, national-minded intelligentsia.<sup>108</sup>

In the eyes of officialdom, however, meeting such local needs and wishes remains a reality only where it accords with the larger and longer-term party

<sup>108</sup>See, e.g., J. Birch, *The Ukrainian Nationalist Movement in the USSR since 1956* (London, 1971), pp. 13-19.

objectives.<sup>109</sup> Of course, whether those objectives themselves will succeed it is perhaps too soon to say, but it is of more than passing interest that many of these issues continued to flare up some fifty to sixty years after the revolution. Full scale nationalist movements may face serious impediments to their development in the Soviet Union, and nationalism may not pose an unmanageable threat to the system; nevertheless, it is difficult to share the view of McAuley<sup>110</sup> that nationalism, whatever its varied forms, is of limited importance in the USSR when it so obviously embodies a set of values which are anathema to that system and to the achievement of its end goal. The abandonment by the regime, in its new party programme, of the goal of full communism until some indefinite future is no small matter, insofar as continued national minority resistance has played a part in inhibiting the attainment of the social element of that goal - the universalizing of a Soviet identity. Brute force may only be infrequently employed to assure conformity nowadays, but these studies have shown how administrative obstruction can prove just as effective in frustrating the wishes of the many thousands who have participated in these protests. Despite the dawning of so many allegedly new ages since Stalin's death, it remains a courageous or foolhardy person who stands up within the USSR to declare his support for a reversal of the regime's conception of the inevitable path of progress. While they do, and while such sources of conflict persist, the long-term goal of a profoundly based inter-ethnic harmony will remain as elusive as ever.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>109</sup>For those objectives, see in particular, W. Connor, *The National Question in Marxist Leninist Theory and Strategy* (Princeton 1984), especially pp. 300-22.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>110</sup>M. McAuley, "Nationalism and the Soviet Multi-Ethnic State", in N. Harding, ed., *The State in Socialist Society* (1984), pp. 179-210.

## THE LAST KOZAK CAPITAL ON THE DNIPRO

The Zaporozhian Sich changed its location depending on enemy attacks, the effects of the Dnipro (Dnieper) floods, and the prevailing political circumstances.

Information concerning the last Sich, known as Pidpilna or *Nova Sich* (New Sich, 1734-75), has come down to us in various descriptions and documents of the time.

The first map of the New Sich was drawn by Russian fortification engineers in 1737. It represents the distinct outlines of a town's defences that had remained intact up to that time. By 1740, as evidenced by the description and map of military engineer Prince S. Myshetskyi, the Sich was a completely developed body with a fortified centre, a clearly functional division of territory including several hundred dwellings, public, economic and production facilities.

The Sich was located on a large promontory jutting into the flats of the Velykyi Luh (Big Meadow) washed by the Pidpilna. It rose 5 to 12 metres above the river. The town consisted of four parts: the Kish, suburb, Nova Sich entrenchment, and the suburban sloboda (free settlement).

In ground plan it resembled an irregular triangle. At one point was located a separate circular fortification surrounded by a ditch and a rampart of oak pales and towers. This was the Kish — the centre of the Sich's public life. In documents it is often referred to as the "castle" or "fortress" of the Zaporozhian Kozaks. The Kish neighboured on the suburb (*Vorstadt, bazaar, Gasan-Basha*) — the centre of trade, economic and production activity, with numerous market buildings, armouries, blacksmith shops, and Kozak households. In the suburb was a Sich school, armoury and two redoubts. Next to these was a small defensive work with two semibastions, called the *Nova Sich* Entrenchment, where, considering the then existing military and political situation, the tsarist authorities quartered a small unit of government troops. The entire territory of the Sich was surrounded by an earthen rampart and ditch, with concealed pitfalls and wooden stakes. The rampart was from 3.5 to 4 metres high, and the ditches of about the same depth and width respectively. The entire length of the town's defences was approximately four kilometres, while the area of its fortified core covered some 40 hectares.

Outwardly, the defences were ordinary and simple in appearance. The most important public part of the Sich was the Kish, where the Zaporozhian Host administration and garrison were located. At the general military meetings and during popular holidays, especially the much revered Christmas, Easter and Epiphany, it was the meeting place of the traditional Kozak Council.

The layout of the Kish is clearly revealed in a somewhat schematic drawing by Alexander Rigelman, an 18th century historian: the fortification, surrounded by a ditch, rampart and stockade, is pierced by an entrance in a tower-belfry; not far from the entrance stands a Sich Church; around the square, the scene of a tumultuous Kozak Council, stand the *kurins* (of the total of 38 *kurins*, 22 are represented). Among the buildings are the quarters of the Kish Otaman, the military chancellery, the sexton's quarters, and the *kurins*' storehouses. The Kish had eight entrances and exits — two main and six auxiliary. It was 350 metres long and 300 metres wide. The mode of construction of the *kurins* was itself interesting. To determine their dimensions, it is obviously necessary to know how many Kozaks lived in them. A *kurin* was permanently inhabited by only a part of the Kozaks enrolled in it and serving on the Sich garrison. It was also the first refuge for new arrivals, their number increasing during general Kozak councils.

Perhaps this explains why contemporaries provide controversial information regarding the number of Kozaks dwelling in a *kurin*. For example, Claudius Rondo, the British ambassador in St. Petersburg, wrote in his report to Lord Harrington of April 24, 1736, that the "Zaporozhians live in spacious houses called *kurins*, and in each of them there are some six to seven hundred men". Mykyta Korzh, a former Zaporozhian, stated in his recollections of the Sich (recorded in the early 1830s) that "each *kurin* could seat 600 and more Kozaks during a midday meal". Another eyewitness maintained that the Kozaks lived in the Sich "in kurins with several hundreds of men". The Kozak chronicler, Hryhoriy Hrabianka, reduced the number to 150 men. All these figures appear to be exaggerated. The most probable information, of October 14, 1836, is provided by Hryhoriy Kremianskyi, an archpriest of the Church of the Intercession at Nikopol. Recalling his visit to the Kerevianivka Kurin of the times of the Sich, he noted that 30 men and more could sleep in it.

The Sich was a populous town. Judging by F. Polunin's first geographical dictionary published in Moscow in 1773, the Sich was inhabited by 27,117 Kozaks.

According to contemporaries, the *kurins* were large and spacious buildings of oak, lime or black poplar. After the Zaporozhian Sich was abolished in 1775, some of the *kurins* were moved to Nikopol and Kherson where they served as barracks and armouries.

Contemporaries often compared the *kurins* with monastery refectories. Luka Yatsenko-Zelenskyi visited the Sich in 1750 and 1751, when he was a deacon at the Monastery of the Exaltation of the Cross in Poltava (later he was assigned as a superior of the church at the Russian embassy in Constantinople), and recalled, in part: "Inside that fortress... on either side of the church, are built huge houses, all of them resembling monastery refectories".

"A kurin was built like a refectory, without any storerooms and partitions", Mykyta Korzh noted. Inside, "along the walls up to the doors, stood tables, and around them were benches, on which the Kozaks sat at meals". In describing a *kurin*, Hryhoriy Kremianskyi pointed out that it was "the biggest houses without rooms, with an entrance hall of the same size", in which the kitchen was located. "In this *kurin*, the thickest possible boards, nailed to pales dug into the ground, stretched along the entire length from the threshold to the corner of honour; this was was a table, or *syrno*, as they called it". During a meal "all the Kozaks, even the undersized ones, sat at the table, just like in a monastery refectory, by seniority of their admission to the Zaporozhian Host".

The place of rest was arranged along another wall of the building: "In this very same *kurin* a bunk of thick boards on pales is built for a bed, as is the custom with our peasants in their homes".

Icons and oil lamps were hung in the corner of honour, where the Kurin Otaman and his guests sat. Lampions (chandeliers, as eyewitnesses called them) hung from the ceiling. The wooden walls were covered with kilims, on which glittered the Kozak arms - pistols, swords and muskets. The building was heated by stoves lined with tiles featuring plant and animal ornaments. A ceiling beam traditionally bore a carved signature of the founder of the kurin and the date when it was built (Dmytro Yavornytskyi mentions an inscription he saw in the 1880s on a beam in the cottage of the peasant Korniy Zabara from the village of Pokrovka: "By the blessing of the Father, the assistance of the Son, and the consummation of the Holy Ghost, this kurin was built by the Vasiurin host of the Vasiurin community under Otaman Anton Holovko in the year 1720 on the 24th day of May". Such signatures also adorned the doorposts of the main kurin entrance, which in form and intricate carving was reminiscent of the portals of Ukrainian wooden churches of that time (the doorposts of a Poltava kurin dating to 1763 were painted by Ilia Repin in Nikopol in 1880). The windows of the kurins were glazed with round panes of arkush (sheet, rectangular) panels. The door and window ties, latches, and locks were of local craftsmanship of remarkably diverse decorative forms.

The dwelling quarter was separated from the household part of the *kurin*, where huge copper and pig-iron pots used for preparing meals hung on iron chains and hooks from an oak beam over the open fire — the *kabytsia* (hearth).

According to contemporaries, each *kurin* was made up "of one big and various small houses built in one place", the latter probably being the *kurin komory-skarbnytsi* (storehouses-treasuries) mentioned in Kremianskyi's recollections: "Outside near the *kurin* was built a *skarbnytsia*, i.e. a small storehouse, where the Kozaks kept their clothing and belongings". The storehouse of the Kushchivka Kurin, which held the chests with Kalnyshevskyi's possessions, is mentioned in one of the Kish Otaman's letters of July 1765. One such storehouse, moved from the former Sich to Nikopol, is known to us from photographs and drawings of the early 20th century. It is a two-compartment building made of oak planks and has an eaves resting on four pillars.

During the times of the New Sich, the Host provided the Otaman with a separate

house in the square. Its structure and furnishings can be deduced from the register of damage sustained by Otaman Kalnyshevskyi's quarters during the uprising of the rank-and-file Kozaks in 1769. The building consisted of several rooms, probably also a front room and a bedroom with large windows and tiled stoves. The list of furniture registers a long table, 30 wooden and 12 "raw-leather-lined" chairs. The front room must have been of considerable size and was used for meetings of the Sich *starshyna*, official receptions and similar occasions. Along the tapestried walls stood *kilim*-covered benches and chests. The walls were decorated with icons, portraits, canvases, clocks and weapons.

A church was built in the Sich soon after it had been founded, as evidenced by S. Myshetskyi in 1740. However, in 1743 its interior had not yet been finished, because the Kozaks' requests to Tsarina Yelizaveta Petrovna concerning the allocation of funds for a Sich iconostasis had not been fully met. After the Sich was abolished and the village of Pokrovka appeared on its site, the building of the church gradually fell to ruin and, finally, was pulled down to be replaced nearby by a new brick church. According to the 1836 statistical register of churches in Katerinoslav county, in Pokrovka "after the demolition of the initial Zaporozhian wooden church, the useful wcod that remained, as old local residents can affirm, was used for the belfry, which exists to this day...". According to other accounts, some of the structural elements of the Sich church, specifically the latticed ties of the central cupola, were transferred to the new brick church which had a wooden cupola.

To this day, we have no detailed descriptions or reliable portrayals of the Sich church to make an exact reconstruction of its architecture. On a drawing by Alexander Rigelman the church is represented as a small one-storey building with a little belfry. Three doors and five windows (one of them circular) enlivened the structure which was topped by two cupola crosses and, on the whole, somewhat resembled a Boiko church from the Ukrainian Carpathians. On a 1773 map of the Sich, the building has typical features of North Russian churches, its timber frameworks topped by what were called "barrels", over which rose a dome with onion shaped cupolas on elongated necks. The church belfry had a peaked tent roof.

How then did the Sich church actually look? Apolon Skalkovskyi recorded the accounts of Pokrovka's old residents in 1845 who told him that the "Sich Church of the Intercession of the Mother of God was wooden, with five domes and two altars. One side-chapel, the lower or the main one, was devoted to the Holy Intercession, while the other, in the choir gallery, to St. Nicholas the Thaumaturge, the patron saint of seafarers". That the Sich church had five domes was corroborated in the 1830s by former Zaporozhians and by Georgiy Spasskyi who studied the Kozaks.

On the maps of the Zaporozhian Sich of 1741, 1742, 1745 and 1746 the church is represented as a cruciform structure with outlines typical of churches having five frameworks and five cupolas. Other sources also talk about the five domes and large dimensions of the Sich church. Dwelling on the first measures of the Black Sea Kozaks in establishing their capital at Yekaterinodar in the Kuban, Fiodor Shcherbina, a historian of the Kuban Kozak Host, wrote, referring to documents, that the Kozak administration planned to build a military cathedral "on the pattern of the church which had once existed in the Zaporozhian Sich, but of larger dimensions".

General Kyrayev, dispatched in 1801 to inspect the construction of the Cathedral of the Resurrection at Yekaterinodar, wrote disapprovingly in his report to the procurator-general of the Holiest Synod that what he saw was "a formidably huge wooden church, an architectural likeness of the one that had been in the old Zaporozhian Sich".

Relying on this information, we can say, although with certain reservations, that the Cathedral of the Resurrection built at Yekaterinodar in 1799-1806 was similar to the Sich church. After all, the Kuban Black Sea Kozak Host, established by former Zaporozhians and settlers from Ukraine, carefully maintained and preserved the traditions of the Sich and its people in language, customs, culture and art. The Sich church still existed in 1798, and thus the Black Sea Kozaks, remembering this sacred temple, wanted to recreate it.

A photograph of May 20, 1868, represents the Cathedral of the Resurrection, in front of which a public commemoration of the dead of the Kuban Host in the Caucasian wars is being held and St. George banners are being presented to the Host in a solemn ceremony. Of course, it is not an exact replica of the Sich church; there were, undoubtedly, certain differences in dimensions, details, elements and construction. Nonetheless, the prototype is clearly discernible. The bulk of the multi-tiered church consisted of five octagonal timber frameworks organically fused into a distinctive pyramidal composition typical of Ukrainian folk architecture of the 17-18th centuries. The sixth dome belongs to the belfry built on to the church.

It can be assumed that there were similarities between the Sich Church of the Intercession and a church of the same name at Romny, built in the 1770s on the donations of the last Kish Otaman Petro Kalnyshevskyi. It, too, had five frameworks, five domes, and was furnished inside with a lavish iconostasis and side-benches (*bokuny*). The doors had typical hexagonal posts ornamented with carving. However, the Sich church was larger (with a separate altar in the choir gallery) and taller. According to contemporaries, in the richness of its precious objects and interior furnishings it rivalled the sacristy of the Kyivan Caves Monastery. Inside, the churchgoer could admire the huge multi-tiered iconostasis and holy gates of silver gilt. The iconostasis was so tall that a sexton "standing on tiptoe hardly reached with his *sazhen*-and-a-half-long pincers the candles burning before the icons".

A place of honour in the church was occupied by the small and modestly produced icon of the Zaporozhian Intercession, in which the Mother of God is represented amid grey-mustachioned Kozaks with long forelocks, dressed in colourful *zhupany* (mantles), broad *sharovary* (trousers), and sporting swords and pistols by their sides (a replica of the icon is preserved in the Odessa Museum of History). The Zaporozhians are also represented in other icons.

In the Sich church, the Kozak *starshyna* and guests of honour were seated on benches called *stasidia* or *bokuny*. In the 1880s Dmytro Yavornytskyi saw ten such *bokuny* in the village of Pokrovka — eight unpainted of linden, and five of oak painted in green and adorned with wonderful carving. The *bokuny* had hinged, collapsible seats.

Like the defence towers, the Church of the Intercession was the compositional core in the architecture of the Sich, accentuating the layout of its public centre — the Kish.

The layout and architectural image of the Kozak capital reflected the historical conditions, distinctive features of the Kozak's everyday life, and the age-old traditions of Ukrainian architecture.

Reprinted from "Ukrainian Heritage", published by the Ukrainian Society for the Protection of Monuments of History and Culture and the Ukrainian Culture Foundation, Kyiv.

# NEWS FROM UKRAINE

# PUBLIC RALLY IN KYIV ISSUES ULTIMATUM TO UKRAINIAN SSR SUPREME SOVIET

KYIV—A public rally was held in the centre of this capital city on August 12, 1990, as a follow-up to the ecological warning strike, that was staged here on August 9 to press the authorities to finally close the Chornobyl nuclear power plant and to materially and otherwise compensate the victims of this catastrophe. The rally, as well as the previous strike, were organized by the city's strike committee and the Executive Committee of the Inter-Party Assembly (formed in Kyiv on July 1, 1990).

Mykhailo Ratushnyi — the coordinator of the municipal strike committee and the deputy chairman of the National Council of the Inter-Party Assembly - was one of the speakers who addressed the several thousand participants of the rally. In summarizing the strike and its immediate results, Mr. Ratushnyi pointed out that approximately 100 enterprises supported the strike action, although a considerable number of enterprises, on the instructions of the municipal strike committee, refrained from striking, so as not to harm the ordinary citizen. Also addressing the rally participants were the following representatives of strike committees: Ya. Hoshko of "Medaparatura", Dmytro Tradiuk of the "Leninska Kuznia" factory, Mykola Tatarytsov, representing the city's bus drivers, Konstantyn Prianytskyi of the emergency medical service, Anatoliy Fediyenko from the "Budshlakhmash" factory, Valeriy Kravchenko from the "Arsenal" factory, and others. In addition, Yuriy Mykolskyi — a member of the Inter-Party Assembly's National Council, Anatoliy Lupynis — the chairman of the Assembly's Executive Committee, and Mykola Holovach — the chairman of the Kyiv citizen's committee, also addressed the rally.

In his speech, Mr. Lupynis urged the workers to register themselves as citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic at their place of work. [The UNR — established in 1918 as an independent national state, and subsequently liquidated after Ukraine was invaded and militarily annexed into the USSR. The Assembly is presently gathering signatures to reestablish the UNR].

In a set of resolutions, adopted by the rally participants prior to its close, several demands were issued to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR. The demands were presented in the form of an ultimatum to the effect that if the Supreme Soviet fails to reply by September 17, then the municipal strike committee will stage an Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

all-day warning strike on September 27. Included in the resolution were the following demands:

- a) an immediate resolution of the problems stemming from the Chornobyl disaster;
- b) a reiteration of the demands of the Donbas (Donets Basin) miners: the depoliticization of all state institutions, the KGB, the MVD, as well as an immediate resolution of the various economic problems, that are prevalent in these mining regions;
- c) the transfer of control of enterprises from the state to respective workers' collectives;
- d) the establishment of a truly sovereign Ukrainian state;
- e) guarantees that following the autumn call-up, Ukrainian draftees into the Soviet Army will serve only within Ukraine's borders.

## RESOLUTION of the Kyiv Citizen's Rally on August 12, 1990

In Ukraine, whose economy is a state-run economy, and the state itself — a colony, the workers' movement can and should become an integral part of the national-liberation movement for an independent Ukrainian state. The miners of Donbas, the workers of Lviv, and we, the Kyiv workers, are aware that a resolution of the socio-economic and ecological problems can only be secured in a Ukrainian state, where the nation's products are not sent to the [imperialist — UCIS] metropolis and there parcelled out among the colonies, but where we are the owners of what we produce in our respective enterprises and in Ukraine itself.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, three-quarters of which is composed of communists, and the rest is comprised of those seeking to consolidate with the communists, is in principle incapable of resolving our problems. The weight of the Declaration on "Sovereignty", enacted on July 16 of this year, is to be measured by the weight of the Ukr.SSR Resolution on Chornobyl, in which the most that the Supreme Soviet was able to achieve was "to insist on the halting of the exploitation of the Chornobyl nuclear power plant". Before whom does the highest legislative body of a "sovereign" Ukr.SSR insist? The deceptiveness of this Resolution is an indication of the Declaration itself. Economic and day-to-day poverty, the lack of elementary consumer goods, inflation, social insecurity, — this is the result of the economic and political crisis that is deepening in Ukraine, and which the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR is unable to combat. Moreover, it ignores us and our demands, issued at the ecological rally of July 29, organized by the Inter-Party Assembly and the Kyiv strike committee. The Supreme Soviet ignored the political demands forwarded by the miners of Donbas on July 11.

Given such circumstances, we clearly present the Supreme Soviet of the

Ukr.SSR with the following options: either it takes full control and responsibility for the present and future of Ukraine and secures a set of quick, radical changes, which will lead the country out of the crisis, or it recognizes its inability to rule and dissolves itself. The following are our final questions to the Supreme Soviet:

- 1) Are you capable of resolving the Chornobyl problem?
- 2) How much time is required to meet the demands of the Donbas miners the depoliticization of state institutions, the army, the KGB and MVD, the recognition of the urgency of the resolution of the problems of the mining regions, not only in Donbas, but throughout all of Ukraine?
- 3) When will enterprises pass from the control of the state into the hands of workers' collectives without a buy-out of their primary funds? Or should we wait no longer and take them over ourselves?
- 4) Will you seek to forge for Ukraine a new union treaty a new form of colonial bondage?
- 5) What guarantees are there that draftees inducted into the army during the autumn call-up will serve in Ukraine?

We suggest that the Supreme Soviet reply to these questions to the Kyiv strike committee no later than September 17. Otherwise, the Kyiv strike committee will stage a warning strike on September 27.

We urge all workers' collectives in Ukraine to set up strike committees in their organizations, enterprises and institutions, with the aim of forming an all-Ukrainian strike committee.

## 300,000 Believers Took Part in Religious Service in St. George's Cathedral in Lviv

LVIV—Over 300,000 Ukrainian Catholics jammed into St.George's Cathedral, the square outside the church and the surrounding streets on Sunday, August 19, 1990, to be participants in the first Catholic Divine Liturgy celebrated there in 44 years. According to an eyewitness account by the Rev. Yaroslav Chukhniy — the pastor of the Church of the Assumption in Lviv — "people were crying from happiness in the streets. Lviv has not experienced such a day".

The religious service was conducted by five bishops of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, headed by Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk, who was accompanied by Bishops Sophron Dmyterko, Filemon Kurchaba, Yulian Voronovskyi and Mykhailo Sapryha.

According to reports of representatives of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Lviv, the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church — Aleksey — sent a telegram to Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk several days prior to the Catholic Liturgy being celebrated in St. George's Cathedral. In this telegram Patriarch Aleksey warned the

Archbishop that a Catholic service in the cathedral may damage relations between the Moscow Patriarchate and the Vatican. Moreover, the Patriarch noted, such an action may further exacerbate the tense situation in Lviv. This telegram was also forwarded to the Lviv provincial and municipal soviets.

According to eyewitness reports, crowds of Ukrainian Catholic faithful began gathering near the Cathedral as early as 6:00 a.m. on Sunday morning. Religious services were held throughout the day in other churches around Lviv. The third Sunday in August marks the religious feast of the Ascension, which is celebrated by Ukrainian Christians in a traditional blessing of fruits. Over 100,000 believers participated in such a fruit-blessing ceremony at the Church of the Assumption, which was conducted by several Ukrainian Catholic bishops.

Following the ceremony, the bishops led the people in a march to St. George's Cathedral. Young Ukrainian boys and girls, dressed in traditional, national attire, greeted Archbishop Sterniuk as he approached the cathedral in the traditional manner of welcome: with bread and salt. Afterwards, the choir of St. George's sang the religious hymn — "Oh God, great and one". A few months ago, this choir declared itself to be Catholic, refusing to sing in the cathedral when it was occupied by the Moscow Patriarchate.

Archbishop Sterniuk was officially greeted on behalf of all the Ukrainians of Lviv by Yuriy Shukhevych — the son of Gen. Roman Shukhevych, who was the Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army.

In accordance with tradition, Archbishop Sterniuk banged on the gates of the cathedral three times with a hand-held cross. The gates were then opened and at that moment the voice of the former Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Catholic Church — Andrey Sheptytskyi — from a tape of his Easter greetings delivered in 1939, was heard over loudspeakers.

The religious services continued until 3:30 p.m., after which Archbishop Sterniuk came out on a balcony and read out the greetings of the Head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church — Cardinal Myroslav Lubachivskyi.

# DEMOCRATIC FORCES FORM A COMMITTEE TO ESTABLISH A UKRAINIAN ARMY

On August 17, 1990, an Initiative Committee for the Establishment of Ukrainian Armed Forces was set up in the city of Ternopil, western Ukraine. A similar committee was formed in Lviv on February 7 of this year.

Joining the Ternopil committee were representatives from the following democratic organizations: Mothers of Soldiers Committee, the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), the "Memorial" Society, the Ukrainian Republican Party, the Green Party, the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association, the Ukrainian National Party, the Ukrainian Christian-Democratic Party, the Association of Women, and the Ukrainian Language Society. During the meeting, at which the committee was established, the participants adopted a resolution, an appeal to the Ukrainian people, an appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and an appeal to provincial democratic blocs of Ukraine.

The resolution states that in order to guarantee the inviolability of the Ukrainian people and parliament, and to safeguard stability and peace in Europe, the Committee will strive towards the following goals:

- Temporary military service for residents of Ukraine, with the right to use their own indigenous Ukrainian language, in the Soviet armed forces stationed on the territory of Ukraine, as a transitional stage towards the formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces;
- 2. The establishment of a Ukrainian Defence Ministry;
- 3. A halt to military service on the territory of Ukraine by residents of other republics;
- 4. The replacement of the oath of allegiance to the USSR government with an oath of allegiance to the people of Ukraine, since the primary aim of the Ukrainian army should be to defend the territorial integrity of the republic against all forms of aggression;
- 5. The creation of Ukrainian Armed Forces;
- 6. The opportunity for alternative military service on the territory of Ukraine;
- 7. A gradual transition to Ukrainian armed forces;
- 8. Access to the armed forces for the press, clergy and representatives of civic organizations;
- 9. A condemnation and termination of the policy of deploying armed forces against their own people or other peoples, or as an occupying force on foreign territory.

The Committee also appealed to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet with several concrete and practical demands:

- a. Prior to the upcoming draft of autumn 1990 the question of the conduct of military service by Ukrainian citizens in Ukraine must be resolved;
- b. To take immediate steps towards the passing of legislation on National Armed Forces, which would be subordinate to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR;
- c. Implement measures towards the depoliticization of the army, naval fleet, internal security forces, and institutions of state security;
- d. From September 1, 1990, to takes steps towards the reform of all military political schools in Ukraine into national institutions;
- e. The immediate resolution of the question of the recall of Ukrainian soldiers fulfilling their mandatory military service outside Ukraine;
- f. Prior to the ratification of the Law on National Armed Forces, to demand from military commissions letters guaranteeing the fulfilment of military service by Ukrainians on the territory of Ukraine.

The meeting also urged Ukrainian young men to boycott the autumn draft if these

demands are not implemented and to picket the military commissions. Moreover, the meeting appealed for Ukrainians to stage an all-Ukrainian strike and to participate in protest actions before the Supreme Soviet and provincial and district military commissions. A separate appeal was issued to the provincial democratic blocs to form Initiative Committees for the establishment of Ukrainian Armed Forces and to support the Committee's resolution to the Ukr. SSR Supreme Soviet.

## 40,000 UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC YOUTH PARTICIPATE IN FIRST "YOUTH IN CHRIST" RALLY IN UKRAINE SINCE 1933

LVIV—An estimated 40,000 Ukrainian Catholic youth from all over Ukraine braved rain and gathered in this western Ukrainian city on September 8 to participate in the first "Youth in Christ" rally in this country since 1933, when Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytskyi organized such a manifestation in conjunction with Pope Pius XI's proclamation in that year of an extraordinary Holy Year. The rally, entitled "Seeking Christ", was sponsored by the Ukrainian Catholic Church, which had been banned since its forced liquidation by the Soviet government in 1946. The Church, which existed in the underground since that time, has begun functioning openly in the last year.

The programme, which was part of a "Week of Christian Culture" in Lviv, began at 2:00 p.m. with processions from the Cathedral of St. George, the Church of the Transfiguration and the St. Onufrius Church to the Ukraina stadium. At the stadium, a Pontifical Divine Liturgy, a programme of evangelization and a renewal of baptismal vows were held.

The Divine Liturgy was celebrated by Archbishop Volodymyr Sterniuk, the official representative in Lviv of the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Myroslav Ivan Cardinal Lubachivskyi. Archbishop Sterniuk was joined by Bishops Sofron Dmyterko, Filemon Kurchaba, Yulian Voronovskyi, Ivan Margitych and Mykhailo Sapryha from Ukraine, as well as Bishop Andriy Sapelak from the Ukrainian Catholic Eparchy of Argentina. Fifty priests from Ukraine and North America also participated in the liturgy. Greetings from Pope John Paul II and Cardinal Lubachivskyi were read out.

A programme of evangelization was led by Father Andriy Chirovskyi of the [Metropolitan Andrey] Sheptytskyi Institute in Ottawa. He was assisted by two of the organizers, Borys Gudziak and Father Petro Galadza. The crowd of 40,000 then together renewed their baptismal vows. The rally concluded with a candlelight procession from the stadium to the Cathedral of St. George.

The "Week of Christian Culture" began on September 6 and concluded on September 12. It featured various events held in Lviv and surrounding villages, focussing on providing the youth with an opportunity to experience spiritual life and Ukrainian Christian tradition more fully. During the "Week of Christian Culture", a series of religious events and concerts were held. These included two days of confessions, the celebration of a Divine Liturgy, administration of the sacraments of baptism and confirmation, workshops on Christian marriage, youth hospital ministry, catechization, evangelization and Christian labour and student movements.

Rome, Press Office of the Ukrainian Catholic Church

### UKRAINIAN MOTHERS PICKET SOVIET ARMY Defend sons who want to serve in Ukraine

LVIV—On August 23, 1990, the provincial branch of the Mothers of Soldiers Committee organized a picket of the headquarters of the Carpathian Military District and the provincial military committee in defence of their sons and all Ukrainian young men, who are presently serving in the Soviet army, or are eligible for call-up. The protest action was followed by a public rally on one of this western Ukrainian city's squares.

Some of the placards held by the protesting women read: "Soviet army gendarme of its own people!", "We demand the immediate return of our sons to Ukraine!" The issue of military service has become very volatile in recent months in Ukraine, as an increasingly greater number of Ukrainians, particularly the mothers of soldiers, are resolutely demanding that legislation be passed and implemented requiring that Ukrainian soldiers serve their military obligation strictly on Ukrainian territory, and that they not be used as instruments of Moscow's colonial policies in other republics. With this end in mind, the Mothers of Soldiers Committee was formed, quickly becoming one of the more active groups in the Ukrainian national opposition movement.

The Lviv rally was led by A. Diachyshyn, the chairman of the Mothers' Committee, who gave the opening address. Viktor Furmanov, the chairman of the municipal strike committee, followed with a short address, in which he pointed out that the army is the only source of support for the Central Committee of the CPSU. The Party and general staff, Furmanov continued, deploy the army on punitive operations against the peoples of the USSR.

A deputy to the provincial soviet and the chairman of the military commission — Pavlyshyn — pointed out in his address that deserters from army units stationed outside Ukraine come to him almost daily. Unable to endure further moral and physical abuse, Pavlyshyn continued, they seek shelter and assistance from the new authorities in Ukraine. Pavlyshyn guaranteed that the soldiers will not be returned to their units. He stated that negotiations are presently underway to allow the Ukrainian deserters to continue their military service in Ukraine.

Recently, the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet passed legislation that requires that

Ukrainian servicemen be returned to Ukraine to complete their military obligations. Many Ukrainian servicemen, upon learning of this law, have expressed their desire to return home. Pavlyshyn also stated that until the provincial soviet received firm guarantees that Ukrainians will not serve in military units outside Ukraine, the autumn draft will not take place. The soviets, that are controlled by a democratic majority, will not approve the draft commissions set up by the military committees, according to Pavlyshyn.

The military authorities reacted to the peaceful civic action undertaken by the Mothers' Committee and the residents of Lviv by ordering pilots to fly over the city in a blatant show of force to intimidate the people of Lviv.

The rally participants adopted a resolution demanding: the immediate implementation of the Supreme Soviet decree of July 30 and the decree of the Presidium of the provincial soviet on military service; the depoliticization of the army; a law on republican armed forces; Defence Ministry pensions for servicemen, who sustained injuries in peacetime and for parents of soldiers who died while fulfilling their military service; and the liquidation of the Yavoriv training area.

#### Soviet Military Lashes Out Against Ukrainian Deserters

KYIV—Over the last few weeks there has been an increasingly greater incidence of Ukrainian soldiers deserting their units and returning to Ukraine in protest against various forms of harassment to which they have been subjected in the Soviet army. Many of these soldiers, who deserted from units stationed outside Ukraine, are presently hiding out in dormitories around this capital city. They have discarded their uniforms in exchange for civilian clothing. A director of one of the dormitories, upon learning that soldiers were staying in his dormitory, alerted the military authorities and the police. On August 24, a special unit of police and soldiers surrounded the building, where some of the deserters were staying, and arrested nine of the soldiers. Their names are: S.V. Shatsylo, A.P. Shyutaris, V.M. Shyhanovskyi, V.I. Kunitsyn, V.V. Krasovskyi, O.M. Lobanov, V.O. Shylkin, S.A. Mayboroda, and V.O. Ivanov.

Three soldiers from another group of deserters, also stationed in the Moscow region (Mykola Aksionov — Donetsk province, Serhiy Sydorenko — Kharkiv province, and Serhiy Isanskyi — Poltava province) are also being held in the garrison prison.

At 7:00 p.m. on August 24, a rally was held outside the Kyiv municipal soviet to protest against the arrests. Several Ukrainian soldiers and representatives of the Mothers of Soldiers Committee, the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh), the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party (UNDP) and the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) addressed the demonstrators. At the conclusion of the rally, the protesters formed a column and marched to the city's military administration, where another protest action was held. At this time, several UNDP members proclaimed a 24-hour hunger strike in protest against the arrests.

The following day, on August 25, a delegation of representatives of several democratic groups, headed by Oles Shevchenko and Serhiy Holovatyi, both of whom are people's deputies to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, Tetiana Pradeus of the Inter-Party Assembly, Mykola Holovach of the citizens' committee, and Yevhen Chernyshov of the UNDP, held negotiations with the military authorities.

According to the "Vita Nova" press agency in Kyiv, 40 deserters are currently being held in the garrison prison, approximately 10 are hiding out in the city, and 16 have declared a hunger strike.

## 100,000 LVIV RESIDENTS PROTEST AGAINST NEW UNION TREATY

LVIV, September 2, 1990—At 7:00 p.m., over 100,000 people gathered around the monument to Ivan Franko (a 19th century Ukrainian poet) for a public rally to protest against a new union treaty. On several occasions in the past, M. Gorbachev made reference to the need for such a new treaty and authoritative sources in the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet have stated that relevant legislation on this issue will soon be pending before the Soviet Union's 15 republican Supreme Soviets.

The Lviv rally was organized by the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP). Among the many speakers addressing the mass rally were the following: Rostyslav Bratun and Orest Vlokh — both of whom are people's deputies; Iryna Kalynets and Stepan Khmara — URP representatives; representatives of the Club of Repressed, who have recently returned from the Vorkuta-Inta region, where they were tidying up the graves of Ukrainian political prisoners; Roman Pankevych the chairman of the Lviv municipal branch of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh); Mykhailo Osadchyi — a member of the Presidium of the Lviv regional Rukh branch; and Anatoliy Lupynis, representing the Inter-Party Assembly. All the speakers stressed the need to make every effort to ensure that a new union treaty will not be signed by the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet.

In his address, M. Osadchyi stated: "The new union treaty, that is being drawn up behind closed doors, is merely the transfer of Ukraine from one prison cell to another. In the first place", Osadchyi continued, "Ukraine should achieve genuine sovereignty — political, economic independence, form and make use of its own armed forces, as well as all the other necessary attributes of an independent state — and then determine its own fate — whether to sign a union treaty or whether to join the ranks of independent states, such as France, England, Italy, Poland and other European nations". A resolution was adopted during the rally, which called on the Ukrainian people to stage mass political strikes in the event that the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet should sign such a union treaty. The aim of these mass strikes would be to have the Ukr.SSR government and the Supreme Soviet dissolved and to force new elections.

Moreover, the rally participants voiced their protest against a new union treaty, which would preserve the integrity of the colonial structure of the USSR, stating that the Union Treaty of 1922 was illegal because it was signed by an illegitimate government, that was placed into power during the military occupation of Ukraine by the Red Army. The resolution further called for the immediate adoption by the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet of a Decree on Power, which would correspond to the basic principles enunciated in the "Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine" (ratified by the Supreme Soviet on July 16).

The resolution also called for: the initiation of negotiations with other states regarding bilateral economic treaties; full political and economic independence of Ukraine from Moscow, with no unions, federations, or confederations with the central Soviet authorities; the immediate implementation by the Soviet Ukrainian government of the decree of the Supreme Soviet on military service by Ukrainian citizens, as well as the full implementation of legislation requiring that national Ukrainian armed forces be formed. All young Ukrainians eligible for the autumn call-up were called upon to demand to serve on Ukrainian territory.

Similar rallies took place in Kyiv, Ternopil, Dnipropetrovsk, and a number of other regions.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY HOLDS MEETING A Strategic Plan of Action is Formulated

The Executive Committee of the Inter-Party Assembly held a meeting in Kyiv on September 7, 1990, at which the following issues were discussed and examined:

- 1. preparations for the second session of the Inter-Party Assembly, which is to take place on October 6-7;
- measures to prevent the signing of a new union treaty by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR;
- 3. ways to prevent the recruitment of the young Ukrainians into the Soviet army (autumn call-up);
- 4. the Assembly's participation in the organization of an all-Ukrainian political strike on September 27.

Delegations from political parties and civic-political organizations to the second session of the Inter-Party Assembly are now being formed. In a separate press release the Executive Committee stated its belief that delegations representing Ukrainians, who have registered as citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic, and delegations from workers' collectives should also attend the October session. The Committee is proposing the formation of delegations from provincial communities of registered citizens. The Republican Civic Committee should then establish a norm of representation with regard to every province that would reflect the activity of the provincial Civic Committee and the number of registered citizens in that province. The norm of representation regarding the strike movement should be decided in conjunction with the All-Ukrainian Strike Committee.

The members of the Executive Committee accepted the proposal submitted by Mr. Ratushnyi — the coordinator of the Kyiv Strike Committee — to establish the following set of priorities in the recognition of delegations:

- 1. Civic Committees;
- 2. Strike Committees;
- 3. Political parties and civic-political organizations.

The proposals are based on the following considerations:

- the Civic Committees fulfil the function of the primary bodies of State Government, with regard to which the Executive Committee intends to present its proposals during the second session of the Inter-Party Assembly;
- the strike committees act as administrative bodies of workers' collectives, which are opposed to the official administrative institutions of the centralized economy and, as such, personify the idea that the workers' movement is an integral part of the national-liberation movement;
- the political parties and civic-political organizations represent various ideological, political and social concepts in present-day Ukraine, all united by the concept of the Ukrainian national-liberation movement in the form of a congressional path towards independence.

In light of the likelihood that the communist majority in the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR will succeed in ratifying a new Union treaty, the Executive Committee of the Inter-Party Assembly believes that it is necessary to organize an all-national resistance to such intentions. The Executive Committee is also opposed to the signing of a treaty with the RSFSR, insofar as many peoples remain subjugated in the RSFSR. The only acceptable treaty is with Russia as a state of the Russian people.

During the meeting the Executive Committee accepted the following decisions:

- 1. to organize a rally in Kyiv on September 16 in protest against a Union treaty and a treaty with the RSFSR, during which an appeal will be issued for similar rallies to be held in all the provinces of Ukraine;
- 2. to actively assist the strike committees in Ukraine in the preparation of an all-Ukrainian strike on September 27, if the demands of the Kyiv strike committee are not met by September 17;

3. in the event that the demands of the strike committees are not met after the September 27 strike, to take measures to ensure that the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR would be unable to function.

The Executive Committee intends to use mass civic actions to defend Ukrainian young men from being recruited into the Soviet army during the autumn draft.

The members of the Executive Committee also discussed the Statement and Appeal of the Kyiv Strike Committee, which was submitted by Mr. Ratushnyi the coordinator of the strike committee. The date of the strike on September 27, the motivation behind it and the demands that the Kyiv Strike Committee has issued to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR were all accepted and ratified. The initiative of the Kyiv Strike Committee to call an all-Ukrainian conference of strike committees and workers' committees, at which the question of convening a founding congress of the Conference of the Workers of Ukraine would be decided, was also approved.

## "No to the New Soviet Empire!"

KYIV—Tens of thousands of people attended an anti-union treaty demonstration on September 16, organized by the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, here in the central plaza.

Among the speakers at the rally were: Anatoliy Lupynis, head of the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly; Hryhoriy Musienko and Dmytro Korchynskyi, members of the National Council of the Assembly; Mykhailo Ratushnyi, National Council member and coordinator of the Kyiv strike committee; Mykhailo Bobyliev, representative of the Kyiv strike committee; Andriy Bendziak, representative of the Donbas strike committee and deputy of the Lviv oblast council; Oleksa Mykolyshyn, secretary of the Ukrainian Republican Party; Yevhen Chernyshov, co-chairman of the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party, and others.

In their addresses, they categorically denounced the signing of a new union treaty and declared that without real and not merely proclaimed independence, there can be no new treaty. Otherwise, they said, a new treaty would be the continuation of Ukraine's colonial status.

The participants adopted the following resolution:

We, the participants of the meeting, declare ourselves in favour of complete independent statehood for Ukraine and its immediate secession from the Soviet empire.

We categorically oppose the signing of a new scheming union treaty and demand the withdrawal of representatives of the Ukrainian SSR from the negotiations.

We call for the convening of a new Nuremberg tribunal, focusing on the criminal activity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), which

became the primary instrument of subjugating the Ukrainian and other nations of the Soviet empire, and led us to the brink of economic, national, social and ecological catastrophes.

We demand the instantaneous nationalization of the CPSU's property and the depoliticization of government agencies, the army, KGB and the MVD.

We approve the demolition of monuments to Lenin, which has been witnessed in 16 Ukrainian cities, and demand the immediate demolition of the Lenin monuments in Kyiv, specifically the ones on the October Revolution Square and the Shevchenko Boulevard.

We demand complete glasnost from the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine in preparation for the all-republican programme of privatization of the economy of Ukraine, and parliament's adoption of convincing decrees which would guarantee the rights of a sovereign state in accordance with the declaration of July 16.

We consider it imperative to recommend to councils of people's deputies of all levels of government to declare themselves temporary and to support the registration of citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic and the formation of Citizens' Committees of Ukraine as the initial government structures of an independent Ukrainian state until the convening of a National Congress.

We support the declaration of the conference of representatives of the strike, workers' and trade union committees of Ukraine about holding an all-Ukrainian, one-day, political warning strike on October 1.

## TENS OF THOUSANDS RALLY IN KYIV FOR AN INDEPENDENT UKRAINE Protest Against New Union Treaty Largest Public Rally in Ukrainian Capital in Communist Era

KYIV—On Sunday, September 30, 1990, over 100,000 people participated in a public rally and demonstration in this capital city of Ukraine to protest against a new union treaty and to manifest the independence aspirations of the Ukrainian people. The rally, which is the largest protest action to have taken place in Kyiv (population: 2.6 million) in the communist era, was organized by a political coalition of the major oppositional parties and nationalist groups in Ukraine today. The primary organizers of the rally were: the Inter-Party Assembly, the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and the Secretariat of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh).

According to eyewitness accounts, as early as September 28 Soviet troops began forming a perimeter around the outskirts of the city, so as to control the flow of traffic into the city in an attempt to prevent the rally and subsequent street demonstration from occurring. All entry by bus into the city was prohibited. Moreover, the authorities had hastily ordered a farmers' market to be held on the square where the rally was to take place in an overt attempt to disrupt the planned protest action. The rally organizers were then forced to move the rally to the city's main stadium. Nonetheless, despite these disruptive tactics and overt threats, witnesses report that over 100,000 people actively participated in the rally and the demonstration which followed, with many more Kyiv residents voicing their support from the rooftops and windows of their apartments as the demonstrators paraded in front of their buildings. Many of the participants travelled from regions in western Ukraine and elsewhere, having to find various ways of getting into the capital upon finding their way blocked by Soviet military and security units.

During the rally, which began at 3:00 p.m., representatives of 18 political parties and civic organizations addressed the protesters. All of the speakers decisively spoke against any designs to entrap Ukraine in a new union treaty, which most Ukrainians feel will turn out to be yet another form of colonial bondage. Everyone stressed that only in an independent Ukrainian state will the Ukrainian people be able to develop freely. Several speakers called for the Ukrainian workers to actively support the one-day political warning strike that the coalition organized on Monday, October 1.

The assembled crowd then passed a series of resolutions calling for an independent Ukrainian state; the immediate secession of Ukraine from the USSR; demanding the rejection of any new union treaty by the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR; demanding that the Supreme Soviet, which is controlled by a communist majority, be immediately dissolved and that new elections take place; that Ukrainian citizens drafted into the Soviet army serve strictly on Ukrainian territory and that Ukraine begin forming its own national armed forces; the depoliticization of all governmental institutions, the army, the KGB and MVD; that the Chornobyl nuclear station, as well as all other nuclear-powered facilities be closed down; that Ukraine adopt a free market economy by first allowing its citizens to have private property; that the property of the CPSU be nationalized.

Following the rally, the participants marched out into the streets of Kyiv under a sea of blue-and-yellow banners — the national flag of an independent Ukraine. Many were carrying placards and banners with anti-Soviet slogans, such as: "Down with the Soviet Empire!"; "Long live an Independent Ukraine!"; "No to a new union treaty!"; "The Communist Party is a criminal clique!"; and "Long live the Communist Party — at the Chornobyl power plant!" Leading the marchers was a contingent from the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) carrying a symbolic coffin bearing a photo of Lenin and the words: "Down with the Soviet Empire!" Upon arriving at the Lenin Museum and finding their way blocked by security police, the protesters threw the coffin to the ground and smashed it. Others whistled and chanted at the riot police. Although armoured personnel carriers and riot police were strategically placed outside all government and party buildings in Kyiv, no incidents were reported.

## 400,000 WORKERS STRIKE IN KYIV

KYIV, October 1, 1990—This capital city was today the scene of a political warning strike, organized by the Kyiv Strike Committee and a coalition of political parties and organizations known as the Inter-Party Assembly. Representatives of both groups have stated that over 100 enterprises participated in the strike, including approximately 400,000 workers. Although the Kyiv Strike Committee called for a full one-day strike, many of the participating factories went on strike for several hours, holding separate rallies and issuing demands in support of the striking workers.

In conjunction with the strike, a series of street demonstrations also took place in Kyiv. At 10:00 a.m. the demonstrators began marching towards the Supreme Soviet building, where they joined a large group of protesters picketing the Supreme Soviet. The protesters were demanding the immediate resignations of L.M. Kravchuk — the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet — and V. Masol — the Chairman of the Council of Ministers.

[In the first meeting after the summer recess, the deliberations of the Supreme Soviet were curtailed after the deputies of the democratic opposition, known as the "Narodna Rada" (National Council) walked out in protest against a decision to ban all public rallies, picket actions and demonstrations on Radyanska Square outside the Supreme Soviet building].

The square outside the Supreme Soviet building was blocked off by barriers and special militia units. Trucks had also been parked on all the side streets leading to the square, ready to bar the way of the demonstrating marchers. Despite the heightened level of tension following the mass rallies in protest against a new union treaty that took place on Sunday, September 30, and today's strike, no incidents were reported.

A delegation from the strikers was permitted to publicly present their list of demands from the podium of the Supreme Soviet, which was broadcast on television throughout all of Ukraine. The coordinator of the Kyiv Strike Committee — M. Ratushnyi — in his address before the deputies presented the demands which included:

- a) rejection of any kind of new union treaty;
- b) draftees in the autumn call-up are to fulfil their military service strictly on Ukrainian territory and all Ukrainian soldiers are to be returned to Ukraine, in accordance with the Supreme Soviet decision of July 30;
- c) the immediate closure of the Chornobyl nuclear power station;
- d) acceptance by the Supreme Soviet of the economic and political demands of the Donbas coal miners (the depoliticization of the army, all governmental

institutions, the KGB and the MVD; improvement of working conditions in all mines; higher salaries for the miners);

- e) transfer of control of Ukraine's economy from the state to the workers' and strike committees and the transfer of ownership of all factories and enterprises in Ukraine to labour collectives;
- f) nationalization of all the property of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

Mr. Ratushnyi also stated that the deadline for meeting these demands is November 1 and that if they are not met, then the various strike committees of Ukraine will stage an all-out political strike to demand the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR. Mr. Kravchuk promised that by that time the Strike Committee will receive a reply to the demands.

# UKR.SSR SUPREME SOVIET SESSION DISRUPTED ON FIRST DAY

KYIV, October 1, 1990—The first meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR following the summer recess was disrupted today, when the deputies of the democratic opposition, known as the "Narodna Rada" (National Council), walked out in protest against the passage of legislation banning all public rallies, demonstrations and picket actions on Radyanska Square, outside the Supreme Soviet building. The ban on such protest actions was passed earlier by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet during the summer recess. The "Narodna Rada" deputies raised this issue during the morning session, which sparked a heated debate. The democratic deputies argued that if such decrees can be passed by the Presidium, then the Supreme Soviet will become nothing more than a rubber stamp institution or a mere addition to the Presidium, without any constitutional power or authority.

In a separate vote on this issue, the communist majority managed to have the decree ratified, with 263 of the 450 deputies voting for the ban. In protest, the "Narodna Rada" deputies walked out. Consequently, the Supreme Soviet took a break in its deliberations, during which time the Presidium held a meeting. The "Narodna Rada" held its own meeting, at which the democratic opposition accepted a statement, which included several demands. The statement was read out by People's Deputy Taniuk, when the Supreme Soviet again met in session at 4:00 p.m. Among the demands of the democratic opposition were the following points:

- a) the dissolution of Masol's government;
- b) the dismissal of L. Kravchuk the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet who is responsible for ensuring that the position of the Communist Party becomes the position of the Supreme Soviet;
- c) abrogation of the unconstitutional decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet regarding the ban on all public protest actions before the Supreme Soviet building.

#### VIOLENCE BREAKS OUT AT SUPREME SOVIET

KYIV—The press service of the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh Press International (RPI) — reported that on October 2, 1990, a violent incident occurred in front of the Supreme Soviet building in this capital city of Ukraine. During a demonstration that was being held to protest against a new union treaty, several dozen of the demonstrators attempted to break through the militia barricades that were erected to bar access to the square before the Supreme Soviet building. In the ensuing scuffle, many people were reported to be injured. Although no figures were made available, the RPI dispatch does state that several older women were beaten and one militiaman was also injured.

The demonstration on October 2, in which approximately one thousand people participated, followed a series of anti-union demonstrations, public rallies, strikes and picket actions that took place on Sunday, September 30, and Monday, October 1. The demonstrators were cordoned off in a designated area behind police barricades. The demonstration proceeded peacefully, until a group of unidentified men suddenly appeared and began shouting that the demonstrators must leave the cordoned-off area. Eyewitnesses have stated that these men were provocateurs. Although the details as to what precisely happened at this point are vague, the RPI report states that in the press of the crowd, a small group of old women was pushed to the front, up against the barricades. In the meantime, a contingent of special troops, brought in to Kyiv to control the demonstrations of the last two days, appeared momentarily behind the barricades. It was at this point, apparently, that many in the crowd decided to break through the barricades, expecting the troops to attack them from behind.

Perohiya Pitak, aged 77, was one of the injured women. According the the RPI dispatch, she was sitting on a bench, when someone behind her began provoking one of the militiamen. "Maybe he wanted to hit the person behind me", she said. Instead, Mrs. Pitak was struck by the militiaman's truncheon.

On Monday, October 1, the Supreme Soviet in a close vote ratified the Presidium's ban on all demonstrations, public rallies and picket actions on Radyanska Square before the Supreme Soviet building. The communist majority voted for the ban, which was strongly opposed by the deputies from the democratic opposition. "The decision of the Presidium to limit access to the square will only increase tensions and lead to further confrontation", said Pavlo Movchan, a deputy. "No one is sure", continued Mr. Movchan, "where the square begins or ends".

#### THE UKRAINIAN STUDENT REBELLION

KYIV— After 15 tense days here, Ukrainian students from across the country reaped the satisfaction of victory as Vitaliy Masol, premier of the Ukrainian SSR, bowed to their demands and agreed to resign.

Since October 2 the Ukrainian capital was the national and international focal point of the latest chapter in the Ukrainian nation's war of liberation. Tens of thousands of students, in some instances up to 100,000 at one time, converged on the students' tent city in the shadow of the Supreme Soviet, in what some are calling a student revolt, in support of the reestablishment of an independent Ukrainian state.

With the military in close proximity, the student protesters, along with the group of 300 who conducted the hunger strike on the recently-renamed Independence Square, endured provocation after provocation as well as at least one scuffle with officials as they pressed their demands for the full democratization of their homeland through national independence. While the demonstration and hunger strike were peaceful, the students did not restrain their intentions to restore independence. Sit-ins were held in universities across the capital, traffic was interrupted, and the city was awash in protests for nearly three weeks until the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet agreed in principle to consider their demands. The students' protest actions in the course of 16 days amounted to a citywide student revolt that rocked this capital city and reverberated in the halls of the Kremlin.

Observers viewed this student campaign as a major sign of militant coalescence not only of the students but that of the nation. However, though militantly adamant in seeing their aspirations for national independence fulfilled, there was no attempt to seize power by an armed uprising.

Another significant fall-out in the aftermath of the student protests was that the Ukrainian Popular Movement — Rukh — at last has sensed the mood of the people and outrightly endorsed independence for Ukraine as its goal.

The Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR adopted on October 17 a resolution, drafted by a joint committee comprised of deputies of the communist majority and the "Narodna Rada" (National Council — the democratic opposition), in which it makes a series of concessions to the students. The resolution, which basically accepts most of the students' demands, was approved by 314 deputies. In view of this action, with hugs and tears in their eyes, the students discontinued their protest and hunger strike on October 17.

The resolution consists of the following six points:

 Regarding New Elections — The Supreme Soviet should ratify in the course of the present second session legislation on a referendum in the Ukrainian SSR on the status of political parties and organizations, on the status of the people's deputies, and on new multi-party elections in Ukraine. The referendum is to take place sometime in 1991 and, according to the resolution, will amount to a nationwide vote of confidence or no confidence in the present government of the Ukrainian SSR. This referendum will then indicate if new elections are to be held.

- 2) Regarding Military Service of Ukrainian Citizens Ukrainian citizens, drafted into the Soviet army, will not be forced to fulfil their military obligations outside Ukraine's territorial boundaries. The Supreme Soviet is to ratify legislation in this regard by December 31, as well as legislation giving Ukrainian citizens alternative options to fulfilling their military duty. (The resolution does not specify these options).
- 3) Regarding the nationalization of the CPSU's Property on the Territory of Ukraine — Based on the decision, taken on October 15, the Supreme Soviet is to review the findings of the Justice Ministry of the Ukrainian SSR and of the State Arbitration Board regarding the nationalization of the property of the CPSU and the Komsomol (Communist youth organization). Moreover, a temporary committee is to be established by December 1, to resolve this issue.
- 4) Regarding a Union Treaty In accordance with the decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, ratified by the Supreme Soviet on October 15, 1990, all efforts must be made to stabilize the political and economic situation in the republic, with a view towards establishing a sovereign Ukrainian state, and the ratification of a new republican Constitution. Until such a Constitution is ratified, all discussion regarding a new union treaty is to be regarded as premature.
- 5) Regarding the Resignation of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR — In light of the statement of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR — Leonid Kravchuk — regarding the resignation of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers — Vitaliy Masol — this question is to be resolved in accordance with articles 97-9 and 108-4 of the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR.
- 6) With the aim of forming a legal basis for the implementation of this resolution, necessary amendments are to be incorporated into the existing Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR by November 30, which will reflect the principles of the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine.

Reports from Kyiv persistently indicated that a student revolt was under way. On Friday, October 12, a large student demonstration took place, as tens of thousands of Ukrainian students and schoolchildren marched through the streets of the capital in an unprecedented display of student solidarity and strength. Friday's demonstration was followed by a series of student protest actions that have exacerbated an already tense situation in Kyiv.

At 10:00 a.m. students from various educational institutions in the capital, as well as students from technical schools, and youths from high schools began to gather on Independence Square, reported the Information Centre of the Inter-Party Assembly. At 11:00 a.m. the huge column of approximately 100,000 students (the "Vita Nova" press agency reports 150,000) marched to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR, which was surrounded by several rows of 3,000-4,000 militiamen. On Kirov and Sadova streets, the authorities deployed two units of "black berets" - the crack troops of the special militia detachments - numbering some 300-400, in full riot gear. The demonstrators filled the streets around the Supreme Soviet building and surrounded the Soviet. Hundreds of Ukrainian national blue-andyellow flags and revolutionary red-and-black banners, anti-communist and antigovernment placards could be seen above the heads of the demonstrators. The masses of students chanted continuously, demanding the dissolution of the Ukrainian SSR government and the resignation of the president of the Supreme Soviet, L. Kravchuk. They whistled down the appearance of the now infamous "group of 239" (communist majority) deputies at the windows of the Soviet building.

A group of 200-300 students, the Information Centre report states, managed to break through the police cordon and laid down their mattresses outside the Supreme Soviet building, refusing to move until their demands were met.

At 5:00 p.m., some 5,000 students marched to the Kyiv State University, where more than 100 students entered the building and barricaded themselves in. A Ukrainian national flag was raised over the university building. In light of their victory, on October 16, at 10:00 p.m. the students decided to discontinue the hunger strike action. The tents pitched by the students on the steps of the Supreme Soviet building were taken down, reports the "Vita Nova" press agency. The tent city on October Revolution Square, however, appeared to be in place. In the universities and schools, students gradually brought their successful protest actions to a close. Preparations were still going ahead, however, for an all-Ukrainian strike to begin on Monday, October 22, said "Vita Nova".

Earlier, tens of thousands of people, mostly students, gathered on October 12 on October Revolution Square for a public rally and demonstration, reported the Information Centre of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. Since October 2, nearly 200 Ukrainian students have been staging a hunger strike in the square.

On October 10, the communist majority in the Supreme Soviet rejected what in effect amounted to a motion of no confidence in the government, that was forwarded by the "Narodna Rada" (National Council), the pro-independence opposition. Specifically, the "Narodna Rada" deputies demanded the resignation of Masol. That same evening more than 10,000 indignant residents of Kyiv, following the students' lead, gathered on Independence Square, where a spontaneous rally was held. The rally quickly spilled out in the streets, so that all traffic in central Kyiv was brought to a standstill.

On October 12, the striking students issued a call for an all-Ukrainian student strike. That morning thousands of students blocked off traffic on the main Khreshchatyk Boulevard and began a protest rally. Several student representatives, as well as several People's Deputies, including Stepan Khmara and Maria Kuzemko, addressed the protesters.

On the initiative of Khmara and Kuzemko, together with the deputy chairman of the Inter-Party Assembly — Petro Kahuy — a protest march was held through the capital following the rally. The crowd, which by that time had grown to approximately 100,000 people according to eyewitness accounts, marched through Kyiv to the "bilshovyk" factory, where L. Kravchuk was visiting. The demonstrators, mostly students and schoolchildren, chanted — "Down with Masol and Kravchuk!" and "Freedom for Ukraine!"

The demonstration concluded with a picket of the factory, during which the rally's resolution was delivered to Kravchuk as well as the students' demand that they be given two hours of air time in which to broadcast their demands throughout all of Ukraine. Should this demand not be met, the students had threatened more radical protest actions.

Local protest actions were also under way in support of the Kyiv strike. In Ternopil, according to Vasyl Boychuk, the joint chairman of the city's student strike committees, the coordinating council adopted a resolution to begin a hunger strike and to mobilize the residents of the city to fight against the present political system in Ukraine, reported the "Vita Nova" press agency.

The students' demands included:

- the dissolution of the Ukrainian SSR government;
- the dissolution of the Supreme Soviet and new multi-party elections;
- the formation of a national army;
- nationalization of CPSU and Communist Youth League property.

The student hunger strike began on October 13. By the following day there were 46 students taking part in the action. The coordinating council was to have drawn up a plan of action to implement their demands.

The majority of Ternopil residents supported the students, according to the report. In two days they collected 6,000 signatures and 4,000 *karbovantsi* (roubles). The City Council did not interfere with the students. A delegation of the students met the chairman of the City Council — Pavlo Nehoda — and deputies of the municipal and provincial soviets.

The MVD representative in the city proposed that the students receive assistance

to protect them and in order to maintain order. The KGB did not interfere at all.

"Vita Nova" correspondent — Viktor Baranov — believed that the city council is fairly democratic and would continue to look at the student action favourably. Students and schoolchildren from nearly 40 schools and colleges in Ternopil took part in the action.

In an article in the October 19 edition of *The New York Times*, under a headline reading "Militant Students in Ukraine Force Party Into Retreat", Francis Clines said militancy was the missing force in Ukraine, which "has coalesced with a vengeance here in Ukraine, pushing the communist-dominated parliament into deep retreat and forcing the nationalist movement to put a more aggressive edge on its agenda".

Clines wrote that national independence was the ultimate goal of the students. He quoted 19-year-old Oksana Burakivska, who told him of her UPA grandfather: "My old grandfather used to tell me how he fought in the woods against the Red Army. He always told me to fight for Ukrainian independence, but by the time he died even he had lost faith in that idea".

The New York Times also indicated that the Popular Movement of Ukraine — Rukh — has finally taken a close look at the direction the people have taken and "quickly altered" its policy to drop its previous hesitancy and fully endorses outright independence for Ukraine as its declared policy.

"Rukh leaders, who until now had some qualifications and differences in their approach toward ultimate independence, appeared to be scrambling to catch up with the republic's new student protests", Clines said.

However, the students realize that the military can still negate their victory. Ihor Hnateyko, a member of the large Lviv contingent at the demonstrations, selfconfidently told Clines: "The army will want to remind us what tanks look like and we will want to remind them what our tents look like".

Oleksander Dankevych of western Ukraine, too, saw the military as a major threat to the movement. He told Clines: "We are surrounded by such bloody minirevolutions — in Armenia, Azerbaijan and elsewhere — that we in western Ukraine have decided against bloodshed and in favor of our own peaceful revolution".

In an appeal to students of the world dated October 13, issued in Kyiv and signed by 200 students, the hunger strikers explained the reason for their action in this manner: "The road to freedom for Ukraine has been covered with thorns and blood. We are aware of this and we will not turn back from this course... For our sacred goal — independence and freedom for Ukraine — we are prepared to sacrifice the single right that mercifully has not been taken from us — our lives".
#### SECOND SESSION OF THE UKRAINIAN INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY

KYIV—According to a recent release of the Information Centre of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA), on October 5, 1990, representatives of several Ukrainian political parties and provincial public committees held a meeting with the Executive Committee and National Council of the Assembly in Kyiv. The meeting was held to discuss the upcoming second session of the Assembly, which took place on October 6-7, 1990, and in particular to agree upon the wording of several draft documents that were to be presented during the second session.

[The Inter-Party Assembly is a loose coalition of several Ukrainian, democratic political parties, civic organizations, youth groups and workers' strike committees. Its primary objective is to reestablish Ukrainian statehood and independence. Over the past few months, the Assembly has been gathering signatures of Ukrainians, who want to become citizens of a Ukrainian National Republic. Spokesmen for the Assembly state that over one million signatures have been gathered].

One of the documents that was discussed at the meeting was called a "Decree on changes in the statutory by-laws of the public committees"; once ratified, the proposed changes would give these committees new functions as local governmental bodies. The structure of the Assembly was also discussed. After a lengthy discussion of the drafts, the meeting decided to keep the existing structure basically intact, while eliminating the Coordinating Council of Parties, which, in the assessment of those present, did not prove to be effective. It was also decided to propose at the session that the National Council be given greater executive powers, while the Executive Council's function is to run the day-to-day affairs of the Assembly.

The question of finances was also discussed. A sum of 3 million roubles was set as the minimum amount necessary for the effective operation of all levels of the Assembly's activity. Several proposals were presented with regard to the need to raise funds, including a novel idea of having those who sign up as citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic pay a "tax". This idea was discarded since the Assembly is presently incapable of protecting the interests of these citizens on the territory of a hostile state — the USSR. On a proposition forwarded by the Executive Committee, the members decided to allocate an hour of the second session to a debate on these questions. In the event that the session cannot resolve this financial problem, the meeting decided to make the Executive Committee responsible for making sure that all the structures of the Assembly, on all levels, have everything they need to be able to fulfil their function.

Those present at the meeting also decided to propose to the second session of the Assembly that a Constitutional Committee be established for the drawing up of a draft constitution of an independent Ukrainian state, a law on citizenship and drafts of other laws. It was also agreed that Ukraine should not enter into any agreements or treaties with the Russian SFSR as long as it, too, remains an imperialist structure. The meeting's participants also endorsed several drafts of resolutions, prepared by the Executive Committee, which were to be presented before the second session of the Assembly for its final ratification.

On Saturday and Sunday, October 6-7, 1990, the Assembly held its second session in this capital city of the Ukrainian SSR. According to the report, 335 people participated in this session, including 111 representatives of 14 political parties that form this loose coalition of independence-minded groups. Among the primary parties and organizations that are a part of the Assembly are the following: the Ukrainian National Party (UNP), the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party (UNDP), the Ukrainian Rural-Democratic Party (USDP), the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM), and several strike committees. Another 109 delegates participated in the second session as representatives of various public committees to register citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic. The report also states that 86 representatives of 32 other Ukrainian political parties and organizations, and 29 members of the press and information agencies, also attended the session.

The session was opened by Yuriy Shukhevych, who spent over 35 years in Soviet Russian prisons and concentration camps. [Mr. Shukhevych is also the son of Gen. Roman Shukhevych — the Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA), which fought against Nazi and Russian occupational forces during World War II. Gen. Shukhevych was killed in battle with Soviet forces in March 1950].

Afterwards, the chairman of the National Council of the Assembly — Hryhoriy Prykhodko — and the chairman of the Executive Committee — Anatoliy Lupynis — addressed the participants. In their presentations they described the present situation in Ukraine and what role the Inter-Party Assembly can play in Ukrainian political life. Both speakers also presented their analysis of the perspectives for the reestablishment of a Ukrainian independent state through the creation of public committees and the convocation of a National Congress.

After these two programmatic addresses, Yaroslav Dashkevych, a historian, gave a historical overview of the union treaties of 1920-22. Mykhailo Ratushnyi, who is a member of the Assembly's National Council and the Coordinator of the Kyiv Strike Committee, gave an analysis of the present situation of the workers', strike and trade union movement in Ukraine and what are its perspectives for the future. He also explained the relation that the strike movement has with the Inter-Party Assembly.

The session participants then discussed the structure of the leading organizational bodies of the Assembly. According to the UMA report, the delegates decided to abolish the Coordinating Council of public organizations. The National Council is now to function as the executive body of the Assembly. Hryhoriy Prykhodko and Anatoliy Lupynis were re-elected as chairmen of the National Council and the Executive Committee respectively.

Several documents were ratified by the delegates, most importantly a resolution on the status of public committees, which are now to take over the function of registering citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic. In addition, these committees are also to serve as embryonic representations of a Ukrainian National Government.

Yaroslav Dashkevych, Hryhoriy Musienko and Arkadiy Kyreyev were elected to a constitutional committee, which was authorized with the task of preparing draft documents for the third session of the Assembly, scheduled to take place in three months time. The UMA report goes on to state that the constitutional committee is also to prepare draft resolutions on the political and legal character of the transition period to Ukrainian independence and statehood, on the Ukrainian Churches, on national-ethnic groups in Ukraine, on the registration of ownership and ownership of property in general, and on the situation of education in Ukraine. These drafts are to be presented to the National Council for ratification.

A letter of greetings from the external representation of the Ukrainian National Government of 1941 was read out to the delegates, following which the session ratified a statement to Bohdan Fedorak — the Chairman of the Ukrainian National Government — in which the Assembly recognizes the legitimacy of the Government as the successor of the government of the Ukrainian state, established on June 30, 1941.

A decision was adopted, the UMA report continues, regarding the need to establish a diplomatic representation of the Assembly abroad. The need to consolidate all pro-independence forces both in Ukraine and in the diaspora was stressed. In a series of resolutions, the delegates to the second Assembly session also endorsed the establishment of a joint committee on foreign affairs, comprised of members of the Ukrainian National Government and the Assembly. Representatives of the Assembly are to be included into the National Government, specifically to the proposed joint foreign affairs committee.

# *Resolution* on the status of public committees

By a resolution of the first session of the Inter-Party Assembly "On the registration of citizens of a Ukrainian state", the statutory by-laws of the public committees were ratified, in accordance with which these committees were to be the vehicles for the registration of citizens of an independent Ukrainian state in accordance with the law on citizenship of the Ukrainian National Republic of March 2, 1918. In the interim period between the first and second sessions of the Assembly, these committees proved to be viable in terms of their practical activity.

Based on the foregoing, the second session of the Inter-Party Assembly regards as necessary:

- to assist in the creation and activity of public committees and to develop their activity throughout all the territories of Ukraine;
- —mindful of the progressive disintegration of the existing colonial administration in Ukraine and the continuing weakness of its ability to control the political situation, the second session of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly believes that these committees can begin to gradually take over authority as part of their function, which is feasible in each particular region, with a view towards taking over full governmental responsibility as alternative bodies on their particular level;
- --expand the structure of the public committees and draw up directives to secure their continued functioning;
- —in the event of the emergence of an extreme situation, the public committees are obliged to take over full responsibility, or to create Committees of National Security together with other organizations of the national-liberation movement;
- -the public committees can cooperate with those soviets, which recognize the supremacy over them of the National Congress.

# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY MEETS TO DISCUSS FUTURE PLANS

KYIV, October 11, 1990—The newly-elected Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) today held its first meeting after the Assembly's second session, which was held on October 6-7, reports the UMA Information Centre.

At the meeting, functions were allocated to the newly-elected members of the Executive Committee. The chairman of the organizational department, Petro Kahuy, was chosen as the new deputy chairman of the Executive Committee. In addition to his responsibilities as secretary, Mr. Kahuy was also given the task of coordinating the work of the various UMA departments. The second deputy chairman, Yevhen Chernyshov (chairman of the Coordinating Committee of Public Committees), also chairs the conference of Public Committees, which meets every month. The primary task of the Public Committees is to gather signatures of citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic.

According to the UMA Information Centre release, the meeting of the Executive Committee also reviewed the proposals forwarded by the chairman of the economic department, Yuriy Voskovniuk, in which he suggested various economic measures that the Assembly should take in view of the state of the economy of the Ukr.SSR and the worsening socio-political crisis. Specifically, Mr. Voskovniuk proposed the establishment of several businesses, a labour exchange, a commercial-mediation company, and an independent bank. The participants of the meeting also discussed future plans. The need to coordinate the UMA's activity with other opposition groups in Ukraine and throughout the USSR was underscored. A delegation was appointed to the conference of national-democratic movements of the USSR. The chairman of the publishing and propaganda department of the UMA was chosen to represent the Assembly at the meeting of national-democratic movements of the subjugated nations in the USSR, scheduled to take place in Kyiv on October 13-14.

In light of the refusal on the part of the Ukr.SSR's Supreme Soviet to consider the demands of the October 1 strike in Kyiv, the Executive Committee decided to stage another strike action on November 9. To better coordinate the preparatory activity for this strike, it was decided that Assembly officials will attend a series of meetings of the workers' and strike committees, which are to take place on October 13-14, October 20-21, and October 30.

The UMA report also states that the Executive Committee members discussed contingency plans in the event of an extreme situation developing in Ukraine.

## UKRAINIAN PARTIES HOLD A JOINT MEETING Stress the Need for Consolidating All Opposition Forces in Ukraine

KYIV, October 11, 1990—Representatives of various political groups met in this Ukrainian capital city to discuss the ever more critical situation that has arisen in Ukraine. Specifically, the meeting was called to discuss what action to take in response to the refusal of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet to consider the demands of the October 1 strike in Kyiv and the demands of the student hunger strike, which was begun on October 2 on October Revolution (Independence) Square.

The following representatives were present at the meeting: Anatoliy Lupynis, Pavlo Skochok, Yevhen Chernyshov, Oles Fedoruk and Olena Vedenska of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly; Levko Lukianenko — the chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) and Andriy Koval — a member of URP's Executive Committee; Yuriy Shcherbak — the representative of the republican deputies' club and the chairman of the Green Party; representatives of the organizational committee for the establishment of a Party of Democratic Consensus, including People's Deputy Oleksander Yemets; executive members of the Social-Democratic Party of Ukraine, the Green Party, the Ukrainian Rural-Democratic Party and the Ukrainian National-Democratic Party.

The delegates discussed ways to resolve the present political crisis, the feasibility of establishing an alternative government to the present colonial regime in Ukraine, contingency plans in the event of an extreme worsening of the political situation, and the possibility of joint action between the various political forces. Everyone agreed that the anti-communist forces in Ukraine must consolidate their

strength in order to effectuate the removal of the communists from power.

Representatives from the Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) underscored the need to concentrate all efforts on the formation of alternative administrative/state structures, such as public, strike and workers' committees, in order to preclude the reestablishment of a totalitarian regime and/or to prevent the present situation from becoming more chaotic. Several other delegations expressed their support for this proposal. It was pointed out that the opposition groups in Ukraine cannot expect or anticipate any constructive measures to be undertaken by the communists. The delegates concluded that the only viable means of resolving the crisis is for Ukraine to secede from the Soviet Union and to expedite the convocation of a National Congress, or — in the event of an extreme situation — a Committee of National Security. Furthermore, the delegates expressed their conviction that the nationalist-democratic forces in Ukraine should not harbour any illusions about the possibility of cooperating with the communists to resolve the crisis. Instead, all efforts should be directed towards the consolidation of national, anti-communist forces in Ukraine.

The participants of the meeting also agreed on the need to establish an independent publishing house to print the literature of the various opposition forces. Finally, the participants stressed the need to continue holding such interparty discussions in the future. It was also decided that a joint statement should be prepared, the text of which will be ratified at the next meeting of the political parties on October 16.

## CONFERENCE OF SUBJUGATED NATIONS HELD IN KYIV

KYIV—Representatives of the national-democratic movements of eight subjugated nations in the USSR held a joint conference in the Ukrainian capital on October 13-14, 1990. Such conferences are held every three months. Delegations from the following parties and organizations were among those that attended the conference:

- 1) National-Democratic Party of Georgia;
- 2) Party of National Independence of Georgia;
- 3) Tatar Party of National Independence
- 4) Crimean-Tatar National Movement;
- 5) Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly;
- 6) Ukrainian Republican Party;
- 7) National-Democratic Party of Byelorussia;
- 8) Estonian Party of National Independence
- 9) Fighting Solidarity (Poland)

Five separate resolutions were adopted at the conference:

- in support of the students conducting a hunger strike in Kyiv to protest against

the proposed new union treaty;

- calling for a boycott of recruitment into the Soviet army;
- on common principles of the national-democratic movements, with particular emphasis on anti-communism and the struggle against Russian imperialism;
- in support of the Byelorussian and Central Asian national-democratic movements;
- calling for an international tribunal on communist crimes, with an appeal to the governments and peoples of the world, and to everyone that can bear witness to communist atrocities to take part in the preparations of such a tribunal.

The conference was organized and chaired by Stepan Hura, who represented Ukraine.

# REPRESENTATIVES OF INTER-PARTY ASSEMBLY AND STRIKE COMMITTEES MEET IN DONETSK

DONETSK, October 13-14—The Executive Committee of the Inter-Party Assembly and regional coordinators of workers' and strike committees met in this mining city over the weekend to discuss the worsening political situation in Ukraine, reports the Assembly's Information Centre. The delegates discussed ways of preventing the situation from getting out of control and to forestall the development of an extreme situation. The crisis is the direct result of the refusal of the communist majority in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet to respond in a constructive fashion to the demands that the general Ukrainian national-democratic movement has issued, particularly with regard to a proposed new union treaty. All the organizations and groups, that are active in the movement, have stated that the prosed union treaty represents Moscow's attempt to solidify its colonial stranglehold over Ukraine and have, therefore, demanded that the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, controlled by a communist majority, reject any and all drafts of a union treaty.

In light of this increasingly critical political situation, the meeting resolved to begin preparations for an all-Ukrainian political strike. The delegates also decided to hold a joint meeting with representatives of various political groups and the "Narodna Rada" (National Council) — the pro-independence opposition bloc in the Supreme Soviet.

The meeting approved a statement to the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR, underlining the fact that the republic's government and Supreme Soviet are incapable and unwilling to implement the demands put forward by the political strike of October 1, and informing the Soviet that preparations will begin for an all-Ukrainian strike to demand the dissolution of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet and the setting up of a Committee of National Security.

#### UKRAINIAN POLITICAL GROUPS AGREE TO COORDINATE ACTION

KYIV, October 16—At 2:00 p.m., a meeting of several Ukrainian political parties and organizations was held in the offices of the Executive Committee of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly. The meeting was called to discuss the present critical political situation in Ukraine.

Participating in the meeting were the following: members of the National Council and Executive Committee of the UMA, the acting Secretary General of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) — Serhiy Odarych, Rukh Secretary — Bohdan Ternopilskyi, Ukrainian Republican Party Secretariat members — Roman Koval and Anatoliy Shchebiko, coordinators of regional strike committees — Mykhailo Ratushnyi and Viktor Furmanov, members of the leaderships of parties which belong to the Inter-Party Assembly and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM), representatives of the coordinating committee of the hunger-striking students and the students occupying the state university in the Ukrainian capital.

After the participants had the opportunity to present their positions regarding the present political situation in Ukraine, it was decided to continue holding such meetings. Attention will be directed towards the setting up of a coordinating committee which was delegated the task of forming a Committee of National Security in the event that future developments will even further exacerbate the already tense situation in this capital city. The chairman of the Lviv strike committee, Viktor Furmanov, gave his assessment of the situation in Lviv, particularly with regard to the decision of the Lviv strike committee to begin a strike on October 18. The representatives of all the groups agreed on the viability of beginning a strike on October 22.

#### **THOUSANDS GREET UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX PATRIARCH**

KYIV—The Head of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC), the Patriarch of Kyiv and all of Ukraine, Mstyslav, arrived in the Ukrainian capital from the United States on Saturday, October 20, 1990. Up to 5,000 faithful of the UAOC gathered at the Kyiv Boryspil airport to greet their religious leader, who resides in the United States. Many travelled from as far as Lviv, Ternopil, Ivano-Frankivsk, Rivne, Vinnytsia and other Ukrainian cities and villages.

The welcoming party included the Patriarch's deputy, the Metropolitan of Lviv and Halych — Ioan, Stepan Khmara — a people's deputy to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet and a member of the democratic opposition — "Narodna Rada" (National Council), Ivan Drach — the chairman of Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine), as well as other prominent Rukh leaders.

A solemn moleben (a religious service) was held in the St. Sophia Cathedral in

the Ukrainian capital, celebrated by Patriarch Mstyslav, Metropolitan Ioan, eight bishops and close to 100 priests. After the service, Patriarch Mstyslav addressed the 20,000 faithful, who had gathered outside St. Sophia's to greet their Patriarch. "My soul is filled with happiness that after 49 years I returned to my homeland", said Patriarch Mstyslav. "I am glad that recently in Ukraine the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was officially registered and has been recognized as having the same rights as other religious denominations".

On Sunday, October 21, the Patriarch celebrated a Divine Liturgy at the Church of St. Andrew, assisted by bishops of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. According to eyewitness accounts, approximately 50,000 faithful gathered in and outside the church to attend the religious service.

The following day, Monday, October 22, Patriarch Mstyslav attended a press conference, during which he called for religious unity.

On Tuesday, the Patriarch met with the Chairman of the Presidium of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk. Patriarch Mstyslav also intends to take part in the Rukh congress, which will be held from October 25-28 in Kyiv. He is to address the congress.

On October 27, Patriarch Mstyslav is to visit Lviv. UAOC officials report that Mstyslav will be officially installed as Patriarch of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church during religious ceremonies to be held on November 17-18.

## CONFERENCE OF PUBLIC COMMITTEES HELD IN KYIV Constitutional Assembly Planned for January 1991

KYIV—The Public Committees of Ukraine, a division of the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UMA) that is responsible primarily for gathering signatures of citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic, held a conference here on October 20, 1990, reports the Information Centre of the UMA. The foremost topic for discussion centred on the next, extraordinary session of the UMA, scheduled for December 1, 1990, as a preparatory conference for the convention of a Constitutional Assembly by the end of January 1991.

According to the UMA report, elections are soon to be held, in which registered citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic will elect delegates to this Constitutional Assembly. The meeting of Public Committees also ratified the decision of the Assembly's National Council and Executive Committee to strive towards greater consolidation of all national-liberation forces and opposition groups in Ukraine and to begin forming a Committee of National Salvation.

The participants of the meeting also decided to commemorate November 7 as a day of mourning for the victims of communist terror. The member organizations of the UMA and registered citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic are to stage anticommunist manifestations on that day. The communist authorities plan on holding the traditional Revolution Day parade on November 7. In this regard, the meeting decided to forward to the authorities the position of the UMA, viz., that any parades scheduled for that day will be considered a provocation in violation of the memory of the victims of communist terror and as a challenge to the Ukrainian people's aspirations to liquidate the consequences of communist tyranny in Ukraine, according to the report.

A considerable part of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of what activity the Public Committees should be initiating now, in light of the ever more real threat of political chaos, famine, and even a civil war breaking out in Ukraine. Generally, on the basis of these discussions, the participants decided to strengthen the UMA's statebuilding activities, so that various contingency plans can be effectively put into effect in the event of a crisis breaking out in Ukraine.

The meeting's participants also decided to hold an economic conference in the city of Donetsk on the theme: "Problems of the Coal Mining Regions — the Present Situation and an Outlook for the Future".

#### SECOND RUKH CONGRESS OPENS IN KYIV

KYIV, October 25—The Second Congress of the Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) opened today in the Ukrainian capital, reports the Rukh Information Centre.

The proceedings began at 11:30 a.m., with Patriarch Mstyslav, the head of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC), blessing the delegates, who had gathered in the "Ukraina" palace of culture to attend the Congress. In his address the Patriarch gave a positive view of Rukh and its activity, stressing the great significance of the Church in the process of the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state. "The Church is the pivot around which the people, who strive towards the rebirth of the Ukrainian nation should unite". [Patriarch Mstyslav, who resides in the United States, arrived in Kyiv on October 20. He is to be officially installed as Patriarch of the UAOC during a series of religious ceremonies on November 17-18]. Bishop Yulian Voronovskyi, who represented Metropolitan Sterniuk, the head of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine, also greeted the Congress.

After a brief greeting to the delegates, Rukh chairman, Ivan Drach, delivered his address, which was entitled — "On the political situation in Ukraine and the tasks of Rukh". Having described the critical situation in which Ukraine now finds itself, he pointed out that the role of Rukh is to lead Ukraine out of the crisis and to forge a truly independent Ukrainian state.

Expressing his greetings, Zenon Pozniak, the chairman of the Byelorussian National Front, urged the delegates towards a union of democratic movements against Russian imperialism. Davyd Shakhnarazian of the Armenian National Movement, Yakiv Zbitniew from Poland, as well as representatives of various Ukrainian organizations in the diaspora also greeted the Congress delegates and participants.

After the official opening, the delegates elected a congress presidium, composed of Rukh leaders — Ivan Drach, Serhiy Konev, Mykhailo Horyn, Volodymyr Chernyak, Volodymyr Yavorivskyi and Dmytro Pavlychko. A secretariat and editorial commission were also elected.

Serhiy Konev, Oleksander Savchenko and Yevhen Sverstiuk addressed the delegates, outlining Rukh's organizational problems and discussing its future.

Oleksander Savchenko, an economist, said in his address that a concrete economic plan for the transition of Ukraine to a European economic system has already been made. It envisages the privatization of businesses, a reduction of the role of the state in the economy and a reasonable tax system. "The path of Ukraine to development lies through an independent state and a market economy", said Savchenko.

Serhiy Holovatyi, a member of the "Narodna Rada" (National Council) opposition in the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, in his address pointed out that Soviet Ukraine has no future. "Ukraine's future is an independent republic, which is only possible with the removal of the communists from power... But, while the weight of the political opposition parties is not sufficient for this, Rukh should play the role of a political opposition", he said.

Yevhen Sverstiuk, a notable Ukrainian activist, stressed the need for unity between the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the UAOC in striving towards the achievement of Ukrainian statehood and the need to bring to an end all forms of religious disharmony.

The chairman of the Ukrainian Republican Party, People's Deputy Levko Lukianenko, in his speech gave an analysis of the relation of political forces in Ukraine today. Pointing out that although the CPSU is gradually loosing importance, the decisive word all the same rests with it, for it has the support of the bureaucratic apparatus, the army and the KGB. He also stated that although the opposition is ready for a fight with the communists, it needs time to develop its forces. The empire, which was built for hundreds of years cannot crumble in two years, Lukianenko said.

People's Deputy Dmytro Pavlychko made reference in his address to A. Solzhenitsyn, pointing out that Ukraine is likely to come across modern forms of Russian imperialism.

Oles Doniy, one of the organizers of the recent Ukrainian student rebellion, pointed out that Rukh has neglected the youth. He proposed the election to the Rukh Secretariat of a youth representative.

The idea of Rukh as a bloc of political parties was raised by the speakers and discussed in the lobbies.

The delegates to the Second Congress of the Popular Movement of Ukraine ratified a few amendments to Rukh's statutory by-laws. Most notably, the words "for restructuring", which were originally included in Rukh's official name and which had become increasingly unpopular in Ukraine, were dropped from the official name of the organization. The full name of Rukh (which means "movement" in Ukrainian) is now simply — "Popular Movement of Ukraine".

In addition, according to the new by-laws, a Rukh member cannot be a member of a political party or organization, whose leadership is situated outside Ukraine. According to Rukh officials, this amendment to the by-laws specifically refers to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). The new by-laws also stipulate that Ukrainian political parties have the right to collective membership in Rukh. The delegates to the Second Congress declared Rukh an opposition organization to the Communist Party.

The Congress elected a new leadership. Despite numerous prognostications, Ivan Drach was re-elected chairman of Rukh, giving rise to mixed reactions from those assembled in the auditorium. Many of the delegates wanted to see Mykhailo Horyn elected to that position. Oles Lavrynovych and People's Deputy Larysa Skoryk were elected deputy chairmen. Mykhailo Horyn, the former General Secretary, was elected chairman of the Political Council. Also elected to the central leadership were Serhiy Holovatyi, Lubomyr Senyk, Olena Bondarenko and Viktor Tsymbaliuk.

The delegates adopted a statement, signed by People's Deputy Serhiy Konev, the Congress chairman for the day, to the President of the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet, Leonid Kravchuk, and the acting Premier of the republic, Witold Fokin. The statement concerned the visit to Kyiv of Patriarch Alexey of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Russian Orthodox Patriarch celebrated a Divine Liturgy in Russian in the St. Sophia cathedral in the Ukrainian capital, which the newly-revived Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church considers to be its cathedral. In the statement the Congress delegates pointed out that Patriarch Alexey's trip could lead to a deterioration of relations between the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Ukrainian Christians view the St. Sophia Cathedral as a symbol of spiritual unity and of the independence of the Ukrainian nation, the statement said. As a centre of the Kyiv Patriarchate it also represents the aspirations of the Ukrainian people towards sovereignty and statehood. A religious service conducted by the Russian Patriarch is regarded by many as an affront to the national dignity of Ukrainians.

#### UKRAINIANS PROTEST AGAINST ARRIVAL OF RUSSIAN ORTHODOX PRELATE

KYIV, October 27-28—On Saturday, October 27, the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly organized a protest rally on the square beside St. Sophia Cathedral in this capital city. The theme of the rally was: "Unity of the Ukrainian people in the struggle against Russian provocateurs". The rally began at 5:00 p.m. It was held primarily to protest against the arrival of Patriarch Alexey — the head of the Russian Orthodox Church — who was scheduled to celebrate a Divine Liturgy in the Ukrainian cathedral.

[The Russian Orthodox Church claims that St. Sophia falls under its jurisdiction, whereas the authorities of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which does not recognize the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, is presently fighting to break all ties with the Russian Church].

5,000 people took part in the rally. After the rally, a group of pickets remained outside the cathedral, anticipating the arrival of Patriarch Alexey. Approximately 100 militiamen and internal security troops were dispatched there. The Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine) Congress also delegated part of its security teams to the square outside the cathedral.

At 4:00 a.m., some 2,000 special purpose troops from Moscow and Odessa, as well as Kyiv militia, were brought to the cathedral. The police blocked off all entrances to the cathedral.

At 7:00 a.m., a group of faithful of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholic Churches arrived at the square together with two priests. A scuffle broke out and several people were beaten up by the special purpose detachments. Eyewitness reports indicate that the scuffle was provoked by the security forces. One eyewitness, Larysa Skoryk — a People's Deputy to the Ukr.SSR Supreme Soviet — stated that people were "knocked and kicked to the ground, people's deputies were physically assaulted, while the Kyiv militia stood by helplessly".

When asked to produce their identification cards, the special purpose troops replied with obscenities. The protesters formed a human barricade to prevent the Russians and the Kyiv militia from entering the cathedral. The protesters barred the way until 10:00 a.m. Before the protesters was a row of militia cars. The militia allowed only those with special permits, authorized by Alexey, and members of the Russian Orthodox Church to pass through a narrow passage between the cars.

At 10:00 a.m., under a large police escort, four cars arrived at the cathedral, with Patriarch Alexey, and Metropolitan Filaret of Kyiv, the Russian Orthodox Church's

prelate for Ukraine. People's Deputies Oles Shevchenko and Mykhailo Horyn broke through the police lines and made an attempt to stop the cars from reaching the cathedral by lying down in front of them. The special detachment troops dragged them away by their feet to clear the way. People's Deputy Mykola Porovskyi was beaten up and thrown over a fence so as not to obstruct the proceedings in any way. Deputy Serhiy Holovatyi was also beaten up.

As the bells of St. Sophia began to ring out and the service began, the situation was very tense. After the service, Alexey left under a large police escort to the "Kyiv" restaurant.

#### MILITIA BREAKS UP STUDENT DEMONSTRATION

KYIV—In a predawn raid here on November 7 by about 5,000 militia troops, scores of Ukrainian students, who had gathered to block a military parade commemorating the anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, were beaten up and arrested.

Hundreds of students overnight occupied Victory Square in the Ukrainian capital, awaiting the 10:00 a.m. start of the military parade. Serhiy Koniukhiv, one of the student leaders, said the club-swinging riot police attacked the students at 5:15 a.m.

"I can't tell you exactly how many, but I think several students were injured. At least 20 of the students were loaded into paddy wagons and carried away", Koniukhiv said.

Eyewitnesses confirmed that the students were clubbed and kicked. Several girls suffered concussions and one student's ribs were broken, while others endured different injuries, the sources said. Koniukhiv said his ripped coat was torn in a clash with police and quoted a doctor who arrived in an ambulance as attesting that one coed suffered a concussion when she was struck on the head with a club.

The student demonstration to prevent the military parade was organized by the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, the Ukrainian Student Association and the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association. The militia troops were reportedly brought in from the Poltava and Cherkasy oblasts.

The militia attack forced the students to retreat with their injured friends to the Rukh headquarters, where they barricaded themselves inside, Koniukhiv said.

Earlier, 14 political parties and organizations in the Ukrainian capital issued an appeal to the citizens to block the military parade. However, due to heavy security and the sealing off of access to the centre of Kyiv by thousands of troops and police standing shoulder to shoulder, the military parade began at 10:00 a.m in strong rain and wind.

About 60 Rukh activists and others appeared on the roof of their building with blue-and-yellow Ukrainian flags, decorated with black mourning ribbons, and shouted: "Traitors, traitors" as 3,000 communists marched across Victory Square. During the procession of army, navy and air force troops, the Rukh nationalists chanted: "Down with the occupiers".

With the protesters on the roof of the Rukh building watching the columns of troops, tanks, armoured personnel carriers and rocket launchers, one Ukrainian commented: "The Rukh building looks like a reviewing stand".

Reportedly, some of the marching soldiers smiled and waved at the Rukh activists, but others in tanks trained their anti-aircraft machine guns on the building. A communist supporter taunted the troops, "You should fire at them".

Several windows in the area were covered with black mourning flags to express popular opposition to Moscow's rule.

In the course of the 40-minute parade, one group of opposition demonstrators managed to block the road near the St. Volodymyr Church, forcing some of the revellers to proceed along an alternative route.

The student demonstrators, holding blue-and-yellow as well as revolutionary redand-black flags with mourning ribbons, who had assembled near the Khreshchatyk boulevard were forcibly pushed away from the parade by columns of militia troops. Among this group were people's deputies Stepan Khmara and Bohdan Hudyma and all-Ukrainian strike coordinator Mykhailo Ratushnyi.

One attempt at provoking the crowd to violence was reported to the prosecutor's office. An unknown individual, dressed in civilian clothing, struck Khmara. It was subsequently determined that the assailant was militia Col. Ihor Hryhoriev. The protesters confiscated a pistol from him and turned him over to the prosecutor's office.

Later, a peaceful demonstration in opposition to the parade was convened by the Ukrainian Republican Party and Rukh. About 10,000 persons attended this rally at the St. Sophia Square. Somecommunist activists, escorted by the militia, surrounded the counterdemonstrators and fighting broke out. Before the counterdemonstration was dispersed, people's deputy Mykhailo Horyn managed to address the crowd and urged them to fight for an independent Ukraine.

"Everything depends on each one of you — whether Ukraine will be free or not. But Ukraine must be free, must be free", declared Horyn to the crowd's chants of "Glory to Ukraine".

Horyn asked the participants to remove their hats and stand in a minute of silence in memory of the deaths of millions of Ukrainians killed in the Great Famine of 1932-33.

After the rally, thousands of people marched along Khreshchatyk boulevard, raising Ukrainian flags with mourning ribbons. A Solidarity activist, Miron Kolodko, was seen with this group.

# **DOCUMENTS & REPORTS**

# STATEMENT OF THE RUKH SECRETARIAT ON MILITARY SERVICE BY CITIZENS OF UKRAINE OUTSIDE ITS BORDERS

[UCIS—Following is a statement from Rukh on the status of Ukrainian men in the Soviet army and their ultimate allegiance. According to activists of the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM) in Lviv, many young men left their units this summer. One of them, Roman Kovalchuk from the town of Borynychi in the Lviv oblast, a member of SNUM, was returned to his unit near Moscow after being severely beaten while in custody of the prosecutor. He was denied medical treatment as well as an appeal to higher authorities].

To the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine L.M. Kravchuk:

Copies: chairmen of the permanent commissions on

Legislature and legality;

•Law and order and the fight against crime;

•Glasnost and the mass media;

•Human rights.

Lately, incidents of arbitrary desertion by servicemen, who are citizens of Ukraine, but are serving outside its borders, are becoming more frequent. One of the reasons for this is the brutal psychological and physical oppression and persecution for reasons of nationality. On the basis of the "Declaration on the Sovereignty of Ukraine" and the decree "On Military Service by Ukrainian Citizens and the Deployment of the Republican Security Forces Beyond Its Borders", adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the republic, the deserters consider it their inalienable right and duty to serve on their own territory, but lacking sufficient life experience, fail to take into consideration the judicial aspect of their actions.

The lack of an appropriate appeal by the Supreme Soviet of the republic to all servicemen who are serving outside the borders of Ukraine is a political oversight.

Delays in the resolution of this painful question can lead to unforeseen consequences and further destabilization of the political situation in Ukraine.

Therefore, the Secretariat of the Popular Movement of Ukraine considers the following steps necessary:

1) That the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet draw up an appeal to servicemen, citizens of Ukraine, who are stationed outside the borders of the republic, which

Unless otherwise stated, all information has been provided by the Ukrainian Central Information Service

would guarantee their transfer onto the territory of Ukraine and set appropriate deadlines.

- 2) With regard to the worsening political and inter-ethnic situation in other republics, to speed up the implementation of the decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian SSR of July 30 "On the Carrying Out of Military Service by Citizens of Ukraine".
- 3) That military commissariats of Ukraine arrange for those servicemen who have already arbitrarily left their units to continue their military service in the republic.
- 4) That republican security forces refrain from implementing judicial sanctions against this category of citizens.

August 23, 1990 Acting Chairman of the Rukh Secretariat O. Odarych

Hryhoriy Prykhodko

## THE PRESENT SITUATION IN UKRAINE

The present political situation in Ukraine has been brought about by several factors:

- a) the distribution of political forces;
- b) the serious economic crisis;
- c) the threat of famine and civil war; and
- d) the Soviet armed forces stationed in Ukraine (Ukrainian citizens constitute a mere 20% of their composition).

Today the mass popular actions in Ukraine (strikes, demonstrations, rallies) are motivated by the following factors:

- 1) the protection of soldiers who are deserting from Soviet military units stationed outside the republic and returning to Ukraine, in response to the Decree of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet of 30 July 1990.
- 2) Demands for the formation of national Ukrainian armed forces, which would guarantee national security, territorial integrity and the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state.
- 3) To prevent the further export of food from Ukraine, thereby preventing famine.

The inability of the colonial government to lead Ukraine out of the economic crisis has caused a loss of authority on its part. Discontent with the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR and the Declaration on the State Sovereignty of Ukraine is spreading, as the Declaration provides a basis for a new union treaty. The Ukr.SSR Council of Ministers is failing to implement the decisions of the republic's

"parliament". The internal struggle between national-democrats and communists in the councils and between the councils and the state apparatus, and the government's loss of control over the economy and the armed forces are factors, which are speeding up the break-down of government power. The famine, which is likely to occur, will lead to chaos and civil war.

The reasons for this civil war would be no different to those, which brought about the previous civil war in Russia (1917). Soviet President Gorbachev has an incorrect perception of the causes of the chaos. He believes that civil war will break out as a result of armed conflict between the nations of the Soviet Union. The true cause of the internal war between the Soviet generals will be the famine that will result from the protracted state control of ownership. The split in the Soviet general staff is most likely to occur in Moscow, where the military headquarters are centred, and where the greatest polarization of political forces, each of which has its own supporters among the Soviet generals and officers, is taking place. Famine will lead to a disintegration of government power, which will give the political groups in Moscow an opportunity to make a bid for power with the help of their military supporters.

Reminiscent of the previous civil war in the Russian empire, the fundamental battles between the warring generals will be fought on the territory of Ukraine. For this reason patriotic forces in Ukraine are taking every possible step to prevent social chaos and civil war in their republic. Past experience and the existing situation in the empire have led us to the conclusion that the Soviet armed forces, which are going through an intensive process of disintegration, will become the instrument of the civil war. Ukrainian activists are, thus, demanding the formation of a national army, which would bring about the break-up of the Soviet armed forces.

There are no inter-ethnic conflicts in Ukraine. Although patriotic forces are in control of society, they have no control over the imperial military units stationed in Ukraine. The fact that 80% of the soldiers serving in these units are citizens of other republics, predominantly Russians, Central Asians and Transcaucasians, poses a serious threat. The imperial government and General Staff are relying on the presumption that the intermixed ethnic composition of the military units will greatly facilitate the deployment of the army against the national-liberation movements of the nations subjugated by Russia. This is, indeed, true, but the deployment of the army against the peaceful population will deepen the moral crisis within the military and quicken the pace of the disintegration of the Soviet armed forces into extra-national formations, which will begin a civil war on all the territories of the USSR.

In the present situation, national activists have an opportunity to influence the authorities to form national armed forces. In the Supreme Soviet of the Ukr.SSR

the National Council (democratic opposition), to whose credit belongs the Decree on the recall of Ukrainians serving in military units outside their republic, is actively working towards the formation of a national Ukrainian army. Hand-inhand with the parliamentary processes, the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, as well as various other civic, trade union and women's organizations, are campaigning for a law on national armed forces. Should these demands be ignored, the Assembly is threatening to disrupt the autumn draft into the Soviet armed forces.

The efforts of national activists and democrats of other republics, including the RSFSR, are also directed towards the disintegration of the Soviet armed forces. Soviet generals are well aware that they may soon be left with no one to command. Groups calling for the disintegration of the Soviet army are actively promoting their ideas among the military units. In Kharkiv, a Committee for the Formation of Ukrainian Armed Forces is openly working towards its specified goal. It has already submitted a concrete proposal for experimental military training for Ukrainian servicemen in their own republic. The Committee has the support of several anti-imperial generals and officers.

The Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, which was formed on 1 July 1990, has become a powerful new factor in the political life of Ukraine. Its members are presently involved in the registration of Ukrainians as citizens of the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR — the Assembly is striving to restore the independent Ukrainian state of 1918-22). They are forming various civic committees and consolidating the national political forces. The Assembly is also establishing links with the national-liberation movements of other republics, and working towards the formation of a national strike committee. For this purpose it has come into contact with the regional strike committees, as well as strike committees outside Ukraine. The regional strike committees have become politicized. The work-force and industrial intelligentsia now realize that the causes of the economic crisis lie in the colonial status of the subjugated peoples and are accepting the idea of an independent Ukrainian state and the disintegration of the empire. As a result, economic strikes are becoming political.

Women have also become active, particularly the mothers whose sons are presently serving, or are eligible for service, in the Soviet armed forces. The women's movement includes a Council of Soldiers' Mothers and a Women's Association. These organizations are active in protecting Ukrainians who deserted from the Soviet army. The women's organizations are focusing their attention on the military aspect of the national-liberation movement, stressing once again that the military problem has today become the most pressing. Only national armed forces can prevent civil war and achieve independence. This does not, however, mean that national armed forces will prevent an internal war within the Soviet Union. Their task is to safeguard national security against political and economic measures on the part of the colonial government, and to prevent hostile military groups of the imperial armed forces from crossing the national borders of the republics.

Ukrainian democratic activists are guiding popular effort towards the realization of the attributes and guarantees of national independence. They will succeed in opposing the colonial government's attempts to provoke inter-ethnic, interconfessional and class conflicts. The politically-conscious activists will take the necessary measures to preserve peace in their republic. If the disintegration of the Soviet armed forces and the formation of national armed forces is successful, the peoples of the Soviet Union, together with the rest of the civilized world, will avoid a catastrophe. Soviet nuclear forces remain a complicated problem. This is, however, an international problem. These forces exist because of the international policy of nuclear deterrence. Ukrainian activists, particularly the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly, do not recognize Soviet laws, but have a profound respect for international law. We believe that the time has come for the USSR's military rivals to convince the Soviet government to begin dismantling its nuclear arsenal, and, together with the governments of various dictatorial regimes, to commence the liquidation of nuclear weapons and others weapons of mass destruction.

The Soviet empire today finds itself on the threshold of disintegration. It is unfortunate that the civilized world did not perceive the inevitability of this development soon enough, and for a long time continued to believe the myths of perestroika and the viability of the "evolutionary" transformation of the USSR into a democratic confederation. Attempts to preserve the Soviet empire by restoring the structure and political and economic system of the USSR contradict the natural evolution of democratic processes. As a result of these processes, the USSR, which was from its inception an unnatural creation, will disappear. Western economic aid can no longer save it.

# IMPLEMENTING THE SOVEREIGNTY DECLARATION An Interview with Bohdan Horyn

The following interview with Bohdan Horyn was taken by Marko Boycun, a free-lance writer, on 21 August 1990 in London. Mr. Horyn is a deputy to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, elected from Lviv in March 1990. He serves as deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Committee on Foreign Affairs and is a member of the Ukrainian Republican Party, Rukh and the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society.

#### Introductory Statement by Bohdan Horyn:

We are witnesses of a unique period in world history when before our eyes an empire is falling apart. The uniqueness also lies in the fact that we don't have an analogy of an empire falling apart peacefully, without great confrontations, without military interventions. We don't know how things will develop in the future, but we can confirm that this period is one of an evolutionary-revolutionary process of the empire's collapse.

The paradox here is that Mikhail Gorbachev, in his attempt to strengthen the empire and the stagnant economy with the aid of his radical slogans of democratization, *glasnost* and restructuring, has brought the empire to the beginning of its collapse. The republics have seized upon these slogans and begun to assert that they are in a colonial condition and want to free themselves from this condition.

The collapse of an empire is accompanied naturally by the break-up of all imperial structures: the ideological structure, that is the Communist Party, the organs of state power, the army, and, of course, in the process of relatively democratic elections, there has been a complete change in the composition of the republics' parliaments.

This applies to Ukraine as well. For the first time in decades of colonial existence, political forces independent of the Communist Party participated in elections. There were 450 seats to be filled in the Ukrainian parliament: 111 of these were taken by members of the Democratic Bloc; of these 111 deputies there are 11 people who spent time in prisons and concentration camps. Of course, all the problems that trouble Ukraine were raised to the level of parliamentary struggle.

Notwithstanding the unequal relationship of forces within it, the parliament has adopted a whole set of radical resolutions. Ukraine, having a population of some 52 million, a large territory, abundant natural resources, possesses all the necessary preconditions to become an independent state. To become an independent state it is necessary to have all the attributes of independence that are recognized by international law. Thanks to the parliament the adopted declaration [on sovereignty of Ukraine, 16 July 1990] includes all these attributes of independence. The declaration calls for an independent financial and banking system, independence of the judiciary, the right to our own armed forces and an independent foreign policy. If Ukraine manages to realize by parliamentary means the principles it has declared, it becomes an independent state. There will only be left the task of exchanging diplomatic representatives with England, France, Germany and other countries, and to conduct her own domestic and foreign policy.

*Question:* How does the declaration of sovereignty of the Russian Federation affect Ukraine's chances, and what sort of relationship would you like to see between an independent Russia and an independent Ukraine?

*Horyn:* That the Russian Federation raised the question of its sovereignty is a very important moment in the break-up of the empire. The Soviet empire brought all the republics to the point of economic, political and cultural crisis. The model proposed by the ideologues of the Soviet empire is wholly bankrupt. The striving of the republics for their independence is dictated not only by political factors, but in the first instance by economic ones. This is understood in Lithuania, Russia and Ukraine. It will be possible to raise the living standards of the people only when each republic becomes independent.

There are different interpretations of sovereignty. Yeltsin believes that the Russian Federation can be sovereign and at the same time having delegated a whole range of functions to the centre, Yeltsin considers that questions of defence, foreign policy, communications and finance, including a common Soviet currency, should be determined by the central government. He believes there should be common armed forces for all the republics.

The Democratic Bloc in the Ukrainian parliament holds completely different positions. We believe that Ukraine can be independent only when it has an independent financial system, its own currency, its own bank, its own armed forces and foreign policy. To take from the republics these functions means to create a new empire with a new facade. It is patently clear that a confrontation is building here between the centre and the republics. Gorbachev is trying to impose upon the republics a new union treaty, while the republics are trying to free themselves from these new shackles.

Question: Will the Ukrainian armed forces make Ukraine a nuclear power?

*Horyn:* The answer to this question is given clearly in our sovereignty declaration: "The Ukrainian SSR solemnly declares its intention to become a permanently neutral state which does not participate in any of the military blocs and which adheres to three non-nuclear principles: not to accept, not to produce and not to acquire nuclear weapons". *Question:* How can you ensure your independence if states around you have nuclear forces? What is to stop a future Russian government reimposing its sovereignty over Ukraine with the threat of nuclear weapons?

*Horyn:* The contemporary world exists on the basis of adherence to international accords. Non-compliance with international accords by any one country evokes the protest not only by one other state but by the entire international community. Ukraine is a member of the United Nations. And it has the right to establish whatever status that best suits her development. Ukraine's participation in the United Nations has until now been largely formal, merely adding one more vote to the empire's interests. But when Ukraine becomes an independent state, it will be a subject of international relations and will define her own place in the United Nations.

Processes which are presently unfolding in Ukraine are consistently democratic; they evoke no confrontation whatsoever between the national communities living here; and this is a guarantee that Ukraine can pursue her independence in an evolutionary-revolutionary manner.

The democratic forces of Ukraine have to their credit that notwithstanding the country's large population and great variety of nationalities there are no inter-ethnic conflicts breaking out in Ukraine. Under Stalin it was not only the Ukrainian nation that suffered in Ukraine, but the members of all nationalities that live here. Under Brezhnev there was the idea to merge (zlyty) all the nations into one nation and thus to form a Soviet people (narod). The democratic forces of Ukraine presently defend the right of every national community to its national-cultural autonomy.

After many years, synagogues have reopened in Lviv. Jewish schools are about to open. There is a Jewish Society, an Armenian Cultural Society, a Polish Cultural Society. And we believe that every national community has a right to build its own life according to its linguistic, religious and cultural traditions. The democratic forces of Ukraine call upon all citizens of Ukraine to work together to build an independent state in which it will be better for everyone to live — for Ukrainians, Poles, Jews and Armenians.

*Question:* Is the independent Ukraine that you envisage to be contained within the present boundaries of the Ukrainian Soviet republic or do you have other plans? And do you foresee internal divisions, say between eastern and western Ukraine?

*Horyn:* There are many issues lodged within this question. First of all, the democratic forces of Ukraine take the position that one can build an independent state only on condition that border issues are not broached. We consider that raising border issues by any republic would deflect energies and prevent attainment of the essential task of building an independent state. This means that Ukraine should build its own state within those boundaries now defined on the map. Problematic

issues about boundaries with neighbouring states may be discussed by competent parliamentary commissions only when there are independent state institutions.We learned recently that the little republic of Moldavia is raising the question of its borders. We regard this issue as very inopportune and, with respect to certain political circles in Moldavia, without perspectives. Republics that wish to gain independence should help one another to do so, and not argue about borders.

Ukraine is a sufficiently large republic in terms of its population and territory, and presently the main issue is to assure itself a high standard of living and to build an independent state within her existing borders. Thus we conform with the Final Helsinki Act [of 1975] in not raising border issues, but in conformity with this same Act we have a right to self-determination. There has been an incorrect view in many diplomatic circles of several Western countries that the Soviet Union is a single, unitary state. The Soviet Union is composed of republics, and each republic has a right to its own state life. This does not contradict today's international laws and accords.

*Question:* What kind of economy do you foresee in Ukraine and what is going to happen with the all-union industrial complex?

*Horyn:* Before answering this question, I wish to say that Ukraine considers the system which has been in place up to now completely inappropriate to our existence. We believe that Marxism-Leninism has completely failed to justify itself as a life-supporting theory. It would be right in the present circumstances to reject this theory that has failed to assure any country a high standard of development — neither Poland nor Rumania nor Czechoslovakia nor the Soviet Union. But Soviet leaders don't have enough courage or radicalism in deed to do so. That is why the only acceptable variant for raising the economic level of the republics can be a transition to a free market.

Of course this transaction will entail a whole set of complications. If one republic goes over to the market sooner, then another republic which has not gone over will suffer. If Russia goes over to the free market then prices for basic commodities will immediately go up; and Russians will travel en masse to Ukraine to buy up cheap commodities. Ukraine will then have to go over to the free market immediately as well in order to defend itself economically. Such self defence will also have to take the form of establishing its own currency. There is discussion already about a separate currency in Russia. There is even discussion about a separate currency for Moscow itself; others talk of a national currency for the Russian Federation. All this testifies to the break-up of the empire before our very eyes.

*Question:* Has anybody made a serious calculation of the resources of Ukraine, the balance of payments and the trade pattern of a future Ukraine?

*Horyn:* There is a formidable concentration of highly qualified economists in the Ukrainian parliament who are presently making a balance sheet of Ukraine's resources expressed in hard currency terms. Up to now the centre took from us manganese, sugar, grain and other products, and we did not know how much they were worth on the world market. With a transition to a free market and knowing the price of each commodity, we can offer it to another republic on the basis of its world market price.

We are dependent on Russia for petrol. The lack of petrol in Ukraine has had a serious effect upon the harvest. But Ukraine supplies Russia with sugar, iron ore, meat, sulphur, manganese, and if we propose to Yeltsin an accord, then in this way we will re-regulate our economic relations. You have to remember that this big empire has its economy concentrated in the European region, especially its agricultural and industrial potential. I'd like to show you this on a map [Horyn folds out map entitled Agropromyshlennii kompleks SSSR]. When we examine the sugar industry — this is rose-coloured on the map — it is in Ukraine. Sugar production is concentrated here; there's none over there. Ukraine, the Baltic region, Moldavia and part of Russia are the basis of economic development for the whole empire. This is empty — where the concentration camps are.

Question: It may be empty, but its empty with petrol and gold and diamonds...

*Horyn:* Yes. Ukraine's share in gold reserves will be decided by separate negotiations with the centre. It is not only because of Russia that the centre of the empire has large gold and diamond reserves.

Question: They have already handed the diamonds over to South Africa.

Horyn: Every republic should get its share. This will not be easy or straightforward, but we will demand it.

*Question:* Do you propose having your own treaty with De Beers? The reserves of Soviet diamonds are not held in Moscow, but in London — one billion dollars worth.

Horyn: And the gold? Is it in Moscow?

Question: Its in Switzerland now. Three hundred tons were delivered there in the past two weeks. Its being passed on very quickly now, very quickly.

Horyn: These are not simple problems that can be resolved in a few days.

Question: Do you expect these negotiations to take place on a friendly basis?

*Horyn:* Before negotiations there will be strong pressure from Moscow and an attempt to frighten the republics into joining a new imperial complex. We are aware that several drafts of a new union treaty are being prepared in Moscow and these will be circulated among the republics. Three variants with which members

of the Ukrainian parliament have become acquainted are those which seek to build a new empire. I think there are sufficient forces in each republic to mount protests against a new colonial enslavement. It will not be easy for Moscow to draw the republics into a new yoke.

The level of national and political consciousness is growing very rapidly in Ukraine today. This applies not only to the western oblasts where a democratic order has been introduced, but also in the eastern oblasts where analogous processes are taking place. The best proof of this is that the Donbas miners mounted a political strike [on July 11]. Their fundamental demand was for the parliament to adopt the declaration on Ukraine's sovereignty. They don't know the Ukrainian language, but they strive for Ukraine's independence. In that there is also a certain paradox.

Question: During the Soviet period and the attack on the Ukrainian culture, the Ukrainian Church, and so on, the cities were essentially Russian-speaking, the industrial cities were populated largely by ethnic Russians and the Ukrainian language remained alive only in the villages and the countryside. Is that still the case, and is there now a non-ethnic Ukrainian nationalism?

*Horyn:* Russification of the population of all republics was one of the most important tasks of Brezhnev's ideological apparatus. The methodology was very carefully worked out. If in Lviv there were Poles who had two Polish schools, then these schools taught the Polish and Russian languages, but not Ukrainian. If in Lithuania there were Polish schools, then these schools taught Polish and Russian, but not Lithuanian. This was the diabolical plan of Russification. Polish children in Ukrainian Lviv could not converse in Ukrainian with Ukrainian children. The opposite process is underway at the moment: all national minorities are being reborn to a self-conscious national, cultural and political life. It is important that this process takes place on a democratic basis. And that is why those national minorities that live in Ukraine — Armenians, Jews and Poles — having understood the essence of the previous imperial politics are beginning to go over to the Ukrainian language. They retain the right to speak in their native language, but they understand that each republic has its own language.

We are now witnessing a process whereby the most russified cities are taking up the ideas of national rebirth, the symbol of which is the national blue-and-yellow flag. This flag now hangs over the highest point of Lviv — the city hall. It was a complete surprise to us that Zhytomyr city council resolved to fly the blue-andyellow flag over Zhytomyr. The members of parliament were astonished to see this flag over Kyiv city hall on Khreshchatyk Boulevard. The well-known russified city of Dniprodzerzhynsk sent a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet named [Sergei] Konev. He's not Ukrainian; perhaps a little Ukrainian and a little Russian. Well, Konev became the initiator in Dniprodzerzhynsk of the attempt to fly the blue-andyellow flag there. A paradoxical phenomenon. The democratic processes unfolding in Ukraine are close to his heart and he has joined in that process.

Question: Food supplies are threatened because the collective farm system is such a poor system. If the agricultural sector goes over to private farming, it will be easier both for Russians and Ukrainians because it will mean that instead of importing grain from America, Russia can import from Ukraine. And oil — it can be acquired more economically, because Odessa is close to the Middle East. Its not far — just across the sea.

*Horyn:* Ukraine has a population of 52 million, and each year it gives 52 million tons of grain — that is one ton per person. An impressive figure. Of that one ton per person, a small part is consumed directly, and the rest is to feed pigs, chicken, and in this way there are meat, eggs, bread, and enough left over to export. Ukraine is well covered in this respect. It always exported, but under communism one did not know where all of it went.

Ukraine has sugar. It gives the Soviet Union half of its sugar.

Question: Tobacco, too, no?

*Horyn:* Yes, lots of it. But that's not important — people can live without tobacco. Ukraine can normally join in relations with any European state on the basis of reciprocity and agreement.

I don't want to pass over one very important point. Why was the empire and the existence of a single Soviet Union so terrible for us? Ukraine holds much of the heavy industry. Ninety-five per cent of Ukraine's enterprises are responsible not to Kyiv, but to Moscow — 95 per cent! It's clear to us that these enterprises give massive returns — some say 50-60 billion roubles worth of goods. And Moscow leaves us with 5 billion roubles worth of goods.

*Question:* Yeltsin has a different point of view. He says that the poor Russian people give to everyone else. And such people as the Ukrainians only take, but have nothing to give.

*Horyn:* Its wonderful that he sees it that way. Wonderful! And he wants to be independent. Let him be.

(... further discussion around map about the concentration of industry ...)

For a long time the West did not understand even the most elementary matters. The West was told: heaven forbid that the empire should fall apart. That would be most unfortunate for the West. It would be best for the West if there was a strong empire with a strong army and for the West to slumber, fearing lest the Soviet Union attack. What a paradox! They give credits to the Soviet Union and say: arm yourselves and be strong so that we can be afraid of you! I have met some Western political figures who say: Listen, Europe is uniting and you are breaking yourselves apart. I say — fine, when we acquire the status that England and France enjoy, we will also start uniting between ourselves. Give us the opportunity to attain such a status and we will unite with the whole world! But we will not have the Soviet Union, Soviet rockets and Soviet provocations looming over our heads. We need once and for all to live peacefully and better than we do. And we can live better only when there will no longer be such a terrible empire in Europe and the world. And the West should finally understand this. The break-up of the empire is to the good of the whole world, and not only for Ukraine and the Baltic states which want to be independent. It is necessary to take this message to the widest political circles and the international community.

# Lenin Monument Removed in Lviv

by Petro Shmigel — UCIS/Australia

"People power" triumphed again in Ukraine as the monument to V.I. Lenin the founder of the Soviet system — was removed in Lviv on September 14 with 50,000 residents present. The action was taken in accordance with a decision of the democratically-elected Lviv City Council.

"The demolition of the Lenin monument in Lviv is another victory for the national-democratic movement in Ukraine", said Stefania Shabatura, a city councilwoman and former political prisoner. "With every day, communists in the bureaucracy must heed the decisions of elected bodies".

The series of events leading to the monument's demolition began with a public meeting on September 13 in front of the monument. Organized by a "defenders of Lenin" committee, the meeting soon turned into a confrontation between hard-core communists and citizens wishing to demolish the monument. The advantage quickly swung to the nationalists and they proceeded to throw red paint at the monument and drape it with posters reading "Lenin — Out of Lviv".

On the following day, September 14, the Lviv City Council began its first session following summer recess and soon took up the issue of the monument's removal. Thousands of citizens — Ukrainian national flags and posters in hand — gathered outside the City Council's premises in the historic Rynok Square and listened to the debate over a public address system. During statements by communist council members who opposed the demolition proposal, the crowd did its loud best to express its disfavour.

Anticipating a positive decision from the City Council, tremendous numbers of citizens simultaneously descended on the actual monument in front of the opera house in the city's centre. Public safety teams from Rukh (Popular Movement of Ukraine), clad in paramilitary uniforms, ensured order.

At 5:00 p.m., debate concluded in the City Council and voting on the demolition

proposal was held. The final tally read: more than 100 council members "for" demolition and only 8 "against". Word quickly reached the crowds waiting at the monument and huge cheering broke out as an awaiting crane began to move into position.

The sea of people parted to make way for council members who soon walked over from their premises. The people's deputies raised their hands over their heads to signify victory and were boisterously received. Meanwhile, workers from Rukh and the Ukrainian Republican Party readied the monument for the crane's steel cable. Leaders of the demolition squad appealed for "a display of civilized behaviour" on the part of the present citizens and asked that all national flags and political posters be put away. Compliance with the appeal was complete.

"The organizers of the demolition — Rukh and the Republicans — wished to avert creating the appearance of a lawless mob. The tone of the crowd was calm, though triumphant", said an eyewitness.

By 7:00 p.m., Lenin hung from a steel cable over a huge crowd of joyous Lviv residents. His statue was placed onto a truck and driven away; its future fate is as yet officially undetermined.

When asked to describe his feelings upon witnessing the demolition, Yaroslav Kendzior, a councilman, replied: "In brief — finally!".

Well into the night, Lviv residents milled about the demolition site in order to convince themselves that Lenin was indeed gone.

As work on demolishing the monument's foundation proceeded the following morning, workers discovered marble slates that appeared to come from local cemeteries. Experts are as yet to determine the slates' origin.

From September 14 to 16, monuments of Lenin were also demolished in the western Ukrainian cities of Drohobych, Stryi and Truskavtsi.

# A Profile on Ukraine's Hunger-Strikers

by Petro Shmigel, UCIS/Australia

On Khreshchatyk Boulevard in Kyiv, 300 hunger-striking Ukrainian students are challenging an empire. Thousands more students are conducting daily, peaceful demonstrations in favour of independence and democracy for Ukraine. Ukrainians from all generations and backgrounds — ranging from parliamentarians to peasants — are rallying to support the students' demands.

Students are leading the way in confronting Moscow's domination of Ukraine from the beginning of what can fairly be called "the new Ukrainian revolution". Since 1988, Ukraine's student movement has progressively increased its membership, widened the scope of its activities, and strengthened its influence on the larger society. Indeed, the hunger strike, which is entering its third week, is the culmination of the students' organizational and political development. The Lviv-based Student Brotherhood — which originated the concept of the hunger strike at a September 10 meeting of its executive at which this reporter was present — is typical of the student movement's growing power and seriousness.

Andriy Deshchytsia, a 27-year-old student of history and a member of the Student Brotherhood's external affairs committee, described the origins of the Brotherhood: "In the mid-1980s, the Komsomol and other official student organizations were not defending the interests of students. Indeed, they were acting against their own members and serving the interests of administrative-party organs. In these circumstances, among certain students in Lviv's higher learning institutions arose the idea of an organization that would truly defend the rights of students, that would renew respect for Ukrainian students and intellectuals. In November 1988, our first 'discussion groups' were formed".

On May 25, 1989, these various 'discussion groups' united to officially form the Student Brotherhood; 76 delegates represented the Lviv University and the polytechnic, fine arts, medical, agricultural, and publishing institutes of Lviv. The initial goals of the "brothers" (as they refer to themselves): to break the grip of the Communist Party on higher education and to support the democratization process underway in Ukraine.

The Brotherhood's activities took off. Monuments to the Sich Riflemen who fought for Ukraine's independence in the World War I era were restored. Publications highlighting Ukraine's repressed history and authors were founded. Massive public meetings protesting against communist control of higher education were staged. "Brothers" (and also "sisters") took an active role in the January 21 "Ukrainian Wave" to commemorate Ukraine's Proclamation of Independence. On a cultural level, ancient Ukrainian Christian traditions — such as Christmas pageants and Easter dances — were revived. A hunger strike to protest against the arrest of nationalist students in Kyiv was conducted in February 1990; the authorities were forced to release the arrested students.

By April 1990, the Student Brotherhood had established a reputation in Lviv. Five members were elected to the new democratically-controlled Lviv City Council, and Markian Ivashchyshyn, the Brotherhood's president, was elected to the democratically-controlled Lviv Oblast Council.

The pattern is clear. Starting from a desire for reforms in their daily student lives, the Student Brotherhood and other similar organizations, such as the Independent Ukrainian Youth Association (SNUM), the Ukrainian Student Union of Kyiv, the "Lev" Society, and the "Spadshchyna" (Heritage) Society, recognized their role in Ukraine's campaign for independence. In short, they did what students do; they looked, learned and then acted for justice.

Now, a monument to Lenin — symbol of the colonial system they seek to depose — looms down on them as they attempt to force the disbandment of the

communist-controlled Supreme Soviet of Ukraine, many of whose members "won" their seats under questionable circumstances. The political stakes have been raised higher than ever in the "new Ukrainian revolution".

And many Ukrainians pray that Kyiv will know no "Tianenmens" of its own.

# Red Army Major: Independence for Ukraine By Petro Shmigel UCIS/Australia

VINNYTSIA—The Soviet military machine in Ukraine is breaking down incident by incident, individual by individual. Young men of conscription age are refusing to report for mandatory military duty. On October 10, eight military personnel — including a lieutenant colonel — were killed by fellow soldiers who were apparently attempting to desert. On that same day, Ukraine's Supreme Soviet resolved that Ukrainians should serve only on Ukraine's territory.

And then, there is the example of Major Leonid Brovchenko, who has served in the Soviet army for 23 years. For, Brovchenko, assigned to the Soviet army detachment in the Vinnytsia oblast of Russified central Ukraine, is now an active opponent of Moscow's domination over Ukraine. He chairs the local Popular Movement of Ukraine (Rukh) committee to protest against the widespread abuse of new recruits in the Soviet military.

At a September 4 public meeting here in memory of Vasyl Stus (a Ukrainian poet who died in Perm concentration camp No. 35 in 1985), Brovchenko said: "Persecution in the army continues. The 'didushchyna' system whereby new recruits are physically and psychologically brutalized by officers and veteran enlisted men — 'didy' — lives on. We must defend our children from the Soviet military establishment. If we don't, no one will".

Brovchenko, who appears publicly in his Soviet army uniform, resigned from the Communist Party in August. The resignation came after his military and party superiors unsuccessfully attempted to have him placed in a psychiatric hospital. His "mental imbalance": last spring, he ran for election to Ukraine's Supreme Soviet on a democratic platform.

"I was accused of being mentally ill and an order was given to somehow frame me. Soon, 'eyewitnesses' came forward, attesting that I am a socially-dangerous individual", Brovchenko writes in his statement of resignation from the Communist Party.

Now, Brovchenko has changed camps and has come over to the nationaldemocratic movement in Vinnytsia, where the political situation is acute. The city remains draped in banners proclaiming "Glory to the Communist Party"; the Ukrainian language is considered "provocative". The local party apparatus regularly ignores or derails decisions taken by the democratically-controlled City Council. The September 4 meeting at which Brovchenko spoke took place under the watchful eyes of a detachment of militiamen and countless more plainclothes KGB operatives.

Viktor Ivasiunko, a local Ukrainian Republican Party leader, who has been detained and beaten for his activism, commented: "We still have a long way to go in Vinnytsia. The 'powers that be' here are putting up a tremendous struggle to preserve their positions of privilege. Having someone like Brovchenko come to us is a real victory".

Ultimately, Brovchenko holds no hope that the Soviet army is capable of selfreform, arguing that the present officer corps consists of those promoted solely on the basis of loyalty to the Moscow-controlled, communist system. For Brovchenko, the solution lies elsewhere.

"Ukraine ought to be a free, independent, sovereign, and nuclear-free country with its own professional army. We must not allow a new union treaty", Brovchenko said at the September 4 meeting to a crowd of approximately 1,000 nationalists, some holding the revolutionary red-and-black flag.

No doubt Ukrainians are unaccustomed to hearing such statements from a man wearing the uniform of the Soviet army — the military organization that invaded independent Ukraine in Moscow's name in 1919 and that fought nationalist partisans in the 1940s-50s. And, in 1990, with perhaps many more "Brovchenkos" in its ranks, it is a military organization on the verge of self-destruction.